

Language Barriers: Critical Factors for Female Dropout from Literacy Programme

Dr. Deepak Kumar Pradhan, ¹Ali Bordoloi Saikia

¹Assistant Professor in Education, PQH school of Education, University of Science and Technology, Meghalaya.

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to study the language barriers for the promotion of literacy among Tribal female dropouts from the literacy campaigns, Bolangir District of Odisha. Hypothesis of the Study: there exist no significant differences of opinion among the different Tribal women dropout learners with respect to language barriers for the promotion of literacy among tribal women. Methodology of the Study: Survey design was used for conducting this study. The total number of 18457, Tribal female dropouts from the Total Literacy Campaign, Post-Literacy Programme and Continuing of Bolangir district of Odisha served as the population. 800 respondents were drawn from the universe by using multistage Sampling Procedure. Stage-1: Out of 14 blocks in Bolangir District, 8 blocks were selected on the basis of Random Sampling procedure. Stage-2: From each block, 4 villages were selected again on the basis of Simple Random Sampling procedure. Stage-3: Out of each selected block, 4 villages and 25 Tribal women dropout from different stage of literacy campaign belonging to four prominent tribal groups (Kandha, Lodha, Bonda, Saora) were selected purposively using Convenient Sampling Procedure. Thus the samples drawn from the universe for each of the selected tribal group works out to be 200. The total sample for the purpose of the study was 800. Interview Schedule used for the purpose of data collection and Chi-square (χ^2) was used for the data analysis and interpretation. From the study it was found that there exist significant difference in between different tribal women dropout from the literacy programme with regard to different variables. It was also observed that language really a barrier in the way of the literacy of the Tribal group.

Key words

Language Barriers, female Dropout, Literacy Programme, Tribal Adult Learner

I. Introduction

A language is defined as a system of arbitrary symbols by which members of a social group cooperate and interact. It is a vehicle of communication and a means of social transmission of cultural heritage from one generation to another generation (Midatal, 2009). Every language has its own unique structure. Each language has three components: (1) Sound, (2) Structure and (3) Vocabulary. The first component (i.e.) the sound of language helps to understand the stream of speech, to hear the distinctive sound feature and to approximate their production. The second component is to grasp the structure of the language (i.e.) the arrangement of words into sentences. The third component is to learn the vocabulary. Language links in the ideas, feelings, information and thoughts of the people. Without language the accumulation and transmission of knowledge that differentiates man from other animals could not have been possible (Midatala, 2009). Language barrier refers when two people (or group of people) cannot communicate properly because they do not speak any common language.

Non-formal education provides opportunities to the tribal to bring psychological integration with the rest of the general population. In the context of the literacy programme language skill plays a vital role for teaching the concept and for ensuring participation of the learner. Linguistics competence is necessary for the success of the literacy programme. The Tribal women's are handicapped due to their lack of knowledge about the Odia language. In fact due to this handicap, there is problem for understanding the content of the primers. Exports in adult education have advocated for the use of their mother language in the literacy centres. They have also emphasized on the role of the instructors relating to the language. That means instructor should be trained to use Tribal language for explaining the concept to the learner. As most tribal language do not have a script it was difficult for the learners to comprehend the facts. For making teaching-learning process interesting the instructor should have been trained in the local dialects and used

local language of that community to teach the learners.

Education in mother tongue has been the national policy particularly at primary and elementary levels from the beginning. The National Policy on Education 1968 and 1986 has been emphatic on this issue. In respect of ethnic groups like the tribal's the policy stressed the need to develop curricula and devise instructional materials in tribal languages at the initial stage, with arrangements for switching over to the regional language (MHRD, 1986). The language of teaching-learning (or medium of instruction) in adult literacy programmes has been the mother tongue from the beginning. After TLC became the dominant approach and strategy NLM (National Literacy Mission) adopted the approach of leaving the issue of language of instruction to ZSS. Within a State there are many languages and dialects with or without a written script, spoken by sizeable number of people. There are cases of TLCs that used primers in 6-7 languages, as per their demographic compound language preference of the learners. In some cases, learners not knowing regional language -language of administration may like to become literate in that language. There are also districts with large tribal population speaking a dialect that may or may not have a written script. In such cases learners are initiated into literacy by using the first primer in the local dialect and switching over to regional language written in primers. Tribal women learners being first generation learners lack in vocabulary, spelling, reading speed and comprehension. The languages taught in literacy centre are different from the spoken language of the Tribal women. For this reason Tribal women faced problem in understanding the contents. Though the Tribal women's are acquainted with family and community dialect it is difficult for them to understand odia language. The words and sentences spoken by the instructor in the centre and present in the text book create confusion in the mind of the Tribal women. They found difficult to pronounce, remember and understand. As observed in the field the non tribal instructors have no idea about the local

language of the Tribal women. This leads to communication gap in between the learners and the instructor. In the literacy centre the primer and handbook and other written material are not written in the colloquial language of the Tribal learners. During the instructional process the instructor does not use the Tribal language rather they use the regional language (i.e.) Odia which create a problem for understanding the concepts.

According to Ray and Nandi, (1980); Ravinder, Sachachidananda et al. Rajyalakashmi, Sdamme and Bastia (1981), Natarajan (1982); Acharji and Bisht (1983) Aikara and Ganguli (1984); Prasad (1985); Warudkar (1988); Pillai (1992); Rajan (1993); Chouhan (2001); Obulesu (2005) and Harinath et al (2009) reported that the language is the most important reason for the dropout of adult learners from the literacy centre. Shah and Sivalakshmi (1988) studied the problems faced by instructors of 'Each One Teach One' Scheme in Padra taluka of Baroda District in Gujarat. He reported that the majority of the females are facing the language as a problem. Farooq (1995) in his article "Teaching/ Learning Material for Adult Education" found that language should be simple and natural. It must be avoided the difficult words and idioms but at same time the topic should be suited to the level of maturity of Adult learners. Mohanty (2002) highlighted that (i) the Neo-literate material should be written in the Standard language of the state. However, material can be developed in the more widely used dialects (ii) The language of the text should be simple and the length of the sentence should be shorter in length (iii) A paragraph should not more than the 80 to 120 words. In the year 2013 pattanaik highlighted that student faced the language difficulties during the teaching in class room, Interaction with the student, Reading of the book and writing answer during

examination

II. Objective of the study

To study the language barriers for the promotion of literacy among Tribal women dropouts

III. Hypothesis of the Study

There exist no significant differences of opinion among the different Tribal women dropout's learners with respect to language barriers for the promotion of literacy among tribal women.

IV. Methodology of the Study

Survey design was used for conducting this study. The total number of 18457, Tribal female dropouts from the Total Literacy Campaign, Post-Literacy Programme and Continuing of Bolangir district of Odisha served as the population. 800 respondents were drawn from the universe by using multistage Sampling Procedure. Stage-1: Out of 14 blocks in Bolangir District, 8 blocks were selected on the basis of Random Sampling procedure. Stage-2: From each block, 4 villages were selected again on the basis of Simple Random Sampling procedure Stage-3: Out of each selected block, 4 villages and 25 TRIBAL women dropout from different stage of literacy campaign belonging to four prominent tribal groups (Kandha, Lodha, Bonda, Saora) were selected purposively using Convenient Sampling Procedure. Thus the samples drawn from the universe for each of the selected tribal group works out to be 200. The total sample for the purpose of the study was 800. Interview Schedule used for the purpose of data collection and Chi-square (χ^2) used for the data analysis and interpretation.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Table 1: The Text of the Primers, Handbook and other Written Material were not Presented in Colloquial Language to the Learners

Tribal	Never		Rare		Sometimes		Always		Total	No Response
	<i>fo</i>	<i>fe</i>	<i>fo</i>	<i>fe</i>	<i>fo</i>	<i>fe</i>	<i>Fo</i>	<i>fe</i>		
Kandha	81	84.15	75	56.69	34	41.32	5	12.85	195	5
Lodha	54	83.28	38	56.10	87	40.89	14	12.72	193	7
Saora	111	83.72	30	56.40	33	41.11	20	12.78	194	6
Bonda	88	82.85	82	55.81	10	40.68	12	12.65	192	8
Total	334		225		164		51		774	26

*Significant at 0.05 level

$\chi^2=162.04^*$, $(0.05,9)=16.92$, $\chi^2(0.05,3)=7.81$, $\chi^2 = (\text{KANDHA,LODHA}) = 44.98^*$, $\chi^2(\text{KANDHA,SAORA}) = 32.99^*$, $\chi^2 = (\text{KANDHA,BONDA}) = 16.55^*$, $\chi^2 = (\text{LODHA,SAORA}) = 59.99^*$, $\chi^2(\text{LODHA,BONDA}) = 85.55^*$, $\chi^2 = (\text{SAORA,BONDA}) = 41.09^*$

** Insignificant at 0.05 level

The table 1: shows that the calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value of 162.04 with df 9 was more than the table value of 16.92 at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was significant. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicated that there exists difference on the opinion of the four primitive tribal group respondents with respect to the content of the primers, handbook and other written material which were not presented in colloquial language to the learners. This indicated that the four primitive tribal groups differed in their opinion with respect to their learning hindrance with reference to the text content of the primers, handbooks and other written materials which were not written in their colloquial language. Further the table indicated that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Lodha was 44.98, for Kandha Vs Saora was 32.99,

for Kandha Vs Bonda was 16.55, for Lodha Vs Saora was 59.99, for Lodha Vs Bonda was 85.55 and Saora Vs Bonda was 41.09 which were more than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was significant. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicated that there exists significant difference in the opinion of four primitive tribal women dropout with regard to the content in the primers, handbook and other written which material were not presented in colloquial language to the learners and this acted as a hindrance in their learning process.

Table 2: Mother Tongue was not used in the Primers

Tribal's	Never		Rare		Sometimes		Always		Total	No Response
	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe		
Kandha	81	91.76	79	67.07	29	29.92	5	5.23	194	6
Lodha	83	92.23	56	67.42	50	30.07	6	5.26	195	5
Saora	116	92.70	56	67.76	19	30.23	5	5.29	196	4
Bonda	88	91.29	78	66.73	22	29.76	5	5.20	193	7
Total	368		269		120		21		778	22

*Significant at 0.05 level

** Insignificant at 0.05 level

$$\chi^2 = 35.72^*, \chi^2(0.05,9) = 16.92, \chi^2(0.05,3) = 7.81, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,LODHA)} = 9.61^*, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,SAORA)} = 12.72^*, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,BONDA)} = 1.25^{**}, \chi^2_{(LODHA,SAORA)} = 19.49^*, \chi^2_{(LODHA,BONDA)} = 35.15^*, \chi^2_{(SAORA,BONDA)} = 15.78^*$$

The table 2: shows that the calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value of 35.72 with df 9 was more than the table value of 16.92 at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was significant. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicated that there exists difference on the opinion of the four primitive tribal groups with respect to mother tongue was not used in the primer. Further the table indicated that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Lodha was 44.98, for Kandha Vs Saora was 32.99, for Kandha Vs Bonda was 16.55, for Lodha Vs Saora was 59.99, for Lodha Vs Bonda was 85.55 and for Saora Vs Bonda was 41.09 which were more than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 level

of significance. The difference was insignificant. Hence the null hypothesis was accepted. It indicated there exist no significant difference between Kandha Vs Lodha, Kandha Vs Saora, Kandha Vs Bonda, Lodha Vs Saora, Lodha Vs Bonda and Saora Vs Bonda with regard to the mother tongue was not used in the Primer. Further the ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Bonda was 1.25 which was less than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was insignificant. Hence the null hypothesis was accepted. It indicated that there exist no significant differences in between Kandha Vs Bonda response with regard to the above mentioned item.

Table 3 : Pace of Learning was Slow as the Language used by the Volunteer Teacher was Odia

Tribal's	Never		Rare		Sometimes		Always		Total	No Response
	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe		
Kandha	70	87.72	89	61.66	31	39.85	5	5.76	195	5
Lodha	70	87.72	33	61.66	86	39.85	6	5.76	195	5
Saora	121	87.28	44	61.34	22	39.65	7	5.74	194	6
Bonda	89	87.28	80	61.34	20	39.65	5	5.74	194	6
Total	350		246	246	159		23	23	778	22

Significant at 0.05 level,

** Insignificant at 0.05 level

$$\chi^2 = 129.73^*, \chi^2(0.05,9) = 16.92, \chi^2(0.05,3) = 7.81, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,LODHA)} = 51.65^*, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,SAORA)} = 30.70^*, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,BONDA)} = 5.12^{**}, \chi^2_{(LODHA,SAORA)} = 53.19^*, \chi^2_{(LODHA,BONDA)} = 63^*, \chi^2_{(SAORA,BONDA)} = 15.76^*$$

The table shows that the calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value of 129.73 with df 9 was more than the table value of 16.92 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence it was significant indicating that there exists difference on the opinion of the four primitive tribal group respondents with respect to pace of learning was slow as language used by the instructor was Odia. Consequently the null hypothesis was rejected. Further the table indicates that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Lodha was 51.65, for Kandha Vs Saora was 30.70, for Kandha Vs Bonda was 5.12, Lodha Vs Saora was 53.19, Lodha Vs Bonda was 63.00 and Saora Vs Bonda was 15.76 which were more than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the difference was found to be

significant. It indicated that there exists significant difference in the opinion of four primitive tribal women dropout with regard to Learning was slow as the language used by the volunteer teacher. Further the table indicates that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Bonda was 5.12 which were more than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 levels of significance. Hence the difference was found to be Insignificant. It indicated that there no exists significant difference in the opinion Kandha Vs Bonda tribal women dropout with regard to Learning was slow as the language used by the volunteer teacher.

Table 4: Language of the Primer was Different from the Local Dialects

Tribal's	Never		Rare		Sometimes		Always		Total	No Response
	Fo	Fe	Fo	Fe	Fo	Fe	Fo	Fe		
Kandha	5	5.76	18	25.78	71	69.09	101	94.37	195	5
Lodha	7	5.70	37	25.52	65	68.38	84	93.40	193	7
Saora	6	5.79	30	25.92	65	69.44	95	94.85	196	4
Bonda	5	5.76	18	25.78	75	69.09	97	94.37	195	5
Total	23		103		276		377		779	21

*Significant at 0.05 level

$$\chi^2=13.51^{**}, \chi^2(0.05,9)=16.92, \chi^2(0.05,3)=7.81, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,LODHA)}=8.71^{**}, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,SAORA)}=3.50^{**}, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,BONDA)}=0.19^{**}, \chi^2_{(LODHA,SAORA)}=1.46^{**}, \chi^2_{(LODHA,BONDA)}=8.53^{**}, \chi^2_{(SAORA,BONDA)}=3.82^{**}$$

** Insignificant at 0.05 level

The table 4: shows that the calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value of 13.51 with df 9 was less than the table value of 16.92 at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was insignificant. Hence the null hypothesis was accepted. It indicated that there exists no significant difference on the opinion of the four primitive tribal group respondents with respect to language of the primer was different from the local dialects. Further the table indicated that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Lodha was 8.71 and for Lodha Vs Bonda was 8.53 which were more than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was significant. Hence the null hypothesis was

rejected. It indicated that there exists significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Lodha and Lodha Vs Bonda with regard to language of the primer was different from the local dialects. Further It indicated that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value for Kandha Vs Saora was 3.50, for Kandha Vs Bonda was 0.19, for Lodha Vs Saora was 1.46 and for Saora Vs Bonda was 3.82 which were less than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the difference was found to be Insignificant. It indicated that there no exists significant difference in the opinion Kandha Vs Saora, Kandha Vs Bonda, Lodha Vs Saora and Saora Vs Bonda on the same

Table 5: Speaking and Writing Odia was Difficult

Tribals	Never		Rare		Sometimes		Always		Total	No Response
	Fo	Fe	Fo	Fe	Fo	Fe	Fo	Fe		
Kandha	5	6.02	27	24.06	61	68.93	102	96.00	195	5
Lodha	6	5.95	9	23.81	75	68.22	103	95.01	193	7
Saora	8	6.11	42	24.43	58	69.99	90	97.47	198	2
Bonda	5	5.92	18	23.69	81	67.87	88	94.52	192	8
Total	24		96		275		383		778	22

*Significant at 0.05 level

$$\chi^2=32.73^{*}, \chi^2(0.05,9)=16.92, \chi^2(0.05,3)=7.81, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,LODHA)}=10.53^{*}, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,SAORA)}=4.76^{**}, \chi^2_{(KANDHA,BONDA)}=5.63^{**}, \chi^2_{(LODHA,SAORA)}=24.63^{*}, \chi^2_{(LODHA,BONDA)}=4.50^{**}, \chi^2_{(SAORA,BONDA)}=14.03^{*}$$

** Insignificant at 0.05 level

Table 5: shows that the response of the four primitive tribal groups with regards "volunteer teacher taught in Odia and did not use in the local tribal language while teaching". The calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value of 32.73 with df 9 was more than the table value of 16.92 at 0.05 level of significance. The difference was significant. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicated that there exist differences on the opinion of the four primitive tribal groups with 'Speaking and writing Odia was difficult for me'. Further the table indicated that the calculated ' χ^2 ' value. Kandha Vs Lodha was 10.53, for Lodha Vs Saora was 24.63, and Saora Vs Bonda was 14.03 which were more than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 levels of significances. The difference was significance. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicated that there was difference on the opinion of Kandha Vs Lodha, Lodha Vs Saora, and Saora Vs Bonda on the above mentioned item. Further for Kandha Vs Saora was 4.76, for Kandha Vs Bonda was 5.63 and for Lodha Vs Bonda was 4.50 which were less than the table value of 7.81 at 3 degree of freedom at 0.05 levels of significance. The difference was insignificant.

Hence the hypothesis was accepted. It indicated that exist no significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Saora, Kandha Vs Bonda and Lodha Vs Bonda on the above mentioned item.

V. Main Findings

Item 1: The Text of the Primers, Handbook and other Written Material were not Presented in Colloquial Language to the Learners

It was found from the item no 1 that there exist significant difference in the opinion of all the respondents from four primitive tribal women groups with respect to the content in the primers, handbook and other written material not written in colloquial language and this was a hindrance in their learning process. Further it was found that there exist significant difference in the opinion of Kandha, Lodha, Saora and Bonda with regard to the content in the primers, handbook and other written materials were not presented in colloquial language to the learners.

Item 2: Mother Tongue was not used in the Primers

It was found from the item no 2 that there exist significant

difference in the opinion of the Kandha Vs Lodha, Kandha Vs Saora, Lodha Vs Saora, Lodha Vs Bonda and Saora Vs Bonda with regard to mother tongue was not used in the primers, so did not facilitate better learning for me where as there exist no significant difference in the opinion of the Kandha Vs Bonda on the same above mentioned item.

Item 3: Pace of Learning was slow as the language used was Odia

It was found from the item no 3 that there exists difference in the opinion of the four primitive tribal women group with respect to my pace of learning was slow as the language used was odiya. However that there exist significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Lodha, Kandha Vs Saora, Lodha Vs Saora, Lodha Vs Bonda and Saora Vs Bonda on pace of learning slow as the language used was odiya” where as there exist no significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Bonda on the same item.

Item 4: Language of the primer was different from the local dialects

It was found from the item no 4 that there exists no significant difference in the opinion of the four primitive tribal women group with respect to “language of the primer was different from local dialects”. However there exist significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Lodha and Lodha Vs Bonda the item “language of the primer was different from local dialects” where as there exist no significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Saora Kandha Vs Bonda, Lodha Vs Saora and Saora Vs Bonda on the same item.

Item 5: Speaking and writing Odia was difficult

It was found from the item no 5 that there exists significant difference in the opinion of the four primitive tribal groups with respect to speaking and writing Odia difficult for them. However there no exist significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Saora, Kandha Vs Bonda, Lodha Vs Bonda on speaking and writing Odia difficult for them where as there exist significant difference in the opinion of Kandha Vs Lodha, Lodha Vs Saora, Saora Vs Bonda on the mentioned item.

VI. Discussion of Results

Discussion of the results in this section is based upon the null hypothesis of the study (i.e.) “there exist no significant differences of opinion among the different Tribal female dropout learners with respect to language barriers for the promotion of literacy among tribal women” It was observed from the present study language barrier is the most important barrier for the primitive tribal women for attending the literacy classes. Results of the language related barrier shows that for the Kandha, Lodha, Saora and Bonda perceive it some time to always problem. It is clear that the primer of the literacy programme still not prepared in primitive language. The content of the primer did not include the primitive tribal women needs and interest. Further the analysis reveals that that Kandha, Lodha, Saora, Bonda was differing in their opinions with regard to language barriers. Furthermore observed from the data volunteer teachers is teaching in the Odia language which is not interested for them

VII. Suggestion for Language Related Barrier

The ability to communicate clearly is a key factor for all the people. Being able to communicate effectively in an individual’s first or home language connects a person to their ethnic group and also helps to shape the identity of the individual. The indigenous Tribal identify strongly with a traditional language identity.

Cultural heritage and knowledge is passed on throughout each generation through language. Language is integral in affirming and maintaining the wellbeing, self esteem and a strong sense of identity among the tribal group. Languages contain complex understandings of a person’s culture and their connection with their land. There is a wealth of evidence that supports the positive associations of health, literacy and employment outcomes as well as general wellbeing with language and culture. Indigenous languages keep people connected to culture and this strengthens a feeling of pride and self worth. Cultural knowledge, kinship, song and stories are reliant on language in order that these important cultural elements can be passed on from generation to generation. Language is an essential part that is intrinsically linked to indigenous Tribal’s’ ways of life, culture and identities. Language embodies many Tribal values and concepts and also contains indigenous peoples’ histories and development. They are fundamental markers of indigenous people’s distinctiveness and cohesiveness of the peoples. Not only that they speak the language linked with the tribal identity but generations upon generations of their families have also spoken it. The language they speak identifies them who they are. Sacred language does have its own language. They claim their languages through their grandparents. They should know their language first before they learn other languages-to know it, to understand it and also to relate to it. Therefore it is suggested that in order to remove the language barrier, the primers of the literacy programme should be bi-lingual in nature. Content of the primer should be written in the primitive tribal mother tongue as they do not have any written script. It is also important that the instructors should be well conversant with primitive tribal language i.e. the mother tongue. Thus, the primitive tribal language should be the medium of the instruction during the teaching learning process of the literacy centre.

VIII. Conclusion

It is observed from the present research study that language is most important problem for achieving success in the literacy programme of primitive tribal society. Still, the government of India is not provided the primers to the primitive tribal adult learner in their local language. For this reason most of the primitive tribal women discontinue to the literacy programme. It was also observed from the study the volunteer-teacher are not well expert in teaching tribal language in the literacy centre. Speaking Odia, writing Odia and understanding Odia is too difficult for them.

Reference

- [1]. Acharji, N. (1983): *Adult Education in Bihar*, Xavier Labour Relations Institute, Jamshedpur.
- [2]. Aikara, J. (1984): *Adult Education Programme in Maharashtra - An Appraisal*, Tata Institute of Social Science, Bombay.
- [3]. Chandrasekaran, R (1977): “Role of Voluntary Organizations in Meeting the Needs of Women in the Fields of Adult Education and Female Literacy”, *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 38, No.5, Pp. 16-23.
- [4]. Chouhan.H. (2001): “A study on problems of post literacy campaign: Cause and Remedies”, *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol.62, No.2, Pp-37-42.
- [5]. Devi, U. (2011): “Education of the Tribal Children as Perceived by the Community Members”, *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 72, No.1, January-March, Pp. 75-87

- [6]. Firdos, S. (2006): "Trajectories of Socio-economic Transformation of Tribal in Jharkhand", *Journal of the Indian Anthropological Society*, Vol. 41, No. 2, July, Pp. 125-135.
- [7]. Mishra, P. (2012): "Equitable Quality Education in Tribal Areas - The Case of Tribal Education in Odisha", *Adivasi, SCSTRTI, Bhubaneswar, Odisha*, Vol. 52. No. 1 and 2, Pp. 60-62.
- [8]. Mohanty, J: "Adult and Non-Formal Education, (Second Revised and Enlarged Edition), Deep and Deep publication Pvt. Ltd.
- [9]. Natarajan, R. (1992): "Evaluation of National Adult Education Programme in Bihar", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 35, No.4, Pp. 9-20.
- [10]. Nishat, F (1988): "Teaching/Learning Material for Adult Education", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 51, No. 2, April-June, Pp. 36-41.
- [11]. Obuleseu.M.C (2005): "A study of the Problem of Adult dropouts". *Indian Journal of Adult Education and Extension*, Vol.1.No.2, Pp-11-16
- [12]. Pasayat, C. (2008): "Language and Identity with Special Reference to the Tribal People in Orissa" *Orissa Review*, April, Pp. 63-65.
- [13]. Pasayat, C. (2011): "Tribal and Non-Tribal Interaction in Kalahandi District of Odisha: A Study of Chhatar Jatra of Goddess Manikeswari in Bhawanipatna", *Adivasi*, Vol. 51, No. 1 & 2, June and December, Pp. 45-55.
- [14]. Pillai, P. (1992): "Total Literacy Programme in Kerala - A Case Study", *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol. VI, No.3 July, Pp. 287-296
- [15]. Prasad, M. (1985): "Motivating Adult Learners in Rural Areas - An Analytical Study", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 46, No. 3, Pp. 20-24.
- [16]. Rajalakshmi, C. (1981): "Motivational Problems in Functional Literacy Programme", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 42, No.1-2, Pp. 9-10.
- [17]. Rajan, R. (2004): "Impact of Literacy Programmes on Development in Tamil Nadu-A Perspective", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 65, No. 3-4, July-December, pp. 36-40.
- [18]. Rao, D.P. (2010): "Population Literacy and Educational Status of Scheduled Tribes in India", *Indian journal of Population Education*, Vol. 35, No-50, Pp. 19-29.
- [19]. Ravinder, A. (1981): "Adult Education-A Opinion Study", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 42, No. 6, Pp. 25-28.
- [20]. Ray, G.L. and Nandi, S.K. (1981): "Drop-out from Adult Education Centers in West Bengal", *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, Vol. 42, Nos. 7-8, Pp. 39-43.
- [21]. Sachindananda and Sinha, A.K. (1991): "Evaluation of the Project on Radio Education For Adult
- [22]. Satapathy, C. (2012): "Language, Script and Ethnic Identity of Tribes of Odisha", *Adivasi, SCSTRTI, Bhubaneswar*, Vol. 52, No.1 and 2, 22-27.