Journal of North East India Studies
Vol. 3, No. 1, Jan.-Jun. 2013, pp. 1-17.

Educational Development among the Scheduled Tribes of Manipur

Marchang Reimeingam

Education among the Scheduled Tribes of Manipur, predominantly dwelling in the hills, has substantially developed in terms of literacy rates and educated persons between1991 to 2001. Yet, females are lacking behind in it. However, the gap of literacy rates has narrowed down. The share of the educated has increased crossing a quarter of the literates for all Scheduled Tribes. The proportion of student was larger in urban than rural areas. Males and females get similar opportunity in studies. More than nine-tenth of the population lives in rural areas resulting to a similar share of population studying in rural areas. Close to nine-tenth of the share of rural students were in school institutions and the rest in college and others. Tendency for higher educational pursuit is higher among the urban dwellers. About two-tenth of the urban students were in college and others.

Keywords: Education, Development, Tribes, Manipur.

Introduction

Manipur, which is located in the North Eastern Region of India, is inhabited by 33 recognised Scheduled Tribes (STs). Major ethnic groups of Manipur include Meitei and Muslim Manipuri dwelling predominantly in the four valley districts and the tribal Nagas and Kukis inhabiting predominantly in the five hill districts. The paper mainly examines the tribal educational development measured in terms of literacy rates and attending educational institutions for males and females separately in rural and urban areas among the STs of Manipur. The measurement is based on the available census data for 29 recognised STs from 1991 to 2001. It analyses whether the population of STs will increase due to improvement in education. As expected, illiteracy is declining as education develops both in terms of attaining higher literacy rates and the quality of educated ones which changes their social and economic well being.

Scheduled Tribes

In India the term "tribe" is not properly defined and is used as administrative groupings. The British, until March 31, 1937 categorised them as "backward classes". It was under

Dr. Marchang Reimeingam is Assistant Professor at the Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, India.

ISSN 2278-1455 / ISSN 2277-6869

http://www.jneis.com

the Government of India Act, 1935 that they were first scheduled as tribes, a practice that was retained in independent India (Chaube 1999). Tribal refers to groups of people who define themselves by a kinship to an early pedigree before they identify with the nation. Anthropologists termed tribe as consisting of a singular cultural unit, having shared traits such as language and the absence of a hierarchical political structure. There is no definition for tribal in the Constitution of India. It simply says that the President of India can specify the tribes or tribal communities to be Scheduled Tribes. According to Clause (25) of Article 366 of the Constitution, "Scheduled Tribes" means such tribes or tribal communities or parts of or groups within such tribes or tribal communities as are deemed under Article 342 to be Scheduled Tribes for the purposes of this Constitution (Chandra 2011). The term "Scheduled Tribes" refers to specific indigenous peoples whose status is acknowledged to some degree by national legislation. Tribal communities do have similarities, though broad generic ones. They are known to dwell in compact areas, follow a community way of living, in harmony with nature, and have a uniqueness of culture, distinctive customs, traditions and beliefs which are simple, direct and non-acquisitive by nature. Some of these broadly similar characteristics have been used as criteria for the last few decades to identify and declare a particular community as a Scheduled Tribe. Ministry of Tribal Affairs described ST using the criteria such as primitive traits, distinctive culture, geographical isolation, shyness of contact and backwardness. But even all these broad criteria are not applicable to Scheduled Tribes today. Some of the terms used (e.g. primitive traits, backwardness) are also, in today's context, pejorative and need to be replaced with terms that are not derogatory.

Tribes of Manipur

Tribe in Manipur denotes people who live in group or villages depending on forest through hunting and gathering of food and forest products. They practice jhum or shifting cultivation using crude tools for ploughing or harvesting with no specialised modern economic activities. Community owns the land; however, in recent years private land ownership has emerged. The tribes of Manipur are non-homogeneous group. They are one of the most distinctive features of the state and scattered across the hill areas. They represent a unique feature of the state covering 33 communities that originated from Tibetan-Burmese tribal groups of Mongoloid stock. They are categorised on the basis of their distinct language, culture, traditional attire, food habits, belief and superstition. Presently there are 33 recognised tribes in Manipur such as "Aimol, Anal, Angami, Chiru, Chothe, Gangte, Hmar, Kabui, Kharam, Poumai, Rongmei, Liangmai, Zeme, Koirao/ Thangal, Koireng (Koren), Kom, Lamgang, Mao, Maram, Maring, Monsang, Moyon, Paite, Purum, Ralte, Simte, Suhte, Tarao, Mate (read as Maate), Tangkhul, Thadou, Vaiphei, Zou" (Scheduled Tribes of Manipur 2013). These tribal ethnic groups in Manipur are broadly classified into Naga and Kuki.

The distribution of major ethnic group across the districts of Manipur are as follows: Meiteis, Pangans, and few settlements of Kom in the districts of Imphal, Bishnupur and Thoubal; Tangkhul Nagas and few settlements of Kukis in Ukhrul; Mao Nagas, Poumei Nagas, Maram Nagas, Thangal Nagas, Thadou Kukis, Komrems and Nelpalis in Senapati; Zeliangrong Nagas (Zeliang, Rongmei and Zeme), Chirus, and Kukis in

Tamenglong; Marings, Monsangs, Lamkangs, Chothes, Monyons, Tharaos, Zous and Thadou Kukis in Chandel; and Paite, Simte, Ralte, Mizos, Hmar, Suhte, Purum, Gangte, Vaiphei, Thadou-Kukis in Churachandpur district (Shimray 2001).

Major Ethnic Groups

Manipur presents a unique traditional, cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious characteristics which are seldom found in other regions in India. It also reveals unique characteristics in terms of demography, social organisation and economic life. It is described as "The Jewel of the East" by the first Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru. It is inhabited by several ethnic groups. The State comprises of three major ethnic groups mainly from the Mongoloid and Tibeto-Burman linguistic group namely Meitei, which dominantly inhabit in the valley, and Nagas and Kuki-Chins in the hills. The government of India recognises the Nagas and Kuki-Chins as Scheduled Tribes in the Indian Constitution, while anthropologists classify Nagas and Kuki-Chins as of Mongoloid stock speaking one of the Tibetan-Burman languages. Besides a small Muslim Manipuri's locally known as Meitei Pangal are settled in the Imphal valley. In addition to Meiteis, the valley is also inhabited by Nepalis, Bengalis, Marwaris and other communities from other states of India. At present several people from the hills have also migrated and settled in the valley for employment and higher education. Different ethnic groups have some sort of similarities in their cultural and traditional practice. In Manipur the districts which are concentrated by the Scheduled Tribe population are Chandel, Churachandpur, Senapati, Tamenglong and Ukhrul.

Population

Scheduled Tribes constitute 8.2 percent of the over 102 crore Indian population according to the Census of 2001. The population of STs have gradually increased over the decades from 6.86 percent in 1961 to 6.94 percent in the following decade and further to 7.76 percent in 1981 in India, excluding Assam (www.indiastat.com 2012). In 1991, as large as 8.01 percent of the population in India was STs. Two factors have contributed to the rise of the tribal population's share in total population from 5.36 per cent in 1951 to the present figure. They are: (i) the removal of intra-state restrictions by the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Act, 1976, and (ii) inclusion of new tribes into the Schedule. Removal of inter-state restrictions on recognition of Scheduled Tribes may further increase their share in the total population (Verma 1990 as cited in Chaube 1999).

Manipur ST population constitutes close to one percent of India's ST; which is larger than the contribution of population of Manipur in the population of India at 0.21 percent. Moreover, the contribution of Manipur ST population in the country's population is negligible at 0.07 percent. There were more than seven lakh ST populations, constituting a large proportion of slightly over 34 percent in the 21 lakh plus population of Manipur. Out of the seven lakh and above ST population about 95 percent live in rural areas and the remaining five percent live in urban areas. The detail proportion of population of each tribe is presented in Appendix 1. Data shows a marginal decline in the share of ST population in the state by about 0.2 percentage point as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Scheduled Tribe Profile of Manipur

Items		1991	2001
Population (Number)	India	846302688	1028610328
	Manipur	1837149	2166788
ST in India* (Number)		67758380	84326240
ST in Manipur (Number)	Total	632173	741141
	Rural	578930 (91.6%)	705912 (95.2%)
	Urban	53243 (8.4%)	35229 (4.8%)
ST India percentage to population India		8.01	8.20
ST Manipur percentage to population Manipur		34.41	34.20
ST Manipur percentage to ST India		0.93	0.88
ST Manipur percentage to population India		0.07	0.07
Population Manipur percentage to population India		0.22	0.21

Note: *ST population of India excludes Jammu & Kashmir in 1991. The 1991 population for India includes projected figure for Jammu & Kashmir as projected by the Standing Committee of Expert on Population Projection (Oct.1989). Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district. Figure in the parentheses are percentage to total.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 1991 and 2001.

It was partially due to the exclusion of census figure in the three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district which are Naga dominated tribal areas in the state in census 2001. ST population was growing at 1.59 percent per annum during 1991-2001 in Manipur. This is due to the higher population growth of females (1.70) against the males (1.48). The higher population growth of females has resulted to an improvement of sex ratio at 980 in 2001 from the previous decade at 959. This shows indifferences in the male gender preference by the parents among the STs.

The improvement in ratio reflects the reduction for the son preference due to rising educational attainment. Hesketh and Zhu (2006:13272) mentioned that sons are preferred because “they have a higher wage-earning capacity, especially in agrarian economies; they continue the family line; and they are generally recipients of inheritance. Girls are often considered an economic burden because of the dowry system; after marriage they typically become members of the husband’s family, ceasing to have responsibility for their parents in illness and old age”. Further, Hesketh and Zhu (2006) noted that the population sex ratio depends on the sex ratio at birth, differential mortality rates between the sexes at different ages, and losses and gains through migration. Although sex ratio at birth favours males, differential gender mortality favors females. Females have greater resistance to disease throughout life and greater overall longevity, so in circumstances where they have the same nutrition and health care as males, females have lower mortalities across all age groups. The situation for men is compounded by their greater tendency to engage in risk behaviours and violence, thus increasing their risk of premature mortality. The decline in preference of son due to the improvement in education particularly among mothers along with increasing urbanisation and changes in the old systems of social and economic control explain the improvement of sex ratio

among the STs and all the ethnic groups over the years. Also, the increased in male mortality due to the conflict and violence in the state has undoubtedly resulted to the improvement in sex ratio.

Education

The British paved the way for entry of education into tribal societies through Christian missionaries. They spread Christianity in concurrence with the introduction of education from the late 19th century. They brought education and introduced the roman script, and made communication easier between the Naga tribes as well as with the outside world (Chasie 2005). Serto (2000, as cited in Thiyam, 2007) asserted that tribal people in the hills generally lack education, training, communication facilities, etc. Among the Naga tribes of Manipur, the Tangkhuls were the first to receive Christianity; therefore, they were more educated and better adapted to the modern and Western cultures than other tribes (Pukhrambam 2012). It appears that Christianity has played a major role for the tribal in Manipur. As a result large tribal population is not only literate but also educated. Literacy rate, which is the crude measurement of educational development, has substantially increased for all the tribes from 1991 to 2001, as presented in Appendix 2, for both males and females. STs do not experience a uniform attainment in literacy or reducing illiteracy in Manipur. Some tribes are deprived considerably with respect to other tribes in the state. This is on top of the findings of Srivastava (2008: 29) that Scheduled Tribes "notwithstanding their inter-cultural differences share the same relation of deprivation with respect to non-tribal people". While ethnic consciousness is very much prevalent in the state, it was believed in western democracies that the spread of education would over a length of time erode ethnic consciousness (Burman 1989).

The increase in the literacy rate is partly attributed to the intervention of the government through free educational schemes, establishment of schools in tribal remote areas and reservation policy; and also partly due to the increase in motivation by both self and parents recognising the importance of education which is required for entering into formal employment. The gradual erosion of false belief and superstitions have also induced tribals to enter in modern educational system. The increased pressure in agriculture necessitates people to seek employment in non-agriculture sector which requires modern education and thus raises the level of educational attainment. Various government schemes and programmes for reduction of poverty among the tribal population have also helped in raising the level of literacy rates.

The literacy rate has increased for all the tribes for both males and females during 1991-2001. The highest increase in literacy rate was among the Maram tribe followed by the Sema, Mao, Ralte, Hmar, Aimol, Angami tribes and so on for males. For females, the highest increase was among the Ralte tribe followed by Sema, Mao, Maram, Angami, Koirang, Koirao, Hmar and so on. The lowest increase rate was among the tribe of Purum for both males and females. The literacy rate has grown more for females than males for all the tribes in Manipur; except for the tribes of Gangte, Simte, Aimol and Maram where literary rate grows faster for males. In developing economies "each worsening of the employment situation calls forth an increased demand for more formal education at all levels" (Todaro 1991: 339). This also partially explains the increase in lit-

eracy rates. Further, it suggests an increased in the number of educated. Interestingly, the wide gap of literacy rates between males and females in the 1990s has narrowed down.

Educational Attainment

The number of ST literates has increased from 2.8 lakh in 1991 to 4.2 lakh in 2001. Concurrently, literacy rates have also increased leading to an increased in the share of educated people. In 1991, as large as 80.0 percent, as shown in Appendix 3A, of the Scheduled Tribe literates were below secondary educational level and the rest 20.0 percent have attained secondary and above. In 2001, the share of literates below secondary has declined to 71.2 percent due to an increase in the share of secondary and above educational attainment. Within below secondary educational level a large proportion were in the primary and middle school level. The large primary and middle educational level base suggests and necessitates the increasing demand for higher education. This could be explain with the increasing proportion of the literates in the secondary, higher secondary and graduates and above. The share of secondary and above has increased to 28.8 percent in 2001 from a mere 20.0 percent in the previous decade. The pattern of educational attainment among the Scheduled Tribes shows that as the literacy rates increase the proportion of educated person also gradually increase.

The proportion of persons below secondary education was largest for the Lamgang with 86.6 percent followed by Zou and Chiru; and it was lowest for Angami with about 49 percent in 1991. In other words, Angami with about 51 percent followed by Purum, Aimol, Mao and others have larger proportion of persons who have attained secondary and above education. Similarly, in 2001, Hmar with 18.6 percent followed by Zou and Purum have lesser proportion of persons who have attained secondary and above level of education (Appendix 3B). Ralte with 75.0 percent followed by Sema, Angami, Koireng and so on have larger proportion with secondary and above education. Among the big tribes in terms of population such as Tangkhul the proportion of persons who have attained below secondary has declined considerably from 80.0 to 65.1 percent over the period against the declined from 84.7 to 74.3 percent for Thadou. It shows the increased of proportion of secondary and above educational level for both Tangkhul and Thadou tribes. The prevalence and the increase of persons with secondary and above education were higher for the Tangkhuls portraying more educated as compared to the Thadous.

Students

Students, defined as those person attending educational institutions, comprised of about one-third of the total population among the STs. The share of students was much larger in urban areas at 41.3 percent as compared to the rural areas at 32.5 percent for persons in 2001 as shown in Appendix 4. It is also true for both males and females. The difference is due to better educational infrastructure in urban areas, better educational accessibility due to lower poverty and higher educational competition which is demanded in most of the urban formal labour market. Rural people educate mostly upto secondary level due to inaccessibility of educational infrastructure. However, rural people who want to pursue higher education and can afford are migrating towards urban areas following the general prevailing trend in any society. Rural people could not access educa-

tion as much as urban people do due to engagement in economic activities to supplement their household income primary arises because of poverty. They think that spending on education is a waste of time and money as they are most likely to drop schooling on the mid way which would be of less implication and use on their life. Opportunity cost for the tribals is supposedly higher as compared to the developed society. Urban people are relatively more educated and affluent which enable them to access education. It is important to note that affluent rural people migrating to urban areas to pursue higher education contributes to the growth of urban population. Females could not attend to educational institutions as much as males could in both rural and urban areas which is a matter of concern. Only 30.4 percent of the females were students against 34.6 percent for males in rural areas. Similarly in urban areas 39.4 percent of females against 43.2 percent of the males were students.

In terms of sex ratio, it was considerably lower for the students when compared with the sex ratio of population among the STs. In 2001, the sex ratio of students was much better in urban (949) than rural (859) areas indicating lesser biasness in motivating and supporting in educating children of both the gender. The ratio for population was far better in urban areas at 1040 against the rural areas (977). It suggests the prevalence of gender indiscrimination among the STs in Manipur. Male population being outnumbered by female in urban areas is attributed partially due to larger female migration towards urban areas, lower female child mortality due to better health care facilities in urban areas and high prevalence of male mortality due to violence and conflict. More importantly, there prevails more equitable access to education in urban areas to both the gender.

Sex ratio for students were higher in urban than rural areas for all the tribes excepting Lamgang, Maram, Monsang, Aimol, Koirao and Suhte as given in Appendix 4, indicating, but too early to conclude, that females are not much interested in studies in urban areas or parents did not support females as much as to their male children in urban areas. The sex ratio for students in rural areas exceeds urban areas by 282 for Lamgang, 212 for Maram, 42 for Monsang, 372 for Aimol, 63 for Koirao and 222 for Suhte due to the excess of sex ratio of population for the corresponding tribes with 117 for Lamgang, 322 for Maram, 48 for Monsang, 532 for Aimol, 61 for Koirao and 426 for Suhte. There is no gender discrimination to educate a child which is evident from the almost proportionately exceeding sex ratios of population and students in rural areas. The low prevalence of sex ratio for students in urban areas is due to low population sex ratio in urban areas.

The distribution of tribal students reveals that 94.0 percent studies in rural areas and the rest six percent studies in urban areas in 2001 as given in Appendix 5. This is because majority of them are living in rural areas with about 95 percent of the total ST population. A similar pattern prevails for both the gender. Population living in urban areas was relatively larger for Angami, Kabui, Koireng, Mao, Monsang, Sema and Any Mizo tribes when compared to other tribes, and as a result relatively larger share of them were students. Angami and Sema were the most prominent tribes who lived and studied in urban areas. However, their population was small in number at only 132 and 13 for Angami and Sema respectively in the year 2001.

In 2001, out of the total 2.4 lakh ST students more than 87 percent were attending

Table 2: Share (%) of ST Students by Educational Institutions in Manipur in 2001

Educational Institutions	Gender	Total	Rural	Urban
School	Person	87.1	87.6	80.6
	Male	86.1	86.4	80.3
	Female	88.4	88.9	80.8
College	Person	11.5	11.2	17.4
	Male	12.4	12.0	17.9
	Female	10.6	10.1	16.8
Vocational institute	Person	0.5	0.4	1.3
	Male	0.6	0.6	0.8
	Female	0.4	0.3	1.8
Other institute	Person	0.7	0.7	0.7
	Male	0.9	0.9	1.0
	Female	0.5	0.5	0.5
Literacy centre	Person	0.1	0.1	0.0
	Male	0.2	0.2	0.0
	Female	0.1	0.1	0.0
Students (No.)	Person	244312	229765	14547
	Male	131056	123591	7465
	Female	113256	106174	7082

Note: Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 2001.

in schools while 11.5 percent in college institutions, only 0.5 percent in vocational institute, 0.7 percent in other institutes and a small share of 0.1 percent in the literacy centre as presented in Table 2. A detail distribution of students with different types of institutions for each tribe is appended at Appendix 6. It was similarly distributed for males and females and across the tribal groups. The share of students attending school was relatively lower for males than females in both rural and urban areas. As a result the share of students attending college institutions in particular and vocational institute, other institute and literary centre were relatively higher for males. It shows that larger proportion of males pursued in higher education indicating, but arguable, that males are more ambitious or economically more responsible as larger share of them were college student as compared to females. A lower literacy rate that is discussed above also explains the lower share of females attending to college.

Conclusions

The share of Scheduled Tribe population, inhabiting in the hills depending mainly on shifting cultivation for their livelihood, has stabilised or rather declined in Manipur due to the exclusion of population from the three Scheduled Tribe subdivisions of Senapati district in 2001 census. Sex ratio has improved due to the changes in son preference and increased in male mortality due to violence. Literacy rates have substantially increased which is a sign of educational development. Females are lacking behind in it resulting to

a wide gap of literacy rates. However, interestingly, the gap has narrowed down over the years. The share of educated has increased crossing a quarter of the literates for STs. The proportion of students was more in urban areas when compared to rural areas. Females also access almost the same opportunity of education as much as males do. More than nine-tenth of the population lived in rural areas resulting to a similar share of population studying in it. Urban STs are more educated and have a higher tendency to pursue in higher education as about two-tenth of the urban students were in college and other educational institutions against rural areas with close to one-tenth of the students in it.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Share (%) of ST Population in Manipur

Tribe Name	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
All STs (No.)	**632173**	**322720**	**309453**	**741141**	**374319**	**366822**
Anal	1.7	1.6	1.7	2.9	2.8	2.9
Angami	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chiru	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8
Chothe	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Kabui	9.9	9.8	10.0	11.1	11.1	11.2
Kacha Naga	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.7	5.7	5.6
Koireng	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Lamgang	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8
Mao	12.2	12.2	12.1	0.6	0.6	0.6
Maram	1.5	1.6	1.5	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maring	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.1
Monsang	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Moyon	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Sema	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tangkhul	17.0	17.0	17.0	19.7	19.9	19.6
Aimol	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Gangte	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.3	1.3	1.3
Hmar	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.8	5.8
Koirao	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Kom	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.0	2.0	2.1
Paite	6.5	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.6	6.7
Purum	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Ralte	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Simte	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5
Suhte	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3
Thadou	19.3	19.2	19.4	24.6	24.6	24.6
Vaiphui	4.3	4.3	4.2	5.2	5.2	5.2
Zou	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8
Generic Tribes etc.**	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1

Note: **Unclassified in 1991. Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 1991 and 2001.

Appendix 2: Literacy Rates (%) of STs in Manipur

Tribe Name	1991			2001			Male-Female Gap	
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	1991	2001
All Scheduled Tribes	**44.8**	**52.1**	**37.1**	**56.6**	**62.8**	**50.3**	**15.0**	**12.5**
Anal	52.0	59.5	44.8	64.0	70.4	57.9	14.8	12.5
Angami	60.7	71.2	46.6	78.0	87.3	67.2	24.6	20.1
Chiru	50.5	58.4	42.1	57.4	63.7	50.9	16.4	12.8
Chothe	59.0	62.4	55.4	69.8	76.4	63.5	7.0	12.9
Kabui	45.8	54.0	37.5	54.5	61.5	47.3	16.5	14.2
Kacha Naga	40.3	47.6	32.6	51.0	58.2	43.5	15.0	14.7
Koireng	56.5	67.6	46.4	72.5	80.4	65.3	21.2	15.1
Lamgang	42.5	49.8	35.0	58.9	64.8	53.0	14.8	11.9
Mao	37.0	46.5	27.0	64.4	71.1	57.6	19.5	13.5
Maram	31.3	36.1	25.8	56.2	63.0	49.4	10.3	13.6
Maring	29.8	39.4	19.5	46.2	55.2	36.8	19.8	18.5
Monsang	57.6	64.5	50.2	65.1	71.4	58.7	14.3	12.7
Moyon	56.7	61.7	52.1	69.2	72.4	66.1	9.6	6.3
Sema	49.5	52.9	43.9	84.6	77.8	100.0	9.0	22.2
Tangkhul	51.1	57.7	44.2	62.0	67.5	56.3	13.6	11.2
Aimol	38.8	47.3	30.5	54.8	63.5	46.2	16.8	17.3
Gangte	46.4	52.2	40.1	53.1	60.1	45.9	12.1	14.3
Hmar	50.4	54.7	46.0	68.2	71.7	64.6	8.7	7.2
Koirao	54.7	62.6	46.7	69.0	72.5	65.3	16.0	7.2
Kom	50.4	58.6	41.6	56.0	61.0	51.0	17.1	10.0
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	59.1	64.1	53.8	64.6	69.7	59.4	10.4	10.3
Paite	55.0	62.1	47.6	68.4	73.6	63.1	14.5	10.6
Purum	49.2	53.3	44.3	47.6	55.6	39.6	9.0	15.9
Ralte	45.2	52.3	37.3	80.0	75.0	100.0	15.0	25.0
Simte	46.0	53.2	38.6	56.4	64.1	48.7	14.6	15.4
Suhte	57.0	64.5	49.3	69.8	76.4	63.7	15.2	12.7
Thadou	39.7	47.0	32.2	49.0	55.3	42.5	14.8	12.7
Vaiphui	45.4	53.0	37.4	52.5	59.5	45.3	15.6	14.2
Zou	37.9	45.8	29.9	52.6	59.7	45.4	15.9	14.2
Generic Tribes etc.**	46.6	55.1	36.6	53.9	62.4	45.1	18.5	17.3

Note: A Literacy rate is the ratio between number of literates and population in percent. Population includes 0-6 years of age. **Unclassified in 1991. Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 1991 and 2001.

Appendix 3A: Share (%) of Literates by Educational Level among STs of Population 7+ age in Manipur in 1991.

Tribe Name	Number of Literate	Literate without educational level*	Below primary	Primary	Middle	Below Secondary	Matric/ Secondary	Higher Secondary/ Intermediate/ Pre-University/ Senior Secondary	Non-technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree	Technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree	Graduate and above	Secondary and Above
All STs	**282940**	**4.4**	**19.5**	**22.7**	**33.5**	**80.0**	**11.5**	**4.2**	**0.1**	**0.1**	**4.0**	**20.**
Anal	5537	2.5	18.5	20.2	35.2	76.4	13.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	23.
Angami	187	2.7	11.2	18.2	16.6	48.7	7.5	4.3	0.0	0.5	39.0	51.
Chiru	3046	3.8	24.0	23.0	35.3	86.2	9.8	2.1	0.1	0.0	1.8	13.
Chothe	1516	3.4	19.2	18.9	35.0	76.4	12.7	5.7	0.2	0.1	4.9	23.
Kabui	28648	3.8	22.0	22.9	30.8	79.6	12.3	3.9	0.1	0.1	4.0	20.
Kacha Naga	13556	3.2	19.3	27.2	34.5	84.2	11.6	2.3	0.1	0.1	1.7	15.
Koireng	493	4.3	12.8	32.3	32.0	81.3	9.9	2.6	0.4	0.0	5.7	18.
Lamgang	1714	3.5	22.0	21.2	40.0	86.6	6.6	4.6	0.1	0.0	2.2	13.
Mao	28518	5.4	12.0	16.0	34.9	68.3	19.0	7.4	0.1	0.2	5.1	31.
Maram	2998	6.6	13.1	19.5	32.2	71.4	21.5	4.0	0.1	0.2	2.8	28.
Maring	4673	6.8	25.9	16.2	34.2	83.0	8.7	3.7	0.8	0.0	3.7	17.
Monsang	1039	2.0	19.3	15.9	39.6	76.8	14.2	5.2	0.0	0.0	3.8	23.
Moyon	1179	4.7	18.7	21.1	27.2	71.8	13.4	5.9	0.0	0.2	8.8	28.
Sema	55	14.5	9.1	23.6	27.3	74.5	14.5	5.5	0.0	0.0	5.5	25.
Tangkhul	54796	2.5	15.0	24.3	38.2	80.0	10.4	4.6	0.3	0.1	4.4	20.
Aimol	817	4.5	17.0	15.5	30.0	67.1	17.1	7.6	0.1	0.2	7.8	32.
Gangte	5933	4.2	20.1	21.1	31.2	76.6	12.0	4.7	0.0	1.4	5.2	23.
Hmar	18043	7.5	26.7	24.1	26.9	85.3	8.0	3.2	0.0	0.1	3.4	14.
Koirao	938	3.8	12.7	23.6	38.2	78.3	14.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	2.3	21.
Kom	6553	5.9	18.0	19.1	35.0	78.0	11.3	4.7	0.0	0.1	5.9	22.
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	4870	2.8	18.2	21.5	29.5	72.0	14.7	5.8	0.1	0.0	7.4	28.

Paite	22429	3.3	23.9	21.5	30.9	79.7	11.9	3.8	0.0	0.1	4.5	20.
Purum	191	6.8	8.9	15.2	24.1	55.0	35.6	5.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	45.
Ralte	113	2.7	22.1	22.1	38.1	85.0	4.4	0.9	0.0	0.0	9.7	15.
Simte	4063	4.8	21.8	25.5	31.3	83.4	10.3	3.1	0.0	0.1	3.2	16.
Suhte	425	3.1	22.6	15.3	37.2	78.1	13.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	7.3	21.
Thadou	48411	5.6	21.0	25.5	32.6	84.7	8.6	3.2	0.1	0.2	3.3	15.
Vaiphui	12208	4.3	20.9	24.4	34.4	83.9	9.8	2.8	0.2	0.1	3.2	16.
Zou	6364	4.8	30.9	22.7	28.2	86.6	7.9	2.6	0.0	0.1	2.8	13.
Generic Tribes etc.**	3627	5.8	15.5	21.5	35.1	78.0	13.0	2.5	0.1	0.1	6.3	22.

Note: * Includes figures for educational level not classifiable. **Unclassified in 1991. Literates without educational level classified as no-formal and formal of 1991 are being classified under literates without educational level and below primary respectively in 2001. Literates with educational level not classifiable, (as calculated by the author) which is the difference between number of literates and the number of literates classified by their educational level, have been added in the literates without educational level in 2001. In 1991, persons with educational level not classifiable were club in non-formal (most possibly) or formal literates without educational level. Census note did not specify clearly in which category it was club; however, shown under the literates without educational level. Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.
Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 1991.

Appendix 3B: Share (%) of Literates by Educational Level among STs of Population 7+ age in Manipur in 2001.

Tribe Name	Number of Literate	Literate without educational level*	Below primary	Primary	Middle	Below Secondary	Matric/ Secondary	Higher Secondary/ Intermediate/ Pre-University/ Senior Secondary	Non-technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree	Technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree	Graduate and above	Secondary and Above
All STs	**419630**	**4.1**	**19.2**	**25.8**	**22.1**	**71.2**	**15.1**	**7.4**	**0.0**	**0.1**	**6.2**	**28.**
Anal	13603	2.4	16.7	24.1	21.9	65.1	17.3	10.1	0.0	0.1	7.4	34.
Angami	103	0.0	5.8	10.7	11.7	28.2	11.7	21.4	0.0	0.0	38.8	71.
Chiru	3228	2.3	16.4	22.6	26.5	67.8	19.8	7.6	0.0	0.0	4.8	32.
Chothe	1928	0.5	15.1	22.7	25.2	63.5	20.1	9.9	0.0	0.2	6.3	36.
Kabui	44876	3.2	17.1	25.6	21.5	67.4	16.6	8.9	0.0	0.1	7.0	32.
Kacha Naga	21427	5.6	18.5	29.2	22.8	76.1	14.7	5.5	0.0	0.0	3.6	23.
Koireng	1022	0.5	14.8	18.0	20.7	54.0	20.7	13.8	0.0	0.1	11.4	46.
Lamgang	3470	2.1	17.8	24.4	21.5	65.8	17.5	10.4	0.0	0.1	6.2	34.
Mao	3050	0.8	16.8	23.4	26.6	67.5	15.6	6.4	0.0	0.4	10.1	32.
Maram	688	3.9	12.9	19.2	28.3	64.4	18.8	6.5	0.0	0.0	10.3	35.
Maring	10744	1.8	21.4	23.2	23.5	70.0	16.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	5.7	30.
Monsang	1386	1.4	16.0	18.9	18.9	55.3	20.6	13.3	0.1	0.2	10.5	44.
Moyon	2054	1.9	14.0	20.7	20.6	57.2	14.8	10.4	0.0	0.8	16.8	42.
Serna	11	0.0	0.0	18.2	9.1	27.3	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.5	72.
Tangkhul	90603	2.0	14.8	24.0	24.3	65.1	17.1	9.5	0.0	0.1	8.2	34.
Aimol	1385	2.8	12.2	16.9	22.5	54.4	20.6	12.3	0.0	0.1	12.6	45.
Gangte	5016	8.6	19.6	26.4	21.3	75.9	12.5	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	24.
Hmar	29268	4.2	30.1	30.0	17.1	81.4	9.9	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	18.
Koirao	1620	2.2	17.2	27.0	22.7	69.0	19.9	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.7	31.
Kom	8176	2.4	15.1	22.5	26.3	66.3	17.7	9.0	0.0	0.1	7.0	33.
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	9794	9.9	16.7	21.5	20.4	68.5	15.3	8.1	0.0	0.1	8.0	31.
Paite	33685	5.1	22.2	25.5	20.9	73.7	13.3	6.4	0.0	0.1	6.4	26.
Purum	272	5.1	18.4	28.3	26.1	77.9	13.2	6.3	0.0	0.4	2.2	22.
Ralte	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.
Simte	6245	4.2	22.4	29.3	21.0	76.8	12.7	6.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	23.
Suhte	1329	14.4	23.3	24.1	11.7	73.4	13.6	7.1	0.0	0.0	5.8	26.
Thadou	89420	4.8	20.6	27.2	21.6	74.3	14.4	6.3	0.0	0.0	4.9	25.
Vaiphui	20079	7.0	21.2	27.7	21.9	77.9	12.8	5.3	0.0	0.1	4.0	22.
Zou	10813	9.1	20.9	26.7	22.1	78.8	11.8	5.5	0.0	0.0	3.9	21.
Generic Tribes etc.	4331	6.3	18.3	19.7	22.7	67.1	19.2	8.0	0.0	0.1	5.7	32.

Note: Same as Appendix 3A.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 2001.

Appendix 4: Share (%) of Students and Sex Ratio among STs in Manipur in 2001.

Tribe Name	Students as percentage to total ST population						Sex ratio of ST Population			
	Rural			Urban			Population		Students*	
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
All STs	**32.5**	**34.6**	**30.4**	**41.3**	**43.2**	**39.4**	**977**	**1040**	**859**	**949**
Anal	32.4	33.7	31.2	47.0	48.7	45.5	1029	1143	951	1067
Angami	40.0	50.0	0.0	42.5	47.8	36.7	250	896	0	688
Chiru	30.0	32.1	27.8	57.3	57.9	56.7	959	947	830	927
Chothe	37.5	41.2	33.9	38.1	38.7	37.6	1031	1218	847	1182
Kabui	33.8	36.4	31.1	42.8	44.7	40.9	986	1019	844	933
Kacha Naga	34.4	36.8	31.9	49.4	50.0	48.9	959	1175	831	1150
Koireng	38.8	41.6	36.2	50.3	57.4	45.5	1018	1443	886	1143
Lamgang	34.6	36.7	32.5	55.8	65.5	44.9	1008	891	893	611
Mao	37.8	39.9	35.6	46.6	50.7	42.8	965	1054	861	889
Maram	32.8	36.9	28.9	33.3	35.7	30.0	1036	714	812	600
Maring	29.9	33.1	26.6	43.5	48.1	38.7	954	981	768	788
Monsang	43.0	46.5	39.4	35.0	37.9	32.0	997	949	845	802
Moyon	37.6	39.5	35.7	42.3	34.5	47.6	1046	1448	945	2000
Sema	16.7	16.7	--	100.0	100.0	100.0	0	1333	0	1333
Tangkhul	38.7	40.2	37.1	47.6	48.0	47.3	960	1114	886	1098
Aimol	35.6	38.7	32.7	57.1	57.1	57.1	1032	500	872	500
Gangte	27.6	29.9	25.2	34.1	37.0	31.4	956	1075	808	911
Hmar	31.5	33.2	29.7	41.4	43.8	39.2	977	1077	873	964
Koirao	37.0	37.7	36.3	46.2	47.1	45.2	973	912	938	875
Kom	32.8	34.2	31.3	42.9	45.2	40.8	981	1116	898	1009
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	30.0	31.8	28.1	39.1	39.6	38.5	993	976	878	948
Paite	34.3	36.6	32.0	46.2	49.5	43.1	994	1065	869	928
Purum	30.5	32.5	28.5	100.0	–	100.0	993	--	871	--
Ralte	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–	--	250	--	--	--
Simte	31.3	33.2	29.3	44.0	43.6	44.3	996	1223	880	1244
Suhte	35.8	39.6	32.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	1093	667	889	667
Thadou	27.9	30.1	25.7	36.5	39.4	33.6	977	1028	834	875
Vaiphui	27.8	30.1	25.5	33.5	35.7	31.5	977	1035	827	913
Zou	30.3	31.9	28.6	36.5	37.0	36.0	992	1036	892	1008
Generic Tribes etc.	34.2	35.8	32.4	35.2	35.0	35.6	974	773	881	787

Note: Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 2001.

Appendix 5: Rural-urban Distribution of ST Students in percent in Manipur in 2001.

Tribe Name	Students						Population					
	Rural			Urban			Rural			Urban		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
All STs	**94.0**	**94.3**	**93.7**	**6.0**	**5.7**	**6.3**	**95.2**	**95.4**	**95.1**	**4.8**	**4.6**	**4.9**
Anal	97.8	97.9	97.6	2.2	2.1	2.4	98.4	98.5	98.4	1.6	1.5	1.6
Angami	3.6	5.9	0.0	96.4	94.1	100.0	3.8	5.6	1.6	96.2	94.4	98.4
Chiru	93.9	94.2	93.5	6.1	5.8	6.5	96.7	96.7	96.7	3.3	3.3	3.3
Chothe	88.4	90.0	86.6	11.6	10.0	13.4	88.6	89.5	87.8	11.4	10.5	12.2
Kabui	86.1	86.7	85.5	13.9	13.3	14.5	88.7	88.9	88.5	11.3	11.1	11.5
Kacha Naga	98.5	98.7	98.3	1.5	1.3	1.7	99.0	99.1	98.9	1.0	0.9	1.1
Koireng	74.2	76.6	71.7	25.8	23.4	28.3	78.9	81.9	76.1	21.1	18.1	23.9
Lamgang	97.2	96.7	97.7	2.8	3.3	2.3	98.2	98.1	98.3	1.8	1.9	1.7
Mao	81.7	81.9	81.4	18.3	18.1	18.6	84.6	85.2	84.0	15.4	14.8	16.0
Maram	96.0	95.5	96.6	4.0	4.5	3.4	96.1	95.4	96.8	3.9	4.6	3.2
Maring	97.3	97.4	97.3	2.7	2.6	2.7	98.2	98.2	98.1	1.8	1.8	1.9
Monsang	83.4	83.1	83.8	16.6	16.9	16.2	80.4	80.0	80.8	19.6	20.0	19.2
Moyon	97.3	98.2	96.4	2.7	1.8	3.6	97.6	98.0	97.2	2.4	2.0	2.8
Sema	12.5	25.0	0.0	87.5	75.0	100.0	46.2	66.7	0.0	53.8	33.3	100.0
Tangkhul	95.9	96.3	95.5	4.1	3.7	4.5	96.7	96.9	96.4	3.3	3.1	3.6
Aimol	98.7	98.4	99.0	1.3	1.6	1.0	99.2	98.9	99.5	0.8	1.1	0.5
Gangte	91.1	91.6	90.6	8.9	8.4	9.4	92.7	93.1	92.3	7.3	6.9	7.7
Hmar	97.2	97.3	97.1	2.8	2.7	2.9	97.9	98.0	97.8	2.1	2.0	2.2
Koirao	96.6	96.5	96.7	3.4	3.5	3.3	97.2	97.1	97.3	2.8	2.9	2.7
Kom	95.1	95.4	94.9	4.9	4.6	5.1	96.2	96.5	96.0	3.8	3.5	4.0
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	81.9	82.5	81.3	18.1	17.5	18.7	85.5	85.4	85.6	14.5	14.6	14.4
Paite	95.3	95.5	95.2	4.7	4.5	4.8	96.5	96.6	96.4	3.5	3.4	3.6
Purum	99.4	100.0	98.8	0.6	0.0	1.2	99.8	100.0	99.6	0.2	0.0	0.4
Ralte	--	–	--	–	--	--	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Simte	97.4	97.8	96.9	2.6	2.2	3.1	98.1	98.3	97.9	1.9	1.7	2.1
Suhte	99.3	99.2	99.4	0.7	0.8	0.6	99.7	99.7	99.8	0.3	0.3	0.2
Thadou	94.2	94.3	94.1	5.8	5.7	5.9	95.5	95.6	95.4	4.5	4.4	4.6
Vaiphui	94.5	94.7	94.2	5.5	5.3	5.8	95.4	95.5	95.3	4.6	4.5	4.7
Zou	96.0	96.2	95.7	4.0	3.8	4.3	96.7	96.7	96.6	3.3	3.3	3.4
Generic Tribes etc.	93.0	92.6	93.4	7.0	7.4	6.6	93.2	92.5	93.9	6.8	7.5	6.1

Note: Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 2001.

Appendix 6: Share (%) of ST students by Educational Institutions in Manipur in 2001.

Tribe Name	Students (Number)	School	College	Vocational institute	Other institute	Literacy centre
All Scheduled Tribes	**244312**	**87.1**	**11.5**	**0.5**	**0.7**	**0.1**
Anal	6937	80.4	18.0	0.6	0.9	0.1
Angami	56	50.0	23.2	26.8	0.0	0.0
Chiru	1735	90.3	9.0	0.5	0.2	0.0
Chothe	1038	86.9	8.8	0.8	3.6	0.0
Kabui	28658	86.8	12.0	0.5	0.5	0.2
Kacha Naga	14505	90.4	8.1	0.4	1.0	0.1
Koireng	582	82.1	17.5	0.3	0.0	0.0
Lamgang	2059	83.1	14.6	0.7	1.6	0.1
Mao	1853	87.2	11.1	0.9	0.6	0.2
Maram	402	92.8	6.0	0.2	0.7	0.2
Maring	7009	87.2	11.7	0.6	0.5	0.0
Monsang	882	79.4	18.1	0.0	2.4	0.1
Moyon	1119	74.8	19.2	1.0	4.3	0.7
Sema	8	37.5	25.0	37.5	0.0	0.0
Tangkhul	56898	85.1	13.5	0.5	0.8	0.1
Aimol	905	79.7	18.1	0.9	1.3	0.0
Gangte	2652	89.4	9.5	0.5	0.6	0.0
Hmar	13614	90.5	8.7	0.2	0.6	0.0
Koirao	875	92.2	6.7	0.1	0.3	0.6
Kom	4841	86.9	12.6	0.4	0.2	0.0
Any Mizo (Lushai) tribes etc.	4745	83.9	14.6	0.9	0.5	0.1
Paite	17114	86.2	12.5	0.5	0.4	0.5
Purum	175	89.1	9.1	1.1	0.6	0.0
Ralte	0	–	--	--	--	–
Simte	3485	90.4	8.7	0.3	0.5	0.0
Suhte	685	84.2	15.0	0.1	0.4	0.1
Thadou	51729	89.0	9.9	0.4	0.5	0.1
Vaiphui	10734	87.7	9.8	0.5	1.5	0.5
Zou	6268	92.1	7.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
Generic Tribes etc.	2749	85.8	11.8	1.1	1.2	0.1

Note: Manipur figure for 2001 excludes three sub-divisions namely Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul of Senapati district.

Source: Calculated by the author based on data from census of India, 2001.

References

Burman, B K Roy (1989): "Problems and Prospects of Tribal Development in North-East India", *Economic and Political Weekly*. 24(13):693-697.

Census (1991 onwards): *Census of India* (Delhi: Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India).

Chandra, V Deo (2011): "The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Bill", (New Delhi: As Introduced in Lok Sabha) Viewed on 9 September 2012 (http://164.100.24.219/BillsTexts/LSBillTexts/asintroduced/108%20of%202011,%20ST%20(eng).pdf)

Chasie, Charles (2005): "Nagaland in Transition", *India International Centre Quarterly*, 32(2/3):253-264.

Chaube, SK (1999): "The Scheduled Tribes and Christianity in India", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34(9):524-526.

Hesketh, Therese and Zhu Wei Xing (2006): "Abnormal Sex Ratios in Human Populations: Causes and Consequences", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 103(36): 13271-13275.

Pukhrambam, Lalitkumar Singh (2012): "The people of Manipur", Viewed on 8 September 2012 (http://e-pao.net/epSubPageExtractor.asp?src=manipur.Ethnic_Races_Manipur.The_People_of_Manipur)

Scheduled Tribes of Manipur (2013): Viewed on 6 January 2013 (http:/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Scheduled_Tribes_in_India#Manipur)

Shimray, UA (2001): "Ethnicity and Socio-Political Assertion: The Manipur Experience", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36(39):3674-3677.

Srivastava, Vinay Kumar (2008): "Concept of 'Tribe' in the Draft National Tribal Policy", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(50):29-35.

Thiyam, Bharat Singh (2007): "Poverty in Manipur", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(3):251-254.

Todaro, Michael P (1991): *Economic Development in the Third World* (Delhi: Orient Longman).

www.indiastat.com (2012): Viewed on 15 December 2012 (http://www.indiastat.com/table/demographics/7/scheduledcastestribes/249/335346/data.aspx)