

*Final Report*

**ENDLINE KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE SURVEY IN DHADING  
AND SIRAHA DISTRICTS UNDER COMMUNITY BASED ALTERNATIVE  
SCHOOLING PROJECT (CASP)**



*Submitted to*

**COMMUNITY BASED ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLING PROJECT (CASP)  
AND  
NON-FORMAL EDUCATION CENTER  
Sanothimi, Bhaktapur Nepal**

*By*

**Institute for Integrated Development Studies (IIDS)**

P O Box 2254, Kathmandu, Nepal  
977-1-4371006/4378831  
iids@wlink.com.np

**February 2009**

## **Acknowledgements**

Children constitute the future of any country. Therefore, enhancing their access to education is a moral obligation of the state. Unfortunately, many children do not have such access since their parents and guardians either do not realise the value of education or cannot afford their education, or both. This survey captures the knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) of parents and guardians in relation to their children's education after the completion of pilot activities on operational models of community mobilization by Community-based Alternative Schooling Programme (CASP).

The Institute for Integrated Development Studies (IIDS) wishes to express its gratitude to the Community-based Alternative Schooling Project (CASP) for entrusting this survey to it. It also wishes to express its thankful to Mr Sushil Pandey, Mr. Laxman Khanal and Mr. Pramod Sharma, the Director, Deputy Director and Section Officer, respectively, of Non-formal Education Centre (NFEC) for providing the IIDS research team with the overall guidance to accomplish this study. Mr. Handa Shigenobu and Ms. Shimada Toshiko of CASP provided very intensive guidance in all phases of this study and, therefore, the team gratefully acknowledges his guidance.

Ms. Yasuko Oda, Mr. Madhav Raj Dahal, Ms. Radha Pradhananga and Ms. Laxmi Karki of CASP provided support to the study team in many forms. The team is, therefore, very thankful to all of them. Finally, the team wishes to thank the District Education Officers of the study districts for training the field researchers on selected themes and for providing supports as needed by the field teams at the time of field survey.

**IIDS Research Team**  
**February 2009**

# Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Contents	ii
List of Tables	iv
Acronyms and Abbreviations	vi
Survey Team Members	vii
Executive Summary	viii
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Summary of baseline KAP survey in Dhading and Siraha	2
1.3 Objectives of the survey	4
1.4 Key definitions	4
1.5 Assumptions	5
1.6 Methodology of the survey	5
1.7 Analysis	7
1.8 Limitations of the study	7
1.9 Organization of the report	7
<b>Chapter 2: Characteristics of Study Communities and Households Surveyed</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Social characteristics	9
2.2 Economic characteristics	12
2.3 Priorities to community development	15
<b>Chapter 3: Schooling of Children</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 Average number of children	16
3.2 Birth registration	16
3.3 Children attending SOP/FSP	17
3.4 Children completing SOP/FSP	18
3.5 Provision of information about SOP/FSP	21
<b>Chapter 4: Knowledge of Respondents on Child Education</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities	24
4.2 Knowledge of child rights issues	25
<b>Chapter 5: Attitude of Respondents on Child Education</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1 Agreement with the child rights issues	30
5.2 Responsibility to educate children	33

5.3 Willingness to participate in the SOP/FSP activities	34
5.4 Value of education	37
5.5 Willingness to send other children to SOP/FSP in the future	38
5.6 Willingness to send children to formal school	39
5.7 Existence of out-of-school children	43
<b>Chapter 6: Practice of Respondents Regarding Child Education</b>	<b>46</b>
6.1 Participation in SOP/FSP activities	46
6.2 Encouragement to children to attend alternative schools	51
6.3 Discussions with children about education	55
6.4 Discussions with family members about child education	57
6.5 Discussions with neighbours about child education	60
<b>Chapter 7: Suggestions of Respondents on Improving KAP of Community</b>	<b>63</b>
7.1 Suggestions of the respondents of Dhading	63
7.2 Suggestions of the respondents of Siraha	64
7.3 Summary of suggestions	65
<b>Chapter 8: Summary of Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	<b>67</b>
8.1 Trend analysis	67
8.2 Cross sectional analysis of community mobilisation activities under CASP	69
8.3 Synchronization among indicators	72
8.4 CASP SOP/FSP outcome assessment	74
8.5 Conclusion and recommendations	76
<b>References</b>	
<b>Annex 1: Questionnaires</b>	
<b>Annex 2: Summary of indicators by VDC in Dhading and Siraha</b>	
<b>Annex 3: Illustration of the method of computing odds ratio</b>	
<b>Annex 4: Odds ratios for selected KAP indicators</b>	
<b>Annex 5: Correlation coefficients of selected KAP indicators</b>	

## List of Tables

Table 1.1	Sample size	6
Table 2.1	Percentage distribution of respondents by caste and ethnicity	9
Table 2.2	Literacy of respondents	10
Table 2.3	Interrelationship between literacy and social status of respondents	10
Table 2.4	Ability of respondents to speak Nepali	10
Table 2.5	Residential status of respondents	11
Table 2.6	House types	11
Table 2.7	Major sources of water	11
Table 2.8	Major source of lighting	12
Table 2.9	Possession of family toilet	12
Table 2.10	Time distance to reach mother school (in minutes)	12
Table 2.11	Sources of livelihood	13
Table 2.12	Ability of the respondents of Dhading to support family by background characteristics	13
Table 2.13	Ability of the respondents of Siraha to support family by background characteristics	14
Table 2.14	Priorities of respondents in community development	15
Table 3.1	Average number of children per household in Dhading and Siraha districts	16
Table 3.2	Birth registration	16
Table 3.3	Children attending SOP/FSP by selected background characteristics	17
Table 3.4	Children completing SOP/FSP	18
Table 3.5	Reasons for not completing SOP/FSP (dropout)	19
Table 3.6	Reasons for sending children to alternative school	20
Table 3.7	Provision of information to respondents to send children to SOP/FSP at first time	21
Table 3.8	Persons informing respondents to send children to SOP/FSP at first time	22
Table 4.1	Percentage of respondents having knowledge of SOP/FSP activities	24
Table 4.2.1	Percentage of respondents with the knowledge of key rights issues	26
Table 4.2.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on key child rights issues	27
Table 4.3	Source of knowledge of child rights issues	28
Table 5.1.1	Percentage of respondents agreeing very much with different child rights issues by background characteristics	30
Table 5.1.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the percentage of respondents agreeing very much on child rights issues	32
Table 5.2.1	Responsibility to educate children	33
Table 5.2.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the percentage of respondents perceiving the responsibility to educate children as that of parents	34
Table 5.3	Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities	35
Table 5.4	Value of education	37
Table 5.5	Willingness of respondents to send children to SOP/FSP	38
Table 5.6	Willingness of respondents to send children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP	39

Table 5.7.1	Degree of willingness to send children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP	40
Table 5.7.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the percentage of respondents willing to send children to formal school	41
Table 5.8	Persons inspiring respondents to send children to formal school	42
Table 5.9	Reasons for not willing to send children to formal school or not admitting children to formal school	43
Table 5.10	Out-of-school children	44
Table 5.11	Suggestions to send the out- of- school children to school	45
Table 6.1	Participation in SOP/FSP activities	46
Table 6.2	Participation in SOP/FSP activities by type of activity	48
Table 6.3	Reasons for not participating in SOP/FSP activities	50
Table 6.4.1	Encouragement to children to attend alternative school	51
Table 6.4.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the encouragement provided to child about education	52
Table 6.5	Approaches taken to encourage children to attend alternative school	53
Table 6.6	Activities influential in motivating respondents to encourage children to attend ASP	54
Table 6.7	Sources influencing the motivation of respondents to encourage children to attend ASP	55
Table 6.8.1	Discussions with children about education	55
Table 6.8.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of discussion with children about child education	56
Table 6.9	Topic of discussion with children about education	57
Table 6.10.1	Discussions with family members about child education	58
Table 6.10.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of discussion with family members about child education	59
Table 6.11	Topic of discussion with family members about child education	59
Table 6.12.1	Discussions with neighbours about child education	60
Table 6.12.2	Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of discussion with neighbours about child education	61
Table 6.13	Topic of discussion with neighbours about child education	61
Table 7.1	Suggestions to implement SOP and FSP in Dhading VDCs	63
Table 7.2	Suggestions to implement SOP and FSP in Siraha VDCs	64
Table 7.3	Summary of suggestions to implement SOP and FSP in the two districts	66

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

ASP	Alternative Schooling Programme
CASP	Community-based Alternative Schooling Project
CMC	Class Management Committee
DEO	District Education Office
EV	Education Volunteer
FSP	Flexible Schooling Programme
GON	Government of Nepal
JICA	Japan International Co-operation Agency
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude and Practice
N	Number
NFEC	Non-formal Education Centre
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
RP	Resource Person
SOP	School Outreach Programme
VDC	Village Development Committee

## Survey Team members

Dr. Khim Kabi Sharma	Team Leader
Mr. Ashwasthama Pokhrel	Senior Data Analyst
Mr. Bhupendra Batsa Lamsal	Research Officer
Mr. Dilli Ram Sharma	Field Supervisor
Mr. Amit Sharma	Enumerator
Mr. Anish Pokhrel	Enumerator
Mr. Prakash Gurung	Enumerator
Mr. Satyadhar Kadel	Enumerator
Mr. Prem Nath Kharel	Enumerator
Mr. Nagendra Shah	Enumerator
Ms. Ram Pari Yadav	Enumerator
Mr. Shyam Kumar Yadav	Enumerator
Mr. Ram Ashish Yadav	Enumerator
Mr. Bikau Yadav	Enumerator
Ms. Silam Ranjit	Data Coder
Mr. Govinda Ghimire	Data Enterer

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Background**

The Community-based Alternative Schooling Project (CASP) was implemented in Nepal since 2004 with the technical support of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for developing an operational model of community-based alternative schooling project. The major strategy of CASP consisted of institutional strengthening of SOP and FSP (as part of Alternative Schooling Programme or ASP), community mobilisation and support, and networking among stakeholders. The SOP and FSP classes were implemented in April 2005 on pilot basis in four VDCs of each of Dhading and Siraha districts. A baseline survey of parents/respondents to capture their Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) relating to the education of children was done in 2005. As the piloting has come to an end in Dhading and Siraha districts, there was a need to do an end line KAP survey of the parents of those districts.

### **Objectives of the survey**

The major objectives of this end line survey were to:

1. Assess the level of KAP regarding child education among parents in the target communities after their exposure to the pilot activities including community mobilisation and participation under CASP,
2. Identify the determining factors of parental attitude and practices related to child education in the target communities, and
3. Provide recommendations for potential interventions in terms of community mobilisation after CASP.

### **Methodology of the survey**

The survey captured the KAP of 335 parents/respondents of Dhading and Siraha districts where SOP and FSP classes were run. Semi-structured questionnaires were used for this purpose.

## **Assumptions of the survey**

The broad assumptions underlying this end line survey are as follows:

1. Positive KAP of parents regarding child education are developed by the pilot activities including community mobilisation and participation under CASP (intervention factors), and
2. The degree of development of KAP is also influenced by the characteristics of target communities (structural or indigenous factors) as demographical, social, and economic factors in addition to CASP activities.

The specific assumptions underlying this survey are as follows:

1. The higher the ones' socio-economic status (i.e. literate, higher caste, relatively better off economically, fluent in Nepali), the better the ones' knowledge, attitude and practice relating to child education. Conversely, the lower the ones socio-economic status, the worse the ones knowledge, attitude and practice.
2. Knowledge, attitude and practice change over time with the interventions, but the higher the ones socio-economic status, the faster the change in the indicators of knowledge, attitude and practice, Conversely, the lower the ones socio-economic status, the slower the change in the indicators of knowledge, attitude and practice, and
3. The rate of change in key indicators can be high only if the implementation of CASP activities is regular or intensive (full support model). Conversely, the rate of such change becomes slow if the implementation of CASP activities become irregular or interrupted (partial support model) as in Siraha.

## **Key Findings**

### **1. Trend analysis**

#### *Socio-economic characteristics*

The percentage of illiterate respondents, which was very high in both Dhading (72.4) and Siraha (71.6) at the time of baseline survey, has decreased in a span of three years. However, there are still 54.4 per cent of illiterates in Dhading and 63.8 per cent in Siraha, indicating that Siraha has lagged behind Dhading in this respect. The percentage of wage labourer, which was 13.8 in Dhading and 55.2 in Siraha at the time of baseline survey, has decreased to 3.8 in Dhading and 35.0 in Siraha in the same timeframe indicating that the decrease is low in Siraha. As is noteworthy, there are still a considerable percentage of

families in Siraha (35 %) involved in it. Similarly, only 1.9 per cent of the Dalits of Dhading and 3.0 per cent of those of Siraha supported their family easily at the time of baseline survey. The percentage of Dalits supporting their family easily has now come up to 30.4 and 2.2 respectively, thus, suggesting that the Dalits of Siraha have fallen behind those of Dhading in this respect also. In addition, 3.9 per cent of the respondents of Dhading and 9.5 per cent of those of Siraha had expressed preference for education, literacy and awareness programme at the time of baseline survey. The percentage of respondents preferring them has now come up to 18.4 per cent in Dhading and 15.8 per cent in Siraha, thus, indicating that Siraha still rates low in terms of having preference for education, literacy and awareness. In brief, the improvements in the socio-economic scenario of Siraha are not in par with those of Dhading.

As has also been found, 16.6 per cent of the children of Dhading and 33.3 per cent of those of Siraha had their birth registered at the time of base line survey. The figures have now come up to 23 per cent in Dhading and 93.7 per cent in Siraha.

The terrain of Dhading was rough and the settlements there were dispersed, thus, making the social interaction difficult because of the difficulty it caused in traveling within and outside the settlements in general and in implementing development programmes in particular. On the other hand, the terrain of Siraha was gentle and the settlements there were nucleated, thus, making social interactions easier there. In the meantime, Siraha was characterized by higher percentage of Dalits, higher percentage of those who were illiterate, higher percentage of those who were unable to speak Nepali easily and higher percentage of those who were unable to support their family easily. In contrast, Dhading was characterized by a lower percentage of Dalits, lower percentage of illiterates, lower percentage of those who were unable to speak Nepali and lower percentage of those who could support their family with difficulty. Thus, it can be inferred that, persons with lower status (i.e. Dalits) were less literate, less able to speak Nepali and less able to support their family easily as in Siraha and those with higher social status were more able to speak Nepali, more literate and more able to support their family easily as in Dhading. Understanding of this kind of relationship provides basis to analyse the inclusive aspect of the programme or to analyse how well the programme reached the marginalized communities by assessing how well the programme reached Dalits, who can be taken as proxy for all marginalized groups of people.

### *Knowledge*

The respondents' knowledge of six child rights as considered by the programme was lower in Dhading than in Siraha at the time of baseline survey. Over time, the knowledge of those rights has jumped in both districts. However, Siraha still lags behind Dhading in the knowledge of the prohibition of child marriage (Dhading 77.8 per cent versus Siraha 71.2 per cent) and prohibition of child in labour force (Dhading 76.6 per cent versus Siraha 68.4 per cent at present).

Mass media, schoolteacher, neighbours and inner self<sup>1</sup> constituted major sources of knowledge of the child rights at the time of baseline survey in Dhading. Even at present, mass media continue to be the dominant source of information followed by neighbours and inner self there. In Siraha, elite of community and mass media had major role in the past in this regard. However, elite of community is found as being gradually replaced by mass media and inner self over time. Regarding knowledge of SOP/FSP activities facilitators followed by own child and members of CMC constitute major sources in Dhading and facilitators constitute major source in Siraha at present.

### *Attitude*

Drastic improvements have been realized in both districts in the respondents' agreement with the six child rights over time. However, the rate of improvements are much higher in Dhading than in Siraha with respect to agreement on the right of every child to go to school (Dhading from 82.7 per cent to 97.7 per cent and Siraha from 85.8 per cent to 96.6 per cent), the right of girls to go to school as much as boys (Dhading from 82.1 per cent to 98.7 per cent and Siraha from 79.1 per cent to 94.4 per cent), the prohibition of child marriage (Dhading from 68.9 per cent to 93.7 per cent and Siraha from 68.7 per cent to 78 per cent), the right of handicapped children to go to school (Dhading from 74.5 per cent to 97.7 per cent and Siraha from 79.9 per cent to 92.7 per cent) and child care as the responsibility of parents (Dhading from 92.9 per cent to 98.7 per cent and Siraha from 96.3 per cent to 98.8 per cent).

With respect to the responsible person or institution to educate children, the percentage of respondents expressing the responsibility of those of parents has increased in Dhading (from 89.3 per cent to 91.8 per cent) but decreased in Siraha (from 98.5 per cent to 90.4 per cent). On the contrary, the percentage of respondents expressing the responsibility of government and of the community has decreased in Dhading but increased in Siraha.

With respect to willingness to send children to SOP/FSP classes in the future, there has been an increase in the percentage of respondents of Dhading (from 84.2 per cent to 99.4 per cent), but a decrease of those of Siraha (from 97 per cent to 84.7 per cent). With respect to the percentage of respondents very much willing to send their children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes, there has been an increase in both districts. However, the rate of increase is slightly higher in Siraha than in Dhading (Dhading from 82.6 per cent to 91 per cent and Siraha from 66.1 per cent to 98.9 per cent). With respect to the percentage of respondents reporting the existence of out-of school children in the community, there has been a drastic decrease in Dhading (Dhading from 98.5 per cent to 29.7 per cent), but the rate of decrease is very low in Siraha (Siraha from 97 per cent to 82.5 per cent).

---

<sup>1</sup> Inner self may also indicate that a person might have the knowledge of a fact, but does not know the exact source.

## *Practice*

The participation of respondents in the SOP/FSP activities with respect to making contribution in cash (Dhading from 36.3 per cent to 6.5 per cent and Siraha from 42.6 per cent to 3.1 per cent), labour (Dhading from 97.5 per cent to 2.2 per cent and Siraha from 68.1 per cent to 1 per cent) and educational materials (Dhading from 1.3 per cent to 0.7 per cent and Siraha from 14.9 per cent to 0.0 per cent) has drastically reduced in both districts from the time of baseline survey. But the percentage of respondents not participating in these activities because of poverty has increased in Dhading and decreased in Siraha (Dhading from 7.7 per cent to 15.8 per cent and Siraha from 48.3 per cent to 39.7 per cent). The reason for not participating in the activities because of inability to give time has increased in both districts (Dhading from 10.3 per cent to 63.2 per cent and Siraha from 5.7 per cent to 79 per cent).

The percentage of respondents encouraging their children to go to school/become educated has grown faster in Dhading than in Siraha (Dhading from 73.5 per cent to 100 per cent and Siraha from 88.1 per cent to 97.2 per cent). Similarly there has been an increase in both districts in the percentage of respondents discussing with their children (Dhading from 59 per cent to 96.8 per cent and Siraha from 54.6 per cent to 89.8 per cent), family members (Dhading from 71.4 per cent to 82.2 per cent and Siraha from 73.1 per cent to 78.5 per cent) and neighbours (Dhading from 28.6 per cent to 80.4 per cent to and Siraha from 26.9 per cent to 76.3 per cent) about child education.

## **2. Cross-sectional analysis of community mobilization activities under CASP**

The trend analysis as discussed above has made it clear that many KAP indicators were good in Siraha than in Dhading at the time of baseline survey. However, at the time of end line survey only a few KAP indicators, namely the rate of birth registration and willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes, were better in Siraha and the rest of all KAP indicators were better in Dhading despite the fact that the indicators had a positive trend even in Siraha, thus, showing the ability of Siraha to reap the benefits of the programme despite the fact that it was introduced there for a short time. Two major questions that, therefore, need to be answered are (1) What factors or activities were most important in speeding up the evolution of indicators in Dhading which were very bad there at the time of baseline survey but which improved drastically there at the time of end line survey, and (2) How well were the activities synchronized or in harmony with one another to widen up the baseline-end line KAP gap faster in Dhading than in Siraha? This subsection provides answers to these questions by referring to odds ratios, which show the number of times an activity is likely to influence an outcome or indicator in Dhading or the programme area, and the matrix of correlation coefficients.

### *Knowledge and community mobilization activities*

#### Influential activities in aggregate

In aggregate, the relationship of knowledge-related indicators namely the knowledge of SOP/FSP activities, knowledge of the right of every child to go school, knowledge of the

right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys, knowledge of the prohibition of child marriage, knowledge of the prohibition of child labour, knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go to school and knowledge of the responsibility of parents to child education was found very high with three major groups of SOP/FSP activities namely the provision of incentives for best students, organization of interactive programme between community people and children, and provision of support on physical infrastructure by community as shown by the relatively high odds ratios<sup>2</sup>. From this finding, it can be inferred that while the other activities were also influential in both districts to widen the baseline-end line KAP gaps, these three activities were particularly responsible for widening such gaps faster in Dhading. However, as indicated by the odds ratios which are less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.1).

#### Influential activities among the marginalized groups<sup>3</sup>

When the marginalized groups (i.e Dalits) of Dhading were compared with those of Siraha to assess the influence of structural factors such as ability to speak Nepali, literacy, social status and ability to support family and to assess the inclusive aspect of the programme or to assess how well the programme reached the marginalized groups, four major activities, namely formation of child club, provision of incentives for best students, organization of sensitization meetings on child rights and interactive programme among stakeholders were found as having high odds ratio ,thus, indicating that they were largely responsible for widening the gap in the knowledge-related indicators as found between the baseline and end line survey in Dhading.

This means, activities like the interaction between the community people and children and provision of support on physical infrastructure as found important in influencing the knowledge- related indicators in aggregate were relatively less inclusive. In other words, they were relatively less able to break the influence of structural factors. On the other hand, activities with relatively high odds ratios such as formation of child club and organization of sensitization meetings on child rights were found more inclusive in Dhading. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.2).

#### *Attitude and community mobilization activities*

##### Influential activities in aggregate

In aggregate, the relationship of the indicators of attitude, namely willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities, agreement with the six child rights and willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP, was found very high with three major

---

<sup>2</sup> For details, readers are urged to review the tables on odds ratios as presented in Annex 4.

<sup>3</sup> Note also that odds ratios are usually higher in Annex 5 than in Annex 4 and this indicates that the CASP interventions were inclusive and the indicators were less affected by structural factors in Dhading as compared to Siraha.

groups of SOP/FSP activities namely willingness to participate in the incentives programmes for best students, willingness to participate in interactive programme among community people and children and willingness to support on physical infrastructure as shown by the relatively high odds ratios. From this, it can be inferred that these three activities were relatively good in Dhading and, thus, helped widen fast the KAP gap there between the baseline and end line attitude indicators. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.1).

#### Influential activities among the marginalized groups

When the marginalized groups of Siraha were compared with those of Dhading, three major activities, namely willingness to participate in the formation of child club, organization of sensitization meetings on child rights and interactive programme among stakeholders were found strongly associated with the attitude-related indicators as discussed above. It is noteworthy that the relative importance of activities such as willingness to participate in the incentive programme for best students, willingness to participate in the organization of sensitization meetings on child rights, and willingness to participate in interactive programme among community people and children as found important in the previous analysis were found relatively less important from the inclusion point of view. In other words, the effect of structural factor was strong there. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (See Annex table 4.2).

#### *Practice and community mobilization activities*

##### Influential activities in aggregate

In aggregate, the relationship of the practice-related indicators namely actual participation in SOP/FSP activities, encouragement to study and discussions with children, family members and neighbours about child education was found high with actual participation in providing incentives for best students, interactive programme between community people and children and provision of support on physical infrastructure by community. However, as indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was found more effective in Siraha (Annex Table 4.1).

##### Influential activities among the marginalized groups

When the marginalized groups are compared, the relationship of the practice-related indicators as discussed above was found strong with actual participation in the formation of child club, in the organization of sensitization meetings and in the interaction programme among stakeholders. Note that provision of incentives for best student, interactive programme between community people and children and provision of support on physical infrastructure by community did not become important any longer after the influence of structural factor is controlled. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, participation in the provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.2).

### **3. Synchronization among indicators**

This section describes the association or degree of synchronization between different KAP indicators using the matrix of correlation coefficients which were derived by running correlation analysis in which the 20 KAP indicators were used as variables and the 14 SOP/FSP activities were used as observations. In other words, the matrices of odds ratios were used to run the correlation analysis.

#### *Knowledge*

##### Correlation in aggregate

Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities was found significantly correlated only with a few indicators namely the knowledge of prohibition of child labour, knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go to school, agreement on the rights of every girls to go to school as much as boys and agreement on the prohibition of child labour. With the rest of KAP indicators the correlation of knowledge of the SOP/FSP activities was found low or insignificant.

The six child rights were found well correlated with all other KAP indicators/variables with some exception of the knowledge of the handicapped children to go to school, agreement on the rights of the handicapped children to go to school and willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities (Annex table 5.1).

##### Correlation after controlling the effects of structural factors

After comparing the marginalized groups, the scenario of correlation is found slightly changed. For example, knowledge of SOP/FSP activities was found well correlated with several KAP variables except for willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities and willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes. Knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go to school which was found poorly correlated in the previous analysis was found well correlated with other variables after the influence of structural factors are taken into consideration . (Annex table 5.2).

#### *Attitude*

##### Correlation in aggregate

Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities was found significantly correlated only with a few variables namely the knowledge of prohibition of child labour, agreement on the prohibition of child marriage, willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes, encouragement to study/education and discussions with family members.

The six variables on agreement with child rights were found correlated well with the rest of variables except for the relatively poor correlation with agreement on same right for girls to

go to school as much as boys, agreement on prohibition of child labour and agreement on the rights of the handicapped children to go to school (Annex table 5.1).

Correlation after controlling the effect of structural factors

Willingness to participate in the SOP/FSP activities was found correlating well only with two variables which were the knowledge of rights of every child to go to school and agreement with the rights of handicapped children to go to school. Knowledge of the prohibition of child labour as found significant before examining the effect of structural factors was not found significant any longer. Similarly, agreement on the prohibition of child marriage, willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes and discussions with family members which were significant earlier were not found significant any longer (Annex table 5.2).

*Practice*

Correlation in aggregate

As was found, actual participation in SOP/FSP activities correlated well with a great majority of the KAP indicators except for the knowledge of prohibition of child labour, knowledge of the rights of the handicapped children to go to school, agreement on the same rights of girls to go to school as those of boys, agreement on the prohibition of child labour and agreement on the rights of the handicapped children to go to school.

To summarize, the indicators/variables were found very well correlated. However, it is noteworthy that knowledge SOP/FSP activities, willingness to participate in them and actual participation in them were found very poorly correlated among themselves. On the other hand, knowledge of the child rights issues, agreement on the rights issues and other practice-related indicators such as encouragement to study/education, and discussions with children, family members and neighbours were found well correlated (Annex table 5.1).

Correlation after controlling the effect of structural factors

Actual participation in SOP/FSP activities was found well correlated with all other indicators except for the knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go school and willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities (Annex table 5.2).

#### **4. CASP SOP/FSP outcome assessment**

*Outcome related with KAP indicators and other child education issues*

Regular implementation of CASP has produced many desirable changes in the programme communities of Dhading. The positive changes are largely realised with respect to increase in the KAP of parents on several child education issues. To be specific, CASP has been able to increase the knowledge of parents on several of the child rights issues, cause positive attitudes towards those rights issues, motivate parents to send their children in ASP classes in the future, motivate parents to send their children to formal school after the

completion of ASP, and inspire parents to discuss with their children, family and neighbours about their children's education. All these changes do jointly contribute to high retention rates in the SOP/FSP classes. To be specific, when compared to the situation of Siraha, CASP has also been able to minimize the effects of dislike of children to study and the need to work at home for living in Dhading. In light of these many positive changes which CASP has brought about in the programme communities of Dhading, it is adjudged that the programme is worth replication in other parts of Nepal as well.

#### *Community mobilization activities under CASP*

The study found community mobilisation activities, namely provision of incentives for best students, organization of interactive programme between community people and children, provision of support on physical infrastructure by the community, formation of child club, organization of sensitisation meetings on child rights and interactive programmes among the stakeholders, as contributing most to positive changes in the KAP of parent as indicated by their high odds ratios. It is particularly believed that while provision of incentives for best students serves the needs of the marginalised groups of parents to get incentives<sup>4</sup> and duly honors their children<sup>5</sup>, formation of child club makes the school environment more child-friendly, thus, minimizing drop out rate among children who do not like to go to school. It is further believed that while provision of support on physical infrastructure paves way to exchanges of ideas among community people, it also increases the sense of ownership of the programme among them. Additionally it is believed that interaction programmes among community people, children, community people and stakeholders largely enforce the value of education in the community.

The study also found high correlation between the knowledge of child rights issues, attitudes towards those issues and the accompanying changes in their behaviour. Thus, in order to realise synchronization in the KAP of parents, the community mobilisation activities as mentioned above are recommended for consideration while replicating the CASP. Needless to say, utmost care needs to be taken to ensure that these activities mainstream the marginalised groups of people. It is also noteworthy that in communities like Siraha where the terrain is gentle and settlements are nucleated, the door-to-door visit programmes urging parents to send their children to school can have good results even with little efforts. Such activities are, therefore, worth replication in similar geographic areas.

#### *Further analysis of influential factors in Siraha*

Despite limited community mobilisation activities, the KAP indicators in Siraha were nearly as good as those of Dhading even though the indicators there were much higher than those of Dhading at the time of baseline survey. The reasons why the KAP indicators were good in Siraha at the time of endline survey are not clearly understood. However, it is assumed to be due to the demonstration effect of several child-focused programme which

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that non-provision of incentives/scholarship is one of the major reasons for dropout and for not sending children to school.

<sup>5</sup> It is also felt that provision of ID cards and school uniforms to the SOP/FSP children can increase their sense of belonging to the school.

was implemented there by Save the Children for several years. It is also believed to be due to the implementation of Child Development Centers with the support of UNICEF. Organization of door-to-door visit which was very successful in Siraha (as indicated by the odds ratios) because of gentle terrain and nucleated settlements is also believed to have influenced the KAP of parents there. Finally, Indian mass media is also suspected to have played an important role there in this regard.

### *Parental suggestions*

As the study found, the people of Siraha expect more materialistic support/incentives from the programme (refer to tables 3.6 and 5.11 and compare tables 7.1 and 7.2), while those of Dhading have internalized the thrust of CASP programme and accordingly expect support that relate to its institutionalization and replication in secondary education situation as well. Based on the ability of CASP to cause "internalization" of education among the parents, it is further recommended for replication.

While doing so, due consideration need to be given to the suggestions offered by the parents as outlined in Chapter 7<sup>6</sup>. These suggestions, in addition to provision of incentives, basically include improvement of school in such terms as physical structure, room and land; provision of experienced teachers<sup>7</sup> in larger number; provision of higher salaries to teachers; improvement of water, sanitation and sports facilities in schools; enforcing the monitoring system; and institutionalizing the alternative schooling programme in general and extending it to the situation of lower secondary education in particular.

### **Conclusion and recommendations**

Based on the foregoing discussion that is based on the analysis of data, it has become clear that CASP, which included various community mobilisation activities, had positive influence on the development of the parental KAP in Dhading where the community mobilisation activities were intensive as compared to Siraha, where there were no such activities. Especially, activities such as interactive programmes, formation of child club and organisation of sensitisation meeting, are not expensive for implementation. Therefore, it is highly recommended to expand such experience and lesson learnt of CASP to wider areas in Nepal.

However, at this juncture, it is also important to note that other influential activities such as provision of incentives for best students, improvement in physical infrastructure and increase in the salary of facilitators can be very costly if the programme is replicated in a wider area. To address these problems, CASP is highly recommended for fundraising at the community, district, central and international levels and tie up its programme with relevant programmes of the government (e.g. school feeding programme, scholarship programme for the disadvantaged groups) and donor communities in the meantime.

---

<sup>6</sup> For details, see Chapter 7.

<sup>7</sup> Note that inability to understand what teachers taught was one of the causes of dropout.

Among the many good achievements, the study also found that there were risks of children dropping out of school due to the need to work for living and due to early marriage. To address the first problem that relates to the poverty and ignorance of parents, CASP is strongly recommended to tie up its programme with the rural development programmes of the donor communities that focus on poverty alleviation and adult literacy. To address the second problem, more focus on advocacy is needed to safeguard the rights of young girls not to be married early or before their personality develops fully. This could be also enforced through door-to-door visits and individual consultations in addition to mass media.

Finally, the percentage of children participating in the ASP was not so high even in Dhading (see Table 3.3). This was largely due to a small quota set on the number of children per class. To encourage participation of a larger number of community children in such classes, it is strongly recommended that the quota be larger in the future.



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Background

In Nepal, both the community and institutional schools have emerged in the course of time. According to the Three-Year Interim Plan (National Planning Commission, 2007), the number of government and private schools are 28,296 in the country.

According to the same source, the net enrolment of children in primary schools is 87.4 per cent. The percentage of girls among the school-going children is 48.0, that of the children of indigenous/ ethnic groups is 38.0, that of Dalits is 18.0 and that of handicapped children is 1.0. As of this Interim Plan, 13 per cent of children are still deprived of primary education and, even among those who go to school, the class repetition and dropout rates are high. The Plan targets to increase literacy of the children of 6 plus years of age to 76 percent. Similarly it targets to increase the gross enrolment rate, net enrolment rate and participation of female children in primary schools to 104 per cent, 96 per cent and 50 percent, respectively, by its end. The Plan has also set a target of 75 per cent in relation to the gross enrolment rate of children in the lower secondary schools.

The Community-based Alternative Schooling Project (CASP) was initiated in Nepal in 2004 with the technical support of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for developing an operational model of community-based alternative schooling project. For this purpose, it used the materials prepared by the Non-formal Education Centre (NFEC). This project had two distinct components: School Outreach Programme (SOP) and Flexible Schooling Programme (FSP). The SOP intended to provide grade 1-3 primary education to the 6-8-year-old children at proximate locations so that they could enroll in grade 4 in formal primary school after completing the three-year programme. On the other hand, the FSP aimed to provide a condensed form of primary education, grade 1 to 5, to the 8-14-year-old out-of-school children in three years. Both these programmes constituted part of alternative schooling programme of the Government of Nepal (GON) designed to increase the educational access of those groups of people who did not have access to formal education. The major strategy of CASP consisted of institutional strengthening of SOP and FSP, community mobilization and support, and networking among stakeholders.

The SOP and FSP classes were implemented in April 2005 on pilot basis in four VDCs of each of Dhading and Siraha districts. However, the piloting of CASP activities in Siraha was terminated in about a year and half after it was introduced there due to the socio-political unrest there.

## **1.2 Summary of baseline KAP survey in Dhading and Siraha**

Before implementing the programmes, it was essential to measure the knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) of parents vis-à-vis education and their cultural and economic determinants in order to help define precisely the locally-relevant programme strategies from the standpoint of community mobilization, establishment of baseline data on KAP indicators and incorporation of survey results into the community mobilization activities of CASP. Accordingly a baseline KAP survey was done in four VDCs of each of Dhading and Siraha districts where the CASP was planned for piloting.

In the survey, a total of 333 parents/respondents from 17 settlements of the two districts were covered. Information was collected through the use of semi-structured questionnaires. The key findings of the study were as follows.

### *1.2.1 Educational participation of children*

In the survey districts, nearly 50 per cent of these children had, in fact, never joined schools and nearly 500 out of 651 school-age children were not currently enrolled in school. This means, the majority of survey respondents were not accustomed to sending their children to schools.

The reasons for dropout among girls were lack of school nearby and the need of children to work at home for living. The reasons for dropout among boys were lack of school nearby and lack of desire to study. The reasons for dropout as found in Dhading were lack of school nearby and the need of children to work at home for living. The reasons for dropout as found in Siraha were lack of desire among children to study and poor economic conditions of respondents. In Dhading the reasons were lack of school nearby and the need of children to work at home for living. In the case of Siraha, the need of children to work at home for living, lack of desire among children to study, non-availability of educational materials and lack of school nearby were found as the major reasons for their non-enrolment in schools.

### *1.2.2 Knowledge of parents*

The parents were asked about their knowledge of six child rights statements. Knowledge of key child rights issues was found largely influenced by the social, literacy and economic status of the parents. Generally, the lower the status the lower was the level of awareness of these issues. Majority of the parents were aware that child education was the responsibility of parents, but their level of awareness on the issue that it was illegal to send children labor force was very low. In Dhading, schoolteachers and mass media were the key sources of knowledge and information. In Siraha, the elite of community and mass media were the key sources of knowledge and information.

### *1.2.3 Attitudes of parents*

Attitudes to key rights issues were found largely influenced by positive level of awareness of such issues. But social, economic and literacy status were found as co-factors influencing their attitudes. The better these factors the better were the positive attitudes. Since the socio-economic conditions and levels of awareness of key child rights issues of the parents of Siraha were less favorable and positive, their attitudes were also found less positive than those of Dhading.

Parents of both districts expressed the need of ASP and willingness to participate in the programme very highly. Those who expressed more needs of ASP were those who had positive attitudes towards the child rights issues. In Dhading availability of classes at convenient locations was the major factors. In the case of Siraha, provision of free education at convenient locations was the major factor influencing willingness to participate in the programmes. Great majority of the parents expressed willingness to send their children to formal school after the completion of programme. As far the willingness of the parents to participate in different activities of SOP and FSP were concerned, those of Dhading expressed willingness to make contributions in labor while most of those from Siraha expressed willingness to give time in meeting. Majority of the parents also opined that out-of-school children should be sent to school through provision of ASP and other educational incentives.

The parents of both Dhading and Siraha considered the responsibility of educating child largely of those of parents, schools and teachers. But those of Dhading also considered the government as one of the major providers of education. Majority of the parents of both districts valued education in terms of its ability to brighten the future of their children in one or the other ways.

### *1.2.4 Practices of parents*

Majority of the parents also reported to have encouraged their children to study. But those of Siraha encouraged more than those of Dhading. Positive associations were found between the literacy, economic status of parents, their level of awareness of key child rights issues and the level of encouragement. Advising the children on the value of education was the most commonly adopted type of encouragement. Coaxing was also one of the forms of encouraging children to study as found more commonly in Dhading. Parents who were found aware of and who agreed with the child rights issues were found more discussing with their children about their education. Value of education constituted the central theme of discussion in both districts. Those who did not discuss with children reported lack of their own education, as in the case of Siraha, and lack of time as the major reasons for not discussing with children. A large percentage of parents were also found discussing with their families and neighbors about the education of their children. Those who agreed with

the key child rights issues discussed more with their families and neighbours than those who disagreed with them.

A significant majority of the parents had someone to advise on the education of their children. Those who did not have such persons were basically those who were illiterate. Teachers were the commonly preferred advisors. In Siraha, however, the elite groups of community were reported by many as the preferred advisors. As far the contributions made by the parents to local schools is concerned, 80 per cent of those of Dhading and 35 per cent of the parents of Siraha reported that they had made contributions. It was additionally found that 98 per cent of those of Dhading and 68 per cent of the parents of Siraha had made contributions in the form of labor.

### **1.3 Objectives of the survey**

The major objectives of this end line survey were to:

1. Assess the level of KAP regarding child education among the parents/respondents in the target communities after their exposure to the pilot activities including community mobilization and participation under CASP,
2. Identify the determining factors of parental attitude and practices related to child education in the target communities, and
3. Provide recommendations for potential interventions in terms of community mobilization after CASP.

### **1.4 Key definitions**

In contemporary research, the term ‘knowledge’ is popularly used in KAP surveys. KAP is a standard term in which the word ‘knowledge’ is implicitly used as a proxy for awareness. In this report, the terms ‘knowledge’ and ‘awareness’ are, thus, used interchangeably. The term ‘attitude’ is used to refer to the perception or way of thinking and ‘practice’ to refer to the actions or behaviour relating to children’s education.

### **1.5 Assumptions**

The broad assumptions underlying this end line survey are as follows:

1. Positive KAP of parents/respondents regarding child education are developed by the pilot activities including community mobilisation and participation under CASP (intervention factors), and
2. The degree of development of KAP is also influenced by the characteristics of target communities (structural or indigenous factors) as demographical, social, and economic factors in addition to CASP activities.

The specific assumptions underlying this survey are as follows:

1. The higher the ones' socio-economic status (i.e. literate, higher caste, relatively better off economically, fluent in Nepali), the better the ones' knowledge, attitude and practice relating to child education. Conversely, the lower the ones socio-economic status, the worse the ones knowledge, attitude and practice.
2. Knowledge, attitude and practice change over time with the interventions, but the higher the ones socio-economic status, the faster the change in the indicators of knowledge, attitude and practice, Conversely, the lower the ones socio-economic status, the slower the change in the indicators of knowledge, attitude and practice, and
3. The rate of change in key indicators can be high only if the implementation of CASP activities is regular (full support model). Conversely, the rate of such change becomes slow if the implementation of CASP activities become irregular or become interrupted (partial support model) as in Siraha.

## **1.6 Methodology of the survey**

The end line KAP survey was conducted by IIDS in the targeted areas of Dhading and Siraha districts from the first week of July 2008 to the third week of July 2008. This study period coincided with the time of heavy monsoon, rice plantation and closure of schools to carry out agricultural activities. This survey adopted the same methodology as was adopted in the baseline survey of Dhading and Siraha districts as carried out in 2005.

### *1.6.1 Target groups of survey and survey sites*

The survey covered the parents/respondents<sup>8</sup> of nine geographic areas of Dhading and eight geographic areas of Siraha where CASP was piloted. It covered a total of 335 parents/respondents<sup>9</sup> from those areas<sup>10</sup> (Table 1.1).

---

<sup>8</sup> The terms parents and respondents are used interchangeably in this report unless indicated otherwise. The respondents include parents or guardians of children.

<sup>9</sup> Guardians were interviewed when the parents were not available for interview.

<sup>10</sup> At this moment, it is also important to note that of the total persons interviewed, about 26 per cent were interviewed at the time of baseline survey, about 22 per cent could not remember whether or not they were interviewed at the time of baseline survey and the remaining 51 per cent were not interviewed at the time of baseline survey. One possible reason for this inconsistency is that some children of families different from those interviewed at the time of baseline survey were selected in SOP/FSP later.

**Table 1.1: Sample size**

Programme	District	VDC	Tole	Number of respondents surveyed
SOP	Dhading	Benighat VDC	(Ward No.5) Ruding	13
	Dhading	Dhusa VDC	(Ward No.3) Mijar Gaun	15
	Dhading	Dhusa VDC	(Ward No.9) Grasibas	25
	Dhading	Gajuri VDC	(Ward No.6) Lo Gaun	12
	Dhading	Jogimara VDC	(War No.5) Hekrang	22
Sub-total				87
FSP	Dhading	Benighat VDC	(Ward No. 9) Matthilo Orbang	17
	Dhading	Dhusa VDC	(Ward No. 7) Bungpung	19
	Dhading	Gajuri VDC	(Ward No. 1) Subedi Danda	19
	Dhading	Jogimara VDC	(Ward No. 2) Takthali	16
Sub-total				71
SOP	Siraha	Bariyarpatti VDC	(Ward No. 1) Bodar	14
	Siraha	Kushaha Laxiniya VDC	(Ward No. 8&9) Dushad	21
	Siraha	Tenuwapatti VDC	(Ward No. 3) Navka tole/Bazar	12
	Siraha	Vidyanagar VDC	(Ward No.6) Chhajana	30
Sub-total				77
FSP	Siraha	Bariyarpatti VDC	(Ward No. 7) Baluwa	26
	Siraha	Kushaha Laxiniya VDC	(Ward No.1) Baniniya	22
	Siraha	Tenuwapatti VDC	(Ward No. 8) Sohapur	27
	Siraha	Vidyanagar VDC	(Ward No. 1&2)Vidyanagar	25
Sub-total				100
Grand total				335

While the Dhading VDCs were characterized by rough terrain, dispersed settlements and isolation, the Siraha VDCs were characterized by gentle terrain and nucleated settlements, thus, making the implementation of community mobilization programmes and promoting the interactions among community people relatively easy there. In the meantime, however, Siraha was characterized by ethnic violence thereby forcing the programme to terminate there.

### 1.6.2 Research instrument

The survey was carried out by using semi-structured questionnaires (see Annex 1) developed by IIDS in collaboration with CASP, NFEC and DEO. The questionnaires covered information on the background characteristics of respondents, including their social, economic and literacy status, information relating to the schooling of children and the KAP of respondents on many children's education issues. The questionnaire was also

designed to solicit suggestions from the respondents on the ways to effectively increase the KAP of respondents.

### **1.7 Analysis**

This study analyses the KAP issues covered by the questionnaire by various background characteristics of respondents (indigenous or structural factors) and the KAP that relate to interventions made by CASP (intervention factors). This was done to assess the association of these factors with the KAP related issues under investigation. Softwares such as dBase were used to enter data and SPSS were used to analyse the data.

### **1.8 Limitations of the study**

This report contains many data tables, each with several pieces of information. In this report, only the major patterns that had emerged from the data tables are discussed in a parsimonious way. The readers are encouraged to find additional patterns from the tables as per their specific needs and interest.

It is possible that the study could have suffered from the bias of respondents while answering a particular question. However, the study is unable to control such biases, if any.

Similarly, the study is unable to control the effect of external factors on the KAP of respondents. These factors could have been the demonstration effect of other community development programmes and/or the influence of Indian mass media particularly in Siraha.

### **1.9 Organization of report**

This report has been organized into eight chapters. Chapter 1 provides a brief overview of CASP, its purposes and the experience of baseline survey. It then outlines the objectives of the survey, defines some concepts that need clarity, and spells out the assumptions of the study. It also casts light on the methodology and data analysis processes, as well as on the limitations of the survey and the organization of the report.

Chapter 2 describes the background characteristics of both the study communities and the respondents. This description is made to familiarize the readers with the socio-economic conditions and the interrelationships that exist among them. Chapter 3 presents some basic demographics of children from the household roster of children. It also includes information on age, sex and birth registration. This chapter then examines the situation of children in relation to their schooling in general and in relation to their ever enrolment in SOP/FSP programmes and the completion of the programmes in particular.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of this survey on the knowledge dimension, Chapter 5 on the attitude dimension and chapter 6 on the practice dimension. Chapter 7 is devoted to discussing the suggestions of the respondents on improving the alternative schooling programmes. Chapter 8 presents the conclusions based on findings and makes recommendations for consideration by the stakeholders of the programme later. The report is annexed with the questionnaires of the study and summary of selected indicators.

## Chapter 2

### Characteristics of Study Communities and Households Surveyed

This chapter describes the characteristics of study communities and households. This description is made with a view to familiarize the readers with the socio-economic conditions and the interrelationships that existed among them. It is important to note that all data tables in this and the subsequent chapters are in percentage to allow the comparison of data or facts in relative term and that they are examined against a number of relevant background variables to help identify the associations between the factors and a particular response or outcome.

#### 2.1 Social characteristics

##### 2.1.1 Caste and ethnicity<sup>11</sup>

Great majority of the parents/respondents belonged to the intermediate caste groups in both Dhading (72 per cent) and Siraha (67 percent) and were followed by low caste. The percentage of respondents belonging to high caste groups and Muslims was relatively low (Tables 2.1).

**Table 2.1 Percentage distribution of respondents by caste and ethnicity**

Social class	Dhading			Siraha			Total	
	Associated caste	N	%	Associated caste	N	%	N	%
High	Brahmin Chhetry	12	7.6	Das Raya	4	2.3	16	4.8
Intermediate	Newar Tamang Bhujel Magar Gurung Rai Chepang/Praja	123	77.8	Sahni Mandal Yadav Singh Sah Malaha Danuwar Thakur	118	66.7	241	71.9
Low	Damai/Pariyar  Sarki/Nepali/Bisunke/Bayalkoti/Mijar  BK	23	14.6	Mochi Paswan Kamati Ram Sadaya Dom Lohar	46	26.0	69	20.6
Muslims <sup>12</sup>	-			Miya Amshoj Khatun Ansari Sarif Rain	9	5.1	9	2.7
<b>End line Total</b>		<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>		<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>11</sup> This classification is consistent with the methodology of baseline survey. It is also important to note that there were no Muslim parents at the time of baseline survey.

<sup>12</sup> Muslims do not constitute part of Hindu caste system and are, therefore, treated separately in this and subsequent analysis.

### 2.1.2 Literacy

Majority of the respondents of Dhading (54 per cent) and Siraha (64 per cent) were illiterate. They were followed by respondents who could read and write somehow. The percentage of respondents who could read and write well was relatively low in both districts, but particularly low in Dhading (Table 2.2).

**Table 2.2 Literacy of respondents (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Literacy</b>				
Illiterate	86	54.4	113	63.8
Can read only	10	6.3	10	5.6
Can read and write somehow	53	33.5	30	16.9
Can read and write well	9	5.7	24	13.6

As was also found, the lower the ones social status, the higher the ones illiteracy. This held true in both Dhading and Siraha, but particularly true in Siraha (Table 2.3).

**Table 2.3 Interrelationship between literacy and social status of respondents (in percentage)**

Social status	Dhading					Siraha				
	Illiterate	Can read only	Can read and write somehow	Can read and write well/ do calculations	Total N	Illiterate	Can read only	Can read and write somehow	Can read and write well/ do calculations	Total N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>54.4</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>177</b>
Higher	41.7		50.0	8.3	12	25.0		50.0	25.0	4
Intermediate	55.3	8.1	31.7	4.9	123	56.8	8.5	17.8	16.9	118
Lower/Dalit	56.5		34.8	8.7	23	89.1		4.3	6.5	46
Muslim						44.4		55.6		9

### 2.1.3 Ability to speak Nepali

The percentage of respondents who could speak Nepali well was very high in Dhading (98 per cent), but it was very low in Siraha (21 per cent) as shown in Table 2.4.

**Table 2.4 Ability of respondents to speak Nepali (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Ability to speak Nepali</b>				
Can speak easily	154	97.5	37	20.9
Speaks only little	1	0.6	31	17.5
Cannot speak	3	1.9	109	61.6
No	78	49.4	171	96.6

#### 2.1.4 Residential status

An overwhelming majority of the respondents were permanent residents in both districts (Table 2.5).

**Table 2.5 Residential status of respondents (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Residential status</b>				
Permanent	155	98.1	175	98.9
Temporary	3	1.9	2	1.1

#### 2.1.5 House type

About 22 percent of the respondents of Dhading lived in *Kachhi* (temporary) houses. In contrast, about 92 per cent of the respondents of Siraha lived in such houses. The percentage of respondents living in *Pakki* (permanent) and *Ardha Pakki* (semi permanent) houses was much higher in Dhading than in Siraha (Table 2.6).

**Table 2.6 House types (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>House type</b>				
<i>Pakki</i>	66	41.8	3	1.7
<i>Ardha pakki</i>	56	35.4	11	6.2
<i>Kachhi</i>	36	22.8	163	92.1

#### 2.1.6 Major source of drinking water

For a great majority of respondents of Dhading (82 percent) the major source of drinking water was potable. But for a great majority of those of Siraha (99 per cent) hand pump was the major source of water (Table 2.7).

**Table 2.7 Major source of drinking water (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Main source of water</b>				
Potable	130	82.3		
Hand pump			176	99.4
Well/dug well	23	14.6	1	0.6
River	5	3.2		

#### 2.1.7 Major source of lighting

Kerosene was the major source of lighting in both districts. Battery was the second major source of lighting in Dhading and electricity was the second major source of lighting in Siraha (Table 2.8).

**Table 2.8 Major source of lighting (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Main source of lighting</b>				
Electricity	12	7.6	26	14.7
Kerosene	84	53.2	151	85.3
Gobar gas				
Battery/Tucumcari	37	23.4		
Diyalo	18	11.4		
Firewood	6	3.8		
Solar	1	0.6		

### 2.1.8 Toilet

About 51 per cent of the respondents of Dhading and 3 per cent of the respondents of Siraha had family toilet. In contrast, 49 per cent of the residents of Dhading and 97 per cent of the respondents of Siraha did not have family toilet (Table 2.9).

**Table 2.9 Possession of family toilets<sup>13</sup> (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Family toilet</b>				
Yes	80	50.6	6	3.4
No	78	49.4	171	96.6

### 2.1.9 Time distance to mother school

The average time to reach mother school was relatively high in Dhading (59.69 minutes) as compared to Siraha (19.73 minutes). Among the entire programme VDCs, time distance was found highest in Benighat VDC of Dhading and lowest in Tenuwapatti VDC of Siraha (Table 2.10).

**Table 2.10 Time distance to reach mother school (in minutes)**

Dhading		Siraha	
<b>End line average</b>	<b>59.69</b>	<b>End line average</b>	<b>19.73</b>
<b>VDCs and wards</b>	<b>Distance</b>	<b>VDCs and wards</b>	<b>Distance</b>
Jogimara	75.54	Tenuwapatti	14.50
Dhusa	48.28	Vidyanagar	19.41
Benighat	81.50	Kusaha Laxminia	17.23
Gajuri	39.03	Bariyarpatti	28.83

## 2.2 Economic characteristics

### 2.2.1 Sources of livelihood

Agriculture was found as the most important source of livelihood for a majority of respondents in both districts. Wage labour was also found as an important source of livelihood in Siraha. Traditional occupation and remittance were also found relatively important in Siraha (Table 2.11)

<sup>13</sup> One of the findings of this study was that while 56.3 per cent (N=45) of the residents of Dhading used pit latrine and 43.8 per cent (N=35) used pan toilet, 100 per cent (N=6) of those of Siraha used pan/*sulav* toilet.

**Table 2.11 Sources of livelihood (in percentage)**

Major source of family income	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Agriculture (food grains)	83	52.5	59	33.3
Agriculture (vegetable farming, fruit farming, livestock raising)	61	38.6	10	5.6
Service	3	1.9	3	1.7
Business/industry	3	1.9	13	7.3
Wage labor	6	3.8	62	35.0
Pension				
Traditional occupation	1	0.6	14	7.9
Remittance	1	0.6	15	8.5
Others			1	0.6

### 2.2.2 Ability to support family by background characteristics

The families with higher social status supported their families rather easily in Dhading. Those who could read and write well also supported their families easily. Those who were in service and business also supported their families easily. In contrast, the wage laborers supported their family with great difficulty (Table 2.11).

At this juncture, it is also noteworthy that in a three year period, the percentage of respondents supporting their family easily has gone up and the percentage of population supporting their families with very difficulty has gone down in Dhading (Table 2.12).

**Table 2.12 Ability of the respondents of Dhading to support family by background characteristics (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Ability				N	%
	Easily	With some difficulty	With difficulty	With very difficulty		
<b>Baseline average</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>End line average</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>45.6</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Social status</b>						
Higher status	41.7	50.0	8.3		12	7.6
Intermediate	18.7	47.2	26.8	7.3	123	77.8
Lower status/Dalits	30.4	34.8	17.4	17.4	23	14.6
Muslims						
<b>Literacy</b>						
Illiterate	19.8	40.7	24.4	15.1	86	54.4
Can read only	20.0	40.0	40.0		10	6.3
Can read and write somehow	20.8	56.6	22.6		53	33.5
Can read and write well	55.6	33.3	11.1		9	5.7
<b>Ability to speak Nepali</b>						
Can speak easily	22.7	44.2	24.7	8.4	154	97.5
Speaks only little		100.0			1	0.6
Cannot speak		100.0			3	1.9
<b>Major sources of family income</b>						
Agriculture	15.7	48.2	31.3	4.8	83	52.5
Vegetable/fruit farming	24.6	49.2	16.4	9.8	61	38.6
Service	100.0				3	1.9
Business/industry	66.7		33.3		3	1.9
Wage labor		33.3	16.7	50.0	6	3.8
Traditional occupation	100.0				1	0.6
Remittance	100.0				1	0.6

In Siraha, higher castes and Muslims supported their family rather easily. Those who were in business and service also supported their families relatively easily. In contrast, Dalits, those involved in vegetable/fruit farming and wage laborers supported their family with great difficulty (Table12).

It is also worth mentioning that in a three-year period the percentage of respondents that can support their family easily has gone up slightly, but the percentage of respondents that can support their families with very difficulty has come down slightly (Table 2.13)

**Table 2.13 Ability of the respondents of Siraha to support family by background characteristics (in parentage)**

Background characteristics	Ability					N	%
	Easily	With some difficulty	With difficulty	With very difficulty			
<b>Baseline average</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>37.3</b>		<b>134</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>End line average</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>23.2</b>		<b>177</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Social status</b>							
Higher status	25.0	50.0		25.0		4	2.3
Intermediate	15.3	45.8	23.7	15.3		118	66.7
Lower status/Dalits	2.2	17.4	32.6	47.8		46	26.0
Muslims	22.2	44.4	33.3			9	5.1
<b>Literacy</b>							
Illiterate	6.2	39.8	29.2	24.8		113	63.8
Can read only	40.0	30.0	30.0			10	5.6
Can read and write somehow	13.3	36.7	23.3	26.7		30	16.9
Can read and write well	29.2	37.5	12.5	20.8		24	13.6
<b>Ability to speak Nepali</b>							
Can speak easily	21.6	32.4	13.5	32.4		37	20.9
Speaks only little	16.1	45.2	25.8	12.9		31	17.5
Cannot speak	8.3	38.5	30.3	22.9		109	61.6
<b>Major sources of family income</b>							
Agriculture	15.3	49.2	27.1	8.5		59	33.3
Vegetable/fruit farming	10.0	10.0	30.0	50.0		10	5.6
Service	33.3	66.7				3	1.7
Business/industry	30.8	61.5	7.7			13	7.3
Wage labor	1.6	22.6	32.3	43.5		62	35.0
Traditional occupation	14.3	50.0	14.3	21.4		14	7.9
Remittance	26.7	40.0	26.7	6.7		15	8.5
Others		100.0				1	0.6

### 2.3 Priorities to community development

The major priority of Dhading respondents were road construction and maintenance followed by drinking water, and education, literacy and awareness, respectively The major priorities of Siraha respondents were agriculture and were followed by income generation, road construction/maintenance and education, literacy and awareness, respectively (Table 2.14).

**Table 2.14 Priorities of respondents in community development (in percentage)**

Priorities	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line total</b>	158	100.0	177	100.0
Agriculture, livestock and vegetable farming	22	13.9	46	26.0
Road construction/ maintenance	43	27.2	32	18.1
Irrigation and river control	7	4.4	13	7.3
Forest development and conservation	1	0.6		
Electricity	15	9.5	14	7.9
Health and sanitation			6	3.4
Education, literacy and awareness	29	18.4	28	15.8
Physical structure/ community buildings			4	2.3
Drinking water	35	22.2		
Income generation activities	3	1.9	34	19.2
Do not Know	2	1.3		

## Chapter 3

### Schooling of Children

This chapter presents different scenarios relating to the education of children. These include children's demography, birth registration, completion of alternative schooling programmes, and reasons for drop out from the SOP/FSP. In addition, this chapter examines the reasons for sending children to the alternative schooling programmes and the sources of information about sending children to such programmes.

#### 3.1 Average number of children

In response to the question asked about the number of children in the family, the study found that the average number of children (0-17 years of age) per household was slightly higher in Dhading than in Siraha. The study also found that the average number of children (6-17 years of age) was slightly higher in Dhading than in Siraha (Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1 Average number of children per household in Siraha and Dhading districts**

Indicator	Dhading	Siraha
1. Average number of children (0-17 years)	4.14	3.42
2. Average number of children (6-17 years)	2.78	2.71

#### 3.2 Birth registration

In response to the question asked about the birth registration of children 6-17 years of age, nearly 60 per cent of the respondents reported that the birth of their children was not registered. But, as has been found, birth registration was relatively low in Dhading. As has also been found, birth registration was low in families of children selected for SOP, families of higher and intermediate social status, families that could speak Nepali easily and families that could support themselves easily (Table 3.2). In this connection, it is also noteworthy that while about 28 per cent of the children had their birth registered at the time of baseline survey, the percentage of such children jumped to 60 per cent at the time of this end line survey (Table 3.2).

**Table 3.2 Birth registration (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No		Don't know		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Baseline average</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>End line average</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>59.8</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>919</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>District</b>								
Dhading	101	23.0	314	71.4	25	5.7	440	47.9
Siraha	449	93.7	28	5.8	2	0.4	479	52.1
<b>Programme</b>								
SOP	236	52.9	197	44.2	13	2.9	446	48.5
FSP	314	66.4	145	30.7	14	3.0	473	51.5
<b>Sex of child</b>								
Female	254	57.9	169	38.5	16	3.6	439	47.8
Male	296	61.7	173	36.0	11	2.3	480	52.2

Background characteristics	Yes		No		Don't know		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Social status of respondents</b>								
Higher status	19	45.2	23	54.8			42	4.6
Intermediate status	352	52.5	299	44.6	20	3.0	671	73.0
Lower status/Dalits	151	84.8	20	11.2	7	3.9	178	19.4
Muslims	28	100.0					28	3.0
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>								
Illiterate	355	64.0	185	33.3	15	2.7	555	60.4
Can read only	20	35.7	34	60.7	2	3.6	56	6.1
Can read and write somehow	111	50.0	101	45.5	10	4.5	222	24.2
Can read and write well	64	74.4	22	25.6			86	9.4
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>								
Can speak easily	194	37.1	302	57.7	27	5.2	523	56.9
Speaks only little	72	84.7	13	15.3			85	9.2
Cannot speak	284	91.3	27	8.7			311	33.8
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>								
Easily	81	52.6	64	41.6	9	5.8	154	16.8
With some difficulty	217	55.6	162	41.5	11	2.8	390	42.4
With difficulty	131	56.2	97	41.6	5	2.1	233	25.4
With very difficulty	121	85.2	19	13.4	2	1.4	142	15.5

### 3.3 Children attending SOP/FSP

Respondents were asked if their children attended SOP/FSP classes. In response, it was reported that about 45 per cent of children of the 6-14 year age group attended the SOP/FSP classes<sup>14</sup>. The attendance was reported slightly higher in Dhading than in Siraha (Table 3.3).

**Table 3.3 Children attending SOP/FSP by selected background characteristics (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No		Total N
	N	%	N	%	
<b>End line average</b>	410	44.6	509	55.4	919
<b>District</b>					
Dhading	206	46.8	234	53.2	440
Siraha	204	42.6	275	57.4	479
<b>Programme</b>					
SOP	213	47.8	233	52.2	446
FSP	197	41.6	276	58.4	473
<b>Sex of child</b>					
Female	207	47.2	232	52.8	439
Male	203	42.3	277	57.7	480
<b>Social status of respondents</b>					
Higher status	20	47.6	22	52.4	42
Intermediate status	292	43.5	379	56.5	671
Lower status/Dalits	87	48.9	91	51.1	178
Muslim	11	39.3	17	60.7	28

<sup>14</sup> The research team adjudges that participation in the SOP/FSP classes by a limited percentage of eligible children is due to the small quota set per class.

Background characteristics	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>					
Illiterate	242	43.6	313	56.4	555
Can read only	25	44.6	31	55.4	56
Can read and write somehow	105	47.3	117	52.7	222
Can read and write well	38	44.2	48	55.8	86
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>					
Can speak easily	242	46.3	281	53.7	523
Speaks only little	42	49.4	43	50.6	85
Cannot speak	126	40.5	185	59.5	311
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>					
Easily	65	42.2	89	57.8	154
With some difficulty	170	43.6	220	56.4	390
With difficulty	106	45.5	127	54.5	233
With very difficulty	69	48.6	73	51.4	142

### 3.4 Children completing SOP/FSP

The respondents were also asked whether or not the children who attended ASP completed the classes or dropped out of them. The findings are that about 82 per cent of the children had completed the classes and about 18 per cent had dropped out. As has been found, the completion rate was slightly low among the Dalits and those families who could not speak Nepali (Table 3.4).

**Table 3.4 Children completing SOP/FSP (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No (dropout)	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line average</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>82.4</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>17.6</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	174	84.5	32	15.5
Siraha	164	80.4	40	19.6
<b>Programme</b>				
SOP	182	85.4	31	14.6
FSP	156	79.2	41	20.8
<b>Sex of child</b>				
Female	164	79.2	43	20.8
Male	174	85.7	29	14.3
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	14	70.0	6	30.0
Intermediate status	251	86.0	41	14.0
Lower status/Dalits	62	71.3	25	28.7
Muslim	11	100.0		
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	189	78.1	53	21.9
Can read only	22	88.0	3	12.0
Can read and write somehow	92	87.6	13	12.4
Can read and write well	35	92.1	3	7.9

Background characteristics	Yes		No (dropout)	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>				
Can speak easily	208	86.0	34	14.0
Speaks only little	39	92.9	3	7.1
Cannot speak	91	72.2	35	27.8
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	58	89.2	7	10.8
With some difficulty	146	85.9	24	14.1
With difficulty	83	78.3	23	21.7
With very difficulty	51	73.9	18	26.1

### 3.4.1 Reasons for not completing SOP/FSP (dropout)

In response to the question asked about the reason for not completing the SOP/FSP, the respondents reported that the need to work at home for living followed by inappropriate age were the major reason for boys. The dislike of children to go to such schools, the need to work at home for living and early marriage were the major reasons among the girls of 9-17-year age group.

It was also revealed by the respondents that while the major reason of dropout among younger boys was dislike to go to such schools, the major reason for older boys was the need to work at home for living. District wise, while dislike to go to school and the need to work at home influenced the dropout rate in Dhading to some extent, the need to work for living, inappropriate age of child and dislike of child to go to school were the major reasons influencing their dropout (Table 3.5).

**Table 3.5 Reasons for not completing SOP/FSP (dropout) in percentage**

Reasons	Sex of child		Age of child		Distance to mother school (minutes)		District	
	F	M	5-8	9-17	0-30	30+	Dhading	Siraha
<b>Respondents surveyed (N)</b>	43	29	9	63	46	26	32	40
Child did not like to go to alternative school	14.0	34.5	44.4	19.0	21.7	23.1	18.8	25.0
Child needed to work at home for living	41.9	31.0		42.9	50.0	15.4	18.8	52.5
Child was little too young/old to attend school	27.9	6.9	33.3	17.5	28.3	3.8	6.3	30.0
The location of alternative school was too far		6.9	11.1	1.6	2.2	3.8	3.1	2.5
The time of alternative school was not convenient	2.3	3.4		3.2	2.2	3.8	3.1	2.5
Child did not understand what teachers taught		13.8	11.1	4.8	4.3	7.7	12.5	
Classmates misbehaved	9.3	3.4		7.9	10.9		3.1	10.0
Physical facilities were poor		3.4		1.6		3.8	3.1	
Dress was not provided free	2.3	3.4		3.2	4.3			5.0
Scholarship money was not provided	9.3			6.3	8.7			10.0
Child was married	20.9	6.9		17.5	4.3	34.6	28.1	5.0
Parents married another person	2.3			1.6	2.2		3.1	

Reasons	Sex of child		Age of child		Distance to mother school (minutes)		District	
	F	M	5-8	9-17	0-30	30+	Dhading	Siraha
Child goes to school with sibling	9.3	6.9	11.1	7.9	4.3	15.4	15.6	2.5
Child became sick		3.4		1.6		3.8	3.1	
Because of being a daughter	2.3			1.6	2.2			2.5
Death of mother		3.4		1.6		3.8	3.1	
Because child is sent to a boarding school		3.4		1.6	2.2		3.1	

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

### 3.4.2 Reasons for sending children to ASP

In response to the question asked about why they sent their children to alternative school and not to formal school, about 93 per cent of the respondents reported that they did so because the SOP/FSP classes were held in convenient locations. Knowledge of the fact that education was free was another major reason underlying it as reported by about 38 per cent of the respondents. However, this reason was more important in Siraha than in Dhading and in FSP than in SOP. Information that incentives will be provided was the third major reason as reported by 29 per cent of the respondents. This reason was more important in Dhading than in Siraha (Table 3.6).

**Table 3.6 Reasons for sending children to alternative school (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Class was held in convenient location	Class was held in convenient time	Education was free	Information that incentives will be provided	Children were taught by local facilitators	It was easy to understand what teachers taught	Child was too old to go to school	Birth of child not registered	Educational materials were provided free of cost	Education was better in ASP than in formal school	We were too poor to send child to formal school	We were motivated by others to send child to ASP	Others	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>88.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>														
Dhading	91.8	8.2	24.1	38.6	6.3	10.8	3.2		0.6	1.9	0.6	2.5	3.2	158
Siraha	85.3	39.5	49.7	22.0	31.1	36.2	1.1	0.6	0.6	4.5	0.6	0.6		177
<b>Programme</b>														
SOP	87.8	24.4	26.8	31.7	17.1	28.0	1.2	0.6	1.2	6.1	1.2	2.4	1.2	164
FSP	88.9	25.1	48.0	28.1	21.6	20.5	2.9			0.6		0.6	1.8	171
<b>Social status of respondents</b>														
Higher status	93.8	18.8	37.5	18.8	12.5	18.8	6.3			12.5				16
Intermediate status	90.0	24.1	37.8	29.0	17.8	21.6	1.2	0.4	0.4	2.1	0.4	2.1	2.1	241
Lower status/Dalits	81.2	24.6	37.7	34.8	26.1	30.4	4.3			5.8	1.4			69
Muslim	88.9	55.6	33.3	33.3	22.2	55.6			11.1					9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>														
Illiterate	85.4	26.1	41.7	29.1	23.6	23.6	3.0		0.5	2.0	0.5	2.5	1.0	199
Can read only	95.0	30.0	50.0	30.0	15.0	20.0				5.0			5.0	20
Can read and write somehow	94.0	22.9	20.5	32.5	8.4	24.1	1.2		1.2	3.6	1.2		1.2	83
Can read and write well	87.9	18.2	48.5	27.3	24.2	30.3		3.0		9.1			3.0	33

Background characteristics	Class was held in convenient location	Class was held in convenient time	Education was free	Information that incentives will be provided	Children were taught by local facilitators	It was easy to understand what teachers taught	Child was too old to go to school	Birth of child not registered	Educational materials were provided free of cost	Education was better in ASP than in formal school	We were too poor to send child to formal school	We were motivated by others to send child to ASP	Others	N
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>														
Can speak easily	91.6	13.1	28.8	38.7	9.4	14.1	2.6	0.5	0.5	2.6	0.5	2.1	2.6	191
Speaks only little	81.3	53.1	46.9	25.0	21.9	43.8				3.1				32
Cannot speak	84.8	36.6	50.0	16.1	35.7	35.7	1.8		0.9	4.5	0.9	0.9		112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>														
Easily	87.7	28.1	31.6	29.8	19.3	24.6				8.8		1.8		57
With some difficulty	90.7	30.7	40.7	32.1	20.0	22.1	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7		0.7	2.9	140
With difficulty	82.1	16.7	36.9	31.0	16.7	26.2	4.8		1.2	3.6	2.4	2.4	1.2	84
With very difficulty	92.6	18.5	37.0	22.2	22.2	25.9	3.7			3.7		1.9		54

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

### 3.5 Provision of information about SOP/FSP

In response to the questions asked to the respondents about whether or not they were informed about sending their children to SOP/FSP just before the programme started, great majority of the respondents (89 per cent) reported that they were provided with such information. As has also been found, the level of information provided was relatively high with respect to FSP (Table 3.7).

**Table 3.7 Provision of information to respondents to send children to SOP/FSP at first time (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No		N
	N	%	N	%	
<b>End line average</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>89.3</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>					
Dhading	138	87.3	20	12.7	158
Siraha	161	91.0	16	9.0	177
<b>Programme</b>					
SOP	136	82.9	28	17.1	164
FSP	163	95.3	8	4.7	171
<b>Social status of respondents</b>					
Higher status	13	81.3	3	18.8	16
Intermediate status	213	88.4	28	11.6	241
Lower status/Dalits	64	92.8	5	7.2	69
Muslim	9	100.0			9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>					
Illiterate	178	89.4	21	10.6	199
Can read only	20	100.0			20
Can read and write somehow	71	85.5	12	14.5	83
Can read and write well	30	90.9	3	9.1	33

Background characteristics	Yes		No		N
	N	%	N	%	
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>					
Can speak easily	166	86.9	25	13.1	191
Speaks only little	29	90.6	3	9.4	32
Cannot speak	104	92.9	8	7.1	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>					
Easily	49	86.0	8	14.0	57
With some difficulty	118	84.3	22	15.7	140
With difficulty	80	95.2	4	4.8	84
With very difficulty	52	96.3	2	3.7	54

### 3.5.1 Sources of information

When the respondents were asked about the persons who informed them about sending their children to SOP/FSP, education volunteers (EVs) were reported as the key persons informing respondents to send their children to ASP. They were then followed by members of class management committees (CMC), school teachers, other elites of community and people from NGOs. In both Dhading and Siraha, the role of EVs was particularly high in this regard. The EVs were also important source of information among the Muslim families. The role of resource persons (RPs) was relatively low in this regard (Table 3.8).

**Table 3.8 Persons informing respondents to send children to SOP/FSP at first time (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Persons informing to send children to SOP/FSP at first time									N
	Members of CMC	EVs	Facilitators	School teachers	People from NGOs	RPs	Other elite of community	Neighbours	Others	
<b>End line average</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>299</b>
<b>District</b>										
Dhading	31.9	42.0	3.6	35.5	34.1	5.1	14.5	22.5	0.7	138
Siraha	51.6	83.9	23.6	26.7	17.4	8.7	35.4	12.4	1.9	161
<b>Programme</b>										
SOP	36.0	61.8	8.1	24.3	31.6	2.9	27.2	25.7	2.2	136
FSP	47.9	66.9	19.6	36.2	19.6	10.4	24.5	9.8	0.6	163
<b>Social status of respondents</b>										
Higher status	7.7	46.2		30.8	30.8	7.7	30.8	38.5		13
Intermediate status	45.1	60.1	18.3	31.9	21.6	9.4	24.4	14.1	1.4	213
Lower status/Dalits	39.1	78.1	6.3	31.3	37.5		26.6	21.9	1.6	64
Muslim	55.6	100.0			11.1		44.4	22.2		9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>										
Illiterate	43.3	64.0	16.9	32.6	26.4	5.1	23.6	16.3	1.1	178
Can read only	55.0	85.0	10.0	30.0	15.0	15.0	30.0	15.0	5.0	20
Can read and write somehow	36.6	56.3	8.5	23.9	31.0	9.9	31.0	18.3		71
Can read and write well	43.3	73.3	16.7	36.7	10.0	6.7	23.3	20.0	3.3	30

Background characteristics	Persons informing to send children to SOP/FSP at first time									N
	Members of CMC	EVs	Facilitators	School teachers	People from NGOs	RPs	Other elite of community	Neighbours	Others	
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>										
Can speak easily	35.5	47.6	7.8	35.5	29.5	6.6	17.5	20.5	0.6	166
Speaks only little	51.7	93.1	17.2	17.2	10.3	6.9	37.9	20.7		29
Cannot speak	51.0	83.7	24.0	26.9	22.1	7.7	35.6	10.6	2.9	104
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>										
Easily	36.7	57.1	10.2	40.8	26.5	2.0	18.4	28.6	2.0	49
With some difficulty	47.5	59.3	18.6	29.7	28.8	10.2	18.6	12.7	0.8	118
With difficulty	37.5	70.0	13.8	28.8	15.0	7.5	36.3	16.3	1.3	80
With very difficulty	44.2	75.0	9.6	26.9	30.8	3.8	32.7	17.3	1.9	52

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

## Chapter 4

### Knowledge of Respondents on Child Education Issues

This chapter first describes the awareness of respondents about the implementation of the SOP and FSP activities at the community levels. It then describes their awareness of selected child rights statements and the sources of knowledge of such statements.

#### 4.1 Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities

In response to the question asked about their knowledge of different SOP and FSP activities, a higher percentage of respondents from Dhading than that of Siraha reported the knowledge of such activities. The knowledge was also found high among respondents of higher social class, among Muslims, among those who could read and write well and, finally, among those who supported their families rather easily (Table 4.1).

It is noteworthy that at the time of baseline survey, the respondents were asked if they had knowledge of programmes for children not going to school, knowledge of programmes on non-formal education, knowledge of two separate programmes (i.e. SOP and FSP) and knowledge of duration of programmes. The percentage of respondents having knowledge of those programmes was 26.4, 45.5, 18.7 and 71.4, respectively.

**Table 4.1 Percentage of respondents having knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (in percentage)\* \***

Background characteristics	Organization of orientation meetings	Organization of CMC	Identification of EVs	Formation of child clubs	Provision of incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents visiting days	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive program among stakeholders	Interactive program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>42.7</b>	<b>30.1</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>56.1</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>												
Dhading	89.2	73.4	58.2	62.0	77.8	54.4	69.6	69.0	47.5	47.5	93.0	158
Siraha	75.7	60.5	21.5	10.7	11.3	8.5	44.6	72.9	5.6	2.8	23.2	177
<b>Respondent</b>												
Father	84.9	67.4	39.0	36.6	38.4	27.3	61.6	70.3	26.7	25.0	56.4	172
Mother	76.0	60.8	35.2	31.2	44.0	28.0	51.2	70.4	20.8	18.4	53.6	125
Guardian	89.5	81.6	50.0	39.5	57.9	50.0	50.0	76.3	34.2	36.8	63.2	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>												
Higher status	100.0	75.0	37.5	50.0	62.5	37.5	75.0	68.8	25.0	6.3	56.3	16
Intermediate status	83.4	68.0	42.3	37.8	46.5	30.7	58.1	74.7	27.0	27.0	60.2	241
Lower status/Dalits	71.0	56.5	26.1	26.1	30.4	30.4	43.5	55.1	23.2	20.3	47.8	69
Muslim	100.0	88.9	44.4				77.8	100.0			11.1	9

Background characteristics	Organization of orientation meetings	Organization of CMC	Identification of EVs	Format of child club	Provision of incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents visiting days	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive program among stakeholders	Interactive program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	N
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>												
Illiterate	77.4	64.8	33.7	33.2	39.2	25.1	52.8	65.8	19.1	18.1	55.3	199
Can read only	85.0	50.0	25.0	35.0	45.0	35.0	50.0	80.0	25.0	30.0	70.0	20
Can read and write somehow	90.4	75.9	56.6	43.4	55.4	44.6	69.9	77.1	43.4	38.6	62.7	83
Can read and write well	87.9	63.6	33.3	24.2	30.3	21.2	48.5	81.8	18.2	18.2	36.4	33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>												
Can speak easily	87.4	67.5	49.2	52.4	64.9	46.1	62.8	71.2	40.8	37.7	77.0	191
Speaks only little	78.1	68.8	18.8	3.1	9.4	9.4	53.1	78.1	12.5	9.4	25.0	32
Cannot speak	74.1	64.3	26.8	14.3	14.3	8.9	46.4	68.8	2.7	4.5	29.5	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>												
Easily	86.0	75.4	43.9	47.4	52.6	29.8	66.7	71.9	29.8	33.3	70.2	57
With some difficulty	82.1	74.3	47.9	44.3	50.7	36.4	62.9	70.0	35.0	31.4	60.0	140
With difficulty	77.4	56.0	36.9	26.2	38.1	28.6	59.5	73.8	15.5	13.1	48.8	84
With very difficulty	85.2	53.7	13.0	11.1	18.5	16.7	24.1	68.5	11.1	11.1	42.6	54

\*\* Based on elaborative tables, the major sources of knowledge in this regard include facilitators, education volunteers, members of CMC and neighbors.

## 4.2 Knowledge of child rights issues

The respondents were then asked if they had heard the six key child-rights related statements. The statements were:

1. It is the right of every child to go to school;
2. It is the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys;
3. Nepalese law prohibits child marriage;
4. It is illegal to send children to labor force;
5. Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school; and
6. Childcare is the responsibility of parents.

The results of this survey show that the knowledge of the respondents on the child rights statements were very high except for three rights issues namely "Nepalese law prohibits child marriage", "It is illegal to send children to labor force", and "Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school".

The knowledge of respondents on the child rights was found slightly lower in Dhading than in Siraha. As far the trend is concerned, the percentage of respondents having knowledge of such issues has increased very much as compared to that of baseline survey (Table 4.2.1).

**Table 4.2.1 Percentage of respondents with the knowledge of key rights issues (in percentage)**

<b>Background characteristics</b>	It is the right of every child to go to school	It is the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys	Nepalese law prohibits child marriage	It is illegal to send children to labour force	Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school	Child care is the responsibility of parents	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>93.7</b>	<b>94.3</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>94.3</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>							
Dhading	89.2	90.5	77.8	76.6	79.1	94.9	158
Siraha	97.7	97.7	71.2	68.4	83.6	93.8	177
<b>Respondent</b>							
Father	93.6	93.6	77.9	75.0	84.3	95.3	172
Mother	94.4	95.2	68.8	68.0	76.0	92.8	125
Guardian	92.1	94.7	76.3	73.7	86.8	94.7	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>							
Higher status	93.8	93.8	75.0	93.8	93.8	100.0	16
Intermediate status	92.9	93.8	73.9	70.1	80.5	93.4	241
Lower status/Dalits	95.7	95.7	72.5	71.0	79.7	95.7	69
Muslim	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>							
Illiterate	89.9	91.0	66.8	66.3	75.9	94.5	199
Can read only	100.0	100.0	70.0	60.0	70.0	95.0	20
Can read and write somehow	100.0	98.8	85.5	81.9	90.4	92.8	83
Can read and write well	97.0	100.0	93.9	90.9	100.0	97.0	33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>							
Can speak easily	92.1	92.1	79.1	77.5	83.2	95.3	191
Speaks only little	93.8	93.8	78.1	68.8	81.3	90.6	32
Cannot speak	96.4	98.2	65.2	64.3	78.6	93.8	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>							
Easily	94.7	96.5	73.7	78.9	80.7	98.2	57
With some difficulty	92.9	95.0	78.6	72.9	81.4	95.0	140
With difficulty	94.0	92.9	71.4	69.0	78.6	92.9	84
With very difficulty	94.4	92.6	68.5	68.5	87.0	90.7	54
<b>Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (yes only)<sup>15</sup></b>							
Organization of orientation meetings	95.6	95.3	80.4	79.3	87.6	93.8	275
Organization of CMC	96.0	97.3	80.7	80.7	89.2	95.1	223
Identification of EVs	96.9	94.6	85.4	80.0	85.4	95.4	130
Formation of child club	93.2	92.3	83.8	80.3	83.8	96.6	117
Incentives for best students	93.0	93.0	77.6	79.0	81.8	97.2	143
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	97.0	94.1	88.1	82.2	86.1	96.0	101
Organization of parents visiting day	95.8	95.2	84.7	84.7	85.2	96.3	189
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	96.2	95.4	79.0	77.3	86.1	95.0	238
Interactive programme among stakeholders	94.1	91.8	84.7	89.4	89.4	97.6	85
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	93.8	93.8	85.0	85.0	90.0	98.8	80
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	91.5	91.5	80.9	75.5	80.3	95.7	188

<sup>15</sup> Answers like "No" and "Don't know" can be taken as the negative/mirror image of "Yes" answers and, therefore, are not examined separately in this and subsequent data tables.

At the time of baseline survey, respondents' knowledge was relatively high (82 per cent) on a single child rights issue namely "Child care is the responsibility of parents" and knowledge of this issue was nearly equal in both Dhading and Siraha (Table 4.2.2). On the other hand, knowledge of other child rights issues namely "It is the right of every child to go to school", "It is the right of every girl child to go to school as boys", "Nepalese law prohibits child marriage", "It is illegal to send children to labour force" and "Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school" was relatively low in Dhading. At present, both districts have either met the targets or even exceeded them, but as far the rate of evolution of these indicators is concerned, Dhading rates far better than Siraha (Table 4.2.2).

**Table 4.2.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on knowledge of key child rights issues (in percentage)**

Indicator of knowledge and awareness	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of Baseline & End line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who know about children's right to go to school	47.4	89.2	70.1	97.7	Target exceeds in both districts, but as compared to the baseline status, the degree of evolution is relatively high in Dhading	80
Percentage of respondents who know about equal right between girls and boys	51.5	90.5	73.9	97.7	Target exceeds in both districts, but as compared to the baseline status, the degree of evolution is relatively high in Dhading	70
Percentage of respondents who know about prohibition of child marriage	36.2	77.8	67.2	71.2	Target exceeds in both districts, but as compared to the baseline status, the degree of evolution is much higher in Dhading	70
Percentage of respondents who know about prohibition of child labor force	29.6	76.6	42.5	68.4	Target met in Dhading, but only about to be met in Siraha	70
Percentage of respondents who know about equal right between handicapped/disabled children and normal children	34.7	79.1	62.7	83.6	Target exceeds in both districts, but as compared to the baseline status, the degree of evolution is relatively high in Dhading	70
Percentage of respondents who know about parents' responsibility for child care	82.7	94.9	81.3	93.8	Target exceeds in both districts	85

#### 4.2.1 Source of knowledge of child rights issues

In response to the question asked to them about the source of knowledge about the six child rights statements, majority of the respondents reported that awareness coming from

inner self/conscience and mass media were the major sources of knowledge. They were followed by neighbors (Table 4.3).

**Table 4.3 Source of knowledge of child rights issues (in parentage)**

Issues and sources	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>1. It is right of every child to go to school</b>				
Members of CMC	13	9.2	21	12.1
EVs	1	0.7	12	6.9
Facilitators	5	3.5	8	4.6
School teachers	12	8.5	6	3.5
People from NGOs	7	5.0	6	3.5
Resource persons				
Other elite of community	17	12.1	13	7.5
Neighbours	26	18.4	37	21.4
Mass media	36	25.5	29	16.8
From inner self	19	13.5	39	22.5
Programme itself	1	0.7	2	1.2
Own child	2	1.4		
Other	1	0.7		
<b>2. It is right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys</b>				
Members of CMC	6	4.2	9	5.2
EVs	1	0.7	16	9.2
Facilitators	5	3.5	24	13.9
School teachers	12	8.4	6	3.5
People from NGOs	6	4.2	1	0.6
Resource persons	1	0.7		
Other elite of community	10	7.0	12	6.9
Neighbours	21	14.7	27	15.6
Mass media	60	42.0	38	22.0
From inner self	17	11.9	35	20.2
Programme itself	2	1.4	3	1.7
Own child	2	1.4		
Other			2	1.2
<b>3. Nepalese law prohibits child marriage</b>				
Members of CMC	4	3.3	1	0.8
EVs	1	0.8		
Facilitators	1	0.8	8	6.3
School teachers	6	4.9	13	10.3
People from NGOs	5	4.1	5	4.0
Resource persons			1	0.8
Other elite of community	17	13.8	9	7.1
Neighbours	17	13.8	24	19.0
Mass media	59	48.0	59	46.8
From inner self	9	7.3	5	4.0
Programme itself	1	0.8	1	0.8
Book	1	0.8		
VDC programme	1	0.8		
Meeting and training	1	0.8		

Issues and sources	Dhading		Siraha	
	N	%	N	%
<b>4. It is illegal to send children to labor force</b>				
Members of CMC			1	0.8
Facilitators	7	5.8	6	5.0
School teachers	8	6.6	15	12.4
People from NGOs	9	7.4	6	5.0
Resource persons	8	6.6		
Other elite of community	4	3.3	11	9.1
Neighbours	21	17.4	17	14.0
Mass media	39	32.2	35	28.9
From inner self	24	19.8	25	20.7
Programme itself	1	0.8	2	1.7
Own child			1	0.8
Meeting and training			2	1.7
<b>5. Handicapped children have the same right as normal child to go to school</b>				
Members of CMC	4	2.7	1	0.8
Facilitators	4	2.7	8	6.4
School teachers	8	5.4	9	7.2
People from NGOs	9	6.1	11	8.8
Resource persons	3	2.0		
Other elite of community	6	4.1	16	12.8
Neighbours	22	14.9	14	11.2
Mass media	21	14.2	42	33.6
From inner self	68	45.9	17	13.6
Programme itself	3	2.0	2	1.6
Own child			1	0.8
Book			2	1.6
Meeting and training			2	1.6
<b>6. Child care is the responsibility of parents</b>				
Members of CMC	4	2.4	3	2.0
Facilitators	5	3.0	3	2.0
School teachers	4	2.4	8	5.3
People from NGOs	5	3.0	1	0.7
Resource persons	6	3.6		
Other elite of community	4	2.4	6	4.0
Neighbours	12	7.2	11	7.3
Mass media	7	4.2	4	2.7
From inner self	116	69.9	111	74.0
Programme itself	1	0.6	1	0.7
Own child	1	0.6	1	0.7
Spouse	1	0.6		
Meeting and training			1	0.7

## Chapter 5

### Attitudes of Respondents on Child Education

This chapter presents the attitudes of respondents on selected indicators of child education. The attitudes are presented in terms of their perceptions of the child rights statements, participation in the SOP/FSP activities, value of education, willingness to send children to ASP and formal schools and the children who do not go to school.

#### 5.1 Agreement with the child rights issues

The respondents were asked if they agreed with the six child rights statements. As has been found, great majority of the respondents agreed well with all those statements. The degree of agreement was, however, slightly higher among the Dhading respondents than the Siraha respondents. As has also been found, the higher social groups and Muslims agreed more with those statements than the other groups. Likewise, respondents with the knowledge of SOP/FSP activities agreed more with those issues than the other groups. In aggregate, however, the variations were not found sharp in agreement by ones other background characteristics (Table 5.1.1).

**Table 5.1.1 Percentage of respondents agreeing very much with different child rights issues by background characteristics**

<b>Background characteristics</b>	It is the right of every child to go to school	It is the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys	Nepalese law prohibits child marriage	It is illegal to send children to labor force	Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school	Child care is the responsibility of parents	N
<i>End line average</i>	<b>97.0</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>98.8</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>							
Dhading	97.5	98.7	93.7	86.7	97.5	98.7	158
Siraha	96.6	94.4	78.0	73.4	92.7	98.9	177
<b>Respondent</b>							
Father	96.5	94.2	83.7	77.3	93.6	98.8	172
Mother	96.8	99.2	84.8	80.0	96.0	99.2	125
Guardian	100.0	97.4	94.7	89.5	97.4	97.4	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>							
Higher status	100.0	93.8	93.8	81.3	100.0	100.0	16
Intermediate status	96.7	95.4	86.7	80.9	94.6	99.2	241
Lower status/Dalits	97.1	100.0	76.8	72.5	94.2	97.1	69
Muslim	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>							
Illiterate	97.0	96.0	82.4	74.4	92.0	99.0	199
Can read only	100.0	95.0	85.0	80.0	95.0	100.0	20
Can read and write somehow	96.4	96.4	88.0	85.5	100.0	97.6	83
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>							
Can speak easily	98.4	97.9	92.7	86.4	98.4	99.0	191
Speaks only little	90.6	100.0	81.3	84.4	90.6	96.9	32
Cannot speak	96.4	92.9	74.1	67.0	90.2	99.1	112

<b>Background characteristics</b>	It is the right of every child to go to school	It is the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys	Nepalese law prohibits child marriage	It is illegal to send children to labor force	Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school	Child care is the responsibility of parents	N
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>							
Easily	98.2	98.2	93.0	87.7	91.2	100.0	57
With some difficulty	97.1	94.3	86.4	81.4	95.0	98.6	140
With difficulty	96.4	96.4	89.3	79.8	95.2	98.8	84
With very difficulty	96.3	100.0	68.5	66.7	98.1	98.1	54
<b>Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (yes only)</b>							
Organization of orientation meetings	97.1	96.4	85.8	81.8	96.4	98.9	275
Organization of CMC	97.8	94.6	86.5	83.0	95.5	98.7	223
Identification of EVs	98.5	93.1	90.0	80.0	95.4	99.2	130
Formation of child club	99.1	94.0	92.3	82.1	94.9	99.1	117
Incentives for best students	99.3	97.9	93.0	85.3	95.8	99.3	143
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	99.0	94.1	95.0	84.2	98.0	99.0	101
Organization of parents visiting day	97.4	94.7	87.3	84.1	94.2	98.9	189
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	97.1	96.2	86.1	80.3	95.0	99.6	238
Interactive programme among stakeholders	96.5	94.1	90.6	89.4	95.3	98.8	85
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	93.8	96.3	95.0	91.3	97.5	100.0	80
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	96.8	96.3	91.0	83.5	95.7	98.4	188

As compared to the data of baseline survey, the percentage of respondents agreeing very much was found to have improved highly on all child rights issues in both districts, but particularly on " Nepalese law prohibits child marriage", "It is illegal to send children to labour force", and " Handicapped children have the same right as normal children to go to school". But it is particularly noteworthy that the rate of change of these indicators was much faster in Dhading than in Siraha (Table 5.1.2).

**Table 5.1.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the percentage of respondents agreeing very much on child rights issues**

Indicator of attitude regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of Baseline & End line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who agree very much with children's right to go to school	82.7	97.5	85.8	96.6	Target exceeds in both districts with the rate of evolution nearly the same	85
Percentage of respondents who agree very much with equal right between girls and boys	82.1	98.7	79.1	94.4	Target exceeds in both districts with the rate of evolution nearly the same	85
Percentage of respondents who agree very much with prohibition of child marriage	68.9	93.7	68.7	78.0	Target exceeds in both districts with the rate of evolution much faster in Dhading	75
Percentage of respondents who agree very much with prohibition of child labor force	63.8	86.7	53.7	73.4	Target exceeds in both districts with the rate of evolution much faster in Dhading	70
Percentage of respondents who agree very much with equal right between handicapped/disabled children and normal children	74.5	97.5	79.9	92.7	Target exceeds in both districts with the evolution much faster in Dhading	80
Percentage of respondents who agree very much with parent's' responsibility for child care	92.9	98.7	96.3	98.9	Target exceeds in both districts, but as compared to the baseline status, the degree of evolution is relatively high in Dhading	95
Percentage of respondents who are willing very much to send children to formal school after completion of FSP/SOP	82.6	98.9	66.1	91.0	Target exceeds in both districts, but the rate of evolution is much faster in Dhading	85

## 5.2 Responsibility to educate children

Respondents were then asked about whose responsibility was it to educate children. In response, majority of them reported that the major responsibility was those of parents and families. These responses were followed by school teacher and government (Table 5.2.1).

**Table 5.2.1 Responsibility to educate children (in percentage)**

Background characteristics of children	Responsible person or institution							N
	Parents and family	Schools and teachers	Government	Community/society	NGO/other aid organizations	Others	Don't know	
<b>End line average</b>	<b>91.0</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>								
Dhading	91.8	94.3	17.1	31.6	7.0		0.6	158
Siraha	90.4	70.6	62.1	16.9	13.0	0.6		177
<b>Respondent</b>								
Father	87.8	82.0	44.2	23.8	12.2			172
Mother	95.2	80.8	38.4	24.8	7.2	0.8		125
Guardian	92.1	84.2	34.2	21.1	10.5		2.6	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>								
Higher status	93.8	75.0	25.0	43.8	12.5			16
Intermediate status	89.6	83.8	37.3	22.4	8.7		0.4	241
Lower status/Dalits	94.2	79.7	50.7	27.5	15.9	1.4		69
Muslim	100.0	55.6	88.9					9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>								
Illiterate	88.4	82.4	41.7	22.6	9.5	0.5	0.5	199
Can read only	85.0	95.0	35.0	45.0	5.0			20
Can read and write somehow	96.4	81.9	31.3	27.7	10.8			83
Can read and write well	97.0	69.7	63.6	9.1	15.2			33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>								
Can speak easily	91.6	86.9	27.7	26.7	8.9		0.5	191
Speaks only little	90.6	71.9	59.4	18.8	21.9			32
Cannot speak	90.2	75.9	58.0	20.5	8.9	0.9		112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>								
Easily	91.2	84.2	42.1	21.1	12.3			57
With some difficulty	90.0	86.4	39.3	33.6	10.7		0.7	140
With difficulty	95.2	76.2	31.0	21.4	9.5	1.2		84
With very difficulty	87.0	75.9	59.3	5.6	7.4			54

Percentage add up to more than 100 due to multiple response

There has been a slight increase in the perception of responsibility to educate children as those of parents and families in Dhading but some decrease in Siraha. However, both districts are close to the target (Table 5.2.2).

**Table 5.2.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the percentage of respondents perceiving the responsibility to educate children as that of parents**

Indicator of attitude regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of Baseline & End line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who perceive that parents should take responsibility to educate children	89.3	91.8	98.5	90.4	Target exceeds in both districts, but as compared to the baseline status, the evolution is positive in Dhading, but negative in Siraha.	90

### **5.3 Willingness to participate in the SOP/FSP activities**

The respondents were also asked about their willingness to participate in a number of activities that were related with SOP/FSP. In response, quite a high percentage of the respondents expressed positive attitude about the activities by answering affirmatively. However, it is noteworthy that the respondents of Dhading had more positive attitude than those of Siraha on many of the activities. The same held true with the Muslim respondents and those who had knowledge of SOP/FSP activities. Other variations by ones background characteristics were not found so sharp in this regard (Table 5.3).

**Table 5.3 Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities (yes only) in percentage**

Background characteristics	Organization of orientation meetings	Organization of CMC	Identification of EVs	Formation of child club	Provision of incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents visiting days	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive program among stakeholders	Interactive program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Support on physical infrastructure	Contribution in cash	Contribution in labor	Participation in skill-oriented programs	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>77.3</b>	<b>77.9</b>	<b>76.7</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>78.8</b>	<b>77.9</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>79.1</b>	<b>89.9</b>	<b>77.9</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>															
Dhading	98.7	86.1	77.8	91.1	83.5	94.3	97.5	98.1	95.6	93.7	99.4	87.3	100.0	91.1	158
Siraha	86.4	75.1	68.4	65.0	72.9	61.0	78.5	85.9	63.8	63.8	76.8	71.8	80.8	66.1	177
<b>Respondent</b>															
Father	93.0	79.7	67.4	71.5	69.2	72.1	88.4	85.5	75.6	75.0	78.5	75.6	81.4	75.0	172
Mother	88.8	78.4	78.4	81.6	85.6	79.2	84.0	97.6	79.2	78.4	96.0	81.6	99.2	78.4	125
Guardian	100.0	89.5	78.9	89.5	92.1	89.5	94.7	100.0	92.1	89.5	100.0	86.8	97.4	89.5	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>															
Higher status	93.8	87.5	75.0	81.3	81.3	81.3	93.8	93.8	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	16
Intermediate status	93.4	79.3	70.1	75.9	75.1	75.1	88.0	90.0	76.8	77.2	85.1	78.4	88.0	77.6	241
Lower status/Dalits	87.0	79.7	78.3	78.3	84.1	78.3	82.6	95.7	81.2	75.4	94.2	76.8	95.7	73.9	69
Muslims	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>															
Illiterate	90.5	72.9	66.8	71.4	72.4	70.9	82.9	88.9	70.9	71.9	84.4	71.9	86.9	69.3	199
Can read only	90.0	65.0	55.0	60.0	65.0	55.0	75.0	95.0	60.0	50.0	85.0	70.0	90.0	70.0	20
Can read and write somehow	95.2	94.0	84.3	91.6	88.0	90.4	98.8	95.2	94.0	94.0	92.8	92.8	92.8	95.2	83
Can read and write well	97.0	100.0	90.9	87.9	93.9	90.9	93.9	97.0	100.0	90.9	93.9	93.9	100.0	90.9	33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>															
Can speak easily	97.9	88.5	82.2	90.1	85.3	92.7	96.9	97.4	95.8	92.7	97.4	88.0	99.0	91.1	191
Speaks only little	75.0	68.8	62.5	62.5	65.6	59.4	75.0	75.0	65.6	65.6	71.9	65.6	75.0	68.8	32
Cannot speak	87.5	69.6	59.8	59.8	68.8	54.5	75.0	86.6	53.6	56.3	75.0	67.9	78.6	58.0	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>															
Easily	93.0	86.0	73.7	78.9	84.2	77.2	89.5	94.7	82.5	78.9	91.2	86.0	93.0	78.9	57
With some difficulty	92.1	76.4	65.7	71.4	70.0	67.9	85.7	87.9	70.0	70.0	81.4	73.6	83.6	71.4	140
With difficulty	90.5	79.8	77.4	78.6	79.8	83.3	86.9	94.0	83.3	83.3	90.5	78.6	95.2	83.3	84
With very difficulty	94.4	85.2	83.3	88.9	88.9	88.9	90.7	94.4	90.7	88.9	94.4	87.0	94.4	85.2	54

Background characteristics	Organization of orientation meetings	Organization of CMC	Identification of EVs	Formation of child club	Provision of incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents visiting days	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive programme among stakeholders	Interactive program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Support on physical infrastructure	Contribution in cash	Contribution in labor	Participation in skill-oriented programs	N
<b>Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (yes only)</b>															
Organization of orientation meetings	97.1	86.2	76.4	82.9	82.2	83.3	92.4	93.5	85.5	84.4	88.7	84.7	90.2	84.7	275
Organization of CMC	95.1	84.3	74.0	81.2	80.3	79.4	92.4	90.6	82.1	83.0	86.1	82.1	87.4	82.5	223
Identification of EVs	98.5	88.5	76.2	90.0	85.4	83.8	94.6	94.6	86.2	85.4	89.2	86.9	90.8	86.9	130
Formation of child club	97.4	86.3	70.9	84.6	75.2	85.5	92.3	90.6	86.3	84.6	88.9	84.6	89.7	83.8	117
Incentives for best students	95.1	83.2	79.0	84.6	81.8	85.3	88.8	96.5	86.0	83.9	96.5	83.9	97.2	83.9	143
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	98.0	86.1	76.2	89.1	84.2	95.0	97.0	97.0	95.0	94.1	96.0	93.1	96.0	90.1	101
Organization of parents visiting day	94.7	83.1	71.4	80.4	76.7	80.4	95.8	90.5	82.0	82.5	85.2	82.5	86.8	83.6	189
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	93.3	84.5	76.9	81.1	81.5	79.8	88.2	93.3	81.1	80.7	90.3	84.5	91.6	83.2	238
Interactive programme among stakeholders	94.1	90.6	77.6	92.9	85.9	94.1	97.6	94.1	96.5	95.3	95.3	91.8	96.5	94.1	85
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	98.8	90.0	71.3	92.5	85.0	92.5	96.3	96.3	96.3	96.3	95.0	90.0	95.0	90.0	80
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	97.3	83.5	76.1	86.2	83.0	86.7	91.0	96.8	88.3	86.7	96.3	86.7	95.2	85.6	188

## 5.4 Value of education

Respondents were then asked about the value of education. In this regard, while a considerable percentage of the respondents of Dhading valued education in terms of its ability to earn money and get job, make future good and make people smart enough not to be cheated, those of Siraha valued education in terms of its ability to help get good opportunity, and make future good, help earn money and get job, (Table 5.4).

**Table 5.4 Value of education (in percentage)\*\***

Background characteristics	Helps get good opportunity	One can learn good things	Helps in the prosperity of county and community	Makes future good	Helps to become smart/go abroad	Enhances accounting skill	Makes people smart enough not to be cheated	Helps earn money and get job	Enhances skill	Helps earn respect	Others	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>												
Dhading	11.4	34.2	15.8	58.2	34.2	16.5	54.4	78.5	8.9	22.2	3.8	158
Siraha	61.0	41.8	19.2	48.0	28.8	25.4	28.8	41.2	9.0	22.6	1.7	177
<b>Respondent</b>												
Father	40.1	38.4	23.8	50.0	27.3	25.0	36.6	50.6	12.8	21.5	2.9	172
Mother	36.8	35.2	8.0	53.6	40.8	15.2	47.2	64.0	5.6	23.2	1.6	125
Guardian	28.9	47.4	21.1	63.2	18.4	23.7	39.5	78.9	2.6	23.7	5.3	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>												
Higher status	25.0	25.0	12.5	62.5	37.5	6.3	50.0	75.0		31.3		16
Intermediate status	34.9	39.4	20.3	52.7	32.4	22.8	37.3	56.4	9.5	18.7	3.3	241
Lower status/Dalits	42.0	34.8	10.1	50.7	27.5	20.3	52.2	62.3	8.7	29.0	1.4	69
Muslims	100.0	55.6	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1	33.3	66.7	11.1	55.6		9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>												
Illiterate	37.7	37.7	16.1	50.8	32.2	21.6	41.2	58.3	10.1	17.1	2.0	199
Can read only	15.0	50.0	10.0	45.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	5.0	20
Can read and write somehow	37.3	36.1	15.7	59.0	31.3	8.4	44.6	56.6	4.8	34.9	3.6	83
Can read and write well	51.5	39.4	36.4	54.5	27.3	39.4	36.4	60.6	12.1	24.2	3.0	33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>												
Can speak easily	21.5	35.1	17.3	52.4	32.5	18.3	49.2	70.7	9.4	22.5	4.2	191
Speaks only little	78.1	40.6	15.6	50.0	15.6	21.9	31.3	46.9	6.3	37.5		32
Cannot speak	53.6	42.9	18.8	54.5	33.9	25.9	29.5	42.0	8.9	17.9	0.9	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>												
Easily	31.6	42.1	12.3	63.2	31.6	26.3	40.4	68.4	10.5	22.8	3.5	57
With some difficulty	40.0	39.3	22.9	62.9	35.7	25.0	40.7	54.3	9.3	23.6	2.1	140
With difficulty	32.1	36.9	17.9	48.8	23.8	20.2	35.7	69.0	7.1	22.6	2.4	84
With very difficulty	46.3	33.3	9.3	22.2	31.5	7.4	50.0	44.4	9.3	18.5	3.7	54

\*\* Based on elaborative tables, the major sources of inspiration to think about a particular attribute/value of education include awareness coming from within/from inner self, mass media, school teachers and neighbours.

## 5.5 Willingness to send other children to SOP/FSP in the future

Respondents were also asked about their willingness to send their other children, who were not going to alternative or mother school to SOP/FSP if such classes were continued in the future. In this regard, about 92 per cent of them reported that they were very much willing. As has been found, the level of willingness was slightly higher among the Dhading than the Siraha respondents, but was relatively low among the Muslim respondents and also among those who spoke Nepali with great difficulty. It is noteworthy that knowledge of SOP/FSP activities had positive influence on their willingness in this regard (Table 5.5).

**Table 5.5 Willingness of respondents to send other children to SOP/FSP (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Very much willing	Somewhat willing	Only little willing	Not willing	Not having such children in the family	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>						
Dhading	99.4	0.6				158
Siraha	84.7	5.6	2.3	4.5	2.8	177
<b>Respondent</b>						
Father	93.0	3.5	1.7	1.2	0.6	172
Mother	89.6	2.4	0.8	4.8	2.4	125
Guardian	92.1	5.3			2.6	38
<b>Programme</b>						
SOP	90.2	1.8	1.8	4.3	1.8	164
FSP	93.0	4.7	0.6	0.6	1.2	171
<b>Social status of respondents</b>						69
Higher Status	100.0					9
Intermediate status	93.4	3.7	0.8	0.8	1.2	
Lower status/Dalits	85.5	1.4	1.4	8.7	2.9	199
Muslim	77.8	11.1	11.1			20
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>						83
Illiterate	91.5	2.5	1.0	4.0	1.0	33
Can read only	100.0					
Can read and write somehow	90.4	7.2	2.4			191
Can read and write well	90.9				9.1	32
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>						112
Can speak easily	96.3	1.6	0.5	0.5	1.0	
Speaks only little	84.4	12.5	3.1			57
Cannot speak	85.7	3.6	1.8	6.3	2.7	140
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>						84
Easily	100.0					54
With some difficulty	92.9	4.3	1.4		1.4	
With difficulty	92.9	3.6	1.2	1.2	1.2	
With very difficulty	77.8	3.7	1.9	13.0	3.7	
<b>Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (yes only)</b>						
Organization of orientation meetings	93.1	2.5	0.7	1.8	1.8	275
Organization of CMC	93.7	2.2	0.9	1.3	1.8	223
Identification of EVs	96.9	1.5	0.8		0.8	130
Formation of child club	98.3	0.9	0.9			117
Incentives for best students	99.3	0.7				143
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	96.0	3.0	1.0			101
Organization of parents visiting day	96.8	1.1	1.1		1.1	189
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	92.4	3.8	1.3	0.4	2.1	238
Interactive programme among stakeholders	98.8	1.2				85
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	98.8		1.3			80
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	98.4	0.5	0.5		0.5	188

## 5.6 Willingness to send children to formal school

Respondents were additionally asked if they were willing to send their children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP. In response, while about 51 per cent of them reported affirmatively, about 44 per cent reported that they had already admitted their children to the formal school. In this regard, only about 5 per cent of the respondents reported that they were not willing to do so (Table 5.6).

Those who reported positively largely included the guardians, who could read only, who could not speak Nepali, and who supported family with some difficulty. Those who had knowledge of interactive programme organized between community people and children attending SOP/FSP usually had more positive attitude in this regard (Table 5.6).

**Table 5.6 Willingness of respondents to send children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes	Child has already started to go to formal school	No	N
<i>End line average</i>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	54.4	45.6		158
Siraha	49.2	41.8	9.0	177
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	56.4	40.1	3.5	172
Mother	41.6	50.4	8.0	125
Guardian	63.2	36.8		38
<b>Programme</b>				
SOP	45.1	48.8	6.1	164
FSP	57.9	38.6	3.5	171
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher Status	31.3	68.8		16
Intermediate status	56.8	39.4	3.7	241
Lower status/Dalits	44.9	44.9	10.1	69
Muslim		100.0		9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	55.8	37.7	6.5	199
Can read only	65.0	25.0	10.0	20
Can read and write somehow	48.2	50.6	1.2	83
Can read and write well	27.3	72.7		33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>				
Can speak easily	47.6	50.8	1.6	191
Speaks only little	40.6	56.3	3.1	32
Cannot speak	61.6	27.7	10.7	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	40.4	59.6		57
With some difficulty	64.3	34.3	1.4	140
With difficulty	52.4	41.7	6.0	84
With very difficulty	29.6	53.7	16.7	54

<b>Background characteristics</b>	Yes	Child has already started to go to formal school	No	N
<b>Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (yes only)</b>				
Organization of orientation meetings	49.1	47.6	3.3	275
Organization of CMC	53.4	44.8	1.8	223
Identification of EVs	54.6	45.4		130
Formation of child club	53.0	47.0		117
Incentives for best students	53.1	46.2	0.7	143
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	59.4	40.6		101
Organization of parents visiting day	52.4	47.1	0.5	189
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	48.7	47.5	3.8	238
Interactive programme among stakeholders	57.6	42.4		85
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	63.8	36.3		80
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	53.2	46.8		188

### 5.6.1 Degree of willingness to send children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP

Those respondents who were willing to send their children to formal schools after the completion of SOP/FSP were further asked about how much they were willing to send their children to such schools. In response, an overwhelming majority of the respondents (about 98 per cent) reported that they were very much willing to do so. Those who had better knowledge of SOP/FSP activities were also found very much willing. At this moment, it is noteworthy that there has been a substantial increase in the percentage of such respondents from the time of baseline survey (Table 5.7.1).

**Table 5.7.1 Degree of willingness to send children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP (in percentage)**

<b>Background characteristics</b>	Very much willing	Somewhat willing	Not willing	N
<b>Baseline average</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>319</b>
<b>Endline average</b>	<b>98.3</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	97.7	2.3		86
Siraha	98.9		1.1	88
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	96.9	2.0	1.0	98
Mother	100.0			52
Guardian	100.0			24
<b>Programme</b>				
SOP	98.6	1.4		74
FSP	98.0	1.0	1.0	100
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	100.0			5
Intermediate status	97.8	1.4	0.7	138
Lower status/Dalits	100.0			31
Muslim				
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	99.1	0.9		111
Can read only	100.0			13
Can read and write somehow	97.5	2.5		40
Can read and write well	90.0		10.0	10

Background characteristics	Very much willing	Somewhat willing	Not willing	N
<b>Ability to speak Nepali</b>				
Can speak easily	96.7	2.2	1.1	92
Speaks only little	100.0			13
Cannot speak	100.0			69
<b>Ability to support family</b>				
Easily	100.0			23
With some difficulty	98.9	1.1		90
With difficulty	100.0			44
With very difficulty	88.2	5.9	5.9	17
<b>Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities (yes only)</b>				
Organization of orientation meetings	97.8	1.5	0.7	136
Organization of CMC	99.2	0.8		119
Identification of EVs	98.6	1.4		71
Formation of child club	100.0			62
Incentives for best students	98.7	1.3		76
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	96.7	3.3		60
Organization of parents visiting day	99.0	1.0		99
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	99.1	0.9		116
Interactive programme among stakeholders	96.0	2.0	2.0	50
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	98.0	2.0		51
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	98.0	2.0		100

When the baseline and end line data were compared, a rapid increase was found in both districts in the willingness of respondents to send their children to formal school after the completion of SOP/. But, such an increase was found more in Siraha than in Dhading. However, it is also noteworthy that both districts have exceeded the target set in this respect (Table 5.7.2).

**Table 5.7.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the percentage of respondents willing to send children to formal school**

Indicator of attitude regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of Baseline & End line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who are willing very much to send children to formal school after the completion of FSP/SOP	82.6	97.7	66.1	98.9	Target exceeds in both districts, but the rate of evolution is relatively fast in Siraha	85

### 5.6.2 Persons inspiring respondents to send children to formal school

The respondents were further asked about the persons who inspired them to send their children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP. In response, about 29 per cent of the respondents reported that they were inspired by the facilitators. Similarly, about 26 per cent of the respondents reported that they were inspired from their inner self. Members of CMC (11 per cent) were other sources of inspiration in this regard. It is noteworthy that while conscience coming from within a person/inner self was the

important source of inspiration in Dhading facilitators were important sources of inspiration in Siraha (Table 5.8).

**Table 5.8 Persons inspiring respondents to send children to formal school (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Members of CMC	EV	Facilitator	School teacher	People from NGO	Other elite of community	Neighbours	Mass media	Inner self	Program itself	Own child	Family members	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>316</b>
<b>District</b>													
Dhading	10.9		12.2	23.1	1.3	5.1	1.3	1.3	40.4	1.3	2.6	0.6	156
Siraha	11.3	6.9	45.0	10.6	3.1	4.4	4.4		12.5		0.6	1.3	160
<b>Respondent</b>													
Father	11.7	6.1	29.4	18.4	1.8	3.7	3.1		22.7	0.6	1.2	1.2	163
Mother	7.8	0.9	30.4	16.5	2.6	7.0	2.6	1.7	27.8		1.7	0.9	115
Guardian	18.4		21.1	10.5	2.6	2.6	2.6		36.8	2.6	2.6		38
<b>Programme</b>													
SOP	9.2	1.3	30.1	15.7	3.3	3.9	2.0	0.7	30.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	153
FSP	12.9	5.5	27.6	17.8	1.2	5.5	3.7	0.6	22.7		1.8	0.6	163
<b>Social status of respondents</b>													
Higher status	6.3		31.3	6.3					56.3				16
Intermediate status	12.2	4.4	24.9	19.2	0.9	5.2	3.9	0.9	24.5	0.9	2.2	0.9	229
Lower status/Dalits	4.8	1.6	40.3	11.3	8.1	4.8			29.0				62
Muslim	33.3		44.4	11.1								11.1	9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>													
Illiterate	11.9	4.3	28.6	20.0	2.2	6.5	2.7	0.5	20.5	0.5	2.2		185
Can read only	11.1		27.8	5.6		5.6			44.4		5.6		18
Can read and write somehow	11.1	2.5	25.9	17.3	3.7	2.5	1.2	1.2	30.9	1.2		2.5	81
Can read and write well	6.3	3.1	37.5	3.1			9.4		37.5			3.1	32
<b>Ability to speak Nepali</b>													
Can speak easily	9.2	0.5	20.0	20.0	1.1	4.3	2.7	1.1	36.8	1.1	2.2	1.1	185
Speaks only little	19.4	6.5	38.7	12.9	9.7				9.7			3.2	31
Cannot speak	12.0	8.0	42.0	12.0	2.0	7.0	4.0		12.0		1.0		100
<b>Ability to support family</b>													
Easily	15.8	1.8	19.3	5.3		3.5	3.5	1.8	45.6		3.5		57
With some difficulty	13.9	4.4	25.5	21.9	2.2	3.6	1.5		23.4	1.5	1.5	0.7	137
With difficulty	7.6	3.8	35.4	17.7	1.3	3.8	6.3		21.5		1.3	1.3	79
With very difficulty	2.3	2.3	39.5	14.0	7.0	11.6		2.3	18.6			2.3	43

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

### 5.6.3 Reasons for not willing to send children to formal school or not admitting child to formal school

The respondents who were not willing to send their children to formal schools after the completion of SOP/FSP were additionally asked about the reasons for not sending their children to schools. In this connection, while the major reason as reported by the Dhading respondents included lack of interest among children to go to school and lack of school nearby, the major responses as reported by the Siraha respondents included the need of child to work at home for living, lack of incentives, children disliking to go school and lack of scholarship (Table 5.9).

**Table 5.9 Reasons for not willing to send children to formal school or not admitting child to formal school<sup>16</sup> (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Child does not like to go to school	Child needs to work at home for living	Child is little too young/old to go to school	There is no school nearby	School is irregular	It is heard that teachers do not teach well	Physical facilities are poor	They do not provide incentives	It is not a good thing to send girl to school	Behaviour of teacher discouraging	We cannot prepare meal in time	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>District</b>												
Dhading	50.0			50.0								2
Siraha	43.8	50.0	18.8	12.5	31.3	12.5	6.3	50.0	6.3	18.8	12.5	16
<b>Respondent</b>												
Father	25.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	12.5		37.5		37.5	12.5	8
Mother	60.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	10.0		10.0	10
Guardian												
<b>Programme</b>												
SOP	54.5	45.5	9.1	9.1	45.5	18.2		63.6	9.1	18.2	18.2	11
FSP	28.6	42.9	28.6	28.6			14.3	14.3		14.3		7
<b>Social status of respondents</b>												
Higher status												
Intermediate status	45.5	36.4	18.2	27.3		9.1	9.1	18.2	9.1	18.2		11
Lower status/Dalits	42.9	57.1	14.3		71.4	14.3		85.7		14.3	28.6	7
Muslim												
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>												
Illiterate	42.9	50.0	14.3	14.3	35.7	14.3		50.0	7.1	14.3	14.3	14
Can read only	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			50.0	50.0				2
Can read and write somehow	50.0									50.0		2
Can read and write well												
<b>Ability to speak Nepali</b>												
Can speak easily	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0			40.0		20.0		5
Speaks only little		100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0	1
Cannot speak	58.3	41.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	16.7	8.3	41.7	8.3	16.7	8.3	12
<b>Ability to support family</b>												
Easily												
With some difficulty	33.3	66.7										3
With difficulty	60.0	40.0	40.0	40.0		20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0		20.0	5
With very difficulty	40.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	10.0		60.0		30.0	10.0	10

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

## 5.7 Existence of out of school children

Respondents were then asked if there were out-of-school children in their communities. In response, while 30 percent of the respondents of Dhading reported that there were such children an overwhelming majority (83 per cent) of the respondents of Siraha reported that there were such children. At this moment, it is noteworthy that there has been considerable fall in the number of such children when compared to the situation that prevailed at the time of baseline survey (Table 5.10).

<sup>16</sup> Because of a small n, the percentages are subject to statistical instability.

**Table 5.10 Out-of-school children (in percentage)**

<b>Background characteristics</b>	Yes	No	Don't Know	N
<b>Baseline average</b>	<b>97.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>333</b>
<b>Endline average</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	29.7	65.8	4.4	158
Siraha	82.5	4.5	13.0	177
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	67.4	30.8	1.7	172
Mother	46.4	33.6	20.0	125
Guardian	50.0	44.7	5.3	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	37.5	56.3	6.3	16
Intermediate status	59.3	32.8	7.9	241
Lower status/Dalits	50.7	34.8	14.5	69
Muslim	100.0			9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	56.8	30.7	12.6	199
Can read only	45.0	40.0	15.0	20
Can read and write somehow	57.8	39.8	2.4	83
Can read and write well	69.7	30.3		33
<b>Ability of respondents to speak Nepali</b>				
Can speak easily	40.8	55.0	4.2	191
Speaks only little	93.8		6.3	32
Cannot speak	75.9	6.3	17.9	112
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	42.1	47.4	10.5	57
With some difficulty	53.6	36.4	10.0	140
With difficulty	58.3	33.3	8.3	84
With very difficulty	83.3	11.1	5.6	54

### 5.7.1 Suggestions on out of school children

The respondents were then asked for their opinion on what could be done to send such children to school. In response, while most of the Dhading respondents suggested persuading such children to go to school and to provide incentives to them, the Siraha respondents particularly suggested to send such children to school through provision of alternative schooling programme, provision of incentives and provision of classes closer to their home (Table 5.1).

**Table 5.11 Suggestions to send the out- of- school children to school (in percentage)**

<b>Suggestions</b>	<b>Dhading</b>		<b>Siraha</b>	
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>End line total</b>				
Provide alternative schooling programme	6	12.8	111	76.0
Provide incentives such as stationary, tiffin, school uniform	18	38.3	92	63.0
Run classes close to home	6	12.8	64	43.8
Run classes in convenient time	1	2.1	39	26.7
Teachers should take responsibility	1	2.1	37	25.3
Children should be persuaded by parents	32	68.1	22	15.1
Community should be involved	6	12.8	14	9.6
Government should manage this	2	4.3	44	30.1
Increase awareness on value of education	6	12.8	8	5.5
Create employment opportunities			23	15.8
Increase quality of education	3	6.4	11	7.5
Provide scholarship	1	2.1	3	2.1
Do not engage children in household activities			2	1.4
Don't know	2	4.3		

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

## Chapter 6

### Practice of Respondents Regarding Child Education

This chapter reveals the practices of respondents regarding child education. The scopes of practices are limited to the participation of respondents in different types of SOP/FSP activities, encouragements they provide to their children to attend alternative schools, and discussions they make with the children, family members and neighbors about the education of children.

#### 6.1 Participation in SOP/FSP activities

Respondents were asked if they participated in the activities that related to SOP/FSP. In response 88 per cent of the respondents of Dhading and 30 per cent of the respondents of Siraha reported that they participated. The participation was, however, relatively low among the Dalits and among families who could support themselves with very difficulty. In contrast, participation was high among those who had positive attitude towards the SOP/FSP activities (Table 6.1).

**Table 6.1 Participation in SOP/FSP activities (in percentage) \*\***

Background characteristics	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line average</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>70.1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29.9</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	139	88.0	19	12.0
Siraha	96	54.2	81	45.8
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	129	75.0	43	25.0
Mother	77	61.6	48	38.4
Guardian	29	76.3	9	23.7
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	13	81.3	3	18.8
Intermediate status	174	72.2	67	27.8
Lower status/Dalits	40	58.0	29	42.0
Muslim	8	88.9	1	11.1
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	135	67.8	64	32.2
Can read only	12	60.0	8	40.0
Can read and write somehow	66	79.5	17	20.5
Can read and write well	22	66.7	11	33.3
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	46	80.7	11	19.3
With some difficulty	100	71.4	40	28.6
With difficulty	60	71.4	24	28.6
With very difficulty	29	53.7	25	46.3

Background characteristics	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>				
Organization Of orientation meetings	231	74.8	78	25.2
Organization Of CMC	201	74.7	68	25.3
Identification of EVs	173	70.9	71	29.1
Formation of child club	199	76.8	60	23.2
Incentives for best students	187	71.6	74	28.4
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	200	77.8	57	22.2
Organization of parents visiting day	224	76.5	69	23.5
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	216	70.4	91	29.6
Interactive programme among stakeholders	200	75.8	64	24.2
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	200	76.6	61	23.4
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	207	70.6	86	29.4
Contribution in cash	201	75.8	64	24.2
Contribution in labour	209	69.4	92	30.6
Contribution in educational materials	201	77.0	60	23.0

\*\* To summarize from elaborative tables, the major sources of inspiration in this regard include members of CMC, facilitators, education volunteers and neighbors.

### 6.1.1 Participation in SOP/FS- related activities by type of activity

Those respondents who reported that they had participated in the SOP/FSP related activities were further asked about the activities in which they had participated. In response, majority of the respondents of both Dhading and Siraha reported that they had participated in the introductory/orientation meetings. An overwhelming majority of the Dhading respondents also reported that they cooperated in the provision of physical facility. In general, the level of participation was high in Dhading even though it did not apply to all activities. It is also noteworthy that positive attitudes towards the SOP/FSP activities directly resulted in the participation of such activities. Other variations by background characteristics were only minor in this regard (Table 6.2).

**Table 6.2 Participation in SOP/FSP activities by type of activity (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Organizational of orientation meetings	Organization Of CMC	Identification of EVs	Formation of child club	Incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents' visiting day	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive program among stakeholders	Interactive program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	Contribution in cash	Contribution in labor	Contribution in education materials	Others	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>235</b>
<b>District</b>																
Dhading	85.6	27.3	11.5	19.4	15.1	32.4	23.0	22.3	18.0	14.4	89.9	6.5	2.2	0.7	1.4	139
Siraha	82.3	44.8	28.1	3.1	1.0	12.5	31.3	39.6	2.1	5.2	20.8	3.1	1.0			96
<b>Respondent</b>																
Father	82.9	39.5	19.4	11.6	7.8	27.9	22.5	20.9	8.5	7.0	57.4	7.0	3.1	0.8	0.8	129
Mother	83.1	29.9	20.8	14.3	11.7	20.8	33.8	40.3	13.0	13.0	67.5	2.6			1.3	77
Guardian	93.1	24.1	6.9	13.8	10.3	17.2	24.1	37.9	20.7	20.7	65.5	3.4				29
<b>Social status of respondents</b>																
Higher status	84.6	23.1	15.4	7.7	23.1	30.8	23.1	23.1	7.7		61.5					13
Intermediate status	82.8	32.8	17.8	12.1	7.5	25.9	24.1	26.4	10.3	9.8	60.3	6.9	2.3	0.6	1.1	174
Lower status/Dalits	90.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	15.0	20.0	35.0	42.5	20.0	20.0	80.0					40
Muslim	87.5	62.5	25.0				37.5	37.5								8
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>																
Illiterate	80.7	28.1	20.0	9.6	4.4	19.3	28.1	24.4	8.1	8.9	63.0	3.0	0.7		0.7	135
Can read only	91.7	50.0	16.7	25.0	8.3	58.3	16.7	25.0	8.3		75.0	8.3			8.3	12
Can read and write somehow	89.4	43.9	18.2	16.7	13.6	27.3	16.7	27.3	15.2	13.6	63.6	9.1	3.0			66
Can read and write well	86.4	36.4	9.1	13.6	27.3	27.3	50.0	68.2	22.7	18.2	40.9	4.5	4.5	4.5		22
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>																
Easily	80.4	34.8	8.7	13.0	17.4	32.6	37.0	37.0	13.0	19.6	65.2	2.2				46
With some difficulty	87.0	41.0	27.0	17.0	8.0	24.0	27.0	20.0	17.0	12.0	64.0	10.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	100
With difficulty	83.3	28.3	13.3	8.3	8.3	23.3	26.7	38.3	3.3	5.0	53.3	1.7	1.7			60
With very difficulty	82.8	24.1	13.8	6.9	3.4	13.8	6.9	31.0	6.9	3.4	65.5					29

<b>Background characteristics</b>	Organiza- tion of orientation meetings	Organ- ization of CMC	Identi- fication of EVs	Forma- tion of child club	Incentiv- es for best students	Organi- zation of sensitiz- ation meetin- gs on child rights	Organi- zation of paren- ts visiti- ng day	Provision of encouragem- ent to send child to school through door-to- door visits	Interact- ive progra- m among stakeho- lders	Interactive program with communit- y people and children attending SOP/FSP	Provisio- n of support by commu- nity on physical infrastr- ucture	Contrib- ution in cash	Contrib- ution in labor	Contributio- n in education materials	Others	N
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>																
Organization of orientation meetings	84.4	35.1	18.6	13.0	9.5	23.8	26.8	29.0	11.7	10.4	62.3	5.2	1.7	0.4	0.9	231
Organization of CMC	83.1	35.3	16.9	12.9	10.4	22.9	27.4	32.8	12.4	11.4	64.2	6.0	2.0	0.5	1.0	201
Identification of EVs	86.1	34.1	16.2	12.1	11.0	20.8	24.9	35.8	12.7	9.8	65.9	3.5	1.7	0.6	1.2	173
Formation of child club	84.4	31.7	14.6	14.1	11.1	21.6	25.6	33.2	12.6	11.6	67.8	5.5	2.0	0.5	1.0	199
Incentives for best students	86.1	33.2	15.0	12.8	11.8	20.3	25.1	35.3	11.8	11.8	66.8	4.8	1.6	0.5	1.1	187
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	85.0	30.0	14.0	13.5	11.0	24.0	26.5	32.5	13.0	12.0	69.5	5.0	2.0	0.5	1.0	200
Organization of parents visiting day	85.3	33.9	17.4	12.9	9.8	24.1	25.9	30.4	12.1	11.2	62.9	4.5	1.8	0.4	0.9	224
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	84.7	33.3	16.7	13.4	10.2	23.6	25.5	30.6	12.0	10.2	63.9	4.6	1.4	0.5	0.9	216
Interactive programme among stakeholders	85.0	30.0	13.5	14.5	11.0	22.5	27.0	32.0	13.0	11.5	68.5	5.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	200
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	84.0	32.0	14.0	13.5	10.5	23.0	26.5	32.0	13.0	11.5	68.0	4.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	200
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	86.0	30.4	14.5	13.0	10.6	23.2	25.6	31.4	13.0	11.1	68.1	4.3	1.4	0.5	1.0	207
Contribution in cash	86.1	31.3	15.4	12.9	10.4	24.4	25.4	32.8	12.9	11.9	63.7	5.5	2.0	0.5	1.0	201
Contribution in labour	85.2	30.1	13.4	12.9	10.5	24.4	26.3	31.1	12.4	11.0	68.4	4.8	1.4	0.5	1.0	209
Contribution in educational materials	84.6	31.3	14.4	12.9	10.4	24.9	25.9	33.3	11.9	11.9	65.7	5.5	2.0	0.5	1.0	201

### 6.1.2 Reasons for not participating in SOP/FSP activities

Those respondents who had not participated in any SOP/FSP activities were further asked about the reasons for not participating. In response, majority of them reported that this was due to their inability to give time. Lack of information to participate, lack of knowledge about education, and poverty were reported as other important reasons.

It is noteworthy that lack of time, poverty, lack of information to participate and lack of knowledge of education were reported by a higher percentage of respondents Siraha than those of Dhading. Majority of the Dalits and those who could read and write well and support their family with difficulty also reported that their inability to participate was due to lack of time. Similarly the Muslim respondents reported that this was due to poverty and inability to give time. Variations in the reasons by other background characteristics were minimum (Table 6.3).

**Table 6.3 Reasons for not participating in SOP/FSP activities (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	I am poor	I cannot give time	No one told me to contribute	I do not care	School is far	I do not know about education	A woman should not go everywhere	Because government does everything	I didn't know	I don't know	Because I did not live in community	I am too old to go there	Others	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>District</b>														
Dhading	15.8	63.2	15.8			15.8			5.3	15.8			5.3	19
Siraha	39.5	79.0	42.0	16.0	2.5	42.0	13.6	14.8	3.7		2.5	1.2		81
<b>Respondent</b>														
Father	41.9	76.7	34.9	9.3	2.3	34.9	4.7	25.6		2.3	4.7		2.3	43
Mother	31.3	79.2	41.7	18.8	2.1	39.6	16.7	2.1	8.3					48
Guardian	22.2	55.6	22.2			33.3	11.1			22.2		11.1		9
<b>Social status of respondents</b>														
Higher status	33.3	33.3	33.3						33.3					3
Intermediate status	31.3	74.6	38.8	10.4	1.5	41.8	7.5	16.4		4.5	1.5		1.5	67
Lower status/Dalits	41.4	82.8	34.5	20.7	3.4	31.0	20.7	3.4	10.3		3.4	3.4		29
Muslim	100.0	100.0												1
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>														
Illiterate	45.3	73.4	34.4	17.2	1.6	35.9	14.1	3.1	6.3	4.7		1.6	1.6	64
Can read only	50.0	75.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	62.5								8
Can read and write somehow	11.8	76.5	23.5			35.3	5.9	23.5						17
Can read and write well		90.9	63.6	9.1		27.3	9.1	54.5			18.2			11
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>														
Easily	27.3	72.7	63.6	18.2		36.4	9.1	9.1			9.1			11
With some difficulty	40.0	70.0	37.5	7.5	2.5	47.5	10.0	10.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5		40
With difficulty	37.5	83.3	25.0	8.3	4.2	25.0	16.7	8.3	8.3	8.3			4.2	24
With very difficulty	28.0	80.0	36.0	24.0		32.0	8.0	20.0	4.0					25

## 6.2 Encouragement to children to attend alternative school

The respondents were then asked if they encouraged their children to attend alternative school. In response, an overwhelming majority (about 99 per cent) responded affirmatively. While all of the respondents of Dhading reported encouraging the children, 97 per cent of those of Siraha reported to have done so. Those who had positive attitude towards the SOP/FSP activities also encouraged more (Table 6.4.1).

**Table 6.4.1 Encouragement to children to attend alternative school (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No <sup>17</sup>	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line average</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>98.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	158	100.0		
Siraha	172	97.2	5	2.8
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	170	98.8	2	1.2
Mother	122	97.6	3	2.4
Guardian	38	100.0		
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	16	100.0		
Intermediate status	238	98.8	3	1.2
Lower status/Dalits	67	97.1	2	2.9
Muslim	9	100.0		
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	194	97.5	5	2.5
Can read only	20	100.0		
Can read and write somehow	83	100.0		
Can read and write well	33	100.0		
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	57	100.0		
With some difficulty	138	98.6	2	1.4
With difficulty	83	98.8	1	1.2
With very difficulty	52	96.3	2	3.7
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>				
Organization of orientation meetings	306	99.0	3	1.0
Organization of CMC	265	98.5	4	1.5
Identification of EVs	240	98.4	4	1.6
Formation of child club	255	98.5	4	1.5
Incentives for best students	256	98.1	5	1.9
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	254	98.8	3	1.2
Organization of parents visiting day	290	99.0	3	1.0
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	302	98.4	5	1.6
Interactive programme among stakeholders	261	98.9	3	1.1
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	258	98.9	3	1.1
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	288	98.3	5	1.7
Contribution in cash	260	98.1	5	1.9
Contribution in labour	296	98.3	5	1.7
Contribution in educational materials	258	98.9	3	1.1

<sup>17</sup> Since the number of respondents is only 5, no analysis is done regarding reasons for not encouraging children to attend ASP (Q.47).

At the time of baseline survey, parents were asked if they encouraged their children to study instead of asking them if they encouraged their children to attend alternative study as asked at the time of end line survey. If we assume that the questions of baseline and end line survey were more or less the same, with both focusing on the practice of parents to encourage child education, then the encouragement in this regard has increased in both districts. However, the rate of increase is high in Dhading. The percentages of respondents answering that they encourage have also exceeded the set targets in both districts (Table 6.4.2).

**Table 6.4.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of encouragement provided to child about education (in percentage)**

Indicator of practice regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of baseline and end line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who encourage children to become educated	73.5	100.0	88.1	97.2	Target exceeded in both districts, but the rate of evolution is much faster in Dhading	75

### *6.2.1 Approaches taken to encourage children to attend alternative school*

In response to how they encouraged their children to attend alternative school, majority of the respondents reported that they advised their children on the value of education. This was followed by persuading/coaxing the child to study, motivating the child to study more than to play and giving examples of good persons. While coaxing the child to attend alternative school was an important approach taken in Dhading, motivating the child to study than to play was an important approach taken in Siraha (Table 6.5).

### *6.2.2 Activities influential in motivating respondents to encourage children to attend ASP*

The respondents were further asked about the activities which were influential in motivating their child to attend ASP. In response, the respondents reported that organization of orientation meetings followed by provision of door-to-door visit to send child to school, support on physical infrastructure, organisation of CMC, identification of EVs, organization of parents visiting days and sensitization meetings on child rights were the important activities. In general, the activities were found more influential in Dhading than in Siraha (Table 6.6).

**Table 6.5 Approaches taken to encourage children to attend alternative school (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Advised child on the value of education	Coaxed the child to study	Motivated child to study more than to play	Gave examples of good persons	Encouraged child to do home assignments	Helped child to do homework	Advised child that s/he will not be down played by others	Advised child to avoid bad company	Did house hold chores ourselves	Fed child in time	Gave child the educational materials	Bore cost of education	Promised to buy school dress	Others	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>70.3</b>	<b>54.2</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>330</b>
<b>District</b>															
Dhading	71.5	60.8	17.1	26.6	6.3	3.8	13.9	2.5	6.3	27.2	26.6	4.4	25.3	4.4	158
Siraha	69.2	48.3	45.3	29.7	8.7	4.7	22.7	18.6	15.7	11.0	10.5	6.4	9.9	2.3	172
<b>Respondent</b>															
Father	77.6	48.2	38.2	32.9	9.4	4.7	17.1	11.2	7.1	18.8	14.1	4.7	18.2	2.4	170
Mother	63.1	59.8	25.4	24.6	5.7	3.3	24.6	9.8	14.8	19.7	23.0	7.4	13.9	4.9	122
Guardian	60.5	63.2	23.7	18.4	5.3	5.3	5.3	13.2	18.4	15.8	21.1	2.6	23.7	2.6	38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>															
Higher status	81.3	62.5	31.3	31.3	6.3	6.3	18.8			18.8	18.8		18.8		16
Intermediate status	71.8	54.6	32.4	31.1	8.8	3.8	18.1	8.8	7.6	16.4	14.7	6.3	16.8	3.4	238
Lower status/Dalits	61.2	47.8	32.8	19.4	4.5	6.0	20.9	22.4	22.4	25.4	26.9	4.5	19.4	4.5	67
Muslim	77.8	77.8	11.1	11.1			11.1		44.4	33.3	44.4		11.1		9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>															
Illiterate	67.0	55.2	32.5	28.4	6.7	2.6	18.0	11.9	13.9	17.5	17.0	5.7	15.5	4.6	194
Can read only	50.0	35.0	40.0	35.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	15.0	5.0	30.0		20
Can read and write somehow	80.7	57.8	25.3	25.3	3.6	4.8	18.1	8.4	7.2	22.9	24.1	2.4	19.3	2.4	83
Can read and write well	75.8	51.5	39.4	30.3	15.2	9.1	15.2	12.1	6.1	21.2	12.1	12.1	15.2		33
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>															
Easily	71.9	59.6	31.6	31.6	12.3	3.5	15.8	8.8	8.8	24.6	24.6	5.3	24.6		57
With some difficulty	71.7	59.4	42.0	28.3	7.2	1.4	18.8	13.0	6.5	19.6	16.7	2.9	10.9	2.2	138
With difficulty	67.5	50.6	16.9	26.5	7.2	7.2	19.3	7.2	14.5	16.9	20.5	7.2	22.9	6.0	83
With very difficulty	69.2	40.4	28.8	26.9	3.8	7.7	19.2	13.5	21.2	13.5	11.5	9.6	17.3	5.8	52

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

**Table 6.6 Activities influential in motivating respondents to encourage children to attend ASP (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Organization of orientation meetings	Organization of CMC	Identification of EVs	Formation of child club	Provision of incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents visiting days	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive Program among stakeholders	Interactive Program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Support on physical infrastructure	Others	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>56.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>330</b>
<b>District</b>													
Dhading	86.7	50.0	42.4	46.8	52.5	63.3	38.6	66.5	36.7	37.3	81.6	0.6	158
Siraha	79.1	47.7	45.3	2.3	8.7	20.9	47.1	65.7	9.3	8.7	32.6	0.6	172
<b>Respondent</b>													
Father	87.6	47.6	37.6	21.8	26.5	41.8	45.3	62.4	22.4	21.8	56.5	1.2	170
Mother	77.0	45.9	54.9	25.4	30.3	42.6	39.3	70.5	21.3	19.7	52.5		122
Guardian	78.9	63.2	36.8	26.3	42.1	34.2	44.7	68.4	26.3	34.2	65.8		38
<b>Social status of respondents</b>													
Higher status	87.5	31.3	37.5	37.5	43.8	56.3	31.3	62.5	18.8	12.5	56.3		16
Intermediate status	84.5	50.4	43.7	24.4	32.4	45.0	45.8	66.0	26.1	25.6	58.4	0.8	238
Lower status/Dalits	73.1	43.3	47.8	20.9	19.4	26.9	35.8	64.2	13.4	14.9	53.7		67
Muslim	100.0	77.8	33.3		11.1	22.2	44.4	88.9		11.1	11.1		9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>													
Illiterate	77.8	43.3	45.4	20.6	25.3	38.1	40.7	60.8	18.0	17.0	59.3		194
Can read only	70.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	25.0	55.0	50.0	70.0	25.0	20.0	60.0		20
Can read and write somehow	94.0	59.0	45.8	32.5	42.2	48.2	45.8	69.9	30.1	34.9	55.4	1.2	83
Can read and write well	90.9	48.5	33.3	21.2	27.3	33.3	45.5	84.8	27.3	24.2	36.4	3.0	33
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>													
Easily	82.5	50.9	42.1	35.1	36.8	56.1	42.1	66.7	29.8	28.1	61.4		57
With some difficulty	82.6	51.4	50.0	28.3	32.6	47.1	50.7	57.2	28.3	29.7	63.8	0.7	138
With difficulty	81.9	47.0	48.2	16.9	28.9	31.3	44.6	78.3	14.5	12.0	45.8		83
With very difficulty	84.6	42.3	23.1	9.6	15.4	25.0	21.2	69.2	11.5	13.5	46.2	1.9	52
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>													
Organization of orientation meetings	85.3	51.3	42.8	24.8	30.4	42.5	43.8	65.4	22.5	23.2	57.8	0.7	306
Organization of CMC	87.2	52.5	42.3	26.0	32.1	41.9	46.0	66.0	24.2	25.7	57.4	0.8	265
Identification of EVs	86.3	52.9	43.3	25.8	33.8	38.8	40.4	70.8	25.4	25.4	57.9	0.8	240
Formation of child club	88.2	51.0	39.6	28.2	35.3	43.5	42.7	68.6	25.9	26.7	59.2	0.8	255
Incentives for best students	82.4	52.3	42.2	25.4	34.4	39.5	41.0	71.1	23.4	24.2	56.3	0.8	256
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	89.0	50.0	35.8	28.0	34.6	43.7	41.7	66.9	25.6	26.0	59.8	0.8	254
Organization of parents visiting day	86.9	49.3	40.7	26.9	32.4	42.4	44.8	65.5	25.5	24.5	56.9	0.7	290
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	82.1	50.0	42.7	24.5	31.5	41.7	41.4	67.9	22.5	23.2	57.9	0.7	302
Interactive programme among stakeholders	88.1	51.7	36.8	28.4	34.5	42.9	41.0	68.2	26.4	26.8	58.2	0.8	261
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	88.0	51.9	37.6	27.9	33.3	43.8	41.9	67.1	26.0	26.7	59.3	0.8	258
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	83.3	50.3	41.7	26.0	33.0	42.7	39.2	69.8	24.3	24.7	59.4	0.7	288
Contribution in cash	88.5	50.0	41.2	25.4	34.6	41.9	43.5	68.5	25.8	25.8	61.9	0.8	260
Contribution in labour	82.1	49.7	41.9	25.3	31.4	42.2	38.5	69.3	23.3	23.6	58.8	0.7	296
Contribution in educational materials	88.4	50.4	38.0	26.7	33.7	44.2	43.0	67.4	25.2	26.0	59.3	0.8	258

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

### 6.2.3 Sources influencing the motivation of respondents to encourage children to attend ASP

Respondents were further asked about the sources that influenced the motivation of parents to encourage their children to attend ASP. In this regard, facilitators followed by own child, members of CMC and neighbors were reported as the main sources influencing such motivation (Table 6.7).

**Table 6.7 Sources influencing the motivation of respondents to encourage children to attend ASP (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Organization of orientation meetings	Organization of CMC	Identification of EVs	Formation of child club	Provision of Incentives for best students	Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	Organization of parents visiting days	Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	Interactive program among stakeholders	Interactive program with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	Support on physical infrastructure	Other
<b>Respondents surveyed</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>2</b>
Members of CMC	30.3	28.0	8.3	7.7	5.1	9.6	7.0	11.5	17.6	13.5	28.1	100.0
EVs	6.2	11.2	13.8	1.3	2.0	1.5	1.4	3.2	1.4	1.4	0.5	
Facilitators	24.1	23.6	46.9	21.8	14.3	14.7	53.1	41.3	14.9	17.6	10.8	
School teachers	6.2	5.6	6.9	12.8	11.2	18.4	18.2	20.6	13.5	14.9	3.8	
People from NGOs	4.4	1.2	2.1	1.3	2.0	9.6	2.8	3.2	4.1		2.2	
Resource persons						1.5	4.9	1.8		1.4	0.5	
Other elite of community	2.2	3.7	2.8	1.3	1.0	14.0	2.1	3.7	6.8	8.1	4.3	
Neighbours	13.1	11.2	7.6	7.7	1.0	8.8	2.8	5.5	12.2	9.5	24.3	
Mass media				1.3	1.0	1.5		0.9	4.1	1.4		
From inner self	4.0	6.8	4.8	5.1	6.1	7.4	2.1	3.2	9.5	10.8	16.2	
Programme itself	8.4	6.8	4.1	11.5	8.2	11.8	3.5	4.1	14.9	20.3	8.1	
Own child	0.7	1.9	2.8	28.2	48.0	1.5	2.1	0.5	1.4	1.4	1.1	
Other	0.4							0.5				

Column percentage adds up to more than 100

### 6.3 Discussions with children about education

The respondents were then asked if they discussed with their children about their education. In response, about 91 per cent of the respondents reported that they discussed. Also, a slightly higher percentage of respondents of Dhading than those of Siraha discussed with their children. The study found that there were variations in the level of discussion by the attitudes towards SOP/FSP activities. The variations by other background characteristics were only minor (Table 6.8.1).

**Table 6.8.1 Discussions with children about education (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Endline average</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>93.1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6.9</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	153	96.8	5	3.2
Siraha	159	89.8	18	10.2
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	162	94.2	10	5.8
Mother	115	92.0	10	8.0
Guardian	35	92.1	3	7.9
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	15	93.8	1	6.3
Intermediate status	228	94.6	13	5.4
Lower status/Dalits	60	87.0	9	13.0
Muslim	9	100.0		
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	178	89.4	21	10.6
Can read only	19	95.0	1	5.0
Can read and write somehow	82	98.8	1	1.2
Can read and write well	33	100.0		

Background characteristics	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	55	96.5	2	3.5
With some difficulty	131	93.6	9	6.4
With difficulty	74	88.1	10	11.9
With very difficulty	52	96.3	2	3.7
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>				
Organization of orientation meetings	297	96.1	12	3.9
Organization of CMC	262	97.4	7	2.6
Identification of EVs	238	97.5	6	2.5
Formation of child club	253	97.7	6	2.3
Incentives for best students	249	95.4	12	4.6
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	252	98.1	5	1.9
Organization of parents visiting day	283	96.6	10	3.4
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	290	94.5	17	5.5
Interactive programme among stakeholders	258	97.7	6	2.3
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	256	98.1	5	1.9
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	277	94.5	16	5.5
Contribution in cash	254	95.8	11	4.2
Contribution in labour	282	93.7	19	6.3
Contribution in educational materials	253	96.9	8	3.1

Upon comparison of the baseline and end line data, it has been found that the change in level of discussion with children about their education has improved in both district, but the rate of change is much higher in Dhading. As has been additionally found, both districts have exceeded the set target (Table 6.8.2).

**Table 6.8.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of discussion with children about child education (in parentage)**

Indicator of practice regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of baseline and end line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who discuss with children about their education	54.6	96.8	59.0	89.8	Target exceeded in both districts, but the rate of evolution is much faster in Dhading	60

### 6.3.1 Topic of discussion with children about education

The respondents were further asked about the topic which they discussed with their children. In response most of them reported that they discussed about the need to study hard. This was followed by discussion on the value of education in making a person great, helping find job and earning money. The other discussions were about success or failure in examination and discussion about school homework. While the Dhading respondents discussed more about the need to study hard, the Siraha respondents discussed more about the value of education. A large percentage of the respondents of Dhading also discussed on the school home work and success/failure in examination than those of Siraha (Table 6.9).

**Table 6.9 Topic of discussion with children about education (in percentage)**

<b>Background characteristics</b>	Discussion about the need to study hard	Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and earn respect	Discussion about teaching environment in school	Discussion about school homework	Discussion about educational materials	Discussion about success/failure in examination	Discussion about regularity of teachers	Discussion about children who do not go to school	Telling that children should not work	Telling that scholarship is available /not available	Telling that child should avoid bad company	N
<b>End line average</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>56.1</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>312</b>
<b>District</b>												
Dhading	58.2	37.3	32.0	56.9	13.7	52.3	31.4	4.6			0.7	153
Siraha	64.8	74.2	23.3	20.8	27.7	31.4	26.4	5.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	159
<b>Respondent</b>												
Father	66.7	52.5	32.7	39.5	14.2	38.3	34.0	6.2			1.2	162
Mother	54.8	59.1	21.7	34.8	32.2	44.3	21.7	4.3	0.9	0.9		115
Guardian	60.0	62.9	22.9	45.7	14.3	48.6	28.6	2.9				35
<b>Social status of respondents</b>												
Higher status	53.3	33.3	33.3	66.7	20.0	53.3	40.0					15
Intermediate status	61.4	52.2	31.1	41.7	16.2	41.2	29.8	4.4			0.9	228
Lower status/Dalits	63.3	70.0	16.7	25.0	31.7	43.3	21.7	10.0	1.7	1.7		60
Muslim	66.7	100.0			66.7	22.2	33.3					9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>												
Illiterate	60.1	54.5	28.1	35.4	22.5	39.3	25.3	5.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	178
Can read only	31.6	63.2	31.6	63.2	15.8	68.4	26.3					19
Can read and write somehow	68.3	56.1	22.0	40.2	23.2	37.8	36.6	4.9			1.2	82
Can read and write well	69.7	60.6	36.4	36.4	9.1	48.5	30.3	6.1				33
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>												
Easily	61.8	49.1	30.9	50.9	18.2	63.6	32.7	5.5				55
With some difficulty	67.9	57.3	30.5	38.2	18.3	39.7	24.4	5.3			1.5	131
With difficulty	52.7	54.1	21.6	40.5	23.0	39.2	39.2	2.7	1.4	1.4		74
With very difficulty	57.7	63.5	25.0	23.1	26.9	26.9	21.2	7.7				52

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

#### 6.4 Discussions with family members about child education

The respondents were then asked if they discussed with their family members about child education. In this regard about 81 per cent of the respondents reported that they discussed. A slightly higher percentage of the respondents of Dhading discussed with their family members than those of Siraha. Those who could read and write easily also usually had more discussion with their family members. Similarly, those who had positive attitude

towards the SOP/FSP activities discussed more with family members about child education (Table 6.10.1).

**Table 6.10.1 Discussions with family members about child education (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line average</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>19.4</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	131	82.9	27	17.1
Siraha	139	78.5	38	21.5
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	147	85.5	25	14.5
Mother	92	73.6	33	26.4
Guardian	31	81.6	7	18.4
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	13	81.3	3	18.8
Intermediate status	194	80.5	47	19.5
Lower status/Dalits	54	78.3	15	21.7
Muslim	9	100.0		
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	147	73.9	52	26.1
Can read only	14	70.0	6	30.0
Can read and write somehow	78	94.0	5	6.0
Can read and write well	31	93.9	2	6.1
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	48	84.2	9	15.8
With some difficulty	112	80.0	28	20.0
With difficulty	65	77.4	19	22.6
With very difficulty	45	83.3	9	16.7
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>				
Organization of orientation meetings	262	84.8	47	15.2
Organization of CMC	234	87.0	35	13.0
Identification of EVs	211	86.5	33	13.5
Formation of child club	228	88.0	31	12.0
Incentives for best students	223	85.4	38	14.6
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	229	89.1	28	10.9
Organization of parents visiting day	257	87.7	36	12.3
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	251	81.8	56	18.2
Interactive programme among stakeholders	232	87.9	32	12.1
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	231	88.5	30	11.5
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	239	81.6	54	18.4
Contribution in cash	232	87.5	33	12.5
Contribution in labour	242	80.4	59	19.6
Contribution in educational materials	230	88.1	31	11.9

Upon the comparison of baseline and end line data, it has been found that discussion with family members about child education has increased in both districts but the rate of change is much faster in Dhading (Table 6.10.2).

**Table 6.10.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of discussion with family members about child education (in percentage)**

Indicator of practice regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of baseline and end line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who discuss with family members about children's education	71.4	82.9	73.1	78.5	Target exceeded in both districts, but the rate of evolution is much faster in Dhading.	75

*6.4.1 Topic of discussion with family members about child education*

The respondents were additionally asked about the topics they discussed with other family members. In response, about 58 per cent of the respondents reported that they discussed mostly about the fact that education makes a person great, helps get job and helps earn respect. This was followed by discussion on the need to study hard, success/failure in examination and educational materials (Table 6.11).

**Table 6.11 Topic of discussion with family members about child education (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Discussion about the need to study hard	Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and earn respect	Discussion about teaching environment in school	Discussion about school homework	Discussion about educational materials	Discussion about success/failure in examination	Discussion about regularity of teachers	Discussion about children who do not go to school	Others may make fun of uneducated person	Enquiring about whether or not the child goes to school	Asking why the child is not sent to school	Cost of education	N
<i>End line average</i>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>53.7</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>33.7</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>District</b>													
Dhading	43.5	35.1	32.8	26.7	41.2	45.8	14.5	2.3	1.5	1.5	0.8	0.8	131
Siraha	43.9	71.2	24.5	25.9	26.6	25.9	32.4	9.4					139
<b>Respondent</b>													
Father	48.3	54.4	32.7	27.9	32.0	32.7	17.0	4.1	0.7	1.4	0.7	0.7	147
Mother	39.1	56.5	19.6	25.0	35.9	34.8	33.7	8.7					92
Guardian	35.5	41.9	35.5	22.6	35.5	51.6	25.8	6.5	3.2				31
<b>Social status of respondents</b>													
Higher status	46.2	23.1	38.5	53.8	46.2	38.5	23.1			7.7			13
Intermediate status	45.4	52.1	32.5	23.2	33.0	36.1	18.0	5.7	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	194
Lower status/Dalits	42.6	61.1	16.7	31.5	35.2	35.2	35.2	9.3					54
Muslim	11.1	88.9		22.2	22.2	22.2	77.8						9
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>													
Illiterate	48.3	56.5	30.6	25.9	29.3	34.0	23.8	6.1	1.4	0.7			147
Can read only	21.4	64.3	35.7	21.4	21.4	42.9	14.3	7.1				7.1	14
Can read and write somehow	41.0	44.9	20.5	33.3	42.3	30.8	19.2	6.4		1.3	1.3		78
Can read and write well	38.7	58.1	35.5	12.9	38.7	51.6	38.7	3.2					31
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>													
Easily	47.9	47.9	29.2	27.1	37.5	52.1	18.8	6.3		2.1			48
With some difficulty	50.0	42.9	34.8	27.7	38.4	32.1	23.2	5.4					112
With difficulty	33.8	66.2	18.5	21.5	30.8	38.5	21.5	6.2	3.1	1.5	1.5	1.5	65
With very difficulty	37.8	68.9	26.7	28.9	22.2	22.2	33.3	6.7					45

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

## 6.5 Discussions with neighbours about child education

The respondents were also asked if they discussed with their neighbours about the education of children. In this regard, about 78 per cent of the respondents reported that they discussed. As was found, a slightly higher percentage of respondents of Dhading than those of Siraha held such discussions. As was also found, literate people discussed more than those who were illiterate. Those who could support their family with difficulty also discussed more than the other groups. As was additionally found, respondents with positive attitudes towards the SOP/FSP activities discussed more with neighbours about child education (Table 6.12.1).

**Table 6.12.1 Discussions with neighbours about child education (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<b>End line average</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>21.8</b>
<b>District</b>				
Dhading	127	80.4	31	19.6
Siraha	135	76.3	42	23.7
<b>Respondent</b>				
Father	144	83.7	28	16.3
Mother	91	72.8	34	27.2
Guardian	27	71.1	11	28.9
<b>Social status of respondents</b>				
Higher status	13	81.3	3	18.8
Intermediate status	191	79.3	50	20.7
Lower status/Dalits	49	71.0	20	29.0
Muslim	9	100.0		
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>				
Illiterate	145	72.9	54	27.1
Can read only	11	55.0	9	45.0
Can read and write somehow	76	91.6	7	8.4
Can read and write well	30	90.9	3	9.1
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>				
Easily	41	71.9	16	28.1
With some difficulty	112	80.0	28	20.0
With difficulty	62	73.8	22	26.2
With very difficulty	47	87.0	7	13.0
<b>Attitude to participate in SOP/FSP activities (positive attitude only)</b>				
Organization of orientation meetings	256	82.8	53	17.2
Organization of CMC	230	85.5	39	14.5
Identification of EVs	201	82.4	43	17.6
Formation of child club	221	85.3	38	14.7
Incentives for best students	212	81.2	49	18.8
Organization of sensitization meetings on child rights	224	87.2	33	12.8
Organization of parents visiting day	249	85.0	44	15.0
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visits	240	78.2	67	21.8
Interactive programme among stakeholders	226	85.6	38	14.4
Interactive programme with community people and children attending SOP/FSP	225	86.2	36	13.8
Provision of support by community on physical infrastructure	231	78.8	62	21.2
Contribution in cash	220	83.0	45	17.0
Contribution in labour	234	77.7	67	22.3
Contribution in educational materials	222	85.1	39	14.9

Upon the comparison of baseline and end line data, it has been found that discussion with neighbours has increased in both districts and also that targets have been met in both of them. However, the rate of change in this indicator is faster in Dhading (Table 6.12.2)

**Table 6.12.2 Comparison of baseline and end line data on the level of discussion with neighbours about child education (in percentage)**

Indicator of practice regarding child education among respondents	Dhading		Siraha		Analysis of baseline and end line data	Target by the end of project (percent)
	Baseline data	End line data	Baseline data	End line data		
Percentage of respondents who discuss with neighbors about children's education	64.3	80.4	64.2	76.3	Target exceeded in both districts, but the rate of evolution is relatively fast in Dhading	70

#### 6.5.1 Topic of discussion with neighbours about child education

In response to what they discussed with their neighbours about child education, majority of the respondents reported that they discussed about the value of education in terms of its ability to make a person great, to help get job and to earn respect. About 47 per cent of the respondents reported that they discussed about the teaching environment in school and another 38 per cent reported that they discussed about the need to study hard. In addition, about 33 per cent of them reported discussing about the regularity of teachers and about 23 percent reported discussing about the school homework (Table 6.13).

**Table 6.13 Topic of discussion with neighbours about child education (in percentage)**

Background characteristics	Discussion about the need to study hard	Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and earn respect	Discussion about teaching environment in school	Discussion about school homework	Discussion about educational materials	Discussion about success/failure in examination	Discussion about regularity of teachers	Discussion about children who do not go to school	Discussion on quality of education	Discussion about making ASP permanent	Discussion about the need to study in harmony with classmates	Discussion if children go to school	Discussion if children quarrel in class	Discussion about education of child	Telling that life becomes difficult with education	N
<i>End line average</i>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>21.8</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>262</b>
<b>District</b>																
Dhading	27.6	26.8	59.1	17.3	3.9	26.0	32.3	26.0	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	127
Siraha	48.1	72.6	36.3	28.1	27.4	17.8	34.1	10.4								135
<b>Respondent</b>																
Father	38.9	48.6	50.7	25.0	15.3	18.1	28.5	17.4	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7		144
Mother	40.7	56.0	42.9	18.7	19.8	22.0	40.7	16.5				1.1			1.1	91
Guardian	25.9	40.7	44.4	25.9	7.4	40.7	33.3	25.9	3.7							27
<b>Social status of respondents</b>																
Higher status	30.8	46.2	53.8	30.8		15.4	38.5	23.1	7.7							13
Intermediate status	39.3	47.6	45.0	22.5	15.2	20.4	29.3	18.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	191
Lower status/Dalits	38.8	55.1	59.2	16.3	20.4	28.6	46.9	18.4								49
Muslim	22.2	88.9	22.2	55.6	33.3	22.2	33.3									9

<b>Background characteristics</b>	Discussion about the need to study hard	Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and earn respect	Discussion about teaching environment in school	Discussion about school homework	Discussion about educational materials	Discussion about success/failure in examination	Discussion about regularity of teachers	Discussion about children who do not go to school	Discussion on quality of education	Discussion about making ASP permanent	Discussion about the need to study in harmony with classmates	Discussion if children quarrel in class	Discussion about education of child	Telling that life becomes difficult without education	N
<b>Literacy of respondents</b>															
Illiterate	39.3	53.1	51.0	19.3	15.9	24.1	33.8	15.9	0.7			0.7	0.7	0.7	145
Can read only	18.2	54.5	36.4	27.3	18.2		27.3	27.3			9.1				11
Can read and write somehow	32.9	40.8	47.4	23.7	11.8	19.7	30.3	22.4		1.3		1.3		1.3	76
Can read and write well	53.3	60.0	33.3	36.7	26.7	23.3	40.0	13.3	3.3						30
<b>Ability of respondents to support family</b>															
Easily	31.7	41.5	56.1	22.0	17.1	31.7	41.5	17.1				2.4		2.4	41
With some difficulty	43.8	49.1	50.9	25.9	9.8	17.9	27.7	19.6	0.9	0.9					112
With difficulty	35.5	45.2	41.9	24.2	16.1	24.2	38.7	19.4	1.6		1.6	1.6	1.6		62
With very difficulty	34.0	68.1	38.3	14.9	29.8	19.1	31.9	12.8							47

## Chapter 7

### Suggestions of Respondents on Improving the KAP of Community

This chapter consolidates the major suggestions offered by the respondents on improving the alternative schooling Programme in the future. These suggestions are first presented separately by VDC and district and then are aggregated together to help identify those that are important.

#### 7.1 Suggestions of the respondents of Dhading

In the course of soliciting suggestions from the Dhading respondents, it was suggested by majority of them that the school should be improved/the physical structure of school should be completed/there should be provision of land to school/the school should be made in more open or larger space/ school building should be extended/there should be repair of school building/there should be an increase in the number of rooms in the building/ and SOP/SOP should have its own building and land. A considerable percentage of them also suggested to provide experienced facilitator/ to provide more facilitator/ to provide facilitator in view of the number of students/ and to provide two teachers. Another considerable percentage of them also suggested to make alternative school permanent/ to give continuity to ASP/ and to make such programme regular. Some others suggested to provide education of up to fifth grade and to provide education of higher grade so that children did not need to travel long for receiving education. In addition, a considerable percentage of them suggested providing drinking water, toilet, playground and sports goods. Not only these, another considerable percentage of them also suggested providing tiffin, dress, scholarship, educational materials (notebook, pen, etc) and sports materials (Table 7.1).

**Table 7.1 Suggestions to implement SOP and FSP in Dhading VDCs (in percentage)**

Suggestions	Jogimara	Dhusa	Benighat	Gajuri
1. School should be improved/the physical structure of school should be completed/there should be provision of land to school/make school in more open/larger space/extend school building/ repair school building/increase number of rooms in the building/SOP/FSP should have its own building and land	63.2	55.9	46.7	58.1
2. Provide tiffin, dress, scholarship, educational materials (notebook, pen, etc), sports materials	13.2	15.3	13.3	19.4
3. Provide experienced facilitator/ provide more facilitator/ provide facilitator in view of the number of students, provide two teachers	23.7	27.1	46.7	41.9
4. Provide drinking water, toilet, playground, sports goods	21.1	11.9	26.7	16.1
5. Make alternative school permanent/ give continuity to ASP/ make such programme regular	23.7	25.4	10.0	29.0
6. Should give education of up to fifth grade, provide education of higher grade so that children do not need to go far for education	23.7	37.3	46.7	19.4
7. Provide help to school	5.3	3.4	-	-
8. Increase duration of school	7.9	-	-	-

Suggestions	Jogimara	Dhusa	Benighat	Gajuri
9. Keep medicines in school/make treatment of minor illness of children in school	-	1.7	-	-
13. Increase salary of facilitator/pay them well	-	-	-	-
15. People should be urged to send children to school	-	3.4	-	-
16. Provide quality education	-	3.4	6.7	-
17. Give opportunity to educated people	-	1.7	-	-
18. Parents should provide help	-	1.7	-	-
19. There should be no quota system in the ASP	-	3.4	-	-
20. Encourage reforestation	-	1.7	-	-
21. Ask in writing	2.6	-	-	-
22. Make programme good by involving community	-	1.7	-	-
23. Make the policy of ASP permanent	5.3	-	-	-
24. The number of children should be increased in ASP	-	1.7	3.3	3.2
26. Make it compulsory to go to school by improving environment got them	2.6	1.7	-	9.7
27. Make bridge so people go to school	-	1.7	-	-
28. All should help	-	3.4	-	-
29. There should be peace	-	-	6.7	-
37. There should be provision of peon in school	-	1.7	-	-
<b>Total N</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response

## 7.2 Suggestions of the respondents of Siraha

When the respondents of Siraha were asked to provide suggestions on how to make the alternative schooling programme even better in the future, most of them suggested providing tiffin, dress, scholarship, educational materials and sports materials. A considerable percentage of them also suggested to make alternative school permanent/ to give continuity to ASP/ and to make such programme regular. There were also considerable percentage of respondents who suggested that school should be improved/the physical structure of school should be completed/there should be provision of land to school/ school should be in more open/larger space/school building should be extended/school should be repaired/number of rooms in the building should be increased/SOP/FSP should have its own building and land (Table 7.2).

**Table 7.2 Suggestions to implement SOP and FSP in Siraha VDC (in percentage)**

Suggestions	Tenuwa-patti	Vidyanagar	Kusaha - Laxminia	Bariyar-patti
1. School should be improved/the physical structure of school should be completed/there should be provision of land to school/make school in more open/larger space/extend school building,/repair school building/increase number of rooms in the building/SOP/FSP should have its own building and land	28.2	12.7	23.3	25.0
2. Provide tiffin, dress, scholarship, educational materials (notebook, pen, etc), sports materials	48.7	94.5	76.7	87.5
3. Provide experienced facilitator/ provide more facilitator/ provide facilitator in view of the number of students, provide two teachers	-	3.6	-	7.5
4. Provide drinking water, toilet, playground, sports goods	-	1.8	11.6	-
5. Make alternative school permanent/ give continuity to ASP,/make such programme regular	23.1	27.3	39.5	27.5

Suggestion	Tenuwa patti	Vidyanagar	Kusaha Laxminia	Bariyarpatti
6. Should give education of up to fifth grade/ provide education of higher grade so that children do not need to go far for education	-	1.8	-	-
8. Increase duration of school	2.6	-	-	5.0
9. Keep medicines in school/make treatment of minor illness of children in school	-	1.8	-	-
10. Enforce monitoring system from stakeholders/districts	-	12.7	-	7.5
11. Make provision for rewards/incentives	2.6	3.6	-	5.0
12. Increase salary of facilitators	15.4	-	4.7	5.0
13. Increase salary of facilitator/pay them well	-	-	-	5.0
14. There should be economic support from the government	7.7	-	-	-
15. People should be urged to send children to school	-	-	-	-
16. Provide quality education	2.6	-	2.3	-
25. There should be arrangement of tour for children	-	1.8	-	-
28. All should help	2.6	-	-	-
29. There should be peace	-	1.8	-	-
30. Awareness should be raised	12.8	-	-	-
31. Make education available to all	7.7	-	-	-
32. Government itself should provide ASP	2.6	-	-	-
33. There should be door-to-door programme	2.6	-	-	-
34. There should be extracurricular activity	-	3.6	-	-
35. The facilitator should be female	-	-	-	12.5
36. CMC should be good	-	-	2.3	-
37. There should be provision of peon in school	-	3.6	-	-
38. There should be surprise visit of parents instead of teachers	2.6	1.8	-	-
39. Dalits should be provided with financial help	-	1.8	-	-
40. Separate school from politics	-	1.8	-	2.5
41. There should not be false assurance in any programme	-	9.1	-	-
<b>Total N</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>40</b>

*Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response*

### 7.3 Summary of suggestions

The major suggestions of those of Dhading respondents included improvements of schools and those of Siraha respondents included provision of tiffin, dress, scholarship, educational materials (notebook, pen, etc) and sports materials. While a considerable percentage of the respondents from Siraha suggested to make alternative school permanent, to give continuity to ASP, to make such programme regular, a considerable percentage of those of Dhading suggested to provide education of up to fifth grade and to provide education of higher grade so that children did not need to travel long for education.

Similarly, while a considerable percentage of the respondents of Dhading suggested providing experienced facilitator, to provide more facilitator, to provide facilitator in view of the number of students and to provide two facilitators, a considerable percentage of those of Dhading suggested providing drinking water, toilet, playground and sports goods (Table 7.3).

**Table 7.3 Summary of suggestions to implement SOP and FSP in two districts (in percentage)**

Suggestions	Dhading		Siraha	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. School should be improved/the physical structure of school should be completed/there should be provision of land to school/make school in more open/larger space/extend school building/repair school building/increase number of rooms in the building/SOP/FSP should have its own building and land	89	56.3	38	21.5
2. Provide tiffin, dress, scholarship, educational materials (notebook, pen, etc), sports materials	24	15.2	139	78.5
3. Provide experienced facilitator/ provide more facilitator./provide facilitator in view of the number of students, provide two teachers	52	32.9	5	2.8
4. Provide drinking water, toilet, playground, sports goods	28	17.7	6	3.4
5. Make alternative school permanent/ give continuity to ASP/make such programme regular	36	22.8	52	29.4
6. Should give education of up to fifth grade/ provide education of higher grade so that children do not need to go far for education	51	32.3	1	0.6
7. Provide help to school	4	2.5		
8. Increase duration of school	3	1.9	3	1.7
9. Keep medicines in school/make treatment of minor illness of children in school	1	0.6	1	0.6
10. Enforce monitoring system from stakeholders/districts			10	5.6
11. Make provision for rewards/incentives			5	2.8
12. Increase salary of facilitators			10	5.6
13. Increase salary of facilitator/pay them well			2	1.1
14. There should be economic support from the government			3	1.7
15. People should be urged to send children to school	2	1.3		
16. Provide quality education	4	2.5	2	1.1
17. Give opportunity to educated people	1	0.6		
18. Parents should provide help	1	0.6		
19. There should be no quota system in the ASP	2	1.3		
20. Encourage reforestation	1	0.6		
21. Ask in writing	1	0.6		
22. Make programme good by involving community	1	0.6		
23. Make the policy of ASP permanent	2	1.3		
24. The number of children should be increased in ASP	3	1.9		
25. There should be arrangement of tour for children			1	0.6
26. Make it compulsory to go to school by improving environment got them	5	3.2		
27. Make bridge so people go to school	1	0.6		
28. All should help	2	1.3	1	0.6
29. There should be peace	2	1.3	1	0.6
30. Awareness should be raised			5	2.8
31. Make education available to all			3	1.7
32. Government itself should provide ASP			1	0.6
33. There should be door-to-door programme			1	0.6
34. There should be extracurricular activity			2	1.1
35. The facilitator should be female	5	2.8		
36. CMC should be good	1	0.6		
37. There should be provision of peon in school	2	1.1	1	0.6
38. There should be surprise visit of parents instead of teachers	2	1.1		
39. Dalits should be provided with financial help	1	0.6		
40. Separate school from politics	2	1.1		
41. There should not be false assurance in any programme	5	2.8		
<b>Total N</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Percentage adds up to more than 100 due to multiple response.

## **Chapter 8**

### **Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations**

This chapter summarises the major findings of the study. It then draws conclusions from it and makes a series of recommendations.

#### **8.1 Trend analysis**

##### *Socio-economic characteristics*

The percentage of illiterate respondents, which was very high in both Dhading (72.4) and Siraha (71.6) at the time of baseline survey, has decreased in a span of three years. However, there are still 54.4 per cent of illiterates in Dhading and 63.8 per cent in Siraha, indicating that Siraha has lagged behind Dhading in this respect. The percentage of wage labourer, which was 13.8 in Dhading and 55.2 in Siraha at the time of baseline survey, has decreased to 3.8 in Dhading and 35.0 in Siraha in the same timeframe indicating that the decrease is low in Siraha. As is noteworthy, there are still a considerable percentage of families in Siraha (35 %) involved in it. Similarly, only 1.9 per cent of the Dalits of Dhading and 3.0 per cent of those of Siraha supported their family easily at the time of baseline survey. The percentage of Dalits supporting their family easily has now come up to 30.4 and 2.2 respectively, thus, suggesting that the Dalits of Siraha have fallen behind those of Dhading in this respect also. In addition, 3.9 per cent of the respondents of Dhading and 9.5 per cent of those of Siraha had expressed preference for education, literacy and awareness programme at the time of baseline survey. The percentage of respondents preferring them has now come up to 18.4 per cent in Dhading and 15.8 per cent in Siraha, thus, indicating that Siraha still rates low in terms of having preference for education, literacy and awareness. In brief, the improvements in the socio-economic scenario of Siraha are not in par with those of Dhading.

As has also been found, 16.6 per cent of the children of Dhading and 33.3 per cent of those of Siraha had their birth registered at the time of base line survey. The figures have now come up to 23 per cent in Dhading and 93.7 per cent in Siraha.

The terrain of Dhading was rough and the settlements there were dispersed, thus, making the social interaction difficult because of the difficulty it caused in traveling within and outside the settlements in general and in implementing development programmes in particular. On the other hand, the terrain of Siraha was gentle and the settlements there were nucleated, thus, making social interactions easier there. In the meantime, Siraha was characterized by higher percentage of Dalits, higher percentage of those who were illiterate, higher percentage of those who were unable to speak Nepali easily and higher percentage of those who were unable to support their family easily. In contrast, Dhading was characterized by a lower percentage of Dalits, lower percentage of illiterates, lower percentage of those who were unable to speak Nepali and lower percentage of those who could support their family with difficulty. Thus, it can be inferred that, persons with lower status (i.e. Dalits) were less literate, less able to speak Nepali and less able to

support their family easily as in Siraha and those with higher social status were more able to speak Nepali, more literate and more able to support their family easily as in Dhading. Understanding of this kind of relationship provides basis to analyze the inclusive aspect of the programme or to analyze how well the programme reached the marginalized communities by assessing how well the programme reached Dalits, who can be taken as proxy for all marginalized groups of people.

### *Knowledge*

The respondents' knowledge of six child rights as considered by the programme was lower in Dhading than in Siraha at the time of baseline survey. Over time, the knowledge of those rights has jumped in both districts. However, Siraha still lags behind Dhading in the knowledge of the prohibition of child marriage (Dhading 77.8 per cent versus Siraha 71.2 per cent) and prohibition of child in labour force (Dhading 76.6 per cent versus Siraha 68.4 per cent at present).

Mass media, schoolteacher, neighbours and inner self<sup>18</sup> constituted major sources of knowledge of the child rights at the time of baseline survey in Dhading. Even at present, mass media continue to be the dominant source of information followed by neighbours and inner self there. In Siraha, elite of community and mass media had major role in the past in this regard. However, elite of community is found as being gradually replaced by mass media and inner self over time. Regarding knowledge of SOP/FSP activities facilitators followed by own child and members of CMC constitute major sources in Dhading and facilitators constitute major source in Siraha at present.

### *Attitude*

Drastic improvements have been realized in both districts in the respondents' agreement with the six child rights over time. However, the rate of improvements are much higher in Dhading than in Siraha with respect to agreement on the right of every child to go to school (Dhading from 82.7 per cent to 97.7 per cent and Siraha from 85.8 per cent to 96.6 per cent), the right of girls to go to school as much as boys (Dhading from 82.1 per cent to 98.7 per cent and Siraha from 79.1 per cent to 94.4 per cent), the prohibition of child marriage (Dhading from 68.9 per cent to 93.7 per cent and Siraha from 68.7 per cent to 78 per cent), the right of handicapped children to go to school (Dhading from 74.5 per cent to 97.7 per cent and Siraha from 79.9 per cent to 92.7 per cent) and child care as the responsibility of parents (Dhading from 92.9 per cent to 98.7 per cent and Siraha from 96.3 per cent to 98.8 per cent).

With respect to the responsible person or institution to educate children, the percentage of respondents expressing the responsibility of those of parents has increased in Dhading (from 89.3 per cent to 91.8 per cent) but decreased in Siraha (from 98.5 per cent to 90.4 per cent). On the contrary, the percentage of respondents expressing the responsibility of government and of the community has decreased in Dhading but increased in Siraha.

---

<sup>18</sup> Inner self may also indicate that a person might have the knowledge of a fact, but does not know the exact source.

With respect to willingness to send children to SOP/FSP classes in the future, there has been an increase in the percentage of respondents of Dhading (from 84.2 per cent to 99.4 per cent), but a decrease of those of Siraha (from 97 per cent to 84.7 per cent). With respect to the percentage of respondents very much willing to send their children to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes, there has been an increase in both districts. However, the rate of increase is slightly higher in Siraha than in Dhading (Dhading from 82.6 per cent to 91 per cent and Siraha from 66.1 per cent to 98.9 per cent). With respect to the percentage of respondents reporting the existence of out-of school children in the community, there has been a drastic decrease in Dhading (Dhading from 98.5 per cent to 29.7 per cent), but the rate of decrease is very low in Siraha (Siraha from 97 per cent to 82.5 per cent).

### *Practice*

The participation of respondents in the SOP/FSP activities with respect to making contribution in cash (Dhading from 36.3 per cent to 6.5 per cent and Siraha from 42.6 per cent to 3.1 per cent), labour (Dhading from 97.5 per cent to 2.2 per cent and Siraha from 68.1 per cent to 1 per cent) and educational materials (Dhading from 1.3 per cent to 0.7 per cent and Siraha from 14.9 per cent to 0.0 per cent) has drastically reduced in both districts from the time of baseline survey. But the percentage of respondents not participating in these activities because of poverty has increased in Dhading and decreased in Siraha (Dhading from 7.7 per cent to 15.8 per cent and Siraha from 48.3 per cent to 39.7 per cent). The reason for not participating in the activities because of inability to give time has increased in both districts (Dhading from 10.3 per cent to 63.2 per cent and Siraha from 5.7 per cent to 79 per cent).

The percentage of respondents encouraging their children to go to school/become educated has grown faster in Dhading than in Siraha (Dhading from 73.5 per cent to 100 per cent and Siraha from 88.1 per cent to 97.2 per cent). Similarly there has been an increase in both districts in the percentage of respondents discussing with their children (Dhading from 59 per cent to 96.8 per cent and Siraha from 54.6 per cent to 89.8 per cent), family members (Dhading from 71.4 per cent to 82.2 per cent and Siraha from 73.1 per cent to 78.5 per cent) and neighbours (Dhading from 28.6 per cent to 80.4 per cent to and Siraha from 26.9 per cent to 76.3 per cent) about child education.

## **8.2 Cross-sectional analysis of community mobilization activities under CASP**

The trend analysis as discussed above has made it clear that many KAP indicators were good in Siraha than in Dhading at the time of baseline survey. However, at the time of end line survey only a few KAP indicators, namely the rate of birth registration and willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes, were better in Siraha and the rest of all KAP indicators were better in Dhading despite the fact that the indicators had a positive trend even in Siraha, thus, showing the ability of Siraha to reap the benefits of the programme despite the fact that it was introduced there for a short time. Two major questions that, therefore, need to be answered are (1) What factors

or activities were most important in speeding up the evolution of indicators in Dhading which were very bad there at the time of baseline survey but which improved drastically there at the time of end line survey, and (2) How well were the activities synchronized or in harmony with one another to widen up the baseline-end line KAP gap faster in Dhading than in Siraha? This subsection provides answers to these questions by referring to odds ratios (See Annex 3 for estimating odds ratios) , which show the number of times an activity is likely to influence an outcome or indicator in Dhading or the programme area, and the matrix of correlation coefficients.

### *Knowledge and community mobilization activities*

#### Influential activities in aggregate

In aggregate, the relationship of knowledge-related indicators namely the knowledge of SOP/FSP activities, knowledge of the right of every child to go school, knowledge of the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys, knowledge of the prohibition of child marriage, knowledge of the prohibition of child labour, knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go to school and knowledge of the responsibility of parents to child education was found very high with three major groups of SOP/FSP activities namely the provision of incentives for best students, organization of interactive programme between community people and children, and provision of support on physical infrastructure by community as shown by the relatively high odds ratios<sup>19</sup>. From this finding, it can be inferred that while the other activities were also influential in both districts to widen the baseline-end line KAP gaps, these three activities were particularly responsible for widening such gaps faster in Dhading. However, as indicated by the odds ratios which are less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.1).

#### Influential activities among the marginalized groups<sup>20</sup>

When the marginalized groups (i.e Dalits) of Dhading were compared with those of Siraha to assess the influence of structural factors such as ability to speak Nepali, literacy, social status and ability to support family and to assess the inclusive aspect of the programme or to assess how well the programme reached the marginalized groups, four major activities, namely formation of child club, provision of incentives for best students, organization of sensitization meetings on child rights and interactive programme among stakeholders were found as having high odds ratio ,thus, indicating that they were largely responsible for widening the gap in the knowledge-related indicators as found between the baseline and end line survey in Dhading.

This means, activities like the interaction between the community people and children and provision of support on physical infrastructure as found important in influencing the knowledge- related indicators in aggregate were relatively less inclusive. In other words,

---

<sup>19</sup> For details, readers are urged to review the tables on odds ratios as presented in Annex 4.

<sup>20</sup> Note also that odds ratios are usually higher in Annex 5 than in Annex 4 and this indicates that the CASP interventions were inclusive and the indicators were less affected by structural factors in Dhading as compared to Siraha.

they were relatively less able to break the influence of structural factors. On the other hand, activities with relatively high odds ratios such as formation of child club and organization of sensitization meetings on child rights were found more inclusive in Dhading. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.2).

### *Attitude and community mobilization activities*

#### Influential activities in aggregate

In aggregate, the relationship of the indicators of attitude, namely willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities, agreement with the six child rights and willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP, was found very high with three major groups of SOP/FSP activities namely willingness to participate in the incentives programmes for best students, willingness to participate in interactive programme among community people and children and willingness to support on physical infrastructure as shown by the relatively high odds ratios. From this, it can be inferred that these three activities were relatively good in Dhading and, thus, helped widen fast the KAP gap there between the baseline and end line attitude indicators. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.1).

#### Influential activities among the marginalized groups

When the marginalized groups of Siraha were compared with those of Dhading, three major activities, namely willingness to participate in the formation of child club, organization of sensitization meetings on child rights and interactive programme among stakeholders were found strongly associated with the attitude-related indicators as discussed above. It is noteworthy that the relative importance of activities such as willingness to participate in the incentive programme for best students, willingness to participate in the organization of sensitization meetings on child rights, and willingness to participate in interactive programme among community people and children as found important in the previous analysis were found relatively less important from the inclusion point of view. In other words, the effect of structural factor was strong there. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (See Annex table 4.2).

### *Practice and community mobilization activities*

#### Influential activities in aggregate

In aggregate, the relationship of the practice-related indicators namely actual participation in SOP/FSP activities, encouragement to study and discussions with children, family members and neighbours about child education was found high with actual participation in providing incentives for best students, interactive programme

between community people and children and provision of support on physical infrastructure by community. However, as indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was found more effective in Siraha (Annex Table 4.1).

#### Influential activities among the marginalized groups

When the marginalized groups are compared, the relationship of the practice-related indicators as discussed above was found strong with actual participation in the formation of child club, in the organization of sensitization meetings and in the interaction programme among stakeholders. Note that provision of incentives for best student, interactive programme between community people and children and provision of support on physical infrastructure by community did not become important any longer after the influence of structural factor is controlled. As indicated by the odds ratios of less than 1, participation in the provision of encouragement to send child to school through door-to-door visit was still found more effective in Siraha (Annex table 4.2).

### **8.3 Synchronization among indicators**

This section describes the association or degree of synchronization between different KAP indicators using the matrix of correlation coefficients which were derived by running correlation analysis in which the 20 KAP indicators were used as variables and the 14 SOP/FSP activities were used as observations. In other words, the matrices of odds ratios were used to run the correlation analysis.

#### *Knowledge*

##### Correlation in aggregate

Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities was found significantly correlated only with a few indicators namely the knowledge of prohibition of child labour, knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go to school, agreement on the rights of every girls to go to school as much as boys and agreement on the prohibition of child labour. With the rest of KAP indicators the correlation of knowledge of the SOP/FSP activities was found low or insignificant.

The six child rights were found well correlated with all other KAP indicators/variables with some exception of the knowledge of the handicapped children to go to school, agreement on the rights of the handicapped children to go to school and willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities (Annex table 5.1).

##### Correlation after controlling the effects of structural factors

After comparing the marginalized groups, the scenario of correlation is found slightly changed. For example, knowledge of SOP/FSP activities was found well correlated with several KAP variables except for willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities and willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes.

Knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go to school which was found poorly correlated in the previous analysis was found well correlated with other variables after the influence of structural factors are taken into consideration . (Annex table 5.2).

### *Attitude*

#### Correlation in aggregate

Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities was found significantly correlated only with a few variables namely the knowledge of prohibition of child labour, agreement on the prohibition of child marriage, willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes, encouragement to study/education and discussions with family members.

The six variables on agreement with child rights were found correlated well with the rest of variables except for the relatively poor correlation with agreement on same right for girls to go to school as much as boys, agreement on prohibition of child labour and agreement on the rights of the handicapped children to go to school (Annex table 5.1).

#### Correlation after controlling the effect of structural factors

Willingness to participate in the SOP/FSP activities was found correlating well only with two variables which were the knowledge of rights of every child to go to school and agreement with the rights of handicapped children to go to school. Knowledge of the prohibition of child labour as found significant before examining the effect of structural factors was not found significant any longer. Similarly, agreement on the prohibition of child marriage, willingness to send child to formal school after the completion of SOP/FSP classes and discussions with family members which were significant earlier were not found significant any longer (Annex table 5.2).

### *Practice*

#### Correlation in aggregate

As was found, actual participation in SOP/FSP activities correlated well with a great majority of the KAP indicators except for the knowledge of prohibition of child labour, knowledge of the rights of the handicapped children to go to school, agreement on the same rights of girls to go to school as those of boys, agreement on the prohibition of child labour and agreement on the rights of the handicapped children to go to school.

To summarize, the indicators/variables were found very well correlated. However, it is noteworthy that knowledge SOP/FSP activities, willingness to participate in them and actual participation in them were found very poorly correlated among themselves. On the other hand, knowledge of the child rights issues, agreement on the rights issues and other practice-related indicators such as encouragement to study/education, and discussions with children, family members and neighbours were found well correlated (Annex table 5.1).

#### Correlation after controlling the effect of structural factors

Actual participation in SOP/FSP activities was found well correlated with all other indicators except for the knowledge of the rights of handicapped children to go school and willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities (Annex table 5.2).

### **8.4 CASP SOP/FSP outcome assessment**

#### *Outcome related with KAP indicators and other child education issues*

Regular implementation of CASP has produced many desirable changes in the programme communities of Dhading. The positive changes are largely realised with respect to increase in the KAP of parents on several child education issues. To be specific, CASP has been able to increase the knowledge of parents on several of the child rights issues, cause positive attitudes towards those rights issues, motivate parents to send their children in ASP classes in the future, motivate parents to send their children to formal school after the completion of ASP, and inspire parents to discuss with their children, family and neighbours about their children's education. All these changes do jointly contribute to high retention rates in the SOP/FSP classes. To be specific, when compared to the situation of Siraha, CASP has also been able to minimize the effects of dislike of children to study and the need to work at home for living in Dhading. In light of these many positive changes which CASP has brought about in the programme communities of Dhading, it is adjudged that the programme is worth replication in other parts of Nepal as well.

#### *Community mobilization activities under CASP*

The study found community mobilization activities, namely provision of incentives for best students, organisation of interactive programme between community people and children, provision of support on physical infrastructure by the community, formation of child club, organization of sensitisation meetings on child rights and interactive programmes among the stakeholders, as contributing most to positive changes in the KAP of parent as indicated by their high odds ratios. It is particularly believed that while provision of incentives for best students serves the needs of the marginalised groups of parents to get incentives<sup>21</sup> and duly honors their children<sup>22</sup>, formation of child club makes the school environment more child-friendly, thus, minimizing drop out rate among children who do not like to go to school. It is further believed that while provision of support on physical infrastructure paves way to exchanges of ideas among community people, it also increases the sense of ownership of the programme among them. Additionally it is believed that interaction programmes among community people,

---

<sup>21</sup> Note that non-provision of incentives/scholarship is one of the major reasons for dropout and for not sending children to school.

<sup>22</sup> It is also felt that provision of ID cards and school uniforms to the SOP/FSP children can increase their sense of belonging to the school.

children, community people and stakeholders largely enforce the value of education in the community.

The study also found high correlation between the knowledge of child rights issues, attitudes towards those issues and the accompanying changes in their behaviour. Thus, in order to realize synchronization in the KAP of parents, the community mobilisation activities as mentioned above are recommended for consideration while replicating the CASP. Needless to say, utmost care needs to be taken to ensure that these activities mainstream the marginalised groups of people. It is also noteworthy that in communities like Siraha where the terrain is gentle and settlements are nucleated, the door-to-door visit programmes urging parents to send their children to school can have good results even with little efforts. Such activities are, therefore, worth replication in similar geographic areas.

#### *Further analysis of Influential Factors in Siraha*

Despite limited community mobilisation activities, the KAP indicators in Siraha were nearly as good as those of Dhading even though the indicators there were much higher than those of Dhading at the time of baseline survey. The reasons why the KAP indicators were good in Siraha at the time of endline survey are not clearly understood. However, it is assumed to be due to the demonstration effect of several child-focused programme which was implemented there by Save the Children for several years. It is also believed to be due to the implementation of Child Development Centers with the support of UNICEF. Organization of door-to-door visit which was very successful in Siraha (as indicated by the odds ratios) because of gentle terrain and nucleated settlements is also believed to have influenced the KAP of parents there. Finally, Indian mass media is also suspected to have played an important role there in this regard.

#### *Parental suggestions*

As the study found, the people of Siraha expect more materialistic support/incentives from the programme (refer to tables 3.6 and 5.11 and compare tables 7.1 and 7.2), while those of Dhading have internalized the thrust of CASP programme and accordingly expect support that relate to its institutionalization and replication in secondary education situation as well. Based on the ability of CASP to cause "internalization" of education among the parents, it is further recommended for replication.

While doing so, due consideration need to be given to the suggestions offered by the parents as outlined in Chapter 7<sup>23</sup>. These suggestions, in addition to provision of incentives, basically include improvement of school in such terms as physical structure, room and land; provision of experienced teachers<sup>24</sup> in larger number; provision of higher salaries to teachers; improvement of water, sanitation and sports facilities in schools; enforcing the monitoring system; and institutionalizing the alternative schooling

---

<sup>23</sup> For details, see Chapter 7.

<sup>24</sup> Note that inability to understand what teachers taught was one of the causes of dropout.

programme in general and extending it to the situation of lower secondary education in particular.

## **8.5 Conclusion and recommendations**

Based on the foregoing discussion that is based on the analysis of data, it has become clear that CASP, which included various community mobilisation activities, had positive influence on the development of the parental KAP in Dhading where the community mobilisation activities were intensive as compared to Siraha, where there were no such activities. Especially, activities such as interactive programmes, formation of child club and organisation of sensitisation meeting, are not expensive for implementation. Therefore, it is highly recommended to expand such experience and lesson learnt of CASP to wider areas in Nepal.

However, at this juncture, it is also important to note that other influential activities such as provision of incentives for best students, improvement in physical infrastructure and increase in the salary of facilitators can be very costly if the programme is replicated in a wider area. To address these problems, CASP is highly recommended for fundraising at the community, district, central and international levels and tie up its programme with relevant programmes of the government (e.g. school feeding programme, scholarship programme for the disadvantaged groups) and donor communities in the meantime.

Among the many good achievements, the study also found that there were risks of children dropping out of school due to the need to work for living and due to early marriage. To address the first problem that relates to the poverty and ignorance of parents, CASP is strongly recommended to tie up its programme with the rural development programmes of the donor communities that focus on poverty alleviation and adult literacy. To address the second problem, more focus on advocacy is needed to safeguard the rights of young girls not to be married early or before their personality develops fully. This could be also enforced through door-to-door visits and individual consultations in addition to mass media.

Finally, the percentage of children participating in the ASP was not so high even in Dhading (see Table 3.3). This was largely due to a small quota set on the number of children per class. To encourage participation of a larger number of community children in such classes, it is strongly recommended that the quota be larger in the future.

## **REFERENCES**

CASP. 2004. Terms of Reference for Local NGOs to Implement Pilot Activities under the Community- based Alternative Schooling Project. Kathmandu.

IIDS. 2005. Knowledge Attitude and Practice (KAP) Survey under the Community-based Alternative Schooling Project in Siraha and Dhading District CASP/JICA, Kathmandu.

National Planning Commission. 2007. Three Year Interim Plan. National Planning Commission. Kathmandu





22. What are the things that you prioritize for the development of this community? (**Rank three main priorities**)

1. Agriculture, Livestock and Vegetable Farming
2. Road Construction/maintenance
3. Irrigation and River Control
4. Forest Development and Conservation
5. Electricity
6. Health and Sanitation
7. Education, Literacy and Awareness
8. Physical structure/community Buildings
9. Drinking Water
10. Income Generation Activities
11. Saving and Credit
12. Control of Alcohol
13. Anti trafficking
14. Others (specify)
15. I don't know

**Family Demography and Schooling of Children**

23. How many children aged 0-17 years do you have in the family? \_\_\_\_\_

24. Please provide information on the children up to 17 years of age regarding their schooling.

S.N	Name of child	Age	.Sex M=1 F=2	Is the child's birth registered? Yes=1 No=2	Did the child attend alternative school/class for children 6-8 years of age (SOP) or for children 8-14 years of age (FSP)? (Explain alternative school if necessary)  1= Yes for 6-8 years of age 2= Yes for 8-14 years of age (SOP) 3= No	Did the child complete the three year class or drop out in the middle?  1=Completed the course 2=Dropped out in the middle	If child dropped out from the middle of SOP/FSP course, why? (Write codes from those listed below)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1							
2							
3							
4							

**Codes for column (7) :Reasons for dropout**

1. Child did not like to go to alternative school (SOP/FSP)
2. Child needed to work at home for living
3. Child was little too young/old to attend
4. The location of alternative school class was too far
5. The time of alternative school was not convenient
6. The alternative school was irregular
7. Child did not understand what teacher taught
8. Classmates did not behave well/downplayed
9. The physical facilities were bad
10. Dress was not provided free
11. Tiffin was not provided free
12. Educational materials (notebooks, pens) were not provided free
13. Scholarship money was not provided
14. The child was married
15. We could not prepare meal/feed child in time
16. Parents married another person
17. Others (specify)

25. Why did you send your child to alternative school (SOP/FSP) and not to formal school? (**Explain formal school if necessary**) (multiple response)

1. Class was held in convenient location
2. Class was held in convenient time
3. Education was free
4. School uniform, tiffin and scholarship money were available free
5. Children were taught by local facilitators
6. It was easy to understand what the teachers taught
7. Other s (specify)

26. Did some people tell you to send your children to SOP/FSP at first time?

1. Yes      2.No (*Go to Q 28*)

27. If yes, who were they? (*multiple response*)

1. Members of Class Management Committee (CMC)
2. Education Volunteers
3. Facilitators
4. School Teachers
5. People from NGOs
6. Resource Persons (RP sir)
7. Other Elite of Community
8. Neighbors
9. Others (specify)

**Knowledge/Awareness of Respondents on Child Education**

28. Did you know whether the following interventions were conducted in your community to encourage the educational participation of 6-8 and 8-14 year old children who did not go to formal school ? (**Ask all questions below**) If yes, from which source? (*Use only one source*)

<p><b>Interventions</b> (<i>Now ask the following questions to the respondent</i>)</p>	<p>Knowledge of interventions 1=Yes 2=No 3=Don't know/not sure</p>	<p>28b If yes, source of knowledge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members of Class Management Committee (CMC)</li> <li>2. Education Volunteers</li> <li>3. Facilitators</li> <li>4. School Teachers</li> <li>5. People from NGOs</li> <li>6. Resource Persons (RP sir)</li> <li>7. Other Elite of Community</li> <li>8. Neighbors</li> <li>9. Mass media (street drama, hoarding board, etc)</li> <li>10. From inner self</li> <li>11. Programme itself</li> <li>12. Own child</li> <li>13. Others (specify)</li> </ol>
<p>1. Did you know that there was organization of introductory (orientation) meetings of SOP/FSP (<i>programme for children not going to formal school</i>) targeting community leaders, parents, formal school</p>		

teachers, employees of working children and other relevant stakeholders?		
2. Did you know that there was organization of Class Management Committee (CMC) comprising of parents, formal school teachers, community people, and the facilitator and its activities? ( <i>Explain class management committee if necessary</i> )		
3. Did you know that there was identification of Education Volunteers (EVs) in the target communities or nearby communities (e.g. retired teachers, educated youth and educated community people) and their activities to assist Facilitators and SOP/FSP students?		
4. Did you know that there was formation of Child Club in each classes to carryout various extracurricular activities such as sports, cleanliness, song and dance, <i>Deusi-Bhailo</i> and wall posters? ( <i>Explain child club if necessary</i> )		
5. Did you know that there was provision of some incentives/awards for selected best students of the class and winners of the extracurricular activities?		
6. Did you know that there was organization of a series of sensitization meetings or workshops regarding education for all including SOP/FSP and child rights through such means as role-play, video, flip charts, and talk show?		
7. Did you know that there was arrangement of Parents' Visiting Day in each class?		
8. Did you know that there was provision of encouragement to the parents to continue to send their children to classes through door-to-door visits?		
9. Did you know that there was interactive programme among community people, CMC, mother school, School Management Committee (SMS) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA), such as role play, 1 day discussion, use of flip chart, <i>Bhajan</i> , lecture and street drama?		
10. Did you know that there was interactive programme between <u>community people</u> and <u>SOP/FSP children</u> , such as role-play, 1 day discussion, use of flip chart, <i>Bhajan</i> , lecture and street drama?		
11. Did you know that there was support of community on physical facility as on making buildings, making arrangement of drinking water faucet, toilet and making cash and labor contribution?		

29. Did you hear the following statements before? (*Prompt all statements listed below*)

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Statements</i></p>	<p>1=Yes 2= No</p>	<p>29b If yes, from what source did you hear about them? (use <i>only one major source</i>)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members of Class Management Committee (CMC)</li> <li>2. Education Volunteers</li> <li>3. Facilitators</li> <li>4. School Teachers</li> <li>5. People from NGOs</li> <li>6. Resource Persons (RP Sir)</li> <li>7. Other Elite of Community</li> <li>8. Neighbors</li> <li>9. Mass media (hoarding board etc)</li> <li>10. Knew from inner self</li> <li>11. Programme itself</li> <li>12. Own child</li> <li>13. Others (specify)</li> </ol>
1. It is the right of every child to go to school		
2. It is the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys		
3. Nepalese law prohibits child marriage		
4. It is illegal to send children to labor force		
5. Handicapped/disabled children have same right as the normal children to go to school		
6. Child care is the responsibility of parents		

**Attitude of Respondents on Child Education**

30. Please tell us about the extent to which you agree with the following statements (**Prompt all statements listed below**).

<i>Statements</i>	1 = Agree very much 2 = Agree only to some extent 3 = Do not agree
1.It is the right of every child to go to school	
2.It is the right of every girl child to go to school as much as boys	
3.Nepalese law prohibits child marriage	
4.It is illegal to send children to labor force	
5.Handicapped/disabled children have same right as the normal children to go to school	
6.Child care is the responsibility of parents	

31. In your opinion, whose responsibility is it to educate children? (*multiple response*)

1. Parents and Family
2. Schools and Teachers
3. Government
4. Community/society
5. NGOs or other aid organizations
6. Others (specify)

32. If you are requested, will you do the following activities in the future? (**Ask all questions below**)

<b>Activity-related questions</b>	1=Yes 2 = No 3= Don't know/not sure
1.Will you participate in introductory (orientation) meetings of SOP/FSP targeting community leaders, parents, formal school teachers, employees of working children and other relevant stakeholders?	
2. Will you participation in Class Management Committee (CMC) comprising of parents, formal school teachers, community people, and the facilitator and its activities?	
3. Will you serve as an Education Volunteer (EV) in the target communities or nearby	

communities to assist Facilitators and SOP/FSP students?	
4. Will you facilitate Child Club in each class to carryout various extracurricular activities such as sports, cleanliness, song and dance, <i>Deusi-Bhailo</i> and wall posters?	
5. Will you cooperate with the provision of some incentives/awards for selected best students of the class and winners of the extracurricular activities?	
6. Will you participate in sensitization meetings or workshops regarding education for all including SOP/FSP and child rights through such means as role-play, video, flip charts and talk show?	
7. Will you participate in Parents' Visiting Day in your child's class?	
8 Will you participate in encouraging the other parents to send or continue to send their children to schools including alternative schools?	
9. Will you participate in interactive programme among community people, CMC ,mother school, School Management Committee (SMS) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA), such as role-play, 1 day discussion, use of flip chart, <i>Bhajan</i> , lecture and street drama?	
10. Will you participate in interactive programme between <u>community people</u> and <u>SOP/FSP children</u> , such as role-play, 1 day discussion, use of flip chart, <i>Bhajan</i> , lecture and street drama?	
11. Will you cooperate in providing support on physical facility by the community in matters such as making buildings, making arrangement for drinking water, toilet and making cash and labor contribution?	
12. Will you contribute in cash?	
13. Will you contribute in labor?	
14. Will you participate in skill oriented programme for children (such as handicraft)?	

33. In your opinion, what are the good things about education? (*multiple response*) and what made you think so?

	<p>33-b.  <b>Influential source (<i>use one main source</i>)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members of Class Management Committee (CMC)</li> <li>2. Education Volunteers</li> <li>3. Facilitators</li> <li>4. School Teachers</li> <li>5. People from NGOs</li> <li>6. Resource Persons (RP sir)</li> <li>7. Other Elite of Community</li> <li>8. Neighbors</li> <li>9. Mass media (including hoarding board, etc)</li> <li>10. Inner self</li> <li>11. Programme itself</li> <li>12. Own child</li> <li>13. Others (specify)</li> <li>14. Don't know</li> </ol>
1.Helps get good opportunity	
2. One can learn good things	
3.Helps in the prosperity of country and community	
4. Makes future good	
5. Helps to become smart/go abroad	
6. Enhances accounting skill	
7.Makes people smart enough not to be cheated	
8. Helps earn money and get job	
9. Enhances skill	
10. Helps earn respect	
11. Others	
12. Don't know	

34. How much will you be willing to send other child of yours, who do not go to alternative school or mother school, to alternative schools if the alternative schooling programmes are continued in the future as well?

1. Very much willing      2. Somewhat willing      3. Only little willing      4. Not willing

35. Are you willing to send your child to formal school after the completion of alternative school programme?

1. Yes      2. My child has already started going to formal school (Go to Q. 37)  
 3. No (Go to Q 38)

36. If you are willing to send your child to formal school after the completion of alternative

schooling programme, how much are you willing?

1. Very much willing
2. Somewhat willing (Go to Q. 38)
3. Only little willing (Go to Q. 38)
4. Not willing (Go to Q. 38)

37. If you are very much willing or have already sent your child to formal school, what/who inspired you to think so? (*Use only one code from below and skip to Q. 39*)

1. Members of Class Management Committee (CMC)
2. Education Volunteers
3. Facilitators
4. School Teachers
5. People from NGOs
6. Resource Persons (RP sir)
7. Other Elite of Community
8. Neighbors
9. Mass media (hoarding board, etc)
10. Inner self
11. Programme itself
12. Own child
13. Others (specify)

38. If you are not willing or have not sent your child to formal school, why? (*Ask this question if the answer is not willing in Q. 35*)

1. Education is not necessary
2. Child does not like to go to school
3. Child is handicapped
4. Child needs to work at home for living
5. Child is little too young/old to go to school
6. There is no school nearby/school is too far
7. Child likes to play more than study
8. School is irregular
9. It is heard that teachers do not teach well
10. Physical facilities are poor
11. Classmates do not behave well/downplay
12. Do not provide notebooks, pencils, tiffin, etc
13. It is not a good thing to send girls to school as they become member of other family after marriage
14. It is not a good thing to send girls to school as they wind up in kitchen work after they become married
15. Security situation is not good
16. Behavior of teacher are discouraging (rude, cruel, discriminatory, etc)
17. We cannot prepare meal/feed child in time
18. Political bias (civil war)



meetings of SOP/FSP	
2. Participated in Class Management Committee (CMC)	
3. Served as an Education Volunteer (EV) to assist Facilitators	
4. Facilitated Child Club	
5. Cooperated in the provision of some incentives/awards for selected best students of the class and winners of the extracurricular activities?	
6. Participated in a series of sensitization meetings or workshops about child rights	
7. Participated in Parents' Visiting Day in child's class	
8 Encouraged other parents to send or continue to send their children to schools (including SOP/FSP classes)	
9. Participated in interactive programme among community people	
10. Participated in interactive programme between <u>community people</u> and <u>SOP/FSP children</u>	
11. Cooperated in the provision of support on physical facility by the community	
12. Contributed in cash	
13. Contributed in labor	
14. Contributed in educational materials for handicraft, etc	
15. Others (specify)	

43. If you did not participate in any alternative schooling related activities, why? (*Ask this question if the answer is no in Q. 41*) (multiple response)

1. I am poor
2. *I cannot give time*
3. No one has told me to contribute
4. I do not care
5. School is far
6. I do not know about education
7. A woman should not go everywhere

8. *Because government does everything*

9. *Others (specify)*

12. *Don't know*

44. Did you encourage your child to attend alternative school?

1. Yes      2. No (*Go to Q.47*)

45. If you encouraged your child to attend alternative school, how? (*multiple response*)

1. Advised child on the value of education
2. Coaxed the child to study
3. Motivated child to study than to play
4. Gave examples of good persons
5. Encouraged child to do home assignments
6. Helped child to do home work
7. Advised child that s/he will not be downplayed by others
8. Advised child to avoid bad company
9. Did household chores ourselves
10. Fed child in time
11. Gave child the educational materials
12. Bore cost of education
13. Promised to buy school dress
14. Others (specify)

46. Which activities were most influential in motivating you to encourage your child to attend alternative school programme? (**Prompt the activities listed below**)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Activities</b></p> <p><i>(Note that activities of Q. 28/ 32 are abbreviated here)</i></p>	<p><i>Influence of activity</i></p> <p>1=Influencing 2=Not influencing 3=Don't know/ not sure</p>	<p>46b. If motivating, what/who motivated you to encourage/ (use one major code from below)</p>
1. Organization of introductory (orientation) meetings of alternative schooling programme		
2. Organization of Class Management Committee (CMC)		
3. Identification of Education Volunteers		
4. Formation of Child Club in each classes to carryout various extracurricular activities		
5. Provision of some incentives/awards for the children who do well in class and the child's club		
6. Organization of a series of sensitization meetings or workshops on child rights		
7. Arrangement of Parents' Visiting Day in each class		
8 Provision of encouragement for the parents to continue to send their children to classes through door-to-door visits		
9. Interactive programme among community people, CMC, mother school, School Management Committee (SMS) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA)		
10. Interactive programme between <u>community people</u> and <u>SOP/FSP children</u>		
11. Support on physical facility by the community		
12. Visit of children to mother school		
13. Health services in alternative school		
14. Sports service in alternative school		
15. Others ( <b>Prompt here also the answer of others-specify category in Q.42</b> )		
<p>Codes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members of Class Management Committee (CMC)</li> <li>2. Education Volunteers</li> <li>3. Facilitators</li> <li>4. School Teachers</li> <li>5. People from NGOs</li> <li>6. Resource Persons (RP sir)</li> <li>7. Other Elite of Community</li> <li>8. Neighbors</li> <li>9. Mass media (including hoarding board)</li> <li>10. Inner self</li> <li>11. Programme itself</li> <li>12. Own child</li> <li>13 Others (specify)</li> </ol>		

47. If you did not encourage your child to go to alternative school programme, why? (*multiple response*)(Ask this question if the answer is no in Q. 44)

1. It is not my concern
2. I do not have time
3. I am not educated
4. I do not know about modern education
5. Child is too young/old
6. Child needs to work for living
7. Child does not like to listen to my advice
8. There is no school nearby
9. Other children also do not go to school
10. Others (specify)
11. Don't know

48. Have you ever talked with your children about their education?

1. Yes
2. No (*Go to Q50*)

49. If yes, on what topics have you talked? (*multiple response*)

1. Discussion about need to study hard
2. Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and make respected
3. Discussion about teaching environment in school
4. Discussion about school homework
5. Discussion about educational materials
6. Discussion about success/failure in examination
7. Discussion about regularity of teachers
8. Discussion about children who do not go to school
9. Others (specify)

50. Have you ever talked with your family members about your children's education?

1. Yes
2. No (*Go to 52*)

51. If yes, on what topics have you talked?

1. Discussion about the need to study hard
2. Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and make respected
3. Discussion about teaching environment in school
4. Discussion about school homework
5. Discussion about educational materials
6. Discussion about success/failure in examination
7. Discussion about regularity of teachers
8. Discussion about children who do not go to school
9. Others (specify)

52. Have you ever talked with your neighbors/community members about child education?

1. Yes
2. No (*Go to Q.54*)

53. If yes, on what topics have you talked?

1. Discussion about need to study hard
2. Telling that education makes a person great, helps get job and make respected
3. Discussion about teaching environment in school
4. Discussion about school homework
5. Discussion about educational materials
6. Discussion about success/failure in examination
7. Discussion about regularity of teachers
8. Discussion about children who do not go to school
9. Others (specify)

**Recommendations**

54. What should be done to make the alternative schooling programme even more effective in the future? Please give two major recommendations.

1.

2.

Time taken for interview: \_\_\_\_\_ Starting time: \_\_\_\_\_ Completion time: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

***(Thank the respondent for giving valuable time)***

## Annex 2: Summary of Indicators by VDC

### I: Indicator of knowledge and awareness regarding child education among respondents in Dhading

I	Indicator	District	End line data	I	Indicator	District	End line data	I	Indicator	District	End line data
1	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>children's right to go to school</b>	Dhading SOP	89.7	2	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>equal right between girls and boys</b>	Dhading SOP	88.5	3	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>prohibition of child marriage</b>	Dhading SOP	75.9
		Jogimara	77.3			Jogimara	72.7			Jogimara	63.6
		Dhusa	95.0			Dhusa	95.0			Dhusa	90.0
		Benighat	92.3			Benighat	92.3			Benighat	53.8
		Gajuri	91.7			Gajuri	91.7			Gajuri	75.0
		Dhading FSP	88.7			Dhading FSP	93.0			Dhading FSP	80.3
		Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	87.5			Jogimara	81.3
		Dhusa	78.9			Dhusa	84.2			Dhusa	57.9
		Benighat	82.4			Benighat	100.0			Benighat	88.2
		Gajuri	94.7			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	94.7
4	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>prohibition of child labor force</b>	Dhading SOP	79.3	5	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>equal right between handicapped/disabled children and normal children</b>	Dhading SOP	85.1	6	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>parents' responsibility for child care</b>	Dhading SOP	96.6
		Jogimara	59.1			Jogimara	77.3			Jogimara	90.9
		Dhusa	95.0			Dhusa	90.0			Dhusa	100.0
		Benighat	61.5			Benighat	76.9			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	83.3			Gajuri	91.7			Gajuri	91.7
		Dhading FSP	73.2			Dhading FSP	71.8			Dhading FSP	93.0
		Jogimara	81.3			Jogimara	81.3			Jogimara	100.0
		Dhusa	42.1			Dhusa	36.8			Dhusa	78.9
		Benighat	76.5			Benighat	70.6			Benighat	94.1
		Gajuri	94.7			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0

II: Indicator of attitude regarding child education among respondents in **Dhading**

	Indicator	District	End line data		Indicator	District	End line data			District	End line data
1	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>children's right to go to school</b>	Dhading SOP	97.7	2	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>equal right between girls and boys</b>	Dhading SOP	100.0	3	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>prohibition of child marriage</b>	Dhading SOP	92.0
		Jogimara	90.9			Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	86.4
		Dhusa	100.0			Dhusa	100.0			Dhusa	92.5
		Benighat	100.0			Benighat	100.0			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	91.7
		Dhading FSP	97.2			Dhading FSP	97.2			Dhading FSP	95.8
		Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	93.8			Jogimara	81.3
		Dhusa	89.5			Dhusa	94.7			Dhusa	100.0
		Benighat	100.0			Benighat	100.0			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0
4	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>prohibition of child labor force</b>	Dhading SOP	89.7	5	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>equal right between handicapped/disabled children and normal children</b>	Dhading SOP	97.7	6	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>parents' responsibility for child care</b>	Dhading SOP	100.0
		Jogimara	81.8			Jogimara	95.5			Jogimara	100.0
		Dhusa	90.0			Dhusa	100.0			Dhusa	100.0
		Benighat	100.0			Benighat	92.3			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	91.7			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0
		Dhading FSP	83.1			Dhading FSP	97.2			Dhading FSP	97.2
		Jogimara	81.3			Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	100.0
		Dhusa	68.4			Dhusa	94.7			Dhusa	89.5
		Benighat	82.4			Benighat	94.1			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0

7	Percentage of respondents who perceive that parents should take responsibility to educate children	Dhading SOP	93.1	8	Percentage of respondents who are <b>willing very much to send children to formal school after completion of FSP/SOP</b>	Dhading SOP	100.0
		Jogimara	86.4			Jogimara	100.0
		Dhusa	97.5			Dhusa	100.0
		Benighat	84.6			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0
		Dhading FSP	90.1			Dhading FSP	100.0
		Jogimara	93.8			Jogimara	100.0
		Dhusa	84.2			Dhusa	100.0
		Benighat	88.2			Benighat	100.0
		Gajuri	94.7			Gajuri	100.0

III: Indicator of practice regarding child education among respondents in **Dhading**

	Indicator	District	End line data		Indicator	District	End line data		Indicator	District	End line data
1	Percentage of respondents who <b>encourage children to become educated</b>	Dhading SOP	100.0	2	Percentage of respondents who discuss <b>with children about their education</b>	Dhading SOP	97.7	3	Percentage of respondents who discuss <b>with family members about children's education</b>	Dhading SOP	83.9
		Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	90.9			Jogimara	68.2
		Dhusa	100.0			Dhusa	100.0			Dhusa	87.5
		Benighat	100.0			Benighat	100.0			Benighat	92.3
		Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	91.7
		Dhading FSP	100.0			Dhading FSP	95.8			Dhading FSP	81.7
		Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	100.0			Jogimara	75.0
		Dhusa	100.0			Dhusa	89.5			Dhusa	73.7
		Benighat	100.0			Benighat	100.0			Benighat	88.2
		Gajuri	100.0			Gajuri	94.7			Gajuri	89.5
4	Percentage of respondents who discuss with neighbours <b>about child education</b>	Dhading SOP	78.2								
		Jogimara	81.8								
		Dhusa	77.5								
		Benighat	76.9								
		Gajuri	75.0								
		Dhading FSP	83.1								
		Jogimara	75.0								
		Dhusa	84.2								
		Benighat	88.2								
		Gajuri	84.2								

I: Indicator of knowledge and awareness regarding child education among respondents in **Siraha**

I	Indicator	District	End line data	I	Indicator	District	End line data	I	Indicator	District	End line data
1	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>children's right to go to school</b>	Siraha_SOP	94.8	2	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>equal right between girls and boys</b>	Siraha_SOP	96.1	3	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>prohibition of child marriage</b>	Siraha_SOP	70.1
		Tenuwapatti	83.3			Tenuwapatti	91.7			Tenuwapatti	91.7
		Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	66.7
		Kushaha-Laxinia	90.5			Kushaha-Laxinia	90.5			Kushaha-Laxinia	47.6
		Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	92.9
		Siraha_FSP	100.0			Siraha_FSP	99.0			Siraha_FSP	72.0
		Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	96.3			Tenuwapatti	85.2
		Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	88.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	54.5
		Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	57.7
4	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>prohibition of child labor force</b>	Siraha_SOP	66.2	5	Percentage of respondents who know about <b>equal right between handicapped/disabled children and normal children</b>	Siraha_SOP	77.9	6	Percentage of respondents who know about parents' <b>responsibility for child care</b>	Siraha_SOP	89.6
		Tenuwapatti	66.7			Tenuwapatti	66.7			Tenuwapatti	100.0
		Vidhyanagar	76.7			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	80.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	33.3			Kushaha-Laxinia	38.1			Kushaha-Laxinia	95.2
		Bariyarpatti	92.9			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	92.9
		Siraha_FSP	70.0			Siraha_FSP	88.0			Siraha_FSP	97.0
		Tenuwapatti	74.1			Tenuwapatti	92.6			Tenuwapatti	96.3
		Vidhyanagar	92.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	96.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	40.9			Kushaha-Laxinia	63.6			Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0
		Bariyarpatti	69.2			Bariyarpatti	92.3			Bariyarpatti	96.2

II: Indicator of attitude regarding child education among respondents in Siraha

	Indicator	District	End line data		Indicator	District	Endline data			District	End line data
1	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>children's right to go to school</b>	Siraha_SOP	97.4	2	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>equal right between girls and boys</b>	Siraha_SOP	100.0	3	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>prohibition of child marriage</b>	Siraha_SOP	79.2
		Tenuwapatti	91.7			Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	100.0
		Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	66.7
		Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	95.2
		Bariyarpatti	92.9			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	64.3
		Siraha_FSP	96.0			Siraha_FSP	90.0			Siraha_FSP	77.0
		Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	63.0			Tenuwapatti	63.0
		Vidhyanagar	92.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	84.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	95.5
		Bariyarpatti	92.3			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	69.2
4	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>prohibition of child labor force</b>	Siraha_SOP	72.7	5	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with <b>equal right between handicapped/d isabled children and normal children</b>	Siraha_SOP	94.8	6	Percentage of respondents who agree very much with parents' <b>responsibility for child care</b>	Siraha_SOP	97.4
		Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	100.0
		Vidhyanagar	63.3			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	71.4			Kushaha-Laxinia	85.7			Kushaha-Laxinia	95.2
		Bariyarpatti	71.4			Bariyarpatti	92.9			Bariyarpatti	92.9
		Siraha_FSP	74.0			Siraha_FSP	91.0			Siraha_FSP	100.0
		Tenuwapatti	51.9			Tenuwapatti	77.8			Tenuwapatti	100.0
		Vidhyanagar	84.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	86.4			Kushaha-Laxinia	90.9			Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0
		Bariyarpatti	76.9			Bariyarpatti	96.2			Bariyarpatti	100.0

7	Percentage of respondents who perceive that <b>respondents should take responsibility to educate children</b>	Siraha_SOP	94.8		8	Percentage of respondents who are <b>willing very much to send children to formal school after completion of FSP/SOP</b>	Siraha_SOP	87.0	
		Tenuwapatti	83.3				Tenuwapatti	91.7	
		Vidhyanagar	96.7				Vidhyanagar	70.0	
		Kushaha-Laxinia	95.2				Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0	
		Bariyarpatti	100.0				Bariyarpatti	100.0	
		Siraha_FSP	88.8				Siraha_FSP	94.0	
		Tenuwapatti	85.2				Tenuwapatti	100.0	
		Vidhyanagar	100.0				Vidhyanagar	92.0	
		Kushaha-Laxinia	68.2				Kushaha-Laxinia	90.9	
		Bariyarpatti	100.0				Bariyarpatti	92.3	

III: Indicator of practice regarding child education among respondents in **Siraha**

	Indicator	District	End line data		Indicator	District	End line data		Indicator	District	End line data
1	Percentage of respondents who <b>encourage children to become educated</b>	Siraha_SOP	97.4	2	Percentage of respondents who discuss <b>with children about their education</b>	Siraha_SOP	85.7	3	Percentage of respondents who discuss <b>with family members about children's education</b>	Siraha_SOP	72.7
		Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	83.3			Tenuwapatti	75.0
		Vidhyanagar	93.3			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	100.0			Kushaha-Laxinia	57.1			Kushaha-Laxinia	14.3
		Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	100.0
		Siraha_FSP	97.0			Siraha_FSP	93.0			Siraha_FSP	83.0
		Tenuwapatti	100.0			Tenuwapatti	88.9			Tenuwapatti	85.2
		Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0			Vidhyanagar	100.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	90.9			Kushaha-Laxinia	81.8			Kushaha-Laxinia	45.5
		Bariyarpatti	96.2			Bariyarpatti	100.0			Bariyarpatti	96.2

4	Percentage of respondents who discuss <b>with neighbors members about children's education</b>	Siraha_SOP	74.0
		Tenuwapatti	83.3
		Vidhyanagar	100.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	14.3
		Bariyarpatti	100.0
		Siraha_FSP	78.0
		Tenuwapatti	81.5
		Vidhyanagar	100.0
		Kushaha-Laxinia	27.3
		Bariyarpatti	96.2

### Annex 3: Illustration of the method of computing odds ratio

The odds ratio shows how much likely is an event to occur in the programme area/group as compared to the control area/group. It is derived by dividing the product of the multiplication of cell A with D by the product of the multiplication of cell B with C.

To calculate the odds of the knowledge of SOP/FSP activities by organization of sensitization meetings, data in the cells are filled in as follows:

Area or group	Response	
	Yes	No
Dhading	141 (A)	17 (B)
Siraha	134 (C)	43 (D)

Odds ratio in this case can be calculated as  $141 \times 43 / 17 \times 134 = 2.66$  and can be expressed as "the respondents of Dhading are 2.66 times more likely than those of Siraha to have knowledge of SOP/FSP activities due to organization of sensitization meetings".

When the odds ratio is 1, there is no difference or association. When it is more than 1 then the association is as expected or positive. When it is less than 1, the relation is negative.

## Annex 4: Odds ratios for selected KAP indicators

**Annex table 4.1 Odds ratios for selected KAP indicators in aggregate**

Activity	Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities	Knowledge of right to go to school	Knowledge of same right for girls	Knowledge of prohibition of child marriage	Knowledge of prohibition of child labour	Knowledge of rights of the handicapped	Knowledge of child care as parents responsibility	Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities	Agree on right to go to school	Agree on same right for girls	Agree on prohibition of child marriage	Agree on prohibition of child labour	Agree on rights of the handicapped	Agree on child care as parents responsibility	Willingness to send child to formal school	Actual participation in SOP/FSP activities	Encouragement to study	Discussion with children	Discussion with family members	Discussions with neighbours
Organisation of orientation meetings	2.66	3.55	1.14	3.31	1.76	2.37	3.15	12.23	2.81	2.77	3.31	14.21	2.37	3.15	6.09	1.28	2.43	2.05	1.57	1.1
Organisation of CMC	1.8	1.03	2.19	1.78	1.55	2.54	1.83	2.04	1.73	2.19	1.78	1.55	2.54	1.83	3.15	0.46	1.72	1.62	1.36	1.44
Identification of EVs	5.09	2.55	5.21	3.91	3.51	4.67	5.13	1.62	4.92	5.21	3.91	3.51	2.17	5.13	3.94	0.33	4.92	4.75	4.66	5.41
Formation of child club	13.58	14.3	14.62	10.11	13.29	11.66	12.99	5.54	13.61	14.62	10.11	13.29	11.66	12.99	4.22	7.47	8.58	12.83	4.74	16.88
Incentives for best students	27.58	30.87	31.86	34.07	53.68	51.43	28.02	1.88	28.78	31.86	34.07	53.68	51.43	28.02	9.19	16.9	28.3	30.37	9.72	56.13
Organisation of sensitisation meetings on child rights	12.9	15.07	13.38	12.5	11.4	12.05	13.45	3.39	12.81	13.38	12.5	11.4	12.05	13.45	12.13	3.35	12.5	12.28	12.98	11.9
Organisation of parents visiting day	2.84	3.3	3.4	3.18	3.15	2.79	3.02	10.5	2.78	3.4	3.18	3.15	2.79	3.02	1.03	0.65	2.7	2.48	2.43	2.52
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door to door visits	0.82	0.89	0.95	0.93	0.76	0.8	0.87	8.49	0.86	0.9	0.93	0.76	0.8	0.87	1	0.43	0.81	0.76	0.73	0.76
Interactive programme among stakeholders	15.09	16.07	14.78	11.79	18.12	15.43	14.79	12.21	16.22	14.78	11.79	18.12	182.16	14.79	17.2	10.3	14.64	17.22	19.15	20.42
Interactive programme between community people and children	31.08	31.75	32.22	25.41	71.4	479.05	31.35	5.36	35.71	32.22	25.41	71.4	33.04	31.35	35.57	3.05	30.18	27.38	42	54.04
Provision of support on physical infrastructure by community	1.4	42.18	39.9	47.84	44.81	41.61	44.1	47.33	44	3.3	50.7	4.47	41.61	44.1	43.55	33.92	42.7	39.72	53.56	73.71
Contribution in cash								8.14								1.6				
Contribution in Labour								37.56								2.09				
Provision of support on skill oriented training								5.27								1.4				

**Annex table 4.2 Odds ratios for selected KAP indicators among the marginalized groups**

Activity	Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities	Knowledge of right to go to school	Knowledge of same right for girls	Knowledge of prohibition of child marriage	Knowledge of prohibition of child labour	Knowledge of rights of the handicapped	Knowledge of child care as parents responsibility	Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities	Agree on right to go to school	Agree on same right for girls	Agree on prohibition of child marriage	Agree on prohibition of child labour	Agree on rights of the handicapped	Agree on child care as parents responsibility	Willingness to send child to formal school	Actual participation in SOP/FSP activities	Encouragement to study	Discussion with children	Discussion with family members	Discussions with neighbours
Organisation of orientation meetings	6.75	5.71	5.63	5.48	3.33	2.22	7.56	8.00	6.61	6.75	8.03	6.47	12.44	6.61	25.67	0.33	6.00	8.56	2.33	3.69
Organisation of CMC	3.09	2.67	2.97	1.53	1.18	2.51	3.26	3.70	3.10	3.09	2.48	3.40	2.79	3.10	18.00	1.28	2.83	2.40	1.63	1.64
Identification of EVs	26.87	29.29	25.00	17.33	26.00	27.13	25.00	4.13	25.63	26.88	16.88	22.75	27.33	23.75	10.86	1.66	25.63	38.57	29.71	27.50
Formation of child club	127.5	146.20	119.00	70.00	61.71	85.33	119.00	9.62	121.83	127.50	82.17	72.00	134.40	87.13	22.80	11.69	121.83	118.40	99.00	104.00
Incentives for best students	51.6	46.47	48.00	89.60	61.71	108.80	73.80	6.11	49.20	51.60	32.40	44.20	45.33	45.60	6.80	7.60	51.60	61.20	132.00	104.00
Organisation of sensitisation meetings on child rights	99.75	133.00	97.38	81.00	123.50	69.75	97.38	11.12	99.75	104.50	66.50	121.50	129.83	92.63	170.00	11.69	99.75	81.00	64.00	112.50
Organisation of parents visiting day	3.87	4.59	4.33	2.83	3.09	3.06	3.88	8.11	4.47	3.88	2.81	2.33	3.63	4.02	4.80	2.10	3.63	3.37	3.00	2.68
Provision of encouragement to send child to school through door to door visits	0.49	0.44	0.50	0.29	0.20	0.31	0.50	1.60	0.48	0.49	0.45	0.39	0.49	0.48	1.80	0.27	0.48	0.28	0.29	0.35
Interactive programme among stakeholders	102.8	117.33	98.29	92.80	64.00	88.00	98.29	9.06	100.57	105.14	68.57	74.67	114.67	100.57	200.00	9.99	100.57	96.00	63.14	104.00
Interactive programme between community people and children	71.55	77.00	66.89	58.00	56.00	5.25	66.89	5.08	68.44	71.56	46.67	49.00	75.25	68.44	200.00	11.69	68.44	63.00	51.00	76.80
Provision of support on physical infrastructure by community	70	63.00	64.00	38.00	36.00	42.00	72.60	2.19	74.80	70.00	72.29	52.50	69.30	74.80	220.00	15.27	66.00	47.73	41.82	32.45
Contribution in cash								10.64								0.90				
Contribution in labour								1.53								0.90				
Support on educational materials								5.60								0.90				

Note: Some empty cells are replaced by 1 to facilitate computation of odds ratio in this table

## Annex 5: Correlation coefficients of selected KAP indicators

**Annex table 5.1 Correlation coefficients among selected KAP indicators in aggregate**

Variable	1. Knowledge of SOP/FS P activities	2. Knowledge of right to go to school	3. Knowledge of same right for girls	4. Knowledge of prohibition of child marriage	5. Knowledge of prohibition of child labour	6. Knowledge of rights of the handicapped	7. Knowledge of child care as parents responsibility	8. Willingness to participate in SOP/FS P activities	9. Agree on right to go to school	10. Agree on same right for girls	11. Agree on prohibition of child marriage	12. Agree on prohibition of child labour	13. Agree on rights of the handicapped	14. Agree on child care as parents responsibility	15. Willingness to send child to formal school	16. Actual participation in SOP/FS P activities	17. Encouragement to study	18. Discussion with children	19. Discussion with family members	20. Discussions with neighbours
1	1	0.564	0.6	0.424	.778(**)	.689(*)	0.503	-0.348	0.553	.995(**)	0.392	.936(**)	0.354	0.503	0.329	0.091	0.501	0.55	0.318	0.534
2	0.564	1	.994(**)	.974(**)	.899(**)	0.491	.994(**)	0.542	.992(**)	.604(*)	.969(**)	0.586	0.346	.994(**)	.865(**)	.826(**)	.989(**)	.993(**)	.870(**)	.982(**)
3	0.6	.994(**)	1	.969(**)	.920(**)	0.517	.990(**)	0.488	.992(**)	.640(*)	.963(**)	.616(*)	0.326	.990(**)	.842(**)	.804(**)	.986(**)	.993(**)	.852(**)	.988(**)
4	0.424	.974(**)	.969(**)	1	.835(**)	0.352	.979(**)	.623(*)	.962(**)	0.479	.999(**)	0.469	0.27	.979(**)	.823(**)	.899(**)	.982(**)	.979(**)	.831(**)	.981(**)
5	.778(**)	.899(**)	.920(**)	.835(**)	1	.767(**)	.885(**)	0.237	.914(**)	.804(**)	.819(**)	.853(**)	0.277	.885(**)	.771(**)	0.544	.891(**)	.884(**)	.770(**)	.916(**)
6	.689(*)	0.491	0.517	0.352	.767(**)	1	0.49	-0.069	0.554	.664(*)	0.336	.815(**)	0.052	0.49	0.595	-0.027	0.489	0.439	0.584	0.502
7	0.503	.994(**)	.990(**)	.979(**)	.885(**)	0.49	1	0.592	.996(**)	0.543	.977(**)	0.539	0.317	1.000(**)	.895(**)	.841(**)	.996(**)	.990(**)	.903(**)	.986(**)
8	-0.348	0.542	0.488	.623(*)	0.237	-0.069	0.592	1	0.553	-0.313	.649(*)	-0.237	0.174	0.592	.681(*)	.599(*)	0.588	0.544	.692(*)	0.545
9	0.553	.992(**)	.992(**)	.962(**)	.914(**)	0.554	.996(**)	0.553	1	0.588	.959(**)	0.593	0.336	.996(**)	.902(**)	.802(**)	.992(**)	.986(**)	.909(**)	.985(**)
10	.995(**)	.604(*)	.640(*)	0.479	.804(**)	.664(*)	0.543	-0.313	0.588	1	0.447	.938(**)	0.331	0.543	0.338	0.151	0.542	0.592	0.329	0.58
11	0.392	.969(**)	.963(**)	.999(**)	.819(**)	0.336	.977(**)	.649(*)	.959(**)	0.447	1	0.44	0.263	.977(**)	.829(**)	.909(**)	.980(**)	.974(**)	.838(**)	.976(**)
12	.936(**)	0.586	.616(*)	0.469	.853(**)	.815(**)	0.539	-0.237	0.593	.938(**)	0.44	1	0.232	0.539	0.422	0.098	0.548	0.56	0.398	0.593
13	0.354	0.346	0.326	0.27	0.277	0.052	0.317	0.174	0.336	0.331	0.263	0.232	1	0.317	0.334	0.357	0.336	0.4	0.324	0.3
14	0.503	.994(**)	.990(**)	.979(**)	.885(**)	0.49	1.000(**)	0.592	.996(**)	0.543	.977(**)	0.539	0.317	1	.895(**)	.841(**)	.996(**)	.990(**)	.903(**)	.986(**)
15	0.329	.865(**)	.842(**)	.823(**)	.771(**)	0.595	.895(**)	.681(*)	.902(**)	0.338	.829(**)	0.422	0.334	.895(**)	1	.693(*)	.895(**)	.845(**)	.995(**)	.846(**)
16	0.091	.826(**)	.804(**)	.899(**)	0.544	-0.027	.841(**)	.599(*)	.802(**)	0.151	.909(**)	0.098	0.357	.841(**)	.693(*)	1	.839(**)	.856(**)	.708(*)	.830(**)
17	0.501	.989(**)	.986(**)	.982(**)	.891(**)	0.489	.996(**)	0.588	.992(**)	0.542	.980(**)	0.548	0.336	.996(**)	.895(**)	.839(**)	1	.989(**)	.901(**)	.989(**)
18	0.55	.993(**)	.993(**)	.979(**)	.884(**)	0.439	.990(**)	0.544	.986(**)	0.592	.974(**)	0.56	0.4	.990(**)	.845(**)	.856(**)	.989(**)	1	.853(**)	.985(**)
19	0.318	.870(**)	.852(**)	.831(**)	.770(**)	0.584	.903(**)	.692(*)	.909(**)	0.329	.838(**)	0.398	0.324	.903(**)	.995(**)	.708(*)	.901(**)	.853(**)	1	.855(**)
20	0.534	.982(**)	.988(**)	.981(**)	.916(**)	0.502	.986(**)	0.545	.985(**)	0.58	.976(**)	0.593	0.3	.986(**)	.846(**)	.830(**)	.989(**)	.985(**)	.855(**)	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note: Number in the first column correspond with the variable number and name in the first row.

**Annex table 5.2 Correlation coefficients among selected KAP indicators among the marginalized groups**

Variable	1. Knowledge of SOP/FSP activities	2. Knowledge of right to go to school	3. Knowledge of same right for girls	4. Knowledge of prohibition of child marriage	5. Knowledge of prohibition of child labour	6. Knowledge of rights of the handicapped	7. Knowledge of child care as parents responsibility	8. Willingness to participate in SOP/FSP activities	9. Agree on right to go to school	10. Agree on same right for girls	11. Agree on prohibition of child marriage	12. Agree on prohibition of child labour	13. Agree on rights of the handicapped	14. Agree on child care as parents responsibility	15. Willingness to send child to formal school	16. Actual participation in SOP/FSP activities	Encouragement to study	Discussion with children	Discussion with family members	Discussions with neighbours
1	1	.987(**)	.999(**)	.864(**)	.835(**)	.748(**)	.985(**)	0.536	.999(**)	1.000(**)	.968(**)	.903(**)	.988(**)	.971(**)	0.595	.871(**)	.999(**)	.978(**)	.732(*)	.891(**)
2	.987(**)	1	.991(**)	.842(**)	.870(**)	.717(*)	.960(**)	.614(*)	.984(**)	.990(**)	.934(**)	.932(**)	.997(**)	.952(**)	0.569	.817(**)	.989(**)	.962(**)	.679(*)	.889(**)
3	.999(**)	.991(**)	1	.868(**)	.847(**)	.749(**)	.984(**)	0.552	.998(**)	1.000(**)	.964(**)	.913(**)	.991(**)	.972(**)	0.598	.865(**)	1.000(**)	.977(**)	.726(*)	.896(**)
4	.864(**)	.842(**)	.868(**)	1	.878(**)	.889(**)	.920(**)	0.528	.857(**)	.867(**)	.798(**)	.851(**)	.845(**)	.878(**)	0.515	.758(**)	.874(**)	.894(**)	.890(**)	.981(**)
5	.835(**)	.870(**)	.847(**)	.878(**)	1	.724(*)	.859(**)	0.595	.837(**)	.847(**)	.775(**)	.971(**)	.876(**)	.856(**)	0.558	.743(**)	.850(**)	.818(**)	.717(*)	.915(**)
6	.748(**)	.717(*)	.749(**)	.889(**)	.724(*)	1	.830(**)	0.48	.743(**)	.749(**)	.697(*)	.713(*)	.712(*)	.719(*)	0.207	0.588	.758(**)	.811(**)	.912(**)	.862(**)
7	.985(**)	.960(**)	.984(**)	.920(**)	.859(**)	.830(**)	1	0.516	.985(**)	.985(**)	.958(**)	.904(**)	.963(**)	.964(**)	0.569	.884(**)	.987(**)	.975(**)	.825(**)	.930(**)
8	0.536	.614(*)	0.552	0.528	0.595	0.48	0.516	1	0.522	0.547	0.413	0.595	.604(*)	0.474	0.107	0.205	0.549	0.557	0.376	0.591
9	.999(**)	.984(**)	.998(**)	.857(**)	.837(**)	.743(**)	.985(**)	0.522	1	.999(**)	.979(**)	.911(**)	.988(**)	.978(**)	.623(*)	.888(**)	.998(**)	.968(**)	.718(*)	.879(**)
10	1.000(**)	.990(**)	1.000(**)	.867(**)	.847(**)	.749(**)	.985(**)	0.547	.999(**)	1	.967(**)	.914(**)	.991(**)	.973(**)	0.602	.869(**)	1.000(**)	.976(**)	.726(*)	.894(**)
11	.968(**)	.934(**)	.964(**)	.798(**)	.775(**)	.697(*)	.958(**)	0.413	.979(**)	.967(**)	1	.875(**)	.949(**)	.971(**)	.693(*)	.938(**)	.965(**)	.912(**)	.664(*)	.796(**)
12	.903(**)	.932(**)	.913(**)	.851(**)	.971(**)	.713(*)	.904(**)	0.595	.911(**)	.914(**)	.875(**)	1	.944(**)	.925(**)	.645(*)	.811(**)	.914(**)	.858(**)	.652(*)	.880(**)
13	.988(**)	.997(**)	.991(**)	.845(**)	.876(**)	.712(*)	.963(**)	.604(*)	.988(**)	.991(**)	.949(**)	.944(**)	1	.966(**)	.615(*)	.839(**)	.990(**)	.954(**)	.669(*)	.883(**)
14	.971(**)	.952(**)	.972(**)	.878(**)	.856(**)	.719(*)	.964(**)	0.474	.978(**)	.973(**)	.971(**)	.925(**)	.966(**)	1	.752(**)	.915(**)	.973(**)	.928(**)	.680(*)	.872(**)
15	0.595	0.569	0.598	0.515	0.558	0.207	0.569	0.107	.623(*)	0.602	.693(*)	.645(*)	.615(*)	.752(**)	1	.787(**)	0.595	0.473	0.181	0.447
16	.871(**)	.817(**)	.865(**)	.758(**)	.743(**)	0.588	.884(**)	0.205	.888(**)	.869(**)	.938(**)	.811(**)	.839(**)	.915(**)	.787(**)	1	.867(**)	.788(**)	.640(*)	.734(*)
17	.999(**)	.989(**)	1.000(**)	.874(**)	.850(**)	.758(**)	.987(**)	0.549	.998(**)	1.000(**)	.965(**)	.914(**)	.990(**)	.973(**)	0.595	.867(**)	1	.978(**)	.737(**)	.901(**)
18	.978(**)	.962(**)	.977(**)	.894(**)	.818(**)	.811(**)	.975(**)	0.557	.968(**)	.976(**)	.912(**)	.858(**)	.954(**)	.928(**)	0.473	.788(**)	.978(**)	1	.806(**)	.927(**)
19	.732(*)	.679(*)	.726(*)	.890(**)	.717(*)	.912(**)	.825(**)	0.376	.718(*)	.726(*)	.664(*)	.652(*)	.669(*)	.680(*)	0.181	.640(*)	.737(**)	.806(**)	1	.887(**)
20	.891(**)	.889(**)	.896(**)	.981(**)	.915(**)	.862(**)	.930(**)	0.591	.879(**)	.894(**)	.796(**)	.880(**)	.883(**)	.872(**)	0.447	.734(*)	.901(**)	.927(**)	.887(**)	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note: Number in the first column correspond with the variable number and name in the first row