



2006/ED/EFA/MRT/PI/47

Background paper prepared for the
Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2006
Literacy for Life

Real options for policy and practice in Nepal

Dr. Bidya Nath Koirala in support of Bhanu Raj Aryal
2005

This paper was commissioned by the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report* as background information to assist in drafting the 2006 report. It has not been edited by the team. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the *EFA Global Monitoring Report* or to UNESCO. The papers can be cited with the following reference: "Paper commissioned for the *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2006, Literacy for Life*". For further information, please contact efareport@unesco.org

Real options for policy and practice in Nepal

Dr. Bidya Nath Koirala in support of Bhanu Raj Aryal

Nepali context

Literacy in Nepal is equated with reading and writing ability of an individual. Officially this concept of literacy was endorsed by the Ministry of Education and Culture in the mid 1980s.. Contrasting to this concept the culture holds oral tradition. This provides two rooms in literacy education, one for general literacy with emphasis on 3Rs; and two for extension education in the field of agriculture, health, and environment. The 3Rs type literacy was traditionally handed down by the people of high casteⁱ and high ethnicⁱⁱ groups. This traditional practice of handing down literacy can be understood as “class literacy”. Mass literacy in Nepal is thus a recent phenomenon backed by the political opening of the country to the Western world in 1950. The same thing applies to the oral literacy which was expanded along with the development of modern means of communication. However there were cultural approaches to expand literacy through religious forumsⁱⁱⁱ. Public exhibitions and market place called *haat bazaar* were some of the other venues for the expanded oral literacy programs (massive oral literacy programs in the field of agriculture, health, and family planning). These programs were also considered helpful to encourage people for written literacy.

Though Nepal initiated its general literacy program in the late 40s, the “planned initiatives” appeared only after 1956. From then on there have been many twists and turns in the field of literacy education (Sharma, 2058 BS^{iv}). These twists and turns can be divided into program phase (1956 to 1970), intensive activity phase (1970 to 1980), campaign phase (1980 to 1985), mass awareness phase (1986 to 2000), , and education for all phase (2000 to 2009). To some extent these phases overlap. In the program phase literacy was conceived as a means to address educational needs of the illiterate adults who wanted by subscribe education for them. In the campaign phase, literacy was made a vehicle to reach illiterate adults and out of school children. In the mass awareness phase, it became an entry point to development initiatives and a way to organize people for learning, earning, and action. In the intensive activity phase literacy program was confined to the specific location with integrated contents to cater the learning needs of the adults. And in education for all phase literacy has been understood as a supplementary and complementary to formal education system to address the educational needs of the out of school children, neo-literates, and illiterate adults. Each phase carried its specialty however the campaign and intensive activity phase contributed more to the written literacy while the mass awareness phase made more people critical against the structure and the culture. Moreover it has been understood as nonformal education for people of different abilities, ages, and interests. But in all the phases, literacy education got less importance. The current budgetary provision that ranges from 0.50 to 0.67% of the educational budget (Appendix 1 to 1.4) in three consecutive fiscal years (CERID, 2004; EFA core document, 2002; Informal Sector Research and Society, 2004), stands as a proof. Because of this limited resource support, literacy program has contributed only 3% in the expansion of literacy rate in Nepal (NFEC, 2002).

The literacy context above provides policy and practice options as (a) increment of literacy budget (b) promotion of literacy through modern means of communication, and (c) law enforcement on local political bodies to allocate specific percentage of budget for literacy education.

Definition and concept of literacy

Over the years, literacy has been defined as 3Rs + functionality in Nepal. With this definition the country had 53.74% literacy rate in 2001. A total of 5.88% people could read but they were not found able to write (MOES/Thematic report, 2003). The same source claimed that the female literacy rate stood as 45% while male literacy rate was 70%. Even with this definition, the literacy rate of the Dalit (22 socially untouchable caste groups) ranges from 5 to 30% while it varies from 10 – 80% among 62 ethnic groups (Koirala and Acharya, 2004). The same scenario applies with the female literacy rate. For example, "upper caste" female literacy rate was 55.9 while the Dalits' literacy rate was 24.2%, *Janajati's* (60 indigenous groups of people) 43.1%; and religious minorities' 22.7% (Acharya, 2004). Geography, caste/ethnicity, and gender disparity in literacy attainment is also obvious (Appendices, 6; 6.1; 6.3; 6.4; 6.7). Besides, the literacy data vary from sources to sources however they provide a room for caste/ethnicity and locations specific targeted planning for literacy promotion.

Very recently the definition of literacy has been expanded from 3Rs+ functionality to the access to formal education at Open University (NFEC, 2004). Though widely defined the document has yet to get sanction from the NFE Council, the policy making body for literacy education. On the other hand Basic Primary Education Program (BPEP) which was latter on conceptualized as EFA, defined literacy as the amalgamation of three elements viz., basic literacy, updating skills, and continuing education (EFA Core Program, 2004 – 2009: 11). In other words BPEP added skill training program in literacy education. This shows that these two documents are yet to be made corresponding to each other.

Nepal is a multi-lingual country with one hundred languages. But the definition of literacy conveyed the meaning that it is literacy in Nepali, the official language of the country implying that to be counted as literate one has to learn Nepali compulsorily. However NFEC in its regulations has mentioned that ethnic language literate can also be considered as literate person. But the practice does not reveal any move towards it. And yet there have been efforts to develop literacy primers in different languages^v. INGOs and their NGO allies have been found instrumental on it.

The changed definition of literacy and the country's multilingual setting gives some policy as well as practice options. These options include (a) massive investment on multilingual literacy program, and (b) preparation for "transfer literacy program" to make all the language groups functional.

Relationship between literacy and development plans

The word development has been understood as critical awareness of the literacy graduates; their initiation to saving and credit; their efforts to handle community forest; and their efforts towards sanskritization^{vi}. On this ground, the relationship between literacy and development dimensions was explored and efforts were made to examine basic and primary education including literacy/NFE related 18 studies (from 1999 to 2001) compiled by CERID (2003). Some of these studies were directly related to literacy education. The analysis of these studies provide information that literacy graduates are made critically aware through key word approach to teaching to pass functional message and enable learners by engaging them in dialogue and discourse (Freire, 1970). They further gave the knowledge that most of the literacy graduates especially female adults were found involved in saving and credit activities. Through these involvement women were reported to be instrumental in changing social dynamism. The third areas of development initiatives include women's activism for forest protection. Currently more than 10,000 community forest users' groups are participating literacy activities. Besides, there were sporadic efforts that literacy graduates especially adults were instrumental in infrastructure development initiatives such as trail maintenance, temple renovation and construction, and water source cleaning exercises. And literacy for the out of school children was related to school re-enrollment and inculcation of the vocational skills. The growing approach to participatory learning and collaborative undertaking for development efforts has been the next approach to literacy and development programs linkages (IFCD, 2004). The fourth initiatives to harmonize literacy with development plan are the implementation of literacy programs from different ministries such as agriculture, forestry, industry and commerce, and health. But the forms and nature of literacy program varies in content, method, materials, and evaluation systems from ministry to ministry. This implies that many of the development programs incorporated literacy education as one of the activities. And in order to coordinate all these ministerial activities NFE Council has been constituted. But the evidence shows that over four years' period the council has not met for a single moment (based on interview with NFEC personnel). Two reasons were often cited for it. One, the NFEC Council has busy ex-officio members such as Secretary of different ministries whose priority is elsewhere. Two, there are no such agenda for NFEC meetings. These reasons provide a clue that though initiated from different forums literacy programs are conducted without coordination at least at the policy levels. But there is another side of it as well. For example, there is NFE coordination committees in each district headquarters. The members of these committees are drawn from literacy organizing agencies no matter they belong to government and non-government sector. These committees meet at least once or twice in a year and discuss about program and resource duplications. This provision was made in the early 1990s and it is still continuing.

The current effort to link literacy with development plans provides room to propose policy and practice options. The options could be (a) periodical sharing sessions of inter ministerial and inter NGO reflection sessions over literacy and development programs,

and (b) joint undertaking of the development and literacy planners of the center to the grassroots

Methodologies for measuring and monitoring literacy

Over the years literacy status was assessed through reported information and question answer approach at the national level during census. Going through the methodologies of the available studies one can feel the emergence of different forms of assessment trends at different levels. But these trends do not necessarily comply with the literacy phases set out in the beginning of this paper. The assessment trend shows that at the classroom level, literacy status was measured and monitored by especially assigned literacy supervisors and literacy organizing agencies. At the program level, literacy status was understood through research tools such as survey form, focus group discussion, individual interview, and supervision report of the mother school (IFCD, 2004; Acharya and Singh, 2002). At the individual level, literacy has been measured through reflection over the past attainments. But the core EFA document (2004 – 2009) and EFA thematic report on nonformal education (2002-2009) implicitly as well as explicitly provide the information that literacy is to be monitored by the especially appointed supervisors, district education authorities, and local government bodies. Besides, both the EFA core document (2004 – 2009) and EFA thematic report (2003) have devised some indicators and indexes to measure and monitor literacy programs that include (a) targeted program to the low literacy groups and locations (b) special focus for the girls and women (c) post literacy school enrollment program for out of school children (d) incorporated life skill education for the out of school children (e) income generation program for neo-literates, and (f) establishment of community learning center (CLC) for the institutionalization of literacy initiatives.

The reflection over the literacy measuring and monitoring methodologies helps propose some policy as well as practice options such as (a) enable literacy organizing agencies develop their own indicators and indexes (b) prepare them to reflect on what they achieved towards centrally developed indicators and indexes, and (c) prepare bi-annual report on it for wider dissemination

Patterns and trends in the incidence of literacy

Review of literatures show that Nepali literacy programs witnessed many trends and patterns (though it does not correspond with the literacy phase set out in the beginning of this paper). These trends and patterns were both local and national. And others were literacy providing agency specific. And yet some of these trends and patterns are continued at the national levels and others are dropped for good reasons (Koirala and Acharya, 2003). For example, Nepal promoted general literacy in its institutionalization days and functional literacy was added in the 70s. Currently the functional literacy is continued with the key word approach to teaching under EFA plan of action. Continuation of REFLECT approach to literacy program is the second trend which was initiated in the late 80s with Action Aid Nepal's initiative. The third trend emerged

with the introduction of community literacy program of World Education Nepal in the mid 1990s. Its templet approach^{vii} to material development and the use of ethno knowledge in literacy program are proposed to be continued under EFA plan for nonformal education (NFEC, 2004 NFE plan and strategies). The fourth trend is the use of CLC as literacy promotion strategy envisaged in Dakar Conference (2000). This strategy was experimented in the early 80s with the name of VRC (village reading centre) and is still continuing and promoting by UNESCO Nepal and NFEC. The fifth trend currently noticed in the EFA initiative is the federation of literacy graduates. This process was though introduced by Save the Children US in the 1970s and has now been expanded by Australian Forest Project and Ministry of Forest through its forest user groups. Other literacy organizing agencies are also promoting this trend. The sixth trend is to promote group saving scheme by providing income generating training to the neo literates. Institutionalized by the Save the Children US in the early 1970s this trend has been mainstreamed under EFA initiatives by NFEC (NFEC, 2004 NFE plan and strategies).

The seventh trend in literacy education is the collaborative undertaking of NFEC/INGO with CBOS/NGOs/local bodies. Initially this trend was introduced by Social Welfare Council in the early 90s and now has been mainstreamed under EFA core program as well. The eighth trend is the national use of literacy primers produced by MOES. Under this all the NFE organizing agencies are using MOES's literacy primers. In addition these primers, NFE agencies are producing local materials to address the educational needs of their target population and NFEC supported NGOs/CBOs/local bodies are also using the materials produced other agencies. This means there is reciprocity of material use among the literacy organizers. Paper and pencil test is the ninth trend to assess the achievement of the literacy participants. This trend is also continued along with the proposed individual portfolio assessment system (NFEC, 2004 NFE plan and strategies) to trace the progress of the individual learner. The tenth trend is the use of Freirean approach to teaching called critical pedagogy which was introduced in the 70s. The eleventh trend is the implementation of intensive literacy program as a campaign. The intensive literacy program was experimented and expanded by Integrated Hill Development Project in the 70s while the latter was tested in the mid 80s by the MOES. But the EFA core document has planned for intensive literacy program and left literacy campaign for good. The EFA thematic group report however has proposed to implement literacy campaign as well. In line with this proposal, NFEC has developed its plan (2004 – 2009) to eradicate illiteracy from the low literacy settlement/caste/ethnic groups/female group through alternative school program for the out of school children and adult literacy program for males and female. The twelfth trend includes the introduction of action research in literacy program to get policy, strategy, program, material, pedagogy, and material development feedbacks. Since this trend is recently introduced in Nepal it is yet to be crystallized for wider application.

The reflection over the trends above provides the knowledge that they are both the strengths and weaknesses of literacy education. They are strengths because the country got varieties of tested ideas in the field of literacy. They are also weaknesses because the country could not get a specific trend that can be mainstreamed and be made national. Despite these strengths and weaknesses, the above trends and patterns help generate some policy and practice options. These options are (a) preparation of similar trend pursuing literacy organizing agencies for its specialization (b) development of national forums for shared learning, and (c) publication of NFE journal that help interface the national with international trends.

Determinants of high or low levels of literacy

Review, experience, and reflection help us understand that there are number of determinants of higher and lower level of literacy status. The EFA thematic report (2003) provides a glimpse on

it through its priority base. According to the report, being Dalit is one of the determinants of being illiterate. This implies that hierarchical caste system is the determinants of high/low participation of people in literacy. For example, 55.4% women of hill upper caste women were literate in 2001 while the literacy rate of the Dalit women was 31.8%. This statistics clearly shows that touchability and untouchability is one of the determinants of literacy participation. The second determinant is the ethnicity of the people. For example, the female literacy of the caste groups was 55.9% in 2001 while it was 43.1% to the Janajati (ethnic groups). This figure provides the knowledge that ethnicity is also another determinants of low/high participation in literacy program. The third determinant is the religious belief. For example, only 22.7% of the religious minority groups were literate in 2001. Remoteness is the fourth determinant of literacy participation. The rural urban disparity of literacy rate (6.3; 6.5 a, b) and GDI value of rural and urban setting (0.430:0.562) stand as proof. Apart from these, there are two other cross-cutting determinants of literacy participation widely known as gender and economic status. In other words more males and people from the high income groups are literate. The GDI value of 0.452 against HDI value of 0.471 is another proof (UNDP Nepal, 2004). The estimated HPI figure of 39.6% at the national level, 42.0% of rural area and 25.2% of urban area correspond to the literacy situation of that location (Ibid). In addition to them there are other determinants as well that include cultural value attached with literacy, utility of being literate in life, and access to transportation and communication facilities. A decade long Nepal Communist Party (Maoist) war against state and recently declared state of emergency by the king are some other determinants to restrict literacy movement in the country. The Maoist war against state has created security problem to the literacy organizers and beneficiaries while the recently imposed state of emergency has nurtured suspension among literacy learners and practitioners to implement critical literacy program in the villages. And Maoist themselves are not organizing literacy programs as such.

The discussion above generates some policy and practice options. These options include (a) identification of educationally excluded groups' settlement (b) introduction of settlement illiteracy eradication program (c) preparation of Dalit and Janajati specific learning materials for them and others (d) preparation of "critically empowered" literacy graduates for peaceful negotiation with the authorities, and (e) development of cultural value specific literacy materials.

Excluded groups of literacy program

The determining forces to include and exclude a group of people from education showed that there are number of educationally excluded people in Nepal. These people come from caste group such as Dalit, ethnic group such as *Janajati*, and religious minority group such as Muslim. The table given in the appendices (5 & 5.1) present the list of these groups along with their literacy status (Appendices, 6 to 6.7 and also see appendices 6.9.1 to 6.9.7 for additional information). Interestingly in all these groups, girls and women are the most excluded groups of people whose literacy rate is half or less in the *Dalit*, *Janajati* and so called higher caste and ethnic groups (Map 1, 2, and 3). This situation provides option for the preparation of literacy materials that depict the reasons to be excluded, practices to include, and approaches to be included in the mainstream values.

Policy strategies that make a difference

There have been number of policies and operational strategies for the expansion of literacy education Appendix, 3). These policies and strategies were developed and implemented by different literacy organizers. Even the EFA core document and EFA thematic report mentioned

them. But very few efforts were made to compile these policies and strategies. In this consideration NFEC (2004a and 2004b) compiled those policies and strategies, organized series of reflection sessions with literacy organizing agencies, and finally prepared a report that is yet to be sanctioned by the NFE Council. Because of the participatory process involved in policy and strategies development process, some changes have been experienced. For example, literacy organizers are now discussing gender, child labours, Dalit, and language transfer as well as language promotion issues. But these discussions are yet to be crystallized for a definite shape in literacy education. Despite these positive aspects of change, the deteriorating security system because of Maoist war against state; security threats to the literacy funding partners of the nation, UN, and the abroad, and the threats to the literacy organizing agencies as well as donor agencies at the grassroots level have made difficulties to implement the envisaged policies and strategies into action. This situation gives clues to propose some policy and practice options. They are (a) creation of institutional profile on changes occurred within a year (b) compilation of such changes for wider circulation, and (c) dovetailing the research on the effect of change.

Review international commitments to literacy

Over the decades Nepal showed its commitments to eradicate illiteracy at the international forums. Karanchi conference of 1975, Jomtein conference of 1990, and Dakar conference of 2000 are some examples. In these conferences and confectia Nepal committed to reduce illiteracy if not eliminated from the soil (Appendix 4). Consequently in all its development plans (from 1956 to the present 10th plan under PRSP) the country has been targeting to reduce illiteracy. But in practice these plans tend to be ambitious. For example, following the spirit of Jomtein conference 9th plan (2000-2004) set the target to achieve 70% literacy rate. But the data in 2001 showed that it was 16% less than the planned literacy rate to be achieved. And yet there has been increased literacy percentage from 2% of the 1950 to 54 % of 2001 (appendix). Unfortunately the absolute number of illiterates is also increasing (Appendix, 6.8) and even if it is decreasing the rate is very low. In other words literacy rate is increasing by 1% a year (NFEC, 2002) while population growth rate is 2.3 (CBS, 2001). The same thing applies to the current EFA initiatives. For instance, it is targeted that by the end of 2015 adult literacy rate which was about 30% in 2000 will be doubled. But the data shows that the present effort of nonformal education programs has only 3% share in the annual increment of literacy rate (NFEC, 2002). It means formal education has 97% contribution in literacy. In one hand this figure raises serious questions about the use of investment in literacy education. On the other hand, it provides the information that more resources are to be allocated to show the tangible contribution from literacy education programs. Besides, the formal education system is not reaching to 18% children (MOES, 2004) and none of them have conducted literacy programs for the adults. Moreover literacy program has been the business of the central government and the local bodies are hardly made accountable to it. The absence of elected bodies in the country and the frequent change in the ministry (14 governments from 1990) has aggravated the situation.

The discussion shows that government commitment though ambitious has been exhibited at the central level programs through PRSP document/10th plan, EFA core program, EFA thematic report, NFEC's plan (2004 – 2009). At the district level they are in one or in

other ways reflected in the District Education Plan (DEP). And at the local level schools are preparing School Improvement Plan (SIP) and local bodies especially Village Development Committees^{viii} (VDC) are preparing Village Education Plan. The information available to the Department of Education/MOES shows that all the districts have prepared DEPs; and almost all of the schools are preparing SIPs. But only a few VEPs are prepared so far. Even the SIPs and DEPs are yet to be internalized prior to be implemented. This implies that accountability for the implementation of these plans at the field level has been questioned because most of the plans are developed as a bureaucratic requirement. In other words it signifies that the planners are yet to be made committed for their implementation.

The reflection over the national and international commitments shows that there are some options for policy and practice. These options include (a) national discussion about the comments prior to be committed (b) preparation and implementation of post international commitments as a follow-up initiative (c) organization of progress review sessions at the district and cluster^{ix}.

Institutional management for literacy education

Ideally there are literacy committees at the classroom level, village/municipality level, district level, and national level. The national level literacy committee works as EFA Forum. Back in the 80s, these committees were conceived and made operational. Representatives for these committees were drawn from local bodies, literacy participants, social activists, and educationists. EFA core document and thematic report reiterated the importance of such committees. But the experience shows that classroom literacy committee and the district literacy committee are active. The district literacy committee meets at least once in a year to avoid resource duplication. Here the question comes are these committees accountable for the eradication of illiteracy in their areas? This question is often answered "no". Even the unfreezing fund made available for Village/District Development Fund under PDDP and LGP initiatives is not ensuring illiteracy eradication (Pokhrel and Koirala, 2003). This implies that the literacy committees have cosmetic value rather than their operational importance.

Local bodies at the village/municipalities at the grassroots and district levels are given some responsibility under decentralization program. But they too are not found operational for the enhancement of literacy education (Ibid). However there are some evidences that local bodies have been implementing literacy campaign. For example, Surkhet, Banepa, Ratnanagar, and Dhulikhel municipalities experimented literacy campaigns in different periods that ranged from 1985 to 2000. The experience obtained in literacy campaign of these municipalities stand as a proof that local bodies given the resources, encouraged to be competitive, entrusted with legal provisions to mobilize funds can be instrumental for literacy expansion. But again these are the urban areas with high literacy rate. And none of the efforts are being geared to implement literacy campaign in the Village Development Committee. In this situation, literacy campaign in a total district can be understood as a far cry.

A concept emerged in the early 90s to entrust INGOs (Appendix, 7) to eradicate illiteracy in a specific district and/or VDC/MDC could not get headway. The discussion with the authorities of the Social Welfare Council^x shows that none of the NGOs and INGOs followed illiteracy eradication approach in a specific location. This implies that NGO/GO coordinating agencies are failed to persuade its allies to work for a specific area. It also shows that these allies feel superior to the SWC and does not respond to its intension. This situation is yet to be improved from both ends.

NFEC's plan (2004 – 2009) developed by the consultants in association with NFEC staff has envisaged the mobilization of government bureaucracy and local bodies simultaneously. But the absence of local bodies and the political vacuum of the country due to Maoist insurgency have affected the smooth operation of NFE plan in general and literacy plan in particular. Regarding the implementation of literacy plan by the bureaucracy itself, the preliminary findings of Kafle's ongoing study (2005) provides a clue that bureaucratic, culture, decentralization process, and lived social culture are not responding to each other to implement DEP at the district level. This means that the three aspects are heading towards their own directions without responding to each other. In other words bureaucracy alone is not in a position to mobilize culture, politics, and the bureaucratic functionaries. In this situation the only option left is to identify and use the accountable- implementing body at the grassroots level.

Government and I/NGO collaboration for literacy enhancement

BPEP mid term reports (2004) and EFA core program (2004 - 2009) reiterated the need of government and I/NGO collaboration for literacy enhancement. Different exercises were done to bring these partners together (Blue star meeting at Kathmandu; regulation for collaborative undertaking between government and NGOs, and Bird and Koirala's report, 2003). Currently there is a section to look after government and I/NGO collaboration in DOE. But the exercises led to generalize that government wants I/NGOs as "carrier agencies" while the I/NGOs expect them to be as "equal partner". This conceptual gap and the perceived power relations between the government and the I/NGOs help generalize that government and INGO collaboration for literacy expansion is yet to be made functional. For example, NGO coordination committee did collaborative planning with the government bureaucracy and political unit called District Development Committee in Dang district but the same thing was not applied in Sunsari district; NGOs in this district worked directly with UNICEF Nepal for children and women's education and health (Pokhrel & Koirala, 2003). This situation provides a clue that NGOs and government are to be reoriented for ego management and collaborative undertaking as policy and practice options.

Is ego intentionally the word here? yes

Resource management for literacy education

Literacy education over the years got less than one percent of the education budget. The budget ranged from 0.50% to .0.75.% (Appendix 2). On the other hand education budget also ranged from 11.5% of the national budget to the 16.17% (CERID, 2004). This budgetary provision provides information that literacy education has not been a priority area of the country but a program to be continued any way (Appendix 4 for unit cost in literacy program). Incremental budget in terms of the availability of the amount in education sector is an evidence of it (MOES, Education budget from 1990 onward). On the other hand, there are no such research and survey reports that help us know about INGOs' investment in literacy education nor there are any reports about the total contribution of I/NGOs in literacy enhancement. A crude estimate gives the figure of 60:40 ratio of the I/NGOs and government (discussion with the MOES authorities) contribution in literacy program.

Over the years UNESCO national commission and UNESCO Nepal have been capacitating literacy personnel in Nepal and in abroad. Very few of the abroad trained high level personnel (Appendix 8) are involved in literacy activities these days. At grassroots level as well a huge number of literacy facilitators, supervisors, and NGO/CBO personnel have been prepared so far. The same thing applies with the medium level human resources at the district level. But the ongoing research (UNESCO Nepal, 2005) shows that none of these literacy program organizing agencies were able to give the list of the trained literacy personnel over the years. This situation provides two scenarios. One, there is a lack of updated data base about the literacy personnel. Two, none of the agencies even the government has bothered to document and reuse them. However there have been sporadic efforts by CERID and World Education in different periods to compile the information that gives who is who of literacy personnel, at least the contact person. EFA thematic report and EFA core program have envisaged creating, maintaining, updating, and reusing such literacy personnel and yet there has been no headway so far.

The ongoing research undertaken by UNESCO Nepal shows that literacy education organizing INGOs are resourceful. Even the NGOs because of their partnership with the INGOs and government have no resource problem. But sustainability of the initiated program with the initially available resources has always been the problem. And at the grassroots level, there are no such resources and or interests to initiate literacy program with the local fund. This "outward looking mentality" of the literacy organizing agencies provides knowledge that grassroots level organizers lack resources/techniques to generate resources at the grassroots level, and/or attitude to collect and use resources. In order to get rid of this problem DOE under its EFA program has made efforts to canalize budget and implement SIP effectively. But the practice does not seem to be encouraging. For example, the analysis of MOES allocated budget for NFEC and the proposed budget for the implementation of literacy program shows that it is almost 11 times less than the requirement to reach at the lowest literacy rate districts of the country (NFEC, 2004b).

Budgetary reflection of the literacy program provides some policy and practice options. These options are: use of PDDP/LGP approach to (a) create non freezing budget at the

program level, and. (b) allow local political bodies to raise education tax for the expansion of literacy education.

Efforts to increase literacy programs

In the process of expansion of literacy education, Nepal made institutional efforts to mobilize (a) school teachers and students (b) members of the local political bodies (c) community based organizations and NGOs (d) political party cadres (e) MOES technical personnel working at the field level (e) volunteer groups, and (f) non-educational organizations such as forestry, agriculture, and industry related ministries. These efforts though experimented time and again have been endorsed by the two EFA thematic reports such as adult literacy and gender and social parity in education. This implies that these efforts are technically correct but they are yet to be implemented by the accountable institutions at the grassroots level.

In relation to economic efforts, MOES has been harnessing national, international, and UN resources to enhance literacy program. Currently NFEC is getting economic support to literacy programs from DANIDA, DFID, UNESCO, and JAICA. Apart from their economic support these agencies are providing technical backup for the expansion of literacy education in Nepal. These external support needs to be replaced by the preparation of critical mass at the program location as a policy option.

Innovative programs in literacy education

Literacy education program witnessed number of innovative ideas. Some of them are mainstreamed and others are died out for reasons. These ideas emerged out of the analysis of NFE program from 1990 to 2005 (Appendix 2). But very few of these innovative approaches have been mainstreamed so far. It is partly because these experimented ideas are inadequately disseminated and partly because literacy organizing agencies hesitate to take risk and spend more resources on it. This situation calls for the development and implementation of self reported format to collect and compile innovative programs in literacy education.

Issues in literacy education

Issues usually invite discussions and get headway to be resolved. Among such issues include: How to promote mother tongue literacy programs with 100+ languages of the country? How to promote language transfer approach for mother tongue literacy learners? How to make the mother tongue literacy materials inexpensive and easily available? How to increase girls and women's participation in literacy programs? How to make all the literacy practicers gender sensitive that are living in the gender biased and hierarchical culture? How to eradicate caste based untouchability and touchability to make Dalits easily acceptable in literacy programs? How to manage INGO's "show free approaches" and the identity consciousness" associated with it? How to ensure support services to the "once empowered" literacy participants? How to make formal and nonformal education programs compatible to each other and help learners for advanced

learning? How to generate and use indigenous knowledge and organizations for literacy enhancement? How to ensure operational blend of research and action for improved literacy programs? How to ensure the updated literacy EMIS from grassroots to the central levels? How to activate indigenous supervision, monitoring, and evaluation systems and link with the EFA initiated literacy programs? How to update literacy professionals of different abilities and interests? How to use modern technologies for literacy expansion? How to make local government bodies accountable for illiteracy eradication in the country? How to make poverty reduction program effective through literacy initiatives?

These questions though answered in one or in other way under EFA initiatives demand serious attention. But the efforts made so far do not gear to the level of satisfaction. In other words the issues are yet to be thoroughly discussed and get national consensus prior to implement literacy program in the country. But there is a hope that most of the questions raised above can be answered by the effective implementation of the proposed policy and strategy document which is yet to be sanctioned by the NFE Council.

Policy and practice options

Reflecting upon the EFA provisions against their implementation number of decisions are to be made. One, we have to stop paper work such as preparation of DEP, SIP, and VEP. The resources thus saved should be geared towards their implementation, formative evaluation, and component review for further program. Two, central level people are overly capacitated but their contribution is not reaching to the field. This means the field level functionaries are to be highly equipped to make substantial difference in the field. Three, EFA document envisioned quality control from the local political bodies. MTR (2002) reiterated the importance of EFA provision. But the field lacks accountable agency and competitive environment to implement literacy campaign/program. This implies that we have to identify and prepare these agencies for guaranteed access to literacy education for all. Four, DOE has introduced block grant system to support SIP proposed programs (Ibid). But people at the community level specifically literacy program organizers and participants are inadequately made aware about this provision. This situation requires the mobilization of traditional as well as modern means of communication for community awareness. Five, CLCs over the years are evolving as post literacy program organizing agencies, skill training center, and continuing education outpost. But who will ensure the continuity of the CLCs after the withdrawal of the external resources. We have to address this question as Read Nepal ensured the continuation of its village library (Read Nepal, 2004). Six, language, caste, ethnicity, culture, and topography related diversities are inadequately addressed by the current EFA programs. Though spelled out loudly in the EFA document they have yet to be crystallized for effective implementation including the production of learning materials in different languages with gender concerns in these groups. This situation requires national debate and consensus as a requirement. Seven, the government bureaucracy is shrinking in the villages because of the Maoist insurgency. School teachers, students, literacy workers, and the literacy organizing as well as funding agencies are threatened and terrorized in many ways. This has affected literacy program as well. In order to get rid of this terror and threat, MOES has been trying to make

school a "zone of peace". The concept of "school as zone of peace" can be expanded to make education sector as zone of peace. This work demands national and international efforts for the mediation between warring parties, the Maoist rebellions and the State mechanism and help create learning environment in the villages. Eight, the analysis of 20 research reports shows that policy and action are not backed up by the continuous research especially in girls and women's literacy programs (Bista, 2004). This situation looks for the promotion of built in action research for literacy enhancement. This type of research work though initiated in NFEC could not get headway in the absence of research oriented people. In this consideration, we have to ensure the blend of action research in literacy program.

References

- Acharya, Sushan (2004). *Democracy, gender equality and women's literacy: Experience from Nepal*. A paper presented at the Adult Learning and literacy for democracy and citizenship International Learners Week, September, 2004. Cape Town, South Africa. UNESCO Kathmandu series of monographs and working papers: No. 2.
- Acharya, Sushan and Singh, Ganesh (2002). *Rapid assessment of alternative schools*. A report submitted to European Commission. Lalitpur, Nepal.
- Bird, Cherry and Koirala, B. N. (2003). *NGO modalities for Nepal: A report submitted to European Education Commission*. Lalitpur. Unpublished.
- Bista, Min (2004). *Review of research literature on girls' education in Nepal*. A paper presented at GENIA Meeting Linking Research Findings and Policy Making, 20-22 September, 2004. Seoul, Korea.
- CERID (2003). *Formative research project: Synopsis of research reports (in Nepali)*. Kathmandu. Author.
- CERID (2004). *Fact sheet*. Vol. 7, December. Kathmandu. Center for Educational Innovation and Development.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York. Seabury Press.
- IFCD (2004). *Assessment of out of school children. A report submitted to UNICEF Nepal*. Kathmandu. Innovative Forum for Community Development.
- Kafle, Bhojraj (2005). *Organizational culture of bureaucracy in decentralized education planning in Nepal*. Analysis of the preliminary data collected for Ph. D. thesis to be submitted for Kathmandu University. Unpublished.

Koirala, B. N. and Acharya, S. (2003). Self directed short term literacy: Experience from action research. In *NFEC Bulletin*. Sanothimi, Nepal. NFEC/MOES.

Koirala, B. N. and Acharya, S. (2004). *Celebrating diversities through policy, practice, and research*. A paper presented to the first International Technical Workshop on Strengthening on Literacy and nonformal Education Policies in the Framework of EFA, Paris. July 21 – 24. UNESCO Kathmandu series of monographs and working papers: No. 2.

MOES (2002). *EFA Core Program, 2004 – 2009*. Kathmandu. Author.

MOES (2003). *Compilation of EFA thematic reports*. Kathmandu: Author.

NFEC (2002). *Literacy situation in Nepal: A thematic presentation*. Sanothimi, Nepal: Author.

NFEC (2004a). NFE policies, plan and strategies. Sanothimi, Nepal. Unpublished document.

NFEC (2004b). *NFEC's literacy and NFE plan, 2004 – 2009*. Sanothimi, Nepal. Unpublished document.

Pokhrel, Jagadish and et.al. (2003). UNICEF and decentralization in Nepal. Lalaipur, Nepal. UNICEF Nepal.

Sharma, Gopinath (2058 BS). *History of education in Nepal* (in Nepali). Kathmandu. Makalu Publication.

UNDP Nepal (2004). *Nepal human development report, 2004: Empowerment and poverty reduction*. Lalitpur, Nepal. Author.

UNESCO Nepal, (2005). *NFE resource master plan: Analysis of the preliminary data collected for the development of resource master plan*. Kathmandu. Unpublished.

World Education (2004). *Adolescent girls at risk. Advising girls' health and trafficking*. Kathmandu. Author.

ⁱ "Purity" (blood purity, body purity, mind purity, ritual purity, and food purity) is the base of caste society. Keeping these traditional bases in mind three caste-groups are categorized as High caste, touchable middle caste, and untouchable low caste (Dalit). Brahman, Kshatri of the Aryan blood were considered as high caste groups; Mongoloid groups were regarded as touchable middle caste groups, and labor class people of the Aryan and Dravidian blood were treated as low caste, Dalit.

ⁱⁱ The ethnic group of Mongoloid origin is regarded as egalitarian and yet there are educationally better off people such as Thakali; Lama of Tamang; Ghale of Gurung; and Shrestha of Newar community.

ⁱⁱⁱ Saptahah, Ekaha, Nawaha of the Hindus; lecture sessions of the Buddhists and Namaj session of the Muslims

^{iv} BS is Bikram Era which is 56 year, 8 month, and 14 days ahead of the Christian era. BS starts in the month of April. For example, 14th April, 2005 is the first day of Nepali new year which is 2062

^v . There are literacy primers in (a) hill languages such as Tamang, Magar, Gurung, and Limbu (b) Terai languages such as Tharu, Maithili, and Bhojpuri. But there are post literacy reading materials only in Tharu language.

^{vi} Srinivasan of India coined the word sanskritization to indicate the status of the people as cultured and civilized being.

^{vii} . This is the approach to produce literacy materials in one language and translate it into another language by using the same picture and theme through computers' "cut and paste process".

^{viii} The lowest political unit at the village is Village Development Committee while it is Municipality Development Committee in the city. There are 3999 VDCs and 58 MDCs in the country. At the district level there is District Development Committee which works between parliament and local bodies. There are 75 DDCs in the country. And at the central level there are lower and upper houses. But all these elected bodies are dissolved and recently state of emergency has been imposed by the king.

^{ix} In each cluster there are 8 to 15 schools. Currently the country has approximately 1300 clusters

^x Social Welfare Council registers NGOs and INGOs working in Nepal. The recent data shows that there are 17000 NGOs and 118 INGOs are providing services to the people in different fields and education is one of them. An estimated figure shows that some 300 NGOs and 18 INGOs are conducting literacy programs.

Appendix 1

Budgetary provision and share of NFE

Year in BS.	National Budget	Education Budget	% of national budget for education	Allocated budget to literacy/NFE programs	% of educational budget to literacy/NFE programs
2059/60	96124796	11055611	11.5	70395	0.64
2060/61	102400000	15613274	15.24	77300	0.50
2061/62	11689900	18059654	16.17	120400	0.67

Source: CERID (2004). *Fact sheet*. Vol. 7. December, 2004.

Appendix 1.1

Government expenditure on education (NRs. In million)

Fiscal Year	Total Government exp		Government Expenditure on Education			
	Regular	Development	Regular	% of Total	Development	% of Total
1984/85	2906.2	6213.3	161.4	0.06	61.3	0.01
1990/91	7574.1	16512.8	366.3	0.05	1479.8	0.09
1995/96	21561.9	26542.6	4359.2	0.20	1791	0.07
1999/2000	34523.3	31749.2	6754.8	0.20	2573.7	0.08

Appendix 1.2

Foreign aid commitment by sector

NRs. In million

Fiscal Year	Foreign Aid Committed by Sector		
	All Sector	Education	% on Education budget
1984/85	5991.5	341.4	0.057
1991/92	5665.4	2687.1	0.474
1995/96	16537.3	1062.9	0.064
1999/2000	20448	4034.5	0.197

Appendix 1.3**Foreign aid commitment in education sector (NRs. In Million,)**

Year	2001/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04*
Foreign aid	540.2	2007.4	9208.0	899.8

* In first eight months

Source: District Development Profile of Nepal 2004, Informal Sector Research and Study Centre, Kathmandu, 2004

Appendix 1.4**NFEC's unit cost for literacy education (in NRs)**

Program	Unit cost
Flexible school program	42,000 per center with 30 children for three years
School outreach program	42,000 per center with 30 children for three years
Women's literacy program	875 per participant for 6 months
Income generation program	5000 per beneficiary
Out of school children's program	875 per child per program
Block grant for CLC	50,000 per CLC per year

Source: EFA Core document.

**Appendix 1.5: Allocation of budget on nonformal education (Regular and development budget)
Fiscal Year 1995/96 to 2002/03**

Fiscal Year	Regular Budget		Development Budget		Total Budget on NFE	(% of Total Education Budget on NFE)
	Total	On NFE	Total	On NFE		
1995/96	4,729,367	0	2,501,212	74,093	74,093	1.02
1996/97	5,079,010	0	2,680,287	92,296	92,296	1.19
1997/98	5,455,467	0	2,659,446	120,000	120,000	1.48
1998/99	6,403,340	0	2,259,733	102,375	102,375	1.18
1999/2000	6,879,510	0	3,296,564	130,000	130,000	1.3
2000/01	8,262,986	0	3,486,593	144,979	144,979	1.23
2001/02	10,497,895	4,146	3,574,952	129,382	133,528	0.95
2002/03	11,055,611	0	3,346,810	70,395	70,395	0.5

Source: Education Information of Nepal 2001, MoES/HMGN

Budget Red Books of FY 2000/01, 2001/02 and 2002/03, Ministry of Finance/HMGN

**Appendix 2
Appendix Innovative programs in literacy education**

Areas of innovation	Innovative ideas and action
Content/theme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • homogenous letter arrangement for easy learning • statement followed by question answer approach to content arrangement • individualized content approach for accelerated learning
Pedagogy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • math teaching through calculator • self initiated method for individualized learning • use of cultural approach to scaffolding literacy class • cultural approach to deliver functional message
Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • management of literacy program through users' group

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• management of literacy program through CLC• management of literacy program through VEC
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• portfolio assessment to assess individual progress of the learner• public presentation of the individual/group progress• exhibition of literacy learners' produces

Appendix 3**NFE/literacy related major policies and strategies**

Policy documents	NFE policies	NFE strategies
10 th plan (2002 - 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target groups especially women, disadvantaged ethnics, and Dalits will be encouraged • Literacy rate will be increased by effectively implementing the Adult and children's literacy programs • Literacy, post literacy and continuing education programs will be implemented in an integrated way in order to achieve the objective of relevant education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFE will be up scaled to increase literacy rate • NFE will be made relevant to life
EFA report on NFE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational programs will be made relevant to learners' lives. • Alternative education program will be expanded through innovation and entrepreneurship development • The literacy rate will be increased to 50% • Opportunity to basic and continuing education will be provided especially to adult women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to reduce poverty life skills will be included in NFE • Skill relevant to cottage industries will be imparted • Special programs will be designed for out of school youth and children • Functional and post-literacy programs will be organized for adults • Provision of Continuing education through Community Learning Centers • Literacy campaign to eradicate illiteracy • Implementation of alternative primary education and children's literacy programs to reduce the number of future illiterates. • Participants of alternative primary education and children's literacy programs will be encouraged to attend formal school • Implement the empowerment and functional education targeting women • Provision of continuing education linked

Policy documents	NFE policies	NFE strategies
		<p>with locally relevant income generation activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community learning center will be developed as the spot for literacy class, continuing education, income generation and village service.
Education act (Seventh Amendment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFE, Special need education and distance education will be organized and implemented 	
Education regulation, 2059	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those who can not obtain education from formal schooling will be provided with NFE basic education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education could be provided through adult literacy education, post literacy, continuing education and alternative primary education • The curriculum and textbooks of NFE have to be approved by the National curriculum development and evaluation council • Any agency can run NFE with permission approval from the District NFE committee.
Decentralization and education for all 2004-2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFE and FE will be made complimentary to each other. • Literacy program will consist of basic education, skill upgrading/enhancement education, and continuing education • NFE will indicate to literacy, alternative education and children's education programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination between GOs and NGOs in order to reduce illiteracy rate • Every VDC will implement literacy education program under its VEP. • Agencies at the central, district and RC level will provide learning materials, technical support in training and financial support. • VDCs will be enabled to work in partnership with NGOs and local committee to run literacy programs.
Local Self Governance Act, 2055	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VDC and Municipalities will design and implement adult education and NFE programs. • DDC will devise district level adult education and NFE related policies and programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Source: NFEC (2004). NFE policies and strategies.

Appendix 4
Nepal commitments in international forums for NFE/literacy education

Conventions/Declarations that Nepal endorsed	Areas relevant to education
International declaration of Human Rights, 1948	Education is a right
Child Right Convention, 1989	Legal provision to protect children and their rights to education
CEDAW, 1979	Not only elimination of all forms of discrimination against women but women's participation and achievement in every area of life
Dakar Forum, 2002	Equitable access to and participation of all in quality basic education through 6 goals and 12 strategies
Colombo convention, 1992 (Second SAARC convention on South Asian children)	Elimination of child labor. And gender equality in education
UNDAF 2002-2006	Support HMGN in poverty reduction by supporting in the protection of social, cultural, economic, and civil rights and in enhancing meaningful participation of all in development processes.
MDG , 2002	Universal education and gender equality and women's empowerment.

In order to assess and reinforce the above mentioned commitments many meetings and conventions took place in during 1990s. They are:

1. Children's Convention, 1990
2. UN Convention on environment and development, 1992
3. World Convention on Human Rights, 1993
4. World convention on the Special Needs Education, 1994
5. Social Summit, 1995
6. Fourth World Convention on Women, 1995
7. Mid term International Forum on EFA, 1996
8. Fifth International Convention on Adult Education, 1996
9. World Conference on Child Labor, 1997

Source: NFEC (2004). NFE policies and strategies.

Appendix 5

Education status of the excluded group, Dalit

Education Status of Dalit Castes								
Serial Number	Dalit	Primary	Secondary	SLC#	Above proficiency level	Total	Gross Literacy Rate	Female Literacy rate
1	Gyaine	15.7	3.7	0.3	0.1	19.8	31.32	18.33
2	Damai	15.2	3.2	0.2	0.1	18.7	28.91	17.14
3	Kami	13.7	3.1	0.3	0.1	17.3	26.87	14.22
4	Dhobi	8.9	5.3	0.9	0.7	15.8	21.53	8.77
5	Sarki	12.6	2.5	0.2	0.1	15.4	25.09	13.15
6	Wadi	10.1	2.4	0.4	0.1	12.8	21.52	11.8
7	Khatwe	5.4	2.4	0.4	0.1	8.3	12.39	3.7
8	Chamar	4.8	1.9	0.2	0.1	7.0	10.79	3.34
9	Dusadh	4.2	1.8	0.3	0.1	6.5	10.73	4.02
10	Musahar	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	4.85	2.4
Total Dalit		11.4	2.8	0.3	2.2	14.6		

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), (Nepalma Dalit Samudayako Esthiti 2060 B. S., National Dalit Commission, Kathmandu)

School Leaving Certificate. This certificate is provided to those who get success in the national exam taken at the end of grade ten)

Appendix 5.1

Excluded groups in education

SN	Social Group	Class of Group		Literacy rate
		Janjati	Dalit	
1	Chamar		✓	10.1
2	Damai		✓	27.9
3	Dhimal	✓		39.2
4	Dom		✓	-
5	Dusadh		✓	9.9
6	Jhangad	✓		-
7	Kami		✓	26.6
8	Mushahar		✓	4.2
9	Raute	✓		25.5
10	Sarki		✓	24.2
11	Satar	✓		-
Total		4	7	

Source: Ministry of Education, School Living Statistics of Nepal, 2000, p. 3

Appendix 6

Literacy and educational attainments by caste and ethnicity

Caste/Ethnicity	Literacy Rate of six years and above			Graduate and above (% of literate)		
	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes
Upper Castes (1+4)	79.5	55.9	67.5	7.7	2.1	5.3
1. Hill Upper Castes (2+3)	79.2	55.4	67.1	7.4	1.9	5.1
2. Brahman- Hill	86.2	65.5	75.5	11.3	2.7	7.5
3. Chhetri, Thakuri, Sanyasi	31.2	48.0	60.9	4.1	1.2	2.9
3.1. Chhetri	74.1	47.9	60.8	4.1	1.2	2.9
3.2 Thakuri	75.6	49.4	62.2	4.9	1.9	3.7
3.3 Sanyasi	73.9	48.8	61.0	3.7	1.1	2.6
4. Terai Uupper Castes Terai- Brahman, Rajput, Kayastha, Baniya, Marwadi, Jaine, Nurang, Bengali	83.0	63.8	73.9	11.	4.9	8.8
4.1 Terai- Brahman,	80.6	59.6	70.6	11.5	3.5	8.3
4.2 Rajput	82.4	62.7	73.2	14.0	5.6	10.6
4.3 Kayastha	89.5	76.6	82.7	19.4	7.7	14.0
4.4 Baniya	79.0	55.5	68.0	4.5	2.3	3.7
4.5 Marwadi	93.7	64.6	89.2	18.5	9.5	14.5
4.6 Jaine	95.8	93.5	94.6	30.4	20.8	26.1
4.7 Nurang	85.1	65.0	75.5	11.1	3.6	8.0
4.8 Bengali	85.2	65.5	77.1	6.8	5.4	6.3
5. Terai Middle Castes (Include 6 to 9)	55.5	26.3	41.7	3.4	0.9	2.6
6. Yadav	53.4	22.6	39.2	4.7	1.4	3.5
7. Teli, Teli, Klwar, Sudhi Sonar, Lohar	66.8	37.6	52.7	4.2	1.1	3.17
7.1 Teli	65.7	34.1	50.7	4.7	1.4	3.7
7.2 Klwar	74.7	46.2	61.5	4.4	1.5	3.4
7.3 Sudhi	71.6	42.9	58.7	7.7	1.5	5.6
7.4 Sonar	66.8	42.8	54.7	1.7	0.7	0.8
7.5 Lohar	53.2	23.0	38.6	0.9	0.6	0.8
8. Koiri Kurmi, Kanu, Haluwai, Hajam/Thakur, Badhe, Bahae, Rajbha	56.6	26.4	42.4	2.5	0.5	1.9
8.1 Koirir	58.2	27.4	43.6	2.5	0.2	1.9
8.2 Kurmi	51.5	21.5	37.5	2.2	0.4	1.7
8.3 Kanu	58.3	29.7	45.1	3.2	0.4	2.3
8.4 Haluwai	68.1	42.2	55.9	3.6	1.1	2.7
8.5 Hajam/Thakur	56.8	25.0	42.1	2.6	0.6	2.1
8.6 Badhae	56.4	23.7	41.3	1.7	0	1.3
8.7Rajbhar	54.0	25.2	40.6	1.1	0	0.9
9. Kewat, Mallah, Nuniya, Kumhar, Kahar, Lodha, Bing/Binda, Bhediyar, Mali, Kamar, Dhunia	40.4	15.1	28.4	1.3	0.7	1.1
9.1 Kewat	47.8	19.2	34.2	2	0.7	1.7
9.2 Mallah	35.2	13.0	24.5	0.5	1.8	0.8
9.3 Nuniya	31.3	10.3	21.5	0.4	0	0.3

9.4 Kumhar	49.6	19.9	35.7	2.6	0.3	2.0
9.6 Kahar	46.2	16.5	32.4	0.3	0	0.2
9.7 Lodha	32.4	8.7	21.5	0.6	1.7	0.8
9.8 Bing/Binda	20.4	8.3	14.6	0.8	0	0.6
9.10 Bhediyar	44.5	17.1	31.8	0.7	0	0.5
9.11 Mali	48.9	17.7	34.1	2.3	0	1.8
9.12 Kamar	28.5	7.3	18.5	0	0	0.0
9.13 Dhunia	18.4	0.0	9.4	0	0	0.0
Dalits (10 +15)	43.7	24.2	33.8	0.5	0.7	0.8
10. Hill Dalits (11 to 14)	52.9	31.8	41.9	0.5	0.4	0.5
11. Kami	53.1	31.4	41.8	0.5	0.1	0.4
12. Damai	55.0	35.0	44.6	0.4	0.1	0.3
13. Sarki	49.9	28.8	38.9	0.3	0.1	0.2
14 Badi, Gaine	54.4	37.5	45.6	0.0	0.6	0.2
14.1 Badi	47.1	32.0	39.2	0	0	0.0
14.1 Gaine	62.3	32.1	47.5	0	1.1	0.5
15. Terai Dalits (16 to 19)	30.1	11.5	21.1	0.7	0.3	0.6
16. Chamar	27.9	9.0	18.9	0	0	0.0
17. Musahar	9.8	3.8	6.9	0.3	0.3	0.3
18. Dusadh Tatma, Khatwe, Bantar, Dom, Chidimar	29.6	8.9	19.7	0.7	0.2	0.5
18.1 Dusadh	28.5	8.6	19.1	0	0	0.2
18.2 Tatma	33.0	10.2	22.2	2	0	1.6
18.3 Khatwe	26.4	7.2	17.2	0.6	0	0.5
18.4 Bantar	35.9	10.2	23.4	0.2	0	---
18.5 Dom	14.9	5.2	10.3	0	0	0
18.6 Chidimar	34.0	14.9	25.1	0.2	0.6	0.3
19. Dobi, Halkhor, Dalit/Unidentified Dalit	47.1	22.5	34.8	1.1	0.5	0.9
19.1 Dhobi	46.5	19.1	33.6	2.1	0.9	1.8
19.2 Halkhor	38.1	21.7	30.1	0	0	0.0
19.3 Dalit/Unidentified Dalit	47.6	23.9	35.5	0.7	0.2	0.6
Janajatis (20+36)	64.3	43.1	53.6	2.5	1.3	2.0
20. Hill Janajatis (21+24)	66.4	46.4	56.2	2.8	1.5	2.2
21. Newar/Thakali	82.0	62.6	72.2	7.2	4.0	5.8
22. Newar	82.0	62.6	72.1	7.2	4.1	5.8
23. Thakali	83.1	63.4	72.6	4.4	2.1	3.3
24. Other (25 to 35)	62.3	42.3	52.1	1.3	3.1	1.6
25. Magar	69.0	47.3	57.7	1.3	0.6	1.0
26. Tamang	52.1	31.9	42.0	0.8	0.3	0.6
27. Rai	68.1	49.9	58.7	1.9	0.6	1.4
28. Gurung	67.3	49.0	57.5	1.8	0.9	1.4
29. Limbu	69.9	50.1	59.6	1.7	0.8	1.3
30. Sherpa	57.9	33.6	45.8	1.4	1	1.2
31 Bhote, Walung, Byansi, Yholmo	49.5	29.8	40.0	0.0	0.1	2.0
31.1 Bhote	45.4	25.5	35.9	2.3	0	1.5
31.2 Walung	44.3	26.5	35.5	0	0	0.0
31.3 Byansi	84.0	56.6	7066.0	8.9	0	5.4

31.4 Hyolmo	67.2	65.9	66.3	0	0	0.0
32 Bhujel, Kumal, Sunuwar, Baramu, Pahari, Adivasi Janajati	55.9	35.8	45.7	0.7	0.2	0.5
32.1 Bhujel	64.4	43.4	53.7	0.9	0.2	0.6
32.2 Kumal	56.2	33.9	44.8	0.6	0.1	0.4
32.3 Sunuwar	45.6	27.5	36.7	0.7	0.9	0.8
33.4 Baramu	52.4	40.1	45.7	0	0	0.0
33.5 Pahari	51.8	33.3	42.6	0.9	0	0.6
33.6 Adivasi Janajati	56.3	38.6	47.1	0	0	0.0
33. Yakkha, Chhantel, Jirel, Darai, Dura	69.8	49.3	58.9	1.2	0.0	0.6
33.1 Yakkha	67.9	51.0	58.9	1.9	0	1.0
33.2 Chhantel	71.2	48.8	58.9	1.2	0	0.7
33.3 Jirel	72.1	48.5	59.9	0.8	0	0.5
33. 4 Darai	66.5	47.3	56.5	0.8	0	0.5
33.5 Dura	80.6	50.6	64.0	0.8	0	0.5
34. Majhi, Danuwar, Thami, Lepcha	47.4	27.5	37.4	0.5	0.0	0.3
34.1 Majhi	45.4	26.6	36.0	0.3	0	0.2
34.2 Danuwar	51.2	29.2	40.0	1	0	0.6
34.3 Thami	45.4	25.2	35.3	0	0	0.0
34.4 Lepcha	44.3	33.6	39.3	1.6	0	0.9
35. Bote, Raji, Hayu, Raute, Chepang, Kusunda	37.3	29.8	28.7	0.4	0.0	0.2
35.1 Bote	49.6	28.9	38.9	0.6	0	0.4
35.2 Raji	52.2	21.3	35.4	0	0	0.0
35.3 Hayu	54.3	21.7	38.1	2.3	0	1.6
35.4 Raute	57.7	18.6	39.6	0	0	0.0
35.5 Chepang	34.0	18.1	26.3	0.2	0	0.1
36. Terai Janajatis (37 to 40)	57.7	31.5	44.8	1.4	0.2	1.0
37. Tharu	59.5	33.3	46.6	1.4	0.2	1.0
38. Dhanuk	48.1	18.5	34.1	2.8	0.4	2.2
39. Rajbansi, Tajpuriya, Gangai, Dhimal, Meche, Kisan, Munda	62.8	35.4	49.1	0.8	0.1	0.6
39. Rajbansi	62.6	35.1	49.0	0.8	0.2	0.6
39.1 Tajpuriya	62.1	29.6	45.7	1.1	0	0.8
39.2 Gangai	62.3	32.1	47.5	0.9	0	0.6
39.2 Dhimal	67.5	44.1	55.6	0.8	0	0.5
39.3 Meche	65.2	48.9	56.7	0	0	0.0
39.4 Kisan	40.0	24.9	32.0	0	0	0.0
39.5 Munda	60.9	34.1	48.6	5.1	0	3.4
40. Santhal, hangad/Jhangad, Koche, attharkatta/Kusbadiya	36.9	16.8	26.9	1.8	1.2	1.5
40.1 Santhal	38.8	20.0	29.5	3	1.5	2.5
40. 2 Dhangad/Jhangad	34.8	13.9	24.4	0.4	0.6	0.5
40.3 Koche	43.5	10.1	26.5	0	0	0.0
40. 4 Pattharkatta/Kusbadiya	19.4	7.7	13.8	0	0	0.0
40.5 Kusunda	51.7	0.0	27.0	0	0	0.0
Religious Minorities (41-42)	45.2	22.7	34.5	1.9	0.9	0.2
41. Muslim, Churaute	45.2	22.7	34.4	1.9	0.8	1.6

41.1 Muslim	45.1	22.6	34.4	1.9	0.8	1.5
40.2 Churaute	67.9	42.4	55.6	6.2	3.3	5.1
42. Punjabi/Sikh	60.5	45.8	53.3	8.7	12.3	10.2

Source: Population Census Reports of 1991 and 2001 and the caste groups is taken from "Analysis of Caste, Ethnicity and Gender Data from 2001 Population Census in Preparation for Poverty Mapping and Wider PRSP Monitoring" Submitted to DFID submitted by Tanka Prasad Acharya Memorial Foundation

Appendix 6.1

Literacy rate, educational attainment by caste/ethnicity, (1991 and 2001)

Caste/Ethnicity	Percent 6 years and over age cohort		Increase in Literacy Rate	Of literate population			
	Literacy Rate			SLC and Above		Graduate and Above	
	1991	2001		1991	2001	1991	2001
Hill/Terai B/C+	53.1	67.5	14.4	11.1	24.7	2.1	5.4
Hill B/C+	52.6	67.1	14.5	10.3	24.1	1.9	5.1
Terai B/C+	59.4	73.9	14.5	20.8	33.5	4.9	8.8
Terai Middle Caste	29.6	41.7	12.1	9.9	16.7	1.2	2.7
Dalits	22.6	33.8	11.2	1.7	3.8	0.2	0.4
Hill Dalits	26.8	41.9	15.1	1.4	3.4	0.1	0.3
Terai Dalits	11.0	21.1	10.1	4.1	5.3	0.5	0.6
Janajatis	40.0	53.6	13.6	7.2	12.9	1.4	2.0
Hill Janajatis	43.1	56.2	13.1	7.7	13.8	1.5	2.3
<i>Newar/Thakali</i>	<i>61.0</i>	<i>72.2</i>	<i>11.2</i>	<i>17.9</i>	<i>28.1</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>5.8</i>
<i>Other hill Janajatis</i>	<i>38.2</i>	<i>52.1</i>	<i>13.8</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>8.7</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>
Terai Janajatis	28.7	44.8	16.1	4.6	9.0	0.4	1.1
Religious Minorities	23.1	34.5	11.3	6.5	9.0	1.3	1.6
Others	25.6	50.1	24.5	6.5	19.2	1.4	5.0
Total	40.1	53.7	13.7	8.8	17.6	1.6	3.4

Appendix 6.2

Caste/ethnic composition of literate and educated population (1991 and 2001)

Caste/Ethnicity	Percent in population 6 years+				Of Literate			
	Total		Literate		SLC and above		Graduate and above	
	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001
Hill/Terai B/C+	33.8	32.8	45.2	42.3	57.2	59.4	59.2	66.7
Hill B/C+	31.6	30.9	41.8	39.6	49.2	54.3	48.9	59.7
Terai B/C+	2.2	1.9	3.4	2.7	8.0	5.1	10.3	7.0
Terai Middle Caste	10.7	12.9	7.8	9.7	8.8	9.2	6.0	7.7
Dalits	11.9	11.8	6.6	7.1	1.3	1.6	0.7	0.8
Hill Dalits	8.8	7.1	5.8	5.4	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.5
Terai Dalits	3.1	4.7	0.9	1.7	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3
Janajatis	35.5	37.2	35.6	37.4	29.1	27.4	30.1	22.3
Hill Janajatis	27.7	28.5	30.0	30.3	26.3	23.8	28.9	20.1
Newar/Thakali	5.7	5.5	9.1	7.9	18.5	12.7	23.9	13.6
Other hill Janajatis	22.0	23.0	20.9	22.3	7.8	11.1	5.0	6.5
Terai Janajatis	7.9	8.7	5.6	7.1	2.9	3.7	1.2	2.2
Religious Minorities	3.6	4.3	2.0	2.6	1.5	1.3	1.6	1.2
Others	4.4	1.0	2.8	0.9	2.1	1.0	2.4	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix 6.3

Literacy rate, educational attainment by caste/ethnicity for Urban/Rural areas, 2001

Caste/Ethnicity	Percent 6 years and over age cohort			100 = Literate population of 6 years and over					
	Literacy Rate			SLC +			Graduate and Above		
	Urban	Rural	Diff	Urban	Rural	Diff	Urban	Rural	Diff
Hill/Terai B/C+	80.9	64.7	16.2	38.8	21.0	17.8	11.6	3.7	7.9
Hill B/C+	80.8	64.4	16.4	38.5	20.5	18.0	11.4	3.6	7.8
Terai B/C+	81.6	70.0	11.6	40.7	29.2	11.5	13.1	6.3	6.8
Terai Middle Caste	58.9	39.7	19.2	26.1	15.1	11.0	6.3	2.1	4.2
Dalits	46.5	32.6	13.9	7.3	3.4	3.9	1.2	0.3	0.9
Hill Dalits	54.3	40.7	13.6	7.2	2.9	4.3	1.1	0.2	0.9
Terai Dalits	32.8	20.1	12.7	7.8	4.9	2.9	1.6	0.5	1.1
Janajatis	71.4	50.2	21.2	26.1	9.4	16.7	5.8	1.0	4.8
Hill Janajatis	73.9	52.3	21.6	27.1	9.7	17.4	6.1	1.1	5.0
Newar/Thakali	78.4	66.7	11.7	34.2	21.7	12.5	8.4	3.2	5.2
Other hill Janajatis	68.8	50.1	18.7	17.8	7.2	10.6	3.1	0.6	2.5
Terai Janajatis	52.6	44.1	8.5	16.1	8.2	7.9	2.9	0.8	2.1
Religious Minorities	49.9	31.9	18.0	13.9	7.8	6.1	3.0	1.3	1.7
Others	64.7	46.8	17.9	26.9	16.8	10.1	8.5	3.9	4.6
Total	71.6	50.7	20.9	30.5	14.4	16.1	8.3	2.2	6.1

Appendix 6.4

Literacy rates and male/ female differences (1991- 2001)

Indicators	1991			2001		
	Male	Female	Male-Female differences	Male	Female	Male-Female differences
For 6 years and above						
Urban	80.0	51.2	23.2	80.9	61.6	19.3
Rural	54.2	20.4	29.9	62.2	59.3	22.9
Nepal	54.2	24.7	29.5	65.1	42.5	22.6
15 years +	38.0	13.0	25.0	62.2	34.6	27.6

Source: CBS. .Population Census 1991 and 2001.

Dr. Harka Gurung (2004). *Janajati Serophero*. (In Neplai). Kathmandu: Federation of Indigenous Nationalities.

Appendix 6.5

Literacy rate over years (1981-2001)

Age/Sex	1981*			1991**			2001#		
	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
All Ages (6 +)	23.3	34.0	12.0	39.6	54.5	25.0	54.1	65.5	42.8
Adult (15+)	20.6	31.7	9.2	33.0	49.2	17.4	48.6	62.7	34.9

(a) Rural literacy rate over years (1991-2001)

Age/Sex	1991**			2001#		
	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
All Ages (6 +)	36.8	51.9	22.0	51.0	62.6	39.6
Adult (15+)	29.7	46.0	14.2	45.0	59.4	31.2

(b) Urban literacy rate over years (1991-2001)

Age/Sex	1991**			2001#		
	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
All Ages (6 +)	66.9	78.0	54.8	71.9	81.2	61.9
Adult (15+)	62.5	76.0	47.8	68.3	80.0	55.8

Source:

1. CBS, 1995 Population Monograph,
 - # CBS, 2002; Population Census 2001, National Report Vol. II, Table 11, p.136
 - * CBS, 1984, Population Census 1981, Vol. I, Part IV, Table 14 p. 1
 - ** CBS, 1993, Population Census 1991, Vol. I, Part X, Table 30 p. 1
- Meena Acharya (2001). Tanka Prasad Acharya Memorial Foundation
Population Census in Preparation for Poverty Mapping and Wider PRSP Monitoring” Submitted to DFID

Appendix 6.6
Literacy Rate by the census interval

Year	1971	1981	1991	2001
All Nepal	13.9	23.3	39.6	54.1

Source: Mapping Nepal Census Indicators 2001 and Trends, ICIMOD (MENRIS)/CBS, December 2003, Kathmandu

Appendix 6.7
Literacy rate of 2001 by caste and its population

In percentage

SN	Social Group	Population	Percentage of total of population	Literacy Rate (Nepal 54.1)				
				High Caste	Dalit	Indigenous	Other	unknown
	Nepal	22736934	100	-	-	-	-	-
1	Jaine	1015	0	-	-	-	98.5	-
2	Marwadi	43971	0.19	91.7	-	-	-	-
3	Kayastha	46071	0.2	85.8	-	-	-	-
4	Byangsi	2103	0.01	-	-	81.1	-	-
5	Yoehlmoh	579	0.00	-	-	80.5	-	-
6	Bahun (hill)	2896477	12.74	80.0	-	-	-	-
7	Thakali	12973	0.06	-	-	79.9	-	-
8	Brahmin terai	134496	0.59	76.1	-	-	-	-
9	Newar	1245232	5.48	-	-	76.0	-	-
10	Bangali	9860	0.04	-	-	-	75.6	-
11	Rajput	48454	0.21	74.6	-	-	-	-
12	Nurang	17522	0.08	-	-	-	-	74.4
13	Baniya	126971	0.56	71.9	-	-	-	-
14	Thakuri	334120	1.47	69.2				
15	Lepcha	3660	0.02	-	-	68.8	-	-
16	Dura	5169	0.02	-	-	67.8	-	-
17	Gurung	543571	2.39	-		66.3		
18	Churaute	4893	0.02	-	-	-	66.3	-
19	Kchetri	3593496	15.80	66.1	-	-	-	-
20	Jirel	5316	0.02	-	-	65.9	-	-
21	Limbu	359379	1.58	-	-	65.6	-	-
22	Kalwar	115606	0.51	65.4	-	-	-	-
23	Rai	635151	2.79	-	-	65.0		
24	Sanyasi	199127	0.88	65.0	-	-	-	-
25	Sudhi	89846	0.40	64.3	-	-	-	-
26	Yakkha	17003	0.07	-	-	64.1	-	-
27	Chhantel	9814	0.04	-	-	64.0	-	-
28	Haluwai	50538	0.22	62.6	-	-	-	-
29	Magar	1622421	7.14	-	-	62.5	-	-
30	Darai	14859	0.07	-	-	62.3	-	-
31	Sonar	145088	0.64	-	59.4		-	-

32	Dhimal	1953.7	0.09	-	-	58.8	-	-
33	Kushunda	164	0.00	-	-	58.0	-	-
34	Sherpa	154622	0.68	-	-	57.9	-	-
35	Bhujel	117568	0.52	-	-	57.8	-	-
36	Meche	3763	0.02	-	-	57.8	-	-
37	Teli	304536	1.34	56.6	-	-	-	-
38	Rajwangsi	95812	0.42	-	-	54.7	-	-
39	Tharu	1533879	6.75	-	-	53.7	-	-
40	Gangai	31318	0.14	-	-	52.7	-	-
41	Tajpuria	13250	0.06	-	-	52.2	-	-
42	Sikh	3054	0.01	-	-	-	51.9	-
43	Tamang	1282304	5.64	-	-	51.8	-	-
44	Sunuwar	95254	0.42	-	-	51.7	-	-
45	Gyaine	5887	0.03	-	50.2	-	-	-
46	Damai	390305	1.72	-	50.1	-	-	-
47	Bhote	19261	0.08	-	-	50.0	-	-
48	Barai	35434	0.16	49.6	-	-	-	-
49	Hayu	1821	0.01	-	-	49.5	-	-
50	Kumal	99389	0.44	-	-	49.4	-	-
51	Koiree	251274	1.11	48.9	-	-	-	-
52	Danuwar	53229	0.23	-	-	48.6	-	-
53	Hajam	98169	0.43	48.3	-	-	-	-
54	Kanu	95826	0.42	48.3	-	-	-	-
55	Kami	895954	3.94	-	48.1	-	-	-
56	Munda	660	0.00	-	-	47.8	-	-
57	Badhai	45975	0.20	47.7	-	-	-	-
58	Raute	658	0.00	-	-	46.6	-	-
59	Barhamu	7383	0.03	-	-	46.5	-	-
60	Yadav	895423	3.94	46.0	-	-	-	-
61	Pahari	11505	0.05	-	-	45.6	-	-
62	Sarki	318989	1.40	-	44.8	-	-	-
63	Rajbhar	24263	0.11	44.7	-	-	-	-
64	Lohar	82637	0.36	-	43.0	-	-	-
65	Thami	22999	0.10	-	-	43.0	-	-
66	Kumhar	54413	0.24	42.9	-	-	-	-
67	Kurmi	212842	0.94	42.6	-	-	-	-
68	Badi	4442	0.02	-	42.6	-	-	-
69	Majhi	72614	0.32	-	-	42.5	-	-
70	Mali	11390	0.05	42.3	-	-	-	-
71	Kewat	136953	0.60	42.1	-	-	-	-
72	Raji	2399	0.01	-	-	42.0	-	-
73	Dhanuk	188150	0.83	41.4	-	-	-	-
74	Bote	7969	0.04	-	-	40.6	-	-
75	Kisan	1876	0.01	-	-	40.6	-	-

76	Muslim	971056	4.27	-	-	-	40.1	-
77	Bhedyar	17729	0.08	39.7	-	-	-	-
78	Dhobi	73413	0.32	-	39.1	-	-	-
79	Kahar	34531	0.15	38.1	-	-	-	-
80	Halkhor	3621	0.02	-	37.8	-	-	-
81	Lodha	24738	0.11	36.4	-	-	-	-
82	Chepang	52237	0.23	-	-	36.1	-	-
83	Koche	1429	0.01	-	-	35.7	-	-
84	Chidmar	12296	0.05	-	-	35.1	-	-
85	Mallah	115986	0.51	31.2	-	-	-	-
86	Walung	1148	0.01	-	-	31.1	-	-
87	Jhangad	41764	0.18	-	-	30.8	-	-
88	Santhal	42698	0.19	-	-	29.7	-	-
89	Tatma	76512	0.34	-	29.1	-	-	-
90	Nuniya	66873	0.29	28.1	-	-	-	-
91	Bantar	35839	0.16	-	26.1	-	-	-
92	Dusadh	158525	0.70	-	24.8	-	-	-
93	Dhuniya	1231	0.01	24.0	-	-	-	-
94	Chamar	269661	1.19	-	23.8	-	-	-
95	Khatwe	74972	0.33	-	23.5	-	-	-
96	Kamar	8761	0.04	22.0	-	-	-	-
97	Bing	18720	0.08	19.5	-	-	-	-
98	Kuswadiya	522	0.00	-	-	19.5	-	-
99	Dom	8931	0.04	-	13.8	-	-	-
100	Mushar	172434	0.76	-	11.1	-	-	-
101	Kusunda	164	0.00	-	-	27.0	-	-
102	Adibasi/Janajati	5259	0.02	-	55.7	-	-	-
103	Dalit/unidentified Dalit	173401	0.76	-	45.6	-	-	-
104	Unidentified caste/ethnic#	231641	1.02	-	-	-	56.0	-

Note: Castes are classified by Dr. Harka Gurung in his book "Janjati Serophero" (Nepali), Published by: Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities, January 2004, Kathmandu.

There are two possibilities. One, some of the people did not report their caste/ethnic origin. Two, Central Bureau of Statistics could not figure out the caste/ethnic origin of the people.

Appendix: 6.8

Absolute number of illiterates in Nepal (6+ Years of age) by Census intervals

Census Year	1952-54	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001	2004 (estimated)
Literacy Rate	5.3	8.9	14.3	23.3	39.6	53.7	53.74
Total Population	8,256,625	9,412,996	11,555,983	15,022,839	18,491,097	23,151,423	24,737,584.87
Total Literate Population	437,601	837,756	1,652,505	3,500,321	7,322,474	12,432,314	13,293,978
Total Illiterate Population	7,819,023	8,575,239	9,903,477	11,522,517	1,168,622	10,719,109	11,443,607
Increase/Decrease in % of illiterate population from previous census	NA	Increase by 10 %	Increase by 15%	Increase by 16%	Decrease by 3%	Decrease by 4%	Increase by 7%

Source:

CBS 1958 VOL 1

CBS 1966 VOL 1

CBS 1975 VOL 1

CBS 1984 VOL 1

CBS 1993 VOL 1

CBS 2002 National Report

CBS Population Monograph of Nepal 2003

CBS Statistical Pocket Book Nepal 2004

Appendix 6.9 Ethnic and caste mapping

6.9.1: Dalit and Janajati groups by district, district HDI, and HPI ranks

District	Dalit Population			Total Janajati Population	HDI rank	HPI rank
	Total Hill Dalit	Total Terai Dalit	Total Dalit			
Taplejung	7,328	120	7,448	80,269	36	22
Achham	53,077	87	53,164	1,938	69	71
Arghakhanchi	31,114	168	31,282	40,326	33	29
Baglung	48,876	441	49,317	73,594	19	19
Baitadi	32,896	228	33,124	970	63	56
Bajhang	20,418	88	20,506	1,013	72	72
Bajura	20,232	37	20,269	1,142	74	67
Banke	19,600	10,365	29,965	70,009	29	14
Bara	8,735	68,105	76,840	75,813	37	46
Bardiya	23,608	2,551	26,159	168,865	50	38
Bhaktapur	3,210	254	3,464	119,471	2	6
Bhojpur	18,900	167	19,067	112,314	32	40
Chitawan	31,085	1,027	32,112	162,581	12	7
Dadeldhura	16,695	51	16,746	4,896	49	49
Dailekh	46,841	80	46,921	21,902	66	61
Dang	42,127	733	42,860	161,503	57	32
Darchula	9,020	35	9,055	488	52	45
Dhading	28,299	167	28,466	143,457	55	51
Dhankuta	10,051	60	10,111	88,639	13	12
Dhanusa	10,377	76,419	86,796	29,903	43	31
Dolakha	13,475	102	13,577	75,928	42	42
Dolpa	2,996	3	2,999	8,413	67	74
Doti	34,011	1,028	35,039	7,133	60	64

Gorkha	33,318	118	33,436	124,060	40	34
Gulmi	45,661	114	45,775	67,815	35	23
Humla	4,205	12	4,217	6,299	68	75
Ilam	11,999	194	12,193	142,918	11	11
Jajarkot	31,908	89	31,997	10,789	71	69
Jhapa	32,368	4,148	36,516	207,236	18	4
Jumla	12,218	74	12,292	1,329	70	68
Kailali	55,515	400	55,915	229,448	46	24
Kalikot	21,073	80	21,153	1,083	73	70
Kanchanpur	39,960	178	40,138	83,760	39	15
Kapilbastu	12,442	20,115	32,557	54,763	47	55
Kaski	45,258	258	45,516	93,447	3	1
Kathmandu	14,791	1,747	16,538	367,869	1	3
Kavrepalanchok	17,352	140	17,492	174,135	6	10
Khotang	19,713	74	19,787	118,002	45	37
Lalitpur	6,020	483	6,503	162,653	4	2
Lamjung	22,780	100	22,880	73,485	20	20
Mahottari	12,199	71,808	84,007	33,962	59	58
Makwanpur	13,746	252	13,998	210,784	31	16
Manang	121	1	122	4,602	15	21
Morang	26,299	29,542	55,841	249,798	8	13
Mugu	6,152	16	6,168	3,988	75	73
Mustang	1,213	8	1,221	11,643	26	33
Myagdi	21,126	44	21,170	48,276	17	28
Nawalparasi	31,025	22,202	53,227	185,695	25	27
Nuwakot	16,008	106	16,114	134,728	38	41
Okhaldhunga	12,354	96	12,450	68,295	27	48
Palpa	27,607	99	27,706	132,669	23	9
Panchthar	10,019	98	10,117	118,031	24	36
Parbat	26,429	130	26,559	29,597	14	18

Parsa	9,336	62,180	71,516	55,329	44	43
Pyuthan	33,776	70	33,846	61,596	53	52
Ramechhap	14,429	181	14,610	103,945	48	63
Rasuwa	1,078	19	1,097	27,916	62	66
Rautahat	11,473	56,913	68,386	37,243	56	59
Rolpa	30,447	47	30,494	81,775	65	62
Rukum	31,761	78	31,839	41,558	66	65
Rupandehi	25,696	28,612	54,308	128,873	5	5
Salyan	30,499	96	30,595	31,291	61	53
Sankhuwasabha	10,432	72	10,504	85,444	28	39
Saptari	5,202	84,429	89,631	70,441	41	26
Sarlahi	20,151	61,101	81,252	74,967	58	57
Sindhuli	23,412	1,462	24,874	132,341	34	54
Sindhupalchok	17,555	113	17,668	147,945	54	60
Siraha	5,580	82,334	87,914	44,834	51	50
Solukhumbu	7,000	21	7,021	66,254	30	47
Sunsari	13,231	27,877	41,108	162,738	16	8
Surkhet	59,064	113	59,177	58,157	22	44
Syangja	37,663	116	37,779	104,182	7	17
Tanahu	38,102	222	38,324	140,131	9	35
Taplejung	7,328	120	7,448	80,269	36	22
Terhathum	8,242	35	8,277	52,790	10	30
Udayapur	21,455	2,180	23,635	122,389	21	25
NEPAL	1,619,434	723,313	2,342,747	6,433,865	140/177	

Source: Population Census 1991 Table 25, & 2001, Vol. I & II, CBS, 2002,
Nepal Human Development Report, UNDP, 2004

Appendix 6.9.2

Growth of population by caste/ethnicity and sex ratio, 1991-2001

Caste/Ethnicity	Population, 1991			Population, 2001			Annual % Increase 1991-2001
	<i>Total</i>	Percent	Sex Ratio	Total	Percent	Sex Ratio	
Hill/Terai B/C+	6248829	33.8	97.4	7451580	32.8	98.1	1.76
<i>Hill B/C+ (2,1,14,20)</i>	5837736	31.6	96.5	7023220	30.9	97.3	1.85
Brahman – Hill	2388455	12.9	97.7	2896477	12.7	97.1	1.93
Sub-Group (Chhetri +)	3449281	18.7	95.7	4126743	18.1	97.5	1.79
<i>Terai B/C+</i>	411093	2.2	110.4	428360	1.9	111.5	0.41
Terai Middle Castes	1982817	10.7	109.5	2938827	12.9	109.5	3.93
Yadav	765137	4.1	111.2	895423	3.9	112.2	1.57
Sub-Group (Teli +)	412778	2.2	110.3	737713	3.2	107.2	5.81
Sub-Group (Koiri +)	520999	2.8	108.4	814366	3.6	109.8	4.47
Sub-Group (Kewat +)	283903	1.5	105.9	491325	2.2	108.0	5.48
Dalits	2201781	11.9	97.6	2675182	11.8	97.7	1.95
<i>Hill Dalits</i>	1619434	8.8	95.3	1615577	7.1	93.3	-0.02
Kami	963655	5.2	96.0	895954	3.9	93.5	-0.73
Damai/Dholi	367989	2.0	94.1	390305	1.7	93.2	0.59
Sarki	276224	1.5	94.5	318989	1.4	93.0	1.44
Sub-Group (Gaine +)	11566	0.1	93.1	10329	0.0	94.2	-1.13
<i>Terai Dalits</i>	582347	3.1	104.3	1059605	4.7	104.7	5.99
Chamar/ Harijan/ Ram	203919	1.1	104.2	269661	1.2	106.2	2.79
Musahar	141980	0.8	101.6	172434	0.8	104.3	1.94
Sub-Group (Dusadh +)	159854	0.9	105.5	367075	1.6	107.0	8.31
Sub-Group (Dhobi +)	76594	0.4	106.9	250435	1.1	100.1	11.85
Janajatis	6572265	35.5	98.0	8460701	37.2	98.0	2.53
<i>Hill Janajatis</i>	5119613	27.7	96.9	6484849	28.5	96.8	2.36
<i>Newar/Thakali</i>	1054821	5.7	99.4	1258205	5.5	99.2	1.76
Newar	1041090	5.6	99.5	1245232	5.5	99.2	1.79
Thakali	13731	0.1	93.7	12973	0.1	92.0	-0.57

<i>Other Hill Janajatis</i>	4064792	22.0	96.3	5226644	23.0	96.2	2.51
Magar	1339308	7.2	94.1	1622421	7.1	93.7	1.92
Tamang	1018252	5.5	100.1	1282304	5.6	100.1	2.31
Rai	525551	2.8	97.1	635151	2.8	96.8	1.89
Gurung	449189	2.4	92.4	543571	2.4	91.3	1.91
Limbu	297186	1.6	95.6	359379	1.6	94.7	1.90
Sherpa	110358	0.6	99.0	154622	0.7	100.5	3.37
Sub-Group (Bhote +)	12463	0.1	94.2	23091	0.1	106.5	6.17
Sub-Group (Gharti+)	122955	0.7	87.8	336358	1.5	98.3	10.06
Sub-Group (Yakha +)	10271	0.1	166.3	52161	0.2	90.9	16.25
Sub-Group (Majhi +)	129733	0.7	97.4	152502	0.7	99.0	1.62
Sub-Group (Chepang +)	49526	0.3	99.4	65084	0.3	102.3	2.73
<i>Terai Janajatis</i>	1452652	7.9	101.9	1975852	8.7	102.4	3.08
Tharu	1194224	6.5	101.2	1533879	6.7	102.1	2.50
Dhanuk	136944	0.7	108.3	188150	0.8	107.6	3.18
Sub-Group (Rajbansi +)	121484	0.7	101.7	167216	0.7	100.4	3.20
Sub-Group (Santhal +)	-			86607	0.4	100.8	----
Religious Minorities	664125	3.6	106.0	979003	4.3	106.9	3.88
Sub-Group (Musaalman +)	654833	3.5	106.2	975949	4.3	106.9	3.99
Punjabi/Sikh	9292	0.1	95.2	3054	0.0	105.4	-11.13
Unidentified Caste/Ethnicity	821280	4.4	104.4	231641	1.0	101.3	-12.66
Total Population	1849109	100.0	99.5	22736934	100.0	99.8	2.07

Source: Population Census 2001, Vol. I & II, CBS, 2002

Analysis of Caste, Ethnicity and Gender Data from 2001 Population Census in Preparation for Poverty Mapping and Wider PRSP Monitoring, a report submitted to DfID Nepal by T. P. Acharya Memorial Foundation, Kathmandu

Appendix 6.9.3

Population by caste/ethnicity and age group, 2001

Caste/Ethnicity	Under 15	15 - 59	60 +	Total
Hill/Terai B/C+	37.4	55.8	6.8	100.0
<i>Hill B/C+</i>	<i>37.5</i>	<i>55.6</i>	<i>6.9</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Brahman – Hill	35.4	57.1	7.6	100.0
Sub-Group (Chhetri +)	39.0	54.6	6.4	100.0
Terai B/C+	35.6	58.5	5.9	100.0
Terai Middle Caste	40.7	53.2	6.1	100.0
Yadav	40.1	53.5	6.4	100.0
Sub-Group (Teli +)	40.4	53.8	5.7	100.0
Sub-Group (Koiri +)	41.1	52.9	6.0	100.0
Sub-Group (Kewat +)	41.8	52.0	6.2	100.0
Dalits	43.6	52.7	5.8	100.0
<i>Hill Dalits</i>	<i>43.6</i>	<i>50.9</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Kami	44.0	50.5	5.5	100.0
Damai/Dholi	43.0	51.8	5.2	100.0
Sarki	43.1	50.9	6.0	100.0
Sub-Group (Badi +)	42.0	53.5	4.5	100.0
<i>Terai Dalits</i>	<i>41.5</i>	<i>52.5</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Chamar/ Harijan/ Ram	41.5	52.1	6.3	100.0
Musahar	42.4	52.6	5.0	100.0
Sub-Group (Dusadh +)	41.6	52.5	5.9	100.0
Sub-Group (Dhobi +)	43.0	51.8	5.2	100.0
Janajatis	38.8	54.4	6.8	100.0
<i>Hill Janajatis</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>54.4</i>	<i>7.3</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Newar/Thakali</i>	<i>31.5</i>	<i>60.6</i>	<i>7.9</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Newar	31.5	60.6	7.9	100.0
Thakali	29.0	60.4	10.6	100.0
<i>Other Hill Janajatis</i>	<i>39.9</i>	<i>52.9</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Magar	40.7	52.2	7.1	100.0
Tamang	41.0	52.1	6.9	100.0

Rai	38.7	54.5	6.8	100.0
Gurung	36.0	54.6	9.4	100.0
Limbu	38.7	53.8	7.4	100.0
Sherpa	37.2	56.0	6.8	100.0
Sub-Group (Bhote +)	37.5	55.2	7.3	100.0
Sub-Group (Bhujel +)	41.3	52.2	6.5	100.0
Sub-Group (Yakha +)	38.5	53.5	8.0	100.0
Sub-Group (Majhi +)	41.6	52.7	5.7	100.0
Sub-Group (Bote +)	44.2	50.2	5.6	100.0
<i>Terai Janajatis</i>	40.5	54.4	5.0	100.0
Tharu	40.8	54.3	5.0	100.0
Dhanuk	41.2	53.2	5.6	100.0
Sub-Group (Rajbansi +)	37.5	57.5	5.0	100.0
Sub-Group (Santhal +)	40.9	54.2	4.9	100.0
Religious Minorities	44.9	49.9	5.2	100.0
Sub-Group (Musaalman +)	44.9	49.9	5.2	100.0
Punjabi/Sikh	39.0	55.7	5.3	100.0
Unidentified Caste/Ethnic Group	32.4	38.6	3.8	100.0
Total Population	39.4	54.1	6.5	100.0

Source: Population Census Vol. 1 & 2, Central Bureau of Statistics, 2002

Appendix 6. 9.4

Distribution of caste/ethnic groups of people by Development Regions

Caste\Ethnicity	Eastern Development Region	Central Development Region	Western Development Region	Mid West Development Region	Far West Development Region	Nepal
Hill/Terai B/C+	17.9	27.6	21.3	15.8	17.3	100.0
Hill B/C+	17.4	26.4	21.7	16.4	18.0	100.0
Terai B/C+	27.0	47.0	14.3	6.0	5.7	100.0
Terai Middle Caste	24.3	54.4	15.2	4.1	2.0	100.0
Dalits	21.2	26.5	24.5	14.8	13.0	100.0
Hill Dalit	15.6	16.7	30.4	20.6	16.8	100.0
Terai Dalit	29.8	41.5	15.5	5.9	7.2	100.0
Janajatis	27.8	36.7	19.7	10.6	5.2	100.0
Hill Janajatis	26.9	42.4	22.1	7.4	1.2	100.0
<i>Newar/Thakali</i>	<i>15.1</i>	<i>70.4</i>	<i>12.3</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Other Hill Janajatis</i>	<i>29.8</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>24.4</i>	<i>8.8</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Terai Janajatis	30.7	17.9	11.8	21.3	18.3	100.0
Religious Minorities	22.4	46.9	19.8	10.3	0.5	100.0
Others	41.3	24.5	9.7	4.5	20.0	100.0
Total	23.3	35.1	20.1	11.9	9.6	100.0

Source: Population Census Vol. 1 & 2, Central Bureau of Statistics, 2002

Appendix 6.9.5

Population composition of Development Regions by caste/ethnicity

2001 (Percent)

Caste\Ethnicity	EDR	CDR	WDR	MWDR	FWDR
Hill/Terai B/C+	25.2	25.8	34.7	43.6	59.1
Hill B/C+	23.1	23.2	33.4	42.7	58.0
Terai B/C+	2.2	2.5	1.3	0.9	1.1
Terai Middle Caste	13.5	20.0	9.8	4.4	2.7
Dalits	10.7	8.9	14.3	14.6	15.9
Hill Dalit	4.8	3.4	10.7	12.3	12.4
Terai Dalit	6.0	5.5	3.6	2.3	3.5
Janajatis	44.5	38.9	36.4	33.2	20.0
Hill Janajatis	33.1	34.4	31.3	17.7	3.4
<i>Newar/Thakali</i>	3.6	11.1	3.4	0.8	0.3
<i>Other Hill Janajati</i>	29.5	23.4	27.9	16.9	3.1
Terai Janajatis	11.5	4.4	5.1	15.5	16.6
Religious Minorities	4.2	5.8	4.2	3.7	0.2
Others	1.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Population Census Vol. 1 & 2, Central Bureau of Statistics, 2002

Appendix 6.9. 6

Summary of educational profile of Nepal

	Group Average, 2001						
	1985	1990	1995	2000	2001	SAR	Low income**
Socio-economic context							
Per capita GNI (US\$)	170	220	220	230	230*	450	430
Adult literacy rate (%), (age 15 +)	26.5	30.4	36	41.7	42.9	59.3	63.9
Average years of schooling of adults	1.2	1.6	2	2.4	2.4	4.7	4.4
Duration of education (years)							
Primary level	5	5	5	5	5	5.0	6
Secondary level	5	5	5	5	5
Compulsory schooling	5
Gross enrolment ratio (%)							
Primary level	79.9	107.7	109.1	116.6	121.6	94.8	93.5
Secondary level	25.2	33.1	39.7	39.9	43.9	48.0	45.6
Tertiary level	4.4	5.2	4.4	4.8	5.4	10.0	9.6
Net enrolment ratio (%)							
Primary level	70.5	70.5	81.8	79.5
Secondary level
Grade 1 intake rate (%)							
Gross intake rate	..	123.1	..	114.4	122.3	120.3	113.2
Net intake rate
Student flow--primary level							
Primary completion rate (%)	..	51	..	69.9	72.8*	78.0	68.1
Pupils reaching grade 5 (% of cohort)	..	52	..	77.8	64.9	59.9	66.9
Repetition rate (%)	..	27.4	..	24	21.6	4.6	6.7
School life expectancy (years)	9	9.6
Student flow--secondary level							
Progression to secondary level (%)	..	78	..	81.7	78.2
Repetition rate (%)	..	8.4
Public expenditure on education							
Total spending as a % of GDP	2.7	2	3.3	3.7	3.4	2.3	3.1
Current spending per student (% of per capita GDP)							

Primary level	10.2	13.3	12.5	8.7	..
Secondary level	17.3	8.1	11.1	14.3	11.8	10.4	..
Tertiary level	264.6	90.8	124.9	100.8	82.3	60.4	..
Current spending on teaching materials							
Primary level (%)
Secondary level (%)
Ratio of pupils to teachers							
Primary level	35.3	39.2	39.5	37	39.9	42.2	40.2
Secondary level	33.1	29
Gender parity index (GPI)							
Gross enrolment ratio in primary and secondary	42.9	52.8	69.7	81.2	83.4
Private sector enrolment share							
Primary level (%)	..	4.7	..	6.6	7
Secondary level (%)	26.3	26.3

Note: Break in series between 1997 and 1998 due to change from International Standard Classification of Education 1976 (ISCED76) to ISCED97.

** : Income level classification reflects the 2002 data on per capita GNI.

* : Data are for 2002/03.

Source: Summary Education Profile: Nepal, World Bank, 2003

Appendix 6.9. 7
HDI by caste and ethnicity

Caste/Ethnicity	HDI
Newar	0.457
Brahmin	0.441
Chhetri	0.348
Rajbansi, Tharu,	0.313
Yadav, Aahir	
Gurung, Magar,	0.299
Sherpa, Rai, Limbu	
Muslim	0.239
Occupational Castes	0.239
Others	0.295

Source: Nepal South Asia Centre 1998, Nepal Human Development Report 1998

Endnotes

¹ "Purity" (blood purity, body purity, mind purity, ritual purity, and food purity) is the base of caste society. Keeping these traditional bases in mind three caste-groups are categorized as High caste, touchable middle caste, and untouchable low caste (Dalit). Brahman, Kshatri of the Aryan blood were considered as high caste groups; Mongoloid groups were regarded as touchable middle caste groups, and labor class people of the Aryan and Dravidian blood were treated as low caste, Dalit.

¹ The ethnic group of Mongoloid origin is regarded as egalitarian and yet there are educationally better off people such as Thakali; Lama of Tamang; Ghale of Gurung; and Shrestha of Newar community.

¹ Saptahah, Ekaha, Nawaha of the Hindus; lecture sessions of the Buddhists and Namaj session of the Islams

¹ BS is Bikram Era which is 56 year, 8 month, and 14 days ahead of the Christian era. BS starts in the month of April. For example, 14th April, 2005 is the the first day of Nepali new year. which is 2062

¹ . There are literacy primers in (a) hill languages such as Tamang, Magar, Gurung, and Limbu (b) Terai languages such as Tharu, Maithili, and Bhojpuri. But there are post literacy reading materials only in Tharu language.

¹ Srinivasan of India coined the word sanskritization to indicate the status of the people as cultured and civilized being.

¹ . This is the approach to produce literacy materials in one language and translate it into another language by using the same picture and theme through computers' "cut and paste process".

¹ The lowest political unit at the village is Village Development Committee while it is Municipality Development Committee in the city. There are 3999 VDCs and 58 MDCs in the country. At the district level there is District Development Committee which works between parliament and local bodies. There are 75 DDCs in the country. And at the central level there are lower and upper houses. But all these elected bodies are dissolved and recently state of emergency has been imposed by the king.

¹ In each cluster there are 8 to 15 schools. Currently the country has approximately 1300 clusters

¹ Social Welfare Council registers NGOs and INGOs working in Nepal. The recent data shows that there are 17000 NGOs and 118 INGos are providing services to the people in different fields and education is one of them. An estimated figure shows that some 300 NGOs and 18 INGOs are conducting literacy programs.