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Introduction

The status and quality of higher education are useful indicators of a country’s social and economic development. In addition to generating highly skilled and knowledgeable personnel for social and economic advancement, it critically influences the quality and depth of public discourse and policy-making. There is also a deep organic relationship between higher education and Education for All (EFA). The presence of meaningful educational opportunities at higher levels pulls children and young people through the educational system. Higher education and teacher training will be central for the realisation of the EFA Goals and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Equally, proactive promotion of greater and equitable participation of women and men of all social and ethnic groups can have a significant downstream impact. More women both in public and private sectors, such as school teachers, health care providers, journalists, development workers, bank employees and so on, have a ripple effect – creating role models for women and girls in traditional communities where gender discrimination and sex segregation are the norm.

Scanning through the rich literature on gender and education, it is however, apparent that the bulk of the existing literature pertains to primary/basic, and to a lesser extent, secondary and tertiary education. There is also a lack of national level sex disaggregated indicators in higher education. There are few research-based studies on gender issues in higher education, an issue highlighted by UNESCO and the development and education community. The situation is particularly significant in the Asia-Pacific region – a region rich in the diversity of cultures, economic and human development, and gender relations. This advocacy brief presents an overview of the situation and flags emerging issues.
General Overview on Higher Education as a Sector

The higher education sector is a vast and varied terrain – it encompasses general subject disciplines (sciences, humanities, arts, mathematics, social and cultural sciences), technical (engineering, medicine, agricultural and life sciences and other applied sciences), education and training, vocational and skill-based programmes, training for the service and hospitality sector, teacher education, management education and so on. This sector has grown rapidly, is becoming more diversified and today covers all types of higher education, training and research institutions. Every few years not only are new areas of study added, we also see new forms of education and training (e-learning, work-study programmes, and barefoot colleges) considerably altering earlier modes of higher education that were primarily institution-based (university, college, institute). In addition to full-time study, students can opt for part-time or limited hours programmes and distance learning through correspondence courses. In most countries (especially in the Asia-Pacific region) the progression to higher education is linear, meaning that an aspirant has to complete primary and secondary education before venturing into tertiary education.

Access to higher education is influenced by many factors. First are those relating to the students themselves and their families, which includes academic performance in primary and secondary education, and also parents’ economic situation and the value they place on education. Second is the government policy for higher education, including affirmative action, the fee structure and scholarship/incentive programmes for female students and other socially disadvantaged groups. Third is the students’ environment, such as the physical distance to educational institutions and the quality of education which encourages or discourages young people to advance to higher education. Moreover, these influencing factors are further reinforced by other elements such as sex, ethnicity, caste and race.

Higher education does not stand alone. Being at one end of a linear scale, the cumulative baggage of educational, social and gender-based disadvantages are carried into the higher education space. Therefore, it is not possible to analyse gender inequality-related issues in higher education without referring to the burden of non-learning, discrimination induced loss of self-esteem and confidence, or facility with language. (See Table 1 in Annex on Gender inequality in education).

Universities and other institutions engaged in higher education are strategically placed to undertake multidisciplinary research - which is the engine that stimulates innovation. Unfortunately, many research studies, international conferences and consultations on higher education have not given adequate attention to gender equality issues. As a result, discourse and policy have been limited to the following four arenas:

a) Greater access for women in different fields through affirmative action (more seats reserved for women) or through women-only universities and institutions;
b) Greater participation of women in technical and science education;
c) Nurturing and development of women’s studies; and
d) Women representation in managerial positions in higher education. Rigorous gender analysis of the higher education sector is thus called for. This advocacy brief is an attempt to kindle interest in this area.

1 "It is at the entry point to tertiary education that the compound effects of inequalities in access to and completion of basic education, the progression through secondary education, become most visible.... (Referring to race, social identity) this is the culmination of disadvantage rooted in poverty, social discrimination and the filtering effect of inequality at lower levels of the education system." EFA GMR 2009. Paris, UNESCO, p. 90.
Current Status and Trends in Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific Region from a Gender Perspective

The Asia-Pacific region has 4.1 billion people accounting for more than 60 percent of the world’s population. The region is home not only to the two most populous countries in the world, China (1.3 billion) and India (1.2 billion) that together account for 61 percent of the population of the region, but also to some of the smallest countries. It is also geographically, economically, politically and culturally diverse. Gender equality issues and women’s status differ across and among countries and also among communities. For example, taking the region as a whole, the female advantage in life expectancy is about four years or more. But if we scan each country, the differences between South Asia, North and Central Asia and the Pacific Islands is noteworthy. The sex ratio (being the number of women for 1,000 men) also varies across the region2.

For the region as a whole, the gross enrolment ratio of girls from primary through secondary to tertiary education changes significantly by level: 109 percent at the primary level falls drastically to 48 percent at the secondary stage and slips to a mere 9 percent at the tertiary level. While the region as a whole has, to a considerable extent, bridged the gender gap at the primary level, this is not the case as we move to the next two stages. The Republic of Korea, Japan and the Pacific Islands have the best female gross tertiary enrolment ratios, followed by Thailand, People’s Republic of China and the Philippines. The Gender Parity Index (GPI) for tertiary education exceeds 1 (meaning positive parity where more women access higher education in comparison to men) in the Pacific Islands, Malaysia, Hong Kong SAR and People’s Republic of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Thailand, and the Philippines. However, it is below 0.60, signalling huge gender differences in Cambodia, Bhutan, Bangladesh and Nepal. Gender inequality, be it for men or women, is an area of concern3.

The key gender issues that frame higher education in the region are:

1) Access, Retention and Completion

- The percentage of girls who complete secondary education determines or influences the proportion of girls accessing higher education.

- The location (urban/rural, remote/hilly/desert) of institutions affects girls more than boys, in particular in countries where roads and public transport have not penetrated rural and remote areas. Availability of institutions/universities within reach is an important determinant. Travelling long distances in public transport is an important security issue and this is particularly significant in societies where girls are not permitted to travel alone or have to be escorted.

- Class, caste, race and occupation-related identity issues exert a huge but differing influence on the abilities of young boys and girls. Cultural and religious norms governing gender relations exert a strong influence on access to higher education. Youth with disability face even more challenges.

- Alcoholism, drug abuse and related problems push boys out of school and into the world of the informal economy, crime and gangs. The impact of trafficking, sexual abuse and violence on girls and boys influences their ability to complete schooling and proceed to higher education.

- Early marriage, household responsibilities, pressure to work, family honour and related issues inhibit girls and women from access and completing school.

---

2 UN ESCAP, 2008, Statistical Handbook, p.3.
3 UN ESCAP, 2008, Statistical Handbook, tables 12.1, 12.2, 12.3. See also tables 2 and 3 in this publication.
• Different curricula for girls’ high schools: in some countries, girls’ high schools have different curricula from co-educational or boys’ schools. Girls’ high schools do not teach science and mathematics at an advanced level. As a result, girls cannot enter certain university departments or even if they did, they cannot follow the classes.

2) Interface between Gender and Wealth-Based Disparities

• Recent data reveals that net attendance rates at primary level tend to be lower for poorer households in most countries. For example, in Nepal the gap is striking at the secondary level, with a Gender Parity Index (GPI) of 0.50 for the bottom quintile compared to an average value of 0.96 for the richest group. While this relationship seems to be quite universal, in some countries where the average attendance rates are higher for girls than boys at the secondary level, the relationship between poverty and gender disparity works the other way. For example, “in the Philippines the GPI of the secondary school net attendance for the poorest quintile was 1.24 compared with 0.98 for the richest quintile.” The relationship between gender and poverty is not the same across the region.

• The inter-relationship between poverty, livelihood and investment decisions at the household level operate in different ways in different societies. In some, parents do not invest in the education of their daughters and in very poor households, girls are withdrawn from school. The gender disadvantage can also work against boys. In seaside fishing communities for example, young men drop out of school to join the fishing industry while women are able to pursue their education. On the other hand, the shortage of nurses and the demand for qualified nursing staff in developed countries encourages families to invest in post-secondary education of women.

3) Field of Study

• Given the mindset and gender stereotypes about girls’ and boys’ aptitude for mathematics and science at the primary and secondary school level, fewer women enrol in science and technology-related courses as compared to men. Gender stereotypes encourage women to pursue a career in child development, education, medicine (nursing) and a range of service sector occupations. While this may not be bad per se, women are often pushed into just a few vocations. This attitude has been challenged to a certain extent with the spread of manufacturing and the coming of the digital revolution. Many more young women in the region, especially in China, India, and Republic of Korea, now view vocational training, science and technology as viable career options, thereby enhancing opportunities.

• The emergence of women’s studies and gender studies departments has created opportunities for sustained engagement of women with gender issues in education in many parts of the world. But with the exception of a few countries (India, the Philippines) this discipline is at a nascent stage. Nonetheless, it has not only created an added field of study, but has also encouraged mainstream disciplines – especially in social sciences and literature – to review the curriculum from a gender perspective.

4) The Everyday Experiences of Students

• The last twenty years have seen a significant increase in media reporting on gender-based violence including sexual harassment in educational institutions. Increased publicity on harassment in the workplace affects women in many ways. In some communities it may inhibit women’s participation. In India, for example, greater visibility resulted in a judgement by the Supreme Court of India making it mandatory for all employers to constitute appellate mechanisms in the form of an independent committee. There is inadequate evidence-based research or reliable data on both sexual harassment as well as the effectiveness of institutional committees and this is an area that merits serious research, especially on how overt and subtle forms of harassment influence the ability of women and men to pursue education.

At the tertiary education level, the availability of women faculty, secure spaces for women students to wait between classes and the provision of separate toilets and sanitation facilities, make a big difference to women.

The nature and availability of residential facilities is an important issue at the tertiary level. For example, in South Asia caste and religion issues acquire importance – especially if girls from socially disadvantaged communities find it difficult to integrate. Women students from Dalit and tribal communities could face discrimination and this in turn exerts a strong influence on retention and completion.

5) Texture of Inequalities

There is some evidence that inequalities in secondary education within countries are often more marked than inequalities between countries. In many developing countries, secondary school attendance rates are significantly lower among poorer households than among richer ones. Analysis of the relationship between household wealth and survival rates by grade level reveals a number of patterns. For example, “the relationship between household wealth and survival rates is fairly muted in the early grades of primary education but much more salient in the upper primary grades of secondary education. In some regions there has been a displacement effect with greater equity at the primary level shifting disparities to the secondary level” (EFA-GMR 2009, UNESCO Paris, p. 88).

In the Asia-Pacific region, both girls and boys face obstacles in their participation in school, underlining the fact that promoting gender equality is not just about women and girls, but men and boys as well. Of the 31 countries for which data was available, 14 had lower proportions of boys enrolled in secondary education than girls in 2005, including Fiji, Malaysia, Mongolia, Thailand, the Philippines, Samoa and Tonga. One reason for this is that boys are often co-opted to work full time putting an end to their formal learning. In Mongolia, for example, boys drop out of school to contribute to household incomes by working with livestock. Male child labour in this case is very much influenced by poverty. At the tertiary education level, there is a growing trend of higher rates of girls’ enrolment, and a ‘reverse’ gender gap (UNGEI, 2007).

Scanning through the limited literature on gender and higher education it is more than apparent that governments across the region have not yet tackled the issue of gender equality in tertiary education in a comprehensive manner. Several countries have established women-only universities and institutions. This is particularly visible in traditional Islamic societies and in some parts of India and Republic of Korea (the Korean Women’s Development Institute for example). This has certainly enhanced access and created more opportunities for women. However, a significant and increasing proportion of higher education institutions have been established by the private sector, and most are co-educational. This inhibits the access of women and girls from traditional communities where sex segregation is practiced.
Why Gender Mainstreaming in Tertiary Education?

*Gender Mainstreaming* is a globally accepted strategy for promoting gender equality. It is a process rather than a goal of creating knowledge and awareness of and responsibility for gender equality among all education professionals engaged in tertiary education. It is not an end in itself but a strategy, an approach, a means to achieve the goal of gender equality in higher education institutions – through sensitisation and educating key stakeholders that the costs of women’s marginalization and gender inequalities are born by all in the education sector as a whole (from pre-primary to tertiary and life-long learning). Mainstreaming involves ensuring that gender perspectives and attention to the goal of gender equality are central to all activities – education policy, curriculum, research, advocacy, resource allocation, facilities and planning, implementation and monitoring of tertiary education programmes.

UNESCO’s gender mainstreaming strategy ensures that women and men benefit equally from programme and policy support. It is intended to transform development such that equality becomes both a means and an end. It aims at achieving all international development goals, including, but not only, those explicitly seeking to achieve gender equality. Gender mainstreaming means:

- identifying gaps in gender equality through the use of gender analysis and sex-disaggregated data;
- raising awareness about gaps;
- building support for change through advocacy and alliances/partnerships;
- developing strategies and programmes to close existing gaps;
- putting adequate resources and the necessary expertise into place;
- monitoring implementation; and
- holding individuals and institutions accountable for results.

After the Jomtien Conference of 1990 the world community has worked towards greater gender equality in primary education. In the last two decades, a considerable amount of work has been done in elementary education and periodic EFA monitoring reports have sensitised governments and the larger education community to gender issues. However, this is not the case at the tertiary level. As argued in the opening paragraphs of this advocacy brief, a lot needs to be done at the tertiary level to ensure equal participation of women and men.

Mainstreaming gender essentially involves systematic evidence gathering and analysis of the differential participation and completion of education by women and men, analysis of why gender differences persist, and sensitisation of the stakeholders and decision-makers to existing inequalities. It involves extensive consultations with students, teachers and administrators; and opening up of a broader, free and frank dialogue on gender and higher education. This implies that there is a continuum between evidence gathering and planning of specific interventions and programmes. Ensuring equal access and opportunities for men and women and creating a level playing field, involves engaging with the system and enabling the decision-makers to work towards greater gender equality.

We need to dig deeper and analyse subnational level data to gain a better understanding of gender disparities (UNGEI, 2007). Equally, in view of the emergence of new disciplines of study and new livelihood

---

opportunities, there is a need to revisit gender stereotypes. If we want more women and men to enter tertiary education, and if the future of the knowledge-driven society lies in education, countries across the region have no option but to explore gender issues and adopt gender mainstreaming strategies which include conducting thorough gender analysis as a precursor to gender mainstreaming.

Last and most important, “Higher education is the threshold where future decision-makers and policy-makers generally receive training and are exposed to principles” (Turmaine, 2009). It is thus critical to focus attention on mainstreaming gender equality issues to allow for equal representation of women and men leaders.

Good Practices

While there is an impressive range of small- and large-scale good practices in the region, useful documentation of them is scarce. Some indicative good practices are highlighted to showcase the realm of possibilities. With committed and determined leadership, countries in the region can mainstream gender alongside social equity to make sure that those who are out of the higher education net, get opportunities to move ahead.

Strengthen Political Commitment

Mainstreaming gender requires a better understanding at all levels of the dynamics that sustain and/or create gender inequalities; targeted policies, strategies, and actions; and prioritisation of public expenditure. As gender inequality is deeply rooted in entrenched attitudes, societal institutions and market forces, political commitment at the highest level is essential to institute policies that can trigger social change and allocate the resources required to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment. This has been attempted in the Lao PDR National Socio-Economic Development Plan 2006-10. High level commitment to take a serious look at gender issues is the first step.

Identify Achievable Steps to Enhance Women’s Participation in Science and Technology Education

At the regional level, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Industrial Science and Technology Working Group (ISTWG) and the Telecommunications Working Group (TELWG) are together analysing information and data in order to identify feasible steps to enhance women’s participation in science and technology education. Additionally, they are also working with local universities and student volunteers to encourage schoolgirls to pursue science and mathematics in higher education and also motivating schools to encourage girls to opt for science and mathematics (Heather Gibb, 2001, pp. 29-34).

Enable Young People to Successfully Complete Distance Learning Programmes

Jung (2007) has documented good practices on Open and Distant Learning (ODL) to ensure learners, especially women, receive support from the institution to successfully complete their studies. This involves a shift from a provider-centred to a learner-centred quality assurance mechanism. The process involves developing highly interactive materials (including e-learning), student servicing and tutoring and close monitoring.

Make Universities Safe and Prevent Gender-Based Violence

In India the concerted efforts of women’s groups and NGOs resulted in a landmark judgment by the Supreme Court of India in August 1997, directing all institutions (including universities, technical education and management institutions, vocational training centres and distance education departments) to constitute an independent complaints committee on sexual harassment. By pinning the responsibility of ensuring a non-hostile working environment on employers, the court made it difficult for them to legally evade their responsibility. The judgment provides for making the complaints committee completely autonomous and ensuring that the committee involves every segment of the campus - faculty, students,
and administrative and maintenance staff. Since the landmark judgement, higher education institutions have constituted committees. However, there is no research-based evidence of the impact of the judgement on women's safety. (Source: Blog of Uma Chakravarty, http://www.boloji.com/wfs2/wfs296.htm accessed 10 September 2009)

**Promote Research on Gender Issues and Undertake Curriculum Review**

As far back as 1982 the University Grants Commission of India decided to create Women's Studies Centres in all universities and colleges. The guidelines were reviewed and strengthened in November 2008. The aim of these centres is to encourage and promote research on women's studies and add to the body of knowledge that informs higher education (Source: Government of India, http://www.ugc.ac.in/financialsupport/guidelinepdf/women/annexure1.pdf).

**Create and Support Women-Only Universities**

Pakistan created the Fatima Jinnah Women's University in 1998 to promote and encourage women to move from school to higher education. India too set up similar new institutions to add to the number of older and well-established centres for women's learning like Banasthali Vidyapeeth and SNDT Women's University.

**Provide Stipends and Scholarships for Girls**

Many countries in the region have instituted scholarships and stipends to encourage women to move from primary to secondary education (Bangladesh) and to universities (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh).

**Offer Crèche and Childcare Facilities**

Early marriage and childbearing increases the workload and responsibilities of women (students and teachers) in universities and institutes. Provision of crèche and childcare facilities has been found useful in many institutions and universities across the world. While crèches and childcare facilities have been around for a long time there is little research on the impact of these facilities on the participation of young parents. Availability of crèche and childcare facilities is acknowledged as a positive practice in higher education.

**Recommendations to Mainstream Gender in Higher Education**

Given the diversity of the Asia-Pacific region, there is a need to evolve country-specific policies or strategies. The recommendations given below outline some generic principles and lessons that have been drawn from the gender mainstreaming experiences in elementary education and economic development in the region.6

1. **Mainstreaming gender in higher education has necessarily to start with the government (political leaders, administrators, heads of institutions of higher education).**

   High level political and administrative commitment is essential to ensure it is done across the board and is not a small one-off project.

   - The first step is to get everyone on board. National and international institutions committed to mainstreaming gender need to create advocacy and research groups to gather, compile and analyse data (quantitative and qualitative) on gender inequality in access, participation, teaching-learning,

gender and social stereotyping, safety and harassment and related issues. Recognising the enormity of the challenge by all stakeholders is the essential first step towards mainstreaming.

• The second step is to identify what needs to be done – at which level, in which institutions, and the backward (elementary and secondary education) and forward linkages (employment and livelihood) that have to be built. Priority setting at this stage is critical to ensure that the goals set are not unrealistic and that the plan is feasible.

• The third step is to constitute an empowered group that will draw on the evidence and take the process forward.

• The fourth step is to develop a gender mainstreaming plan for different layers/sectors in higher education.

■ A set of non-negotiable or enabling guidelines on gender equality in tertiary education should be developed.

Looking back at the experience of mainstreaming in elementary and secondary school education, it is clear that training a few key individuals in a few institutions cannot turn the system around.

The following guiding principles should be considered:

• In order to make the process meaningful, gender issues need to be addressed along with issues of social disparities, ability related inequalities and HIV and other disease related exclusion.

• Training a group of people drawn from different institutions in gender mainstreaming has limited value because the trainees have to go back and work among people who have not shared the same experience. They are likely to feel isolated and may gradually lose their enthusiasm. Training programmes that involve a group of people who work together and have different responsibilities in the same organisation have greater impact. They not only reinforce and encourage each other, but are also able to create a conducive environment for change.

• Analysing the problem of limited impact of training programmes highlights that gender sensitisation is not a one-shot event, but a long drawn out process. It may begin with a training programme leading to major managerial adjustments. Entrusting the responsibility for gender mainstreaming to an external group of facilitators does not leave a lasting impact on the organisation. It can, at best, change the attitudes of a few individuals. Lasting impact can be achieved only if people from within the organisation are oriented and empowered to address organisational and management issues simultaneously—the essential building blocks of a successful gender mainstreaming programme.

■ Once the gender mainstreaming agenda is agreed on, it is important to create structures and mechanisms that facilitate the process.

Timely norms, guidelines, rules and regulations need to be framed or amended.

■ Every initiative gets its initial momentum from leaders.

Within a group, there are always those who break the ice and make the journey less formidable for others. It is therefore important to identify such leaders in government, tertiary education institutions, among the faculty and students, encourage them, nurture them and create opportunities for experience sharing, and mutual support and encouragement.

■ Finally, the promoters and managers (in administration, in institutions, among the faculty and students) of the mainstreaming exercise have to prepare and continuously work on a dynamic checklist.

In the initial stage the checklist could start with the following:

• Has the process helped identify gender gaps in each sector / institution?
What are the underlying causes for these gaps? How are women and men affected? Are there other disadvantaged groups such as people living with disabilities, HIV, as well as short-term and long-term migrants who may experience language barriers?

Have the emerging gender issues been analysed?

What could be the best advocacy strategy to create a cocoon that could nurture and support the mainstreaming process?

Does the mainstreaming process and the concomitant implementation structure provide for equal participation of women and men and other disadvantaged groups?

Has the feedback from the administrators, students and faculty been compiled and shared across the board?

Has the mainstreaming plan been reviewed in the light of the feedback?

Is the leadership (political, institutional, administrative as the case may be) on board?

**Conclusion**

Higher education is a vast and complex field and gender mainstreaming a varied and intensive process. Gender mainstreaming in higher education requires high-level commitment among advocates and champions at different levels in universities and institutions. The experience of mainstreaming gender in other sectors like elementary education and primary health, underscores the need to recognise that it is a long haul.

Gender mainstreaming involves both intellectual conviction as well as emotional readiness among all the key stakeholders to face obstacles at every stage. A core group of policy-makers, advocates and champions needs to support each other. If it is planned well and if governments in the region can bring together such a core group, they can together change the face of higher education in the Asia-Pacific region. The following decade should be to higher education what the post-Jomtien period was to elementary education.
Annex
## Table 1: Gender Inequality in Education – Gross Enrolment Ratio (Female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio in primary education, female (%)</td>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio in secondary education, female (%)</td>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education, female (%)</td>
<td>Ratio of female rate to male rate (tertiary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High HD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>People's Republic of China</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium HD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Sri Lanka (2005)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Viet Nam (2005)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Myanmar (2005)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South and West Asia</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Table 2: Gender Inequality in Education – Net Enrolment Ratio (Female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China (2006)</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>28.6 (2005)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam (2000)</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.5 (2000)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (2006)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11.9 (2002)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>41.0 (2004)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6 (2004)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and West Asia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island Developing Economies (2006)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income countries in Asia and the Pacific (2006)</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle income countries in Asia and the Pacific (2006)</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income countries in Asia and the Pacific (2006)</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Participation in Tertiary Education – Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>GPI (F/M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Asia and the Pacific</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia (2006)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (2006)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (2008)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South and West Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (2006)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic of</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and West Asia</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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