

# COLLECTING DATA ON FOUNDATIONAL LEARNING SKILLS & PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION

---

MICS METHODOLOGICAL PAPERS

Paper No. 5, 2017



Data and Analytics Section  
Division of Data, Research and Policy

© United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), Data and Analytics Section, Division of Data, Research and Policy, June 2017

Permission is required to reproduce any part of this publication. Permission will be freely granted to educational or non-profit organizations.

To request permission and for any other information on the report, please contact:

United Nations Children’s Fund  
Data and Analytics Section, Division of Data, Research and Policy  
3 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA  
Tel: +1 (212) 326-7000  
Email: [mics@unicef.org](mailto:mics@unicef.org)

The designations employed in this publication and the presentation of the material do not imply on the part of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) the expression of any opinion whatsoever concerning the legal status of any country or territory, or of its authorities or the delimitations of its frontiers.

The text has not been edited to UNICEF official publication standards. Series template based on an original design by Cynthia Spence and Alexandra March.

Suggested citation: Hattori H., Cardoso M., and Ledoux B. (2017). *Collecting data on foundational learning skills and parental involvement in education*. MICS Methodological Papers, No. 5, Data and Analytics Section, Division of Data, Research and Policy, UNICEF New York.

# COLLECTING DATA ON FOUNDATIONAL LEARNING SKILLS & PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION

---

MICS METHODOLOGICAL PAPERS

Paper No. 5, 2017



Data and Analytics Section  
Division of Data, Research and Policy



## About MICS

The Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys, MICS, is one of the largest global sources of statistically sound and internationally comparable data on children and women. MICS data are gathered during face-to-face interviews in representative samples of households. The surveys are typically carried out by government organizations, with technical support from UNICEF.

Since the mid-1990s, MICS has supported more than 100 countries to produce data on a range of indicators in areas such as health, education, child protection and HIV/AIDS. MICS data can be disaggregated by numerous geographic, social and demographic characteristics.

As of 2016, five rounds of surveys have been conducted: MICS1 (1995-1999), MICS2 (1999-2004), MICS3 (2004–2009), MICS4 (2009–2012) and MICS5 (2012-2015). The sixth round of MICS (MICS6) is scheduled to take place in 2016–2018. Survey results, tools, reports, micro-data and information on the MICS programme are available at <[mics.unicef.org](http://mics.unicef.org)>.

## About the MICS Methodological Papers

MICS Methodological Papers are intended to facilitate exchange of knowledge and to stimulate discussion on the methodological issues related to the collection, analysis, and dissemination of MICS data; in particular, the papers document the background methodological work undertaken for the development of new MICS indicators, modules, and analyses. The findings, interpretation and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNICEF.



## Acknowledgements

The development of the Foundational Learning skills and Parental Involvement modules was led by the Data and Analytics Section, Division of Data, Research and Policy of UNICEF. The process was led by Hiroyuki Hattori, Statistics Specialist (Education) with Manuel Cardoso and Blandine Ledoux, Education Specialists. Valuable inputs and guidance were provided by Attila Hancioglu, Global MICS Coordinator, Priscilla Idele, Senior Statistics Specialist, Shane M Khan, Turgay Unalan and Bo Pedersen, Household Survey Specialists (MICS), Suguru S.M. Mizunoya (Education Specialist) and Eva Quintana, Statistics and Monitoring Specialist in Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO). Richard Harris (external consultant) provided support throughout the development process and field tests. We acknowledge the analytical contribution of Xinxin Yu (Education consultant).

This work is the product of extensive efforts and collaboration with experts in learning assessments and family involvement and accountability in child education. Special thanks go to Aarnout Brombacher and Amy Mulcahy-Dunn (RTI International); Amy Jo Dowd and Jarret Guajardo (Save the Children); Rukmini Banerji, Wilima Wadhwa, Ketan Verma and Vikram Guria (Pratham/ASER); Sara Ruto (UWEZO); David Chard (Southern Methodist University); Albert Motivans (UNESCO Institute for Statistics); Manos Antoninis (Global Education Monitoring Report); Harry Patrinos, Husein Abdul-Hamid, Marguerite Clarke and Amer Hasan (World Bank); and Souhila Messaoud-Galusi and Michael Costello (Consultants). Valuable contributions and support were provided by colleagues within UNICEF including Ivana Bjelic, Yadigar Coskun, Mathieu Brossard, Alia Karim and Ivelina Borisova (NYHQ); Aarti Saihjee, Clemens Gros and Sylvester Baffoe (Ghana Country Office); Daniel Baheta, Shweta Sandilya and Florian Rabenstein (Kenya Country Office).

A special note of appreciation goes to our counterparts for their cooperation, professionalism and the insights they provided. This includes the Ghana Statistical Service, the Ministry of Education of Ghana and the Ghana Education Service; the Statistical Institute of Belize; the National Bureau of Statistics, the Ministry of Education Science and Technology of Kenya and the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development; and the Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos for Costa Rica. We are also grateful to the respondents who participated in the study and to those who facilitated the household visits that allowed us to carry out this activity.

A substantial part of this work was supported by generous funding from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. We are grateful to the Foundation and to Patricia Scheid in particular, who played a catalytic role throughout the process.

# 1

## Summary

---

There is a growing demand for data reflecting quality as well as access to education, particularly in the early years where learning outcomes are an important foundation for later progress. This paper examines the development of two new MICS modules: Parental Involvement (PR) and Foundational Learning skills (FL). These are areas where data are currently lacking, particularly in low-income countries, leading to a call for the development of new tools and, in particular strong support, for household survey based approaches.

The development of the modules has been supported by a technical advisory/expert group and by a number of field tests. Based on these evaluations the recommended modules are to be administered where a child, aged 7-14 years, is randomly selected from a household. The PR module consists of questions on parental/family involvement and oversight of the school, which are asked to the mother or primary caretaker of the child and the FL module, which is administered to the randomly selected child. This includes a brief assessment of foundational reading skills (Grade 2 level) and number skills as well as a few contextual questions.

The field tests demonstrated that it is possible to include a direct assessment of the foundational reading and number skills of young children as part of a MICS household survey. Children were generally open to participation once interviewers explained the purpose of the assessment and more importantly, took time to build a rapport with them. MICS interviewers were generally capable of interviewing children and enjoyed an experience outside of their usual routine. However it is important the interviewers are fully conversant with the ethics and principles for interviewing young respondents and are confident in applying appropriate interviewing techniques in establishing rapport with young children.

Many of the assessments took place after school, in the early evening or at weekends (often as call-backs to the households). This will require particular scheduling to ensure field work in a full MICS survey is conducted in an efficient manner. These are also times when more people are at home and are liable to create distractions during the assessments. Experience in the field tests highlighted distracting noises, insufficient light and presence of others (e.g. parents, siblings) as having possible negative effects on a child's performance during the assessment. While children, in general, seemed able to focus on the task at hand and ignore these disruptions, interviewers need to be more proactive in establishing an appropriate environment for the assessments, than would be the case for other MICS interviews.

The development of appropriate reading texts (possibly in more than one language), with associated comprehension questions, for the reading skills assessment will require extensive work and inputs from national education authorities. Time for this will need to be included in the planning of any national MICS

survey. Certain questions in the PR module, particularly those reflecting school management structures, will also require customisation before any field work. This can be done within the same consultation process as the development of the materials for the reading assessments.

# 2

## Introduction

---

While many countries have significantly improved access to education in the recent past, existing evidence indicates that improvements in quality have not always kept pace. It is estimated that globally 250 million children have not acquired basic literacy and numeracy skills [1], though robust estimates are missing for many individual, particularly low-income, countries. In order to inform policies to improve children's basic academic skills, the collection and analysis of robust learning data on the individual country basis is essential.

As the leading global advocate for children, UNICEF has a pivotal role in providing the world with high quality, up-to-date information on the wellbeing of children across the world. UNICEF has developed and implemented one of the most comprehensive data collection efforts focused on statistics documenting child outcomes in the world, the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). Since its inception in 1995, MICS has become the largest source of statistically sound and internationally comparable data on children and women worldwide. In more than 100 countries, trained fieldwork teams have conducted face-to-face interviews with household members on a variety of topics that directly affect the lives of children and women, including education. MICS was a major data source for tracking the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicators and is expected to play even a greater role in the monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals.

While the current MICS education module has provided essential data on school participation and educational attainment, there have been growing, diverse data demands by governments, by the international community and within UNICEF. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) call for a greater focus on inclusiveness, equity and quality in education, for which comparatively little data currently exists. In order to enable monitoring of the proposed new global education targets under the SDGs, in particular Target 4.1 (By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes), cross-nationally comparable data are needed in areas such as learning outcomes. Enhanced involvement of parents in education (at home or in the management of the education system) can be meaningful to progress towards these goals and further data on these dimensions are also very relevant.

Likewise the UNICEF Strategic Plan and its results framework, which have a strong focus on equity and learning, require more frequent and disaggregated education and learning data, many of which could come from household surveys. Furthermore, there are growing demands for learning outcome data from UNICEF program countries to identify key bottlenecks of their respective educational systems and better inform policy and practice (and in particular, on levers to improve learning). Against this background, the



work on the development of new MICS modules on a simple assessment of reading and number skills as and questions on parental support/involvement in education commenced in late 2014.

# 3

## Rationale for module development

---

### **The Foundational Learning skills (FL) Module**

Globally, there has not been quantification of how well children are learning as measurement of learning achievement is limited in many countries; between 2005 and 2013, only 61 countries measured the foundational reading skills of children in the early grades of primary schooling. The ability to read and understand a simple text is one of the most fundamental skills a child can learn. Yet in many countries, students enrolled in school for as many as 6 years are unable to read and understand simple texts, as shown for instance by regional assessments such as LLECE, PASEC and SACMEQ [2–4]. Acquiring literacy in the early grades of primary is crucial because doing so becomes more difficult in later grades, for those who are lagging behind [5]. Global efforts to expand access to education may be undermined if parents, faced with difficult economic choices and the knowledge that students are not acquiring basic reading skills, remove their children from school.

A strong foundation in basic numeracy skills during the early grades is crucial for success in mathematics in the later years. Mathematics is a skill very much in demand and most competitive jobs require some level of skill in mathematics. Early mathematical knowledge is a primary predictor of later academic achievement and future success in mathematics is related to an early and strong conceptual foundation [6]. The Global Partnership for Education (GPE), the most significant funding mechanism for educational development in low-income countries, and a partnership where UNICEF plays an important role both at global and country levels, counts among its main objectives an increase in the number of children learning and demonstrating mastery of basic numeracy skills by third grade [7].

There are a number of existing tools for measuring learning outcomes [8–10] with each approach having their own strengths and limitations as well as varying levels of applicability to household surveys such as MICS. For some international assessments, it may just be too late: “Even though international testing programs like PISA and TIMSS are steadily increasing their coverage to also cover developing countries, (...) much of the divergence in test scores happens before the points in the educational trajectories of children where they are tested by international assessments”, according to longitudinal surveys like the Young Lives Study [11]. National assessments such as the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA), which happens earlier and is more context specific, will however be less appropriate for cross-country analysis; although it may be possible to compare children who do not complete an exercise (zero scores) set at a level which reflects each national target for children by a certain age or grade. Additionally, it is recognized that some assessments only capture children in school. However, given that many children do not attend school, further data on these out-of-school children is needed and these can be adequately captured in household surveys.

## The Parental Involvement (PR) Module

Parental involvement in their children's education is widely accepted to have a positive effect on their child's learning performance. For instance, reading activities at home have significant positive influences on reading achievement, language comprehension and expressive language skills [12]. Research also shows that parental involvement in their child's literacy practices is a positive long-term predictor of later educational attainment [13]. However, the vast majority of this research and studies relate to mainly high income countries. It is important to identify good practices for other type of economies with different cultural and economic status. The broader geographical coverage of MICS would allow such broader analyses.

Beyond learning activities at home, parental involvement that occurs in school (like participating in school meetings, talking with teachers, attending school meetings and volunteering in schools) can also benefit a student's performance [14]. Research studies have shown that, in the primary school age range, the impact of parental involvement in school activities can even be much bigger than differences associated with variations in the quality of schools, regardless of social class and ethnic group [15]. In the US, learners with strongly involved parents are more likely to get better grades, score higher on tests and pass their classes [16]. However, other studies have shown that this relationship might not be straightforward as parents of students who need more help are more likely to be involved in school-based activities compared to the parents of higher performing students, for whom it doesn't seem necessary [17]. In some countries, increased community oversight of schools and educational activities has been shown to improve learning outcomes for children [18].

Increased accountability through the empowerment and involvement of communities in school management has received a growing interest from the international community. Under its strategic plan 2014-17, UNICEF has been supporting school accountability enhancement through the strengthening of school management committees and education management information systems in a number of countries. UNICEF has also initiated the "Data Must Speak" project (co-funded by UNICEF education thematic fund, the GPE and Hewlett Foundation) and implemented jointly with UNESCO/IIEP/Pole de Dakar in Africa to foster among other things community participation in school management. Other development partners such as the World Bank, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) have also supported programs that aim to reinforce community engagement and accountability in school management. In addition to direct country support, the World Bank has developed a comprehensive framework on developing effective school autonomy and accountability, which emphasizes the importance of, and the positive impact of, parental and community involvement in school management [18].

However there is currently a lack of internationally comparable information on parental/community involvement in school management. The World Bank through its initiative on Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) has developed tools to produce comparative data and knowledge on education policies and institutions and one of them focuses on school autonomy and accountability. However, if SABER evaluates education policies (based on the review of official laws, regulations, decrees,

and other policy documents or practices), it provides an “institutional picture” on how school based management is expected to be implemented but feedback from education stakeholders , and in particular the main beneficiaries (pupils, parents and communities) are not well captured. One of the few sources of data on the issue come from the USAID-supported education surveys (EdData) include some questions about the learning environment at home and parental involvement dimensions, they have been conducted only in a very small number of countries.

The proposed MICS parental involvement module is shorter, less focused on parental perception about school and more on parental involvement in school activities and management. While some EdData surveys also include a very basic literacy assessment of children, the proposed foundational learning skills module is more elaborate, which allows correlation analyses between children’s basic reading and number skills and their individual “learning contexts” including parental support for learning both at home and in school.

# 4

## Process of module development

---

### Technical Advisory/Expert Group

In 2014, UNICEF convened a technical advisory group composed of leading experts from various institutions (ASER/Pratham, Global Education Monitoring Report, Research Triangle Institute, Save the Children, South Methodist University and UNESCO Institute for Statistics, UWEZO and the World Bank) to provide technical advice and support towards the development of methodological guidelines, survey instruments and indicators for the collection and analysis of data on learning outcomes and on parental support/participation in their child's education and school based management.

Three rounds of technical consultation meetings were organised. The first two meetings in December 2014 and June 2015 considered and agreed on the content of the modules and on the need to have progressive field tests that build upon each other. The third meeting, in March 2016, considered the results and observations from two field tests (in Ghana and Belize) and agreed on revisions to the questionnaire for further field testing in Kenya.

### Field Tests

There were four field test for the module. In early November, 2015, a small-scale field test focusing on the identification of problems concerning the content, format and flow of an initial draft of the modules was conducted in Koforidua, Ghana. Following this, a slightly revised version of the questionnaire was tested in Belize in November/December 2015 as part of a dedicated field test for MICS as a means to assess the operational feasibility of the modules in a MICS survey. A third field test was carried out in Kisumu, Kenya in June 2016. This used a similar FL module and highly modified PR module, which was changed based on the previous tests. Along with other modules proposed for MICS6, the two modules were included in a further round of testing in the MICS6 pilot in Costa Rica in July/August 2016.

The purpose of these field tests was to establish whether:

- Respondents are able and willing to answer questions;
- Respondents find any questions particularly difficult to answer or that address sensitive issues;
- Respondents do not understand any questions or specific terms;
- Interviewers can ask the questions, have appropriate codes for the answers and find the instructions easy to follow.

The FL module includes questions and activities to be answered and completed by children, and for which, at the time, there was no questionnaire for this age group. This is a new development for the MICS and posed special design challenges that needed to be explored and evaluated during the field testing. Some of these questions included:

- How should the interviews be conducted to create a friendly and stress-free environment for children?
- Is it possible to find an appropriate environment to conduct the assessment?
- Is it easy to find the children in the target households without too many call-backs?
- What are the ethical implications for interviewing children and how can these be satisfied in a MICS survey?
- How will children react to the reading and number activities?
- Can the usual type of MICS interviewers be trained to adequately implement the FL module?

### **Field Testing Methodology**

Prior to training in Ghana, the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) translated the whole questionnaire into Akuapem Twi and this was translated back into English during training. This back translation revealed no serious problems. There was some discussion about the correct form of the local language to use for a few technical terms and these were resolved during training – it also became apparent that the written GSS translation used a formal form of Akuapem Twi which, while a useful guide to the wording to use when conducting interviews, would not be strictly followed when questions were put orally.

While there was no prior translation of the questionnaire before training in Kenya, the translation of questions was discussed during training and followed up in the debriefing sessions. Luo has a particular word for oral storytelling and interviewers discussed and agreed on a translation of the ‘School Development Plan’ questions. Translation is not necessarily straightforward – though we were told that interviewers and most respondents would be native to the area, this does not guarantee 100% fluency (some interviewers took notes as they were unfamiliar with the agreed translation) and the language of the interview may not easily incorporate technical terms or have words for more modern items. It would have been appropriate to have devoted more time to the translation of the questionnaire.

Field testing is based on the assumption that questionnaire problems will be signalled either by the answers that the questions elicit which can show up in the response tallies (e.g. more frequent ‘don’t know’ or refusals than anticipated) or by some other consequence of asking the questions (e.g. hesitation or discomfort shown by the respondent). In all the field tests interviewers were asked to identify and record problems they experienced reading the questions as written; due to the respondent not understanding words or ideas in the question; and problems due to respondents having trouble providing an answer to the question. Regular debriefings were organised during and after fieldwork with all members of the field teams during each field test to discuss the administration of the questionnaire and to identify problems such as questions that contain unwarranted assumptions, awkward wordings or missing response categories.

The field tests also used behaviour coding where independent observers watched and systematically assessed interviewer and respondent behaviour during the interview, according to a predetermined list of codes, to identify possible problems in the design of a question. The codes describe the interaction process between the interviewer and respondent: (a) whether the interviewers read the questions as

written, if they read them correctly, and if they made any major changes to question wording; (b) codes also identify whether respondents easily answered the question or if they had difficulty answering, often demonstrated by requests for clarification, giving an answer outside of the expected responses or refusing to answer. The frequencies with which different codes were used were then counted across interviews to produce quantified results for each question in each field test.

Observers were asked to use their own experience and judgement to recognise and assess children's behaviour signals (which tend to be non-verbal) and include their observations on structured observation forms.

The approaches above are not always sufficient to uncover all problems with questions e.g. the respondent may not be aware that they have misunderstood a question. In cognitive interviews, which were part of the Belize field test, a purposively selected sample of respondents are asked probing questions about the survey questions they have just answered. This identifies any difficulty the respondent may have had in giving an answer e.g. question comprehension, recall of information, answer formation, reaction to sensitive or difficult questions. This technique allows both the source of, and the reason for, an error in the questionnaire to be identified.

At all stages of training it was stressed that the field test was all about testing the questionnaire. Any departure from instructions, question wording or process would be treated as identifying possible flaws in the design of the questionnaire and analysed as such.

### *Ghana*

Based on a household listing exercise in three target villages in and around Koforidua (one urban area, one peri-urban and one rural village), purposive sampling was used to select children aged 7-14 with a mix of schooling experiences. Only the FL and PR modules were tested and interviews were carried out using an English language paper questionnaire. A small team of 4 interviewers, all experienced field staff from the GSS were given 2 days training along with 4 national observers, 2 of whom were experienced GSS field staff and 2 of whom were Ministry of Education or Ghana Education Service staff with specific experience of working with children and conducting learning assessment.

In total 46 children and their respective mothers/caregivers were interviewed in the local language Akuapem Twi, and the children attempted the reading passage and comprehension questions set in this language. One observer oversaw each interview and an analysis of the behaviour coding forms the observers completed and the comments and feedback collected through de-briefing sessions with both interviewers and observers provided detailed suggestions and recommendations for further refinement of the modules.

### *Belize*

This field test of the FL and PR modules and other MICS modules and questionnaires took place in Stann Creek district with the field teams based in Dangriga town. A total of 20 rural and urban clusters were randomly selected from around the district and, after a household listing exercise, 30 households randomly selected from each cluster. These households were equally divided into two samples to

accommodate alternative versions of questions which had been prepared for some modules (but not the FL and PR modules). The FL and PR modules were implemented in households, with children 7-14 years of age, in one sample as a means to reduce the overall length of time in the household for the field test.

Interviewers (who had just completed a national MICS5 survey) had 5 days of training focusing on the new modules in the field test. Interviews were to be conducted in English and children were administered an English language reading passage and comprehension questions. The survey was administered using a tablet with computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) software and a slightly revised version of the FL and PR modules from the Ghana field test. The FL module was conducted using a printed booklet.

In the sample, there were 75 children age 7-14 years. A total of 61 Parental Involvement modules and 54 FL modules were completed. One mother refused the modules and 2 mothers and one child refused to be part of the FL module. Both interviewers and observers (mainly from the MICS team) completed behaviour coding forms. There was additional qualitative data collected from focus groups, cognitive interviews and debriefings with interviewers and field supervisors.

### *Kenya*

The core implementation team consisted of 10 interviewers who were experienced field staff from the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and 3 national observers from KNBS who were joined during field work by 2 additional observers from the Ministry of Education, Science & Technology (MoEST). The observers completed behavior coding forms to systematically assess whether the interviewer had posed each question as intended and whether the respondent had been able to easily provide an answer and for the learning assessments they also completed structured observation forms to assess the process for administering these activities and each child's behavior. The field test covered five sites to give an appropriate mix of environments; 2 urban and one peri-urban area within and around Kisumu were purposively selected along with 2 rural sites around 1 to 1½ hour drive away from Kisumu town. Prior to the field test the KNBS carried out a household listing exercise at each site, identifying households with children 7-14 years and, for these children, recording their current level of schooling (or the highest level attended if out of school). This listing was used to purposively select 40 children for each site to ensure the field test gave sufficient coverage of children by age, gender and level of schooling. Only the FL and PR modules were fielded.

Training was carried out over 3 days including a field practice during which each interviewer conducted two full interviews followed by a formal debriefing session. Field work was carried out over 4 days – interviewers used an English language paper questionnaire, though interviews were conducted in the local language, Luo, and children were offered an initial choice of English or Kiswahili for the reading passage and comprehension questions (at the end of the interview child were then asked to attempt the reading and comprehension assessments in the other language). Two short informal debriefing were held after the first and third day of field work and a more formal and longer final debrief was held the day after all the field work finished.



The PR module was fully completed for 150 households - one mother refused to participate and a further interview was only partially completed. In 11 of these households the selected child was not at home (this is mainly children who had not returned home from school by the time fieldwork for the day was over). In all a total of 139 children were available to attempt the FL module.

#### *Costa Rica*

This field test of the FL and PR modules took place in San José and surroundings. A total of 28 clusters split evenly between urban and rural areas around San Jose. As the intent of the Costa Rica study was not to be representative but to capture sufficient cases to analyse, the exercise selected 30 households in each cluster without a probability-based sample. In total, 542 households were interviewed. The FL and PR modules were for the first time included within a separate questionnaire for children age 5-17, where 1 child of the age 5-17 was randomly selected using CAPI. These modules were tested within the context of a larger exercise with nearly all modules intended for MICS6.

Interviewers had 5 days of training in Spanish. Interviews were conducted in Spanish, which included the reading passage and comprehension questions. The survey was administered using a tablet and a slightly revised version of the PR and FL modules from the Belize field test.

The PR module was completed for 76 households. As for the FL module: 5 mothers or caregivers refused to let their children be interviewed; 5 children refused to participate; in 5 households, the selected child was not at home (mainly children who had not returned home from school by the time fieldwork for the day was over); and 2 children did not complete the interview for other reasons. A total of 59 children attempted the FL module.

Table 1 below shows a summary of all of the field tests.

	Ghana	Belize	Kenya	Costa Rica
Date	November 2015	November/December 2015	June 2016	July/August 2016
Locality	Koforidua	Stann Creek District	Kisumu	San José and surrounding areas
Modules tested	FL and PR only	FL and PR with MICS questionnaires	FL and PR only	FL and PR within a questionnaire for 1 randomly selected 5-17 year old
Field staff	4 experienced Ghana Statistical Service interviewers	10 interviewers and 2 supervisors from the Statistical Institute of Belize	10 experienced interviewers from Kenya National Bureau of Statistics	11 interviewers with 2 supervisors
Observers	4 national observers from Ministry of Education & Ghana Education Service	Global MICS team and Statistical Institute of Belize	3 national observers from KNBS and 2 from Ministry of Education Science & Technology	Global MICS team and other UNICEF staff and consultants
Training	2 days	5 days (using interviews from the recently completely MICSS5)	3 days including a field practice	5 days
Sample selection	Children purposively selected to give range of age, gender and education experiences from across 3 villages; 1 urban , 1 peri-urban, 1 rural	In half of sample of households, one randomly selected child 7-14	40 children purposively selected to give range of age, gender and education experiences from across each of 5 villages; 2 urban , 1 peri-urban, 2 rural	28 rural and 28 urban clusters, with 1 child age 5-17 selected among all households
Sample size	46 children and their mothers/caregivers	74 children and their mothers/caregivers (from one of the two samples) in total	152 children and their mothers/caregivers	76 children and their mothers/caregivers in total
Survey administration	Paper questionnaire in English	CAPI in English	Paper questionnaire in English	CAPI in Spanish
Language of interview	Akuapem Twi	English	Luo	Spanish

# 5

## Results from field tests

---

### **Foundational Learning skills (FL) module**

The different field tests lead to progressive revisions of the module, instructions and improvements to implementation and final indicators and tabulations. Experiences from the first field tests in Ghana and Belize led to more time being devoted during the training in Kenya and Costa Rica on approaches for interviewing children and providing interviewers with techniques for building rapport with children. The interviewer's manual was significantly enhanced to include detailed instruction on interviewing children and ethical consideration in doing so. The introductory and explanatory texts in the questionnaire were also made more child friendly for these later field tests. Interviewers were trained to remain neutral and not to provide indications of how well a child performed during the activities. Based on the findings from the field tests, several questions were revamped to ensure greater understanding. Interviewers are also advised in training that mispronunciations of words should not be marked as incorrect. When asked if an answer is right or wrong, the interviewers were instructed to put off giving an answer and only congratulate children on their participation but not their performance. These have been introduced as part of the standard MICS6 tools along with further advice and recommendations. Below, we recount the experiences and results of the field tests.

#### *Who is the respondent?*

The expert group initially proposed that the survey should cover children aged 5-14 years, which typically corresponds with the basic education age group (one year pre-primary, primary and lower secondary education) and would be wide enough to enable the analysis of the interaction between learning and age, grade, repetition, late school entry etc. However, to avoid floor effects among younger children the expert group agreed that the age range should increase the lower bound to 7 years. There was also a discussion as to whether to target children enrolled in particular school grades. However, in order to include out-of-school children in the assessment, the expert group agreed to interview all children age 7-14, regardless of school attendance.

While the most natural approach would be to conduct assessments for all the eligible children in the sampled households, this was not considered feasible for time and cost constraints within typical MICS contexts. The expert group agreed that one child should be selected randomly from eligible households for the assessment – this was done explicitly in the Costa Rica MICS6 global pilot survey. For the Costa Rica pilot, one child age 5-17 was selected from eligible households for a questionnaire for children age 5-17, within which, the FL and PR modules were placed, with appropriate filters for ages 7-14. The questionnaire for children age 5-17 was constructed to accommodate a growing number of modules about children of this age, including the FL and PR modules.

### *Content of the module*

The expert group initially agreed that the FL module would have three sections: a short interview to the child, a reading task, and a numbers task. There is a set of questions to establish rapport with the child and collect information on parental support and learning environment as reported by the child. This should include the frequency of reading and being read to at home and being told oral stories; homework; and languages (home language; medium of instruction; preferred language for the reading assessment). The testing and development of the contextual questions in this module, as the field tests were completed, is set out in Annexes A and B with the final recommended version in Annex C.

These questions would be followed by a reading assessment, comprising accuracy and comprehension tasks and a number skills assessment, comprising number recognition; number discrimination; addition; and pattern recognition and completion (or “missing number”). The reading and mathematics assessment is presented in print to elicit oral responses (i.e. there would be no written responses from the children). Pencil and paper is provided as needed (e.g. for the child to work out answers to the additions). The advisory group decided that the tasks would not be timed or have a time limit, as this was considered difficult to implement under MICS field conditions. However, there would be guidelines for proceeding to the next task as part of the protocol, to avoid stressing the child and facilitate time management.

The expert group agreed that the assessments should measure the basic reading and numeracy skills of children at Grade 2 level. With reading and comprehension assessments, it is also important to take into account differences between languages - some languages are more difficult to master and it takes more time for children to become competent readers. As cross-country comparability is a key objective in MICS surveys, the expert group reached a compromise between the translation of a common text and the independent development of assessments for each language. The expert groups recommends that each country develops different versions of the reading task in each of that country’s main languages. These will not be direct translations from a common source story, but they will present a “similar” story using words drawn from national school textbooks reflecting appropriate material for Grade 2. The texts, however, should not be drawn directly from textbooks, in order to avoid interference from prior knowledge. The development of appropriate reading texts with the associated comprehension questions will require inputs from national educational authorities. This development work was done and worked well for the Kenya field test, with texts in both English and Kiswahili provided by the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (for the other field tests the texts were sourced from existing assessment material e.g. EGRA).

For Ghana and Belize, the first field tests, 3 comprehension questions were asked (2 literal and one inferential), as initially proposed by the advisory group. However, a study using the Save the Children-supported Literacy Boost data established that the identification of children who were ‘readers with comprehension’ (as identified by Save the Children) would be improved by adding more comprehensions questions to the FL module [19]. As a consequence, the number of comprehension questions was increased to 5, with 3 literal and 2 inferential questions, for the Kenya field test and Costa Rica pilot.

After the Ghana field test, a practice reading and comprehension exercise was introduced for children 9 years or younger and for all out of school children (regardless of age). This was included as a means to

help ease these children into the assessment. However it was noted by observers that some children were still put off by the immediate level of the reading and comprehension activities, compared to the number tasks which were more graduated. It would be possible to take the child through the number tasks first though it seems a more natural to attempt the reading task first. We note that this was tried with some children during the Ghana field test and there were examples from other field tests of children refusing to try the reading assessment, completing the number tasks and then being willing to attempt the reading.

In the Belize field test, where the FL module was administered to 54 children, 65% of children were able to correctly read 90 percent or more of the words in the passage, 78% were able to answer both literal questions, 67% were able to answer an inferential question and overall, 57% were able to do all of these tasks. For the number tasks, 82% of children were able to read all numbers correctly, 78% were able to complete a number discrimination task, 61% were able to do an addition task and 42% were able to complete a pattern recognition task. Combined, only 28% of children were able to do all tasks correctly.

#### *Establishing rapport with children*

Across the different field tests, interviewing children was a new experience for most interviewers. Some interviewers were excellent at establishing rapport with children, while for others, building rapport followed the script provided by the questionnaires, and appeared to be a perfunctory process. In Belize, one interviewer expressed, "In order to make the situation comfortable to conduct the interview with the child, we built a rapport with the child before they asking questions, and we did whatever worked for the child." In the same setting, while interviewers in focus groups expressed they felt comfortable conducting interviews with children, several observers noted that insufficient time was devoted to building rapport with the children. Interviewers noted that children who had been present from the onset of the entire interview usually felt comfortable enough to answer the questions when interviewers started the learning assessment. In keeping with their lack of experience with interviewing children, some interviewers felt nervous and cited the need for further practice.

Overall, children did not seem unduly stressed by the assessments and with interacting with the interviewers, especially when they were present for the household interview. Observers of the Kenya field test recorded, for example, only 8% of children as showing signs of distress during the assessment.

#### *Interview environment*

The ideal environment for the assessment would be to minimize distractions but also ensure the protection of the child. As such, interviewers were trained to find a location that was quiet (which could be inside or outside the household) but also ensure that the assessment takes place within sight of an adult known to the child, preferably a parent. These conditions also ensure that children from other households do not hear the interview, given that they could be potentially interviewed later and that surveys are expected to produce only one set of tasks for the assessment.

While the field tests showed that it is possible to administer the reading and number activities in different home environments, conditions can be far from perfect – noise and other distractions, poor light, curious onlookers, intrusive parents and other household members can be present. Interviews in Ghana usually took place outside the house, often without a table for the child to lean on (the child would have the

Reading and Number Booklet on his/her lap) and with other children around. In Belize and Kenya, it was more common for interviews to take place in the home, with table and chairs available. Parents, especially mothers, would usually carry on with their household activities while sometimes observing the assessment. Occasionally a parent would try to help or encourage their child, though this was not frequent. In some cases, interviewers needed to ask parents and other household members not to contribute to the answers.

#### *Consent for the assessments*

The assessments require a two-step approach on consent. First, the interviewer must first obtain verbal permission from the mother or main caretaker to talk to the child (adult consent). Adult consent is gained by reading a specific script found in the MICS instrument. This allows the interviewer to approach the child. Then, the interviewer reads a second script to the child which includes what the interview is about and voluntary participation. At this point, the child can provide agreement (or not) to continue with the interview (assent from child).

In Belize, interviewers and observers agreed that the introduction section was too long and difficult for the child to understand. Interviews with children clearly reflected this:

I: What she [the interviewer] read to you [the introduction], did you hear any of it?

R: Something about survey and mother and how children are doing in school.

I: Do you know what a survey is?

R: Something like a story." (Interview 23, Dangriga, 12 year old female)

Here is another example:

I: Did you understand what she just read to you?

R: Yes.

I: What did she say?

R: She ask [sic] if I know my numbers." (Interview 24, Dangriga, 8 year old female)

In the same setting, interviewers routinely modified the introduction or did not read it at all, as they explained in FG 1: "Starting the interview with the child took a little bit of creativity. We ended up not reading the introduction; we modified it so the child would understand."

However, even an individual explanation provided to the children did not always lead to a clear understanding of the learning assessment. This cognitive interview, exploring the child's understanding of the interviewer's explanation immediately following it, showed that while the interviewer tried to explain the purpose of the learning assessment, it was not necessarily understood by the participant:

I: What did she just explain to you? What do you remember about what she just told you?

R: How you learn to read at school.

I: What do you understand about what she is going to do now?

R: She will teach me how to learn to read." (Interview 29, Pamaona, 9 year old female)

These observations have led to the development of a consent statement that matches the level of development of children.

*Response rates*

In Ghana, no parent refused permission for their child to participate in the survey and all children tried the activities (see Table 2). In Belize, 2 mothers refused permission for their child to participate and one child (13 years old) refused, out of 61 cases and 4 were not at home. In Kenya, 5 children refused, 11 were not at home and 9 children were coded ‘Did not try’ (as the reading assessments were not available in their language of choice). In Costa Rica, 5 caretakers refused to let their child be interviewed for the FL module, 5 children refused out of 76 cases and 5 children were not at home. The majority of these cases are older children and those in upper grades.

	<b>Ghana</b>	<b>Belize</b>	<b>Kenya</b>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
Number of eligible children	46	61	150	76
Number not at home	0	4	11	5
Number where mother/caretaker refused	0	2	0	5
Number of children who refused	0	1	5	5
Number of children who did not complete for other reasons	0	0	9	2
Number of children who fully completed interview	46	54	139	59

*Understanding of questions*

The early learning questions were investigated through cognitive interviewing in Belize. Largely consistent with their developmental stages, children had varies degrees of challenges understanding these questions. For questions FL1-3 (Appendix A) which focussed on reading books (aloud or silently), being read to at home and having stories told to the child at home, observers found that younger children under the age of about 10 years were often unable to answer the question of “how often”, and rather provided an answer as to ‘who’ or ‘how’. The interviewers thought that in relation to the first question, EL1, the child answered for school instead of home.

A major challenge of the early learning questions is related to children’s developing understanding of time and place. As interviewers expressed in a focus group, “the children do not understand what ‘last week’ means, because children think about weekdays and weekend days”. They do not think about the concept of last week. When we ask them when was last week, they think it was a long time ago. Children also do not understand the term ‘how often’».

This interview with a child confirms this:

I: When she [the interviewer] asked about if somebody read books, did you understand that?

R: Yea.

I: When she asked about how many times last week, did you understand that?

R: No.” (Interview 36, San Roman, 8 year old male)

The following interview excerpt revealed a similar lack of understanding of the term “last week”:

I: She asked you about “last week”. What is last week?

R: From a long time.

I: How long a time?

R: I do not know. [...]

I: When she asked you about last week, was that difficult to answer?

R: No.

I: When was last week?

R: A long time ago.” (Interview 29, Pamona, 9 year old female)

Children had difficulty understanding EL5, the question about who checks your homework, which was eventually dropped. First, children do not understand the word “household”. Secondly, children had difficulty understanding the questions relating to place: being at home versus being at school. One focus group indicates that “The children would always include things from school.”

The opening of EL 1 refers to reading, while EL1C refers to storytelling. This seemed to create confusion in children’s understanding. The question on storytelling was eventually dropped. “The children were confused with reading and telling a story; children did not really distinguish between the two.” (FG 2)

Moreover, while several cultures in Stan Creek (like the Maya or Garifuna) have a strong, oral storytelling culture, children understood the question about storytelling as referring to home conversations or to stories they had read. This observer summarized the learning assessment of a 12 year old female: When asking “questions related to storytelling, it showed that she understood the question differently than intended. She understood the questions as the conversations between her sisters talking about school, rather than the culture of storytelling as we know it. She also referenced stories she had read when asked about what stories she knew.”

A similar confusion of conversation, storytelling and reading emerged in the interviews:

I: When does Marcia [your sister] read to you?

R: Every day, when I come from school,

I: And what does she read for you?

R: My homework.

I: Does someone sometimes read other things to you at home?

R: Yes, stories about tigers.

I: Someone reads to you, or tells you stories?

R: Tells me stories.” (Interview 29, Pamona, 9 year old female)

These issues were reflected in the behaviour coding tables for EL1-EL8 where the first three questions (EL1A-EL1C) had the most problems (see Table 3).



Question	% of cases with interviewer/respondent problems
EL1A	50
EL1B	47
EL1C	37
EL4	9
EL6	31
EL7	13
EL8	12

### *Social desirability bias*

Several observers to the field tests suspected that some children tended to give answers biased by social expectations. One observer pointed out that a particular 9 year old in Belize appeared “maybe too much of a “people pleaser” attempting to give us the “right answers” on the questions on her learning environment”, observation of a 9 year old male in San Juan, Belize. Another instance illustrating this point was the observation that « the mother’s presence in itself [might be] an interference, particularly during the Early Learning questions, more specifically EL5 (“Does anyone in your household check that you have completed your homework?”): The two children I observed in Belize looked at their mother, who was looking at them, and answered: “Yes, my mom.” There may be a social desirability bias operating here vicariously through the children. »

This caregiver (also in Belize) agreed with the potential for socially desired responses:

I: We ask who helps you with your homework and checks it. Do you think some kids answer what people want to hear?

R: Some will lie about it just to look good, and some will be honest by telling the truth.” (Interview 11, Pamona, 18 year old female)

### *Interviewer rating of children’s reading*

While some children seemed to understand the text well, several had issues of pronunciation. In Belize, for example, the word “umbrella” was mispronounced with frequency (field notes from observer). Interviewers noted that children had different pronunciations for the words and found that difficult for rating, according to one focus group. Related to variations in children’s pronunciation, interviewers and observers sometimes rated assessments differently. Observers seemed to rate the missing final “s” in plural words more consistently as errors than interviewers. These observations have led to the decision that minor mispronunciations would not be rated incorrectly.

### *Time taken to complete the module and timing of interviews*

The time taken to complete the module is shown in table 4 below for Ghana and Kenya where time information was recorded. In Ghana, excluding the time for introductions, interviews took an average of

18 minutes to complete the FL module (as measured by interviewers). In Kenya, where both interviewers and observers recorded the interview start and finish times, interviews were, on average, shorter by around 4 minutes, partly due to the reduction in the number of contextual questions asked to children. Maximum times, excluding one observation of 45 minutes in Ghana and one of 49 minutes in Kenya, were around 30 minutes. No observations on time were done in Belize and Costa Rica as these modules were part of larger questionnaires.

	Interviews with usable start & end times	Median Time taken (mins.)	Average Time taken (mins)	Range (mins.)
Ghana	45	17	18	9-45
Kenya – interviewers	133	13	14	4-49
Kenya – observers	41	14	14	8-26

For FL module, the field work needs to be organised around the availability of the selected child to be interviewed at home. At the rural sites in the Kenya, primary school children were only able to be interviewed on a school day when they returned home for lunch and after school. Most interviewers completed one interview at lunch time and another two after school (having interviewed the mothers on the PR module while waiting for school to finish). As part of a MICS survey, special arrangements such as call-backs during weekends may be required to interview sampled children in an efficient manner.

#### *Final Indicators and tabulations*

Based on these experiences, a final set of indicators were recommended and included as part of the standard MICS questionnaires for the sixth round or surveys. Essentially, the FL module measures 1 composite indicator, the percentage of children with foundational reading and number skills. The denominator is children age 7-14 years. The numerator is comprised of a reading element and a numeracy element with the following specifications:

#### 1. Reading:

Children age 7-14 years who successfully complete three foundational tasks:

- a) 90% of words read correctly in the reading passage
- b) Answers correctly 3 literal questions about the reading passage
- c) Answers correctly 2 inferential questions about the reading passage

#### 2. Numeracy:

Children age 7-14 children who successfully complete four foundational number tasks:

- a) 6 simple number recognition tasks
- b) 5 simple number discrimination tasks
- c) 5 simple addition tasks
- d) 5 simple pattern recognition & completion tasks

The composite indicator (“Children with foundational reading and number skills) has the following specification:

Numerator: Number of children 7-14 years who successfully complete

- a) three foundational reading tasks (listed above in “Reading”)
- b) four foundational number tasks (listed above in “Numeracy”)

Denominator: Total number of children age 7-14 years

Additionally, the module collects data on the reading habit of children (reading at home or being read to at home) and languages used by children for learning (children whose home language is used at school).

In the below table, we tabulate data on these indicators for Kenya and Costa Rica where these indicators were available. As field-tests in Ghana and Belize were earlier than the other countries, these did not include all of the necessary questions to calculate the final indicators as shown below. These results are intended to show overall distributions and it is expected that in the final tabulations provided by MICS, there may be changes to how the calculations are made.

<b>Table 5. Summary of key indicators for FL module</b>						
<b>Domain</b>		<b>Kenya-English</b> (n=135)	<b>Kenya-Kiswahili</b> (n=135)	<b>Costa Rica</b> (n=65)	<b>Ghana</b> (n=46)	<b>Belize</b> (n=55) <sup>1</sup>
<b>Reading</b>						
90% of words read correctly	Yes	61.5	67.4	70.8	28.3	65.1
	No	20.7	9.6	13.8	17.4	31.0
	Missing	17.8	23.0	15.4	54.3	3.9
Answers correctly 3 literal questions	Yes	57.0	72.6	76.9	28.3 <sup>2</sup>	78.0 <sup>2</sup>
	No	26.7	10.4	7.7	15.2	18.1
	Missing	16.3	17.0	15.4	56.5	3.9
Answers correctly 2 inferential questions	Yes	54.1	57.0	66.2	21.7 <sup>2</sup>	67.1 <sup>2</sup>
	No	28.1	25.2	18.5	21.7	29.0
	Missing	17.8	17.8	15.4	56.5	3.9
Percentage who successfully complete 3 foundational reading tasks	Yes	43.0	49.6	60.0	19.6	57.3
	No	37.0	25.9	23.1	23.9	38.8
	Missing	20.0	24.4	16.9	56.5	3.9
<b>Kenya (reading either language)</b>						
<b>Numeracy</b>						
6 simple number recognition tasks	All correct	75.6		72.3	43.5	82.4
	Incorrect	22.2		16.9	56.5	15.8
	Missing	2.2		10.8	0.0	1.8
5 simple number discrimination tasks	All correct	79.3		73.8	54.3	77.5
	Incorrect	17.0		13.8	39.1	20.7
	Missing	3.7		12.3	6.5	1.8
5 simple addition tasks	All correct	68.1		49.2	37.0	60.8
	Incorrect	28.1		36.9	54.3	37.4
	Missing	3.7		13.8	8.7	1.8
5 simple pattern recognition & completion tasks	All correct	48.1		33.8	30.4	42.0
	Incorrect	44.4		43.1	65.2	56.2
	Missing	7.4		23.1	4.3	1.8
Percentage who successfully complete 4 foundational numeracy tasks	All correct	35.6		21.5	19.6	27.9
	Incorrect	54.8		55.4	69.6	70.3
	Missing	9.6		23.1	10.9	1.8
<b>Composite indicator</b>						
Percentage with foundational reading and numeracy skills <sup>3</sup>	Yes	23.7	26.7	20.0	13.0	11.9
	No	51.1	43.0	52.3	30.4	84.3
	Missing	25.2	30.4	27.7	56.5	3.9

<sup>1</sup>Weighted

<sup>2</sup>Ghana and Belize have only 2 literal questions and 1 inferential question

<sup>3</sup>Cases with partial answers are regarded as missing in the composite indicator

## Parental Involvement (PR) module

### *Who is the respondent?*

The mother or primary caretaker of child randomly selected for the FL module will be interviewed for the PR module. This person is identified in the household questionnaire during the listing of household members. There was some discussion as whether the father (if not the primary caretaker) could be the respondent to avoid a call-back to interview the mother but it was decided to keep to standard MICS procedure of interviewing the mother/caretaker. It should be noted that the FL and PR modules are now part of a separate questionnaire for children age 5-17 in MICS6 where the mother is the respondent, and only when she does not live in the household, a caretaker is interviewed.

### *Content of the module*

The expert group agreed the focus on measuring parental participation/family involvement and support for their child's education, with questions under two main headings – home based activities (including questions about homework, the availability of reading materials, reading practices and languages) and school-based activities (attending meetings, discussing progress with teachers, attending school events, participating in school management, having access to information on school performance etc.). The testing and development of the questions in this module is set out in Annexes A and B with the final recommended version in Annex C. The PR module went through extensive streamlining and refinement based on the results of the field tests and expert reviews. Initially, the module was called "Parental Participation (PP)" but was later changed to "Parental Involvement (PR)". Both terms are used in this report.

### *Expert review of PR questions*

Before the Belize field test, a preliminary review of the questionnaire by the MICS team identified a number of issues with the PR module that could not be solved before the field work. Many questions were too wordy and lengthy (e.g. PR7, PR8 in Annex A). Terms used in many questions were difficult to interpret (e.g. 'authorized information' in PR7, Annex A) and at times included items which are not part of the expected daily lexicon of respondents (e.g. 'School Management Committee' in PR12, Annex A). Further, some questions focussed on issues that were not salient to respondents and required information that respondents do not know the answers to. These are exemplified by PP14 which asked mothers/caregivers about the activities of the PTA and SMC to improve school attendance or learning (a double-barrelled question). Parents may be aware of the PTA and SMC but may not know of the details of their activities and work plans sufficiently to adequately answer this question.

The field testing of the module confirmed many of the above issues. Table 6 shows the most problematic questions in Belize. The most problematic question was PP4 with close to two-thirds of the cases flagging for any issue.

Question	% of cases with interviewer/respondent problems
PP4	63
PP8	55
PP7	51
PP18	50
PP23	50
PP19	47
PP1	44
PP10	41
PP14	39
PP11	38

Qualitative observations showed that caregivers were often exhausted at this point in the interview. In Focus Group 2, the interviewers mentioned that “it was better when we administered the [Parental Involvement] questionnaire with the child, because it gave the mother a break.”

During the administration of the parental participation questions (PP14-15 and PP19-20), when respondents are asked to provide examples, it sometimes showed that they did not understand the questions by giving irrelevant or incorrect examples. For example, one observer noted, “when asked to provide an example of when she gave feedback to a teacher to improve the school performance, she explained how she told the teacher to call her if one of her children were acting out or not completing their assignments.”

Observations, cognitive interviews and the focus groups all suggested that question PP4, which is shown by being the most problematic question based on behaviour coding (“which type of authority controls the school”) was not clear to most respondents:

“Respondents think about law when they hear the word ‘authority’ ” (Focus Group 2)

I: When you hear the question about authorized information about performance of the school - does it tell you anything?

R: No.

I: What is your understanding of this question?

R: I do not know.” (Interview 35, Georgetown, 32 year old female)

*Potential respondent fatigue in early version of module*

There was some feedback in the Kenya debriefing sessions that some respondents seemed uninterested and repeated the same answer to similar questions without thinking about the question. As a check, responses to three sets of questions (as set out in Annex B) were analysed:

Responses	Questions		
	PR7 - PR11	PR 15A - PR15D	PR19A - PR19E
All 'Yes'	70%	25%	26%
1 'No', rest 'Yes'	19%	36%	33%
2 'No', rest 'Yes'	4%	24%	17%

<sup>1</sup>See Annex B for questions

The questions PR7 to PR11 are on checking homework, helping with schoolwork, and discussing progress at school. These questions were taken from other data collection instruments for evaluating family involvement [20]. For these questions to perform well, there needs to be more than one question on each topic so some statements could be positively worded and some negatively worded to break the pattern of responses. Due to considerations of time on the module, this was not possible. The results show that 70% of mothers/primary caretakers in the Kenya pilot gave a 'Yes' response to all 5 questions.

PR15 (a) to (d) refer to parental participation at school and PR19 (a) to (e) concern knowledge of information on school performance. In each case, around a quarter of respondents gave all 'Yes' answers to the various parts of each question. However, in each case, around a third of respondents included 1 'No' response and around 20% included 2 'No' responses, with around 5% of respondents giving all 'No' responses.

#### *Reading habits*

In the Kenya pilot, both mothers/primary caretakers and children were asked the same questions about reading at home, being read to at home and being told stories at home (questions PR3 and FL1 in Annex B). This provided a useful basis to compare child responses to that of the mother/caregiver. There are 135 interviews with responses from both mother and child with response categories of 'never' (coded as 'No' in Table 5) and 'some days' and 'every day' (coded as 'yes' in Table 8).

	Reading at home		Being read to at home		Being told stories	
	Mother respondent	Child respondent	Mother respondent	Child respondent	Mother respondent	Child respondent
	PR3A	FL1A	PR3B	FL1B	PR3C	FL1C
Yes	88.1	84.4	46.7	43.0	36.2	54.1
Some days	38.5	48.9	34.1	29.6	32.6	43.7
Every day	49.6	35.6	12.6	13.3	3.7	10.4
No	10.4	14.1	49.6	53.3	63.0	45.2
Missing	1.5	1.5	3.7	3.7	0.7	0.7

Though mothers/caretakers were more likely to say that the child read at home every day than the child, the distribution of responses, when treating the answers as 'Yes' or 'No', were fairly similar for reading at home and being read to at home. The comparison of mother and child responses shows more divergence for 'being told stories' and based on the field test results, this question was removed in the final recommended version of the questionnaire. The behaviour coding results showed that interviewers had more problems asking the 'reading at home' question to the mother (PR3A) than to the child (FL1A) while

mothers had more issues responding to the ‘being read to at home’ question (PR3B) than did children (FL1B). In the final recommended version of the questionnaire, these questions are asked to the child with ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ response categories.

Also in the Kenya pilot both mothers/primary caretakers and children were asked the same questions about the language spoken most often at home and the language spoken most often by teachers at school. However parents did not always know the language most often used in school (and asked the child for the answer). Children, prompted by interviewers reading the list of language options, were able to answer and these questions have been retained on the FL module and removed from the PR module.

#### *Time taken to complete the module*

In Ghana, excluding the time for introductions, interviews took around 15 minutes on average for the PR module (as measured by interviewers, see Table 9). In Kenya, where both interviewers and observers recorded the interview start and finish times, interviews were, on average, shorter by around 3 to 4 minutes, partly reflecting the reduction in length and simplification of the questions in this module. Maximum times, excluding one of 40 minutes in Kenya, were around 25-30 minutes. No times were recorded in the other field tests.

	Interviews with usable start & end times	Median time taken (mins.)	Average time taken (mins.)	Range (mins.)
Ghana	42	17	15	5-27
Kenya - Interviewers	148	11	12	4-40
Kenya – Observers	55	12	11	6-24

#### *Final Indicators and tabulations*

The questions in the PR module will allow the measurement of several areas. These are outlined in the below:

1. Learning environment at home:
  - a. Availability of 3 or more books at home
  - b. Support with homework
2. Availability of information on children's school performance
3. Involvement in school management:
  - a. Opportunity to participate in school management
  - b. Participation in school management
  - c. Effective participation in school management
4. Engagement with school:
  - a. Discussion with teachers regarding children’s progress
  - b. Contact with school concerning teacher absence/strike

These indicators are defined in Annex D. A summary table below shows the values of these indicators (where possible) in the various field-tests (see Table 10).



<b>Table 10. Summary of key indicators for PR module</b>					
<b>MICS6 indicator</b>		<b>Kenya (n=151)</b>	<b>Costa Rica (n=76)</b>	<b>Belize<sup>1</sup> (n=61)</b>	
7.20	Availability of information on children's school performance	Yes	65.6	94.7	79.0
		No	33.8	2.6	8.8
		Missing	0.7	2.6	12.1
7.21	Opportunity to participate in School Management	Yes	80.1	85.5	76.5
		No	2.6	9.2	5.6
		Don't know	15.2	2.6	7.4
		Missing	2.0	2.6	10.5
7.22	Participation in school management	Yes	69.5	78.9	60.4
		No	9.9	6.6	16.1
		Don't know	3.3	-	-
		Missing	14.7	5.2	17.9
		No school management board	2.6	9.2	5.6
7.23	Effective participation in school management	Yes	35.1	73.7	3.3
		No	14.6	5.3	4.9
		Don't know	2.0	-	-
		Missing	7.2	11.9	9.8
		No school management plan/does not know about plan	41.1	9.2	82.0
7.24	Discussion with teachers regarding children's progress	Yes	82.1	84.2	-
		No	16.6	13.2	-
		Missing	1.3	2.6	-
7.25	Contact with school concerning teacher absence/strike	Yes	4.6	10.5	3.5
		No	11.3	34.2	10.0
		Missing	27.8	2.6	12.0
		No absenteeism/strike	56.3	52.6	74.5
7.26	Support with homework	Yes	78.1	78.9	-
		No	21.2	17.1	-
		Missing	0.7	3.9	-
7.27	Availability of books at home	Yes	15.9	53.9	49.7
		No	82.8	46.1	47.6
		Missing	1.3	-	2.8

<sup>1</sup>Weighted results

# 6

## Discussion

---

The design and content of the FL and PR modules reflect the support and inputs from a technical advisory/expert group and the evaluation of experiences in various field tests as the questionnaire has evolved. The key objective, to develop an approach to focus on measures of the foundational reading and numeracy skills of children, as well as measures of parental/family involvement in their child's education and oversight of the performance and management of the school, has been met. The FL and PR modules are now part of the 6<sup>th</sup> round of MICS.

Interviewing and assessing children, 7-14 years of age, in their own homes, as part of a national household survey, will be a new attempt in many countries. Final training and implementation guidance on how the FL module will be administered as part of a full MICS survey are also being included in the MICS manual for Interviewers as well as in Regional MICS Survey Design Workshops. As part of the usual technical assistance made available to countries, MICS will also lend assistance to ensuring that reading assessment materials, which are highly context specific, are developed according to the recommended guidelines.

To further understand the properties of the new instrument, a validation study was conducted in October 2016 in Kenya. In the study, children were administered the MICS reading and numeracy assessments and a comparator test with known validity (e.g. EGRA/EGMA). These results are currently being analysed and will be released in 2017.

# 7

## References

---

1. UNESCO. Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2013-14. Paris, France; 2014.
2. CONFEMEN. PASEC 2014 Education system performance in Francophone sub-Saharan Africa. Competencies and learning factors in primary education. [Internet]. Dakar, Senegal; 2015. Available: [http://www.pasec.confemen.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Rapport\\_Pasec2014\\_GB\\_webv2.pdf](http://www.pasec.confemen.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Rapport_Pasec2014_GB_webv2.pdf)
3. Makuwa DK, Maarse J. The Impact of Large-Scale International Assessments: A Case Study of How the Ministry of Education in Namibia Used SACMEQ Assessments to Improve Learning Outcomes. *Res Comp Int Educ.* 2013;8: 349–358. doi:10.2304/rcie.2013.8.3.349
4. Spaul N. Poverty & privilege: Primary school inequality in South Africa. *Int J Educ Dev.* 2013;33: 436–447. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2012.09.009
5. Stanovich KE. Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Read Res Q.* 1986;22: 360–407.
6. Duncan GJ, Dowsett CJ, Claessens A, Magnuson K, Huston AC, Klebanov P, et al. School readiness and later achievement. *Dev Psychol.* 2007;43: 1428–1446. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1428
7. Strategic Plan 2012-2015 | Global Partnership for Education [Internet]. [cited 15 Mar 2017]. Available: <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/strategic-plan-2012-2015>
8. LMTF (Learning Metrics Task Force). Toward Universal Learning. A Global Framework for Measuring Learning. Report No. 2 of the Learning Metrics Task Force. Montreal and Washington: UNESCO Institute for Statistics and Center for Universal Education at the Brookings Institution; Report No.: 2.
9. Buckner E, Hatch R. Literacy Data: More, but not always better [Internet]. Education Policy and Data Center; 2014. Available: [http://www.epdc.org/sites/default/files/documents/EPDC\\_Literacy%20Data\\_Final.pdf](http://www.epdc.org/sites/default/files/documents/EPDC_Literacy%20Data_Final.pdf)
10. Wagner DE. Smaller, Quicker Cheaper – Improving Learning Assessments for Developing Countries. [Internet]. International Institute for Educational Planning; 2011. Available: <http://www.literacy.org/sites/literacy.org/files/publications/213663e.pdf>
11. Singh A. Emergence and evolution of learning gaps across countries: Linked panel evidence from Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam. [Internet]. Report No.: 2014–28. Available: <https://www.csae.ox.ac.uk/workingpapers/pdfs/csae-wps-2014-28.pdf>

12. Gest SD, Freeman NR, Domitrovich CE, Welsh JA. Shared book reading and children's language comprehension skills: the moderating role of parental discipline practices. *Early Child Res Q.* 2004;19: 319–336. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2004.04.007
13. Flouri E, Buchanan A. Early father's and mother's involvement and child's later educational outcomes. *Br J Educ Psychol.* 2004;74: 141–153. doi:10.1348/000709904773839806
14. Pomerantz EM, Moorman EA, Litwack SD. The How, Whom, and Why of Parents' Involvement in Children's Academic Lives: More Is Not Always Better. *Rev Educ Res.* 2007;77: 373–410. doi:10.3102/003465430305567
15. Desforges C, Abouchaar A. The Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support and Family Education on Pupil Achievements and Adjustment: A Literature Review [Internet]. 2003. Report No.: 433. Available: <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR433.doc>
16. Henderson AT, Mapp KL. New Wave of Evidence - The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement: Annual Synthesis. [Internet]. 2002. Available: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED536946.pdf>
17. Gove A, Cvelich P. Early reading: Igniting education for all. A report by the Early Grade Learning Community of Practice. [Internet]. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute; 2010. Available: [http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/early-reading-report\\_gove\\_cvelich.pdf](http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/early-reading-report_gove_cvelich.pdf)
18. Demas A, Arcia G. What Matters Most For School Autonomy and Accountability: A Framework Paper [Internet]. The World Bank; 2015. Available: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/385451468172788612/pdf/96450-WP-SABER-Framework-Paper-Box391437B-PUBLIC.pdf>
19. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). Understanding what works in oral reading assessments: Recommendations from Donors, Implementers and Practitioners. [Internet]. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS); 2016. Available: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/what-works-oral-reading-assessments.pdf>
20. Westmoreland H, Bouffard S, O'Carroll K, Rosenberg H. Data Collection Instruments for Evaluating Family Involvement. Harvard Graduate School of Education; 2009.

## Annex A: Observations & recommendations from Ghana & Belize field tests by question

Question	Observation	Recommendation
<p><b>PR1.</b> FIRST I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF <i>(name)</i>'S EARLY LEARNING SKILLS AT HOME.</p> <p>HOW MANY CHILDREN'S BOOKS OR PICTURE BOOKS DO YOU HAVE THAT ARE SUITABLE FOR <i>(name)</i> TO READ</p>	<p>Interviewers in Ghana confused by mixture of methods for recording answers – circling 0 or 10 but recording actual answer if between 1 and 9. A number of questionnaires had written 00.</p> <p>Problems recorded in over 40% of interviews in Belize.</p>	<p>Reword opening sentence</p> <p>Retain after rewording –</p> <p>HOW MANY CHILDREN'S BOOKS OR PICTURE BOOKS DO YOU HAVE FOR <i>(name)</i>?</p>
<p><b>PR2.</b> ARE THERE ANY NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES OR OTHER MATERIALS FOR <i>(name)</i> TO READ AT HOME?</p>	<p>Observers in Ghana marked 15% of interviews as respondent provided an inadequate response that could not easily be coded.</p>	<p>Retain after rewording</p> <p>ARE THERE ANY OTHER READING MATERIALS AT HOME SUCH AS NEWSPAPERS OR MAGAZINES?</p>
<p><b>PR3.</b> DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, THAT IS 2015-2016, DID <i>(name)</i> ATTEND SCHOOL OR PRESCHOOL AT ANY TIME?</p>	<p>Filter question</p>	<p>Retain as filter</p>
<p><b>PR4.</b> WHICH TYPE OF AUTHORITY CONTROLS AND MANAGES THE SCHOOL THAT <i>(name)</i> ATTENDS?</p>	<p>Problems observed in 63% of interviews in Belize.</p> <p>Include the possible response categories with the question (at least one respondent answered 'the head teacher').</p>	<p>Reword and retain</p> <p>DOES <i>(name)</i> ATTEND A GOVERNMENT OR PUBLIC SCHOOL, A SCHOOL RUN BY A RELIGIOUS BODY OR A SCHOOL RUN BY ANOTHER ORGANISATION?</p>
<p><b>PR5.</b> DO YOU CURRENTLY PAY ANYONE TO PROVIDE TUTORING FOR <i>(name)</i> OUTSIDE REGULAR SCHOOL HOURS?</p> <p><b>PR6.</b> HOW MUCH DO YOU PAY PER MONTH?</p> <p><i>Circle 998 for 'Don't know'.</i></p>	<p>Asking for cost of tutoring is considered to be outside the range of customary questions for MICS. May not be useful independent of other monetary information.</p>	<p>Omit if on social protection module.</p>
<p><b>PR7.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD ANY AUTHORISED INFORMATION ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE SCHOOL <i>(name)</i> ATTENDS?</p> <p>THIS COULD FOR EXAMPLE BE SCHOOL EXAMINATION RESULTS OR PUPIL ATTENDANCE OR TEACHER ATTENDANCE RATES.</p> <p><b>PR8.</b> DID THIS INFORMATION INCLUDE A COMPARISON WITH OTHER SCHOOLS?</p> <p>FOR EXAMPLE, THIS MIGHT BE A COMPARISON WITH OTHER INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS OR WITH THE AVERAGE RESULTS FOR ALL SCHOOLS IN A DISTRICT, IN A REGION OR NATIONALLY.</p> <p><b>PR9.</b> HAVE YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD RECEIVED ANY TRAINING TO HELP YOU UNDERSTAND AND USE THIS INFORMATION?</p>	<p>These questions raised the most concerns on the behaviour coding forms in both Ghana and Belize. Over a third of (Ghana) and a half (Belize) of interviews reported as having issues - either the interviewer asking the question with changes that affect meaning or the respondent providing an inadequate response.</p> <p>Question has too many parts 'in the last 12 months' 'seen or heard', 'authorised' and examples (some respondents also initially thought this question was about their child's performance). Interviewers often had to repeat parts of the question.</p>	<p>Retain and reword PR7 and PR8.</p> <p>THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT <i>(name's)</i> SCHOOL. HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD ANY INFORMATION ABOUT THIS SCHOOL'S</p> <p>[A] EXAMINATION SUCCESS</p> <p>[B] PUPIL ATTENDANCE</p> <p>[C] TEACHER ATTENDANCE</p> <p>[D] BUDGET OR FUNDS RECEIVED</p> <p>[E] ANY TYPE OF INFORMATION WITH COMPARISON TO OTHER SCHOOLS OR TO THE DISTRICT'S AVERAGE</p> <p>PR9 to be omitted.</p>

Question	Observation	Recommendation
<p><b>PR10.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD ANY AUTHORISED INFORMATION ABOUT THE FINANCES OF THE SCHOOL (<i>name</i>) ATTENDS, SUCH AS THE BUDGET OR GRANTS?</p> <p><b>PR11.</b> WERE YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD INVOLVED IN ANY FORMAL DISCUSSIONS REGARDING THE USE OF RESOURCES BY (<i>name</i>)’S SCHOOL?</p>	<p>Observers in Ghana and Belize coded PR10 as one of the most problematic question - 40% of interviews having problems with interviewers asking the question with changes that affect meaning and respondents struggling to answer.</p> <p>Question has too many parts - ‘in the last 12 months’ ‘authorised’ and examples (some respondents were also confused that this included PTA funds/levies).</p>	<p>PR10 to be rewritten and included in question above PR11 rewritten</p> <p>YOU HAVE TOLD ME THAT YOU HAVE SEEN OR HEARD INFORMATION ABOUT THE BUDGET OR THE FUNDS RECEIVED BY (<i>NAME</i>)’S SCHOOL. HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED IN ANY FORMAL DISCUSSION REGARDING THE USE OF THESE FUNDS?</p>
<p><b>PR12.</b> DOES THE SCHOOL HAVE A PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION (PTA) AND/OR A SCHOOL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SMC)?</p> <p><b>PR13.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD ATTENDED A PTA/SMC MEETING AT (<i>name</i>)’S SCHOOL?</p>	<p>Ghana pre-test - all mothers/caretakers with children in school, except 1 (an error?) reported that the school had a PTA and virtually all had attended a meeting in the last 12 months.</p> <p>Observers noted that other members of the household were not always included when the question was put to the respondent while Interviewers reported cases where an adult outside the household attended meetings e.g. one person on behalf of a group of parents.</p> <p>Debriefing also noted that some respondents were displeased to be asked this question after identifying PTAs in PR7 &amp; PR10.</p>	<p>Both questions to be retained and moved earlier in the interview and PR13 to be reworded</p> <p>IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU ATTENDED A MEETING CALLED BY (<i>name</i>)’S SCHOOL PTA OR SMC?</p> <p><i>Probe if ‘NO’</i> – IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAS ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD ATTENDED A MEETING CALLED BY (<i>NAME</i>)’S SCHOOL PTA OR SMC?</p>
<p><b>PR14.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAS THIS PTA/SMC DONE ANYTHING TO IMPROVE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OR IMPROVE STUDENTS’ LEARNING?</p> <p><b>PR15.</b> CAN YOU GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE?</p>	<p>Observers in Ghana noted that the question put to respondents did not always include both examples of improvements.</p> <p>In Ghana 80% of respondents said that the PTA had improved school attendance or learning and all these were recorded as providing an example. Debriefing recommended that the example should be specified in full.</p> <p>In Belize 40% of interviews observed with problems, with respondents not understanding the question or giving irrelevant or incorrect examples</p>	<p>Both questions to be omitted.</p>

Question	Observation	Recommendation
<p><b>PR16.</b> DO YOU KNOW WHAT A SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN IS?</p> <p><b>PR17.</b> DO YOU KNOW IF <i>(name)</i>'S SCHOOL HAD A SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR THE LAST SCHOOL YEAR?</p> <p><b>PR18.</b> WERE YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD INVOLVED IN ANY FORMAL DISCUSSIONS REGARDING ACTIVITIES IN THIS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN?</p>	<p>Observers in Ghana noted that interviewers were asked for clarification of the term School Improvement Plan in around 15% of interviews.</p> <p>In Ghana just under two-thirds of respondents knew what a SIP was and just over a half of these reported that they were involved in discussions over the content of the plan.</p> <p>PR18 observed to have problems in a half of interviews in Belize</p>	<p>PR16 and PR17 to be retained with rewording to allow for the country specific term for a School Improvement Plan to be used.</p> <p>DO YOU KNOW WHAT A SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS?</p> <p>DO YOU KNOW IF <i>(name's)</i> SCHOOL HAD A SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE LAST SCHOOL YEAR?</p> <p>PR18 to be reworded and retained.</p> <p>DID YOU ATTEND ANY MEETING THAT DISCUSSED THE PREPARATION OF THIS PLAN</p> <p><i>Probe if 'No'</i> – DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD ATTEND ANY MEETING THAT DISCUSSED THE PREPARATION OF THIS PLAN?</p>
<p><b>PR19.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD PROVIDED ANY SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE PERFORMANCE OF <i>(name)</i>'S SCHOOL TO A TEACHER OR HEAD TEACHER OR AT A PTA/SMC MEETING ?</p> <p><b>PR20.</b> CAN YOU GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE?</p>	<p>In Ghana just over a half of respondents reported providing suggestions and all these were recorded as providing an example. Debriefing recommended that the example should be specified in full. In Belize nearly a half of interviews observed as having problems with respondents not understanding these questions or giving irrelevant or incorrect examples.</p>	<p>Both questions to be omitted.</p>
<p><b>PR21.</b> IN THE LAST COMPLETED SCHOOL TERM WAS <i>(name)</i>'S SCHOOL EVER CLOSED WHEN IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN OPEN?</p> <p><b>PR22.</b> FOR HOW MANY DAYS WAS <i>(name)</i>'S SCHOOL CLOSED? <i>Circle 98 for Don't Know</i></p> <p><b>PR23.</b> DID YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD CONTACT THE HEAD TEACHER, ANY OTHER OFFICIAL OR THE PTA/SMC WHEN THE SCHOOL WAS UNOFFICIALLY CLOSED?</p>	<p>In Ghana 11 respondents reported school closures of which 4 had complained.</p> <p>These questions could be combined by asking directly whether the respondent had complained about school closures (followed by a probe for other adults in the household).</p> <p>PR23 observed to have problems in a half of interviews in Belize</p>	<p>These questions retained with rewording to PR23.</p> <p>WHEN THIS HAPPENED DID YOU CONTACT THE HEADMASTER, ANY OTHER EDUCATION OFFICIAL, OR THE PTA/SMC <i>(if appropriate)</i> ABOUT THIS?</p> <p><i>Probe if 'No'</i> – DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD CONTACT ANY EDUCATIONAL OFFICIAL ABOUT THIS?</p>
<p><b>PR24.</b> IN THE LAST COMPLETED SCHOOL TERM WAS <i>(name)</i>'S TEACHER EVER ABSENT WHEN THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN AT SCHOOL?</p> <p><b>PR25.</b> FOR HOW MANY DAYS WAS <i>(name)</i>'S TEACHER AWAY? <i>Circle 98 for Don't Know</i></p> <p><b>PR26.</b> DID YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD CONTACT THE HEAD TEACHER,</p>	<p>This is a difficult question to answer where a child has more than one (subject) teacher. This happens from upper primary level in Ghana. 7 respondents reported teacher absences of which 2 had complained. These questions could be combined by asking directly whether the respondent had complained about teacher absences (followed by a probe for other adults in the household).</p>	<p>Omit PR25 and retain other questions with some rewording.</p> <p>IN THE LAST SCHOOL TERM HAVE ANY OF <i>(NAME'S)</i> TEACHERS MISSED ANY SCHOOL DAYS?</p> <p>DID YOU CONTACT THE HEADMASTER, ANY OTHER EDUCATION OFFICIAL, OR THE PTA/SMC <i>(if appropriate)</i> ABOUT THIS?</p>

Question	Observation	Recommendation
ANY OTHER OFFICIAL OR THE PTA/SMC WHEN <i>(name)</i> 'S TEACHER WAS AWAY		<i>Probe if 'No'</i> – DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD CONTACT ANY EDUCATIONAL OFFICIAL ABOUT THIS?
<p><b>PR27.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU OR ANY ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD GONE TO <i>(name)</i>'S SCHOOL:</p> <p>[A] FOR A MEETING WITH THE HEAD TEACHER OR A TEACHER</p> <p>[B] FOR A GENERAL ASSEMBLY</p> <p>[C] FOR A SCHOOL CELEBRATION, PERFORMANCE OR SPORTS EVENT</p> <p>[D] TO COLLECT OR RETURN <i>(name's)</i> SCHOOL REPORT OR REPORT CARD</p>	<p>The term 'general assembly' should be replaced by 'school assembly'. Suggestion from debriefing that the question should ask first if the household had 'been invited' and then whether they had gone.</p>	<p>Retain with some rewording</p> <p>IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU OR ANY ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD GONE TO <i>(name's)</i> SCHOOL:</p> <p>[A] FOR A SCHOOL ASSEMBLY, A SCHOOL CELEBRATION, PERFORMANCE OR SPORTS EVENT</p> <p>[B] TO COLLECT OR RETURN <i>(name's)</i> SCHOOL REPORT OR REPORT CARD</p> <p>[C] TO DISCUSS <i>(name's)</i> PROGRESS WITH <i>(name's)</i> TEACHERS</p> <p>[D] TO HELP WITH ACTIVITIES</p>

QUESTION	Observation	Recommendation
<p><b>FL1.</b> IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID</p> <p>[A] YOU READ BOOKS ALOUD OR SILENTLY AT HOME?</p> <p>[B] SOMEONE READ TO YOU AT HOME?</p> <p>[C] SOMEONE TELL YOU STORIES AT HOME?</p>	<p>Response categories should be included in the questions. Need to clarify whether 'someone' needs to be a household member. Could ask if 'anyone' and then specify to find out 'who' and if a household member. Cognitive interviews in Belize suggested that children less than 10 years old could not relate to 'in the last week', while a third to a half of interviews recorded as having problems with different parts of this question.</p>	<p>Retain after rewording</p> <p>FIRST WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT READING.</p> <p>[A] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID YOU READ BOOKS AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>[B] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID SOMEONE READ TO YOU AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>[C] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID SOMEONE TELL YOU STORIES AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>Also, in next field test ask same question to primary caretaker for comparison.</p>
<p><b>FL2.</b> IS THERE SOMEONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD WHO HELPS YOU WITH YOUR STUDIES WHEN YOU NEED IT?</p>	<p>Debriefing suggested that the person involved be specified by adding 'Who?' to the question.</p>	<p>Ask the question to the primary caretaker</p>
<p><b>FL4.</b> DOES YOUR TEACHER EVER GIVE YOU ANY HOMEWORK?</p>	<p>Children can have more than one teacher.</p>	<p>Ask the question to the primary caretaker</p>
<p><b>FL5.</b> DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CHECK THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR HOMEWORK?</p>	<p>Debriefing suggested that the person involved be specified by adding 'Who?' to the question. Discussion around whether this question is about doing homework or completion.</p>	<p>Ask the question to the primary caretaker</p>
<p><b>FL6.</b> WHAT LANGUAGE DOES YOUR TEACHER USE MOST OFTEN WHEN TEACHING YOU IN CLASS?</p>	<p>Some experts thought younger child respondents might not be able to identify languages.</p>	<p>Include list of relevant languages when asking the question</p>



QUESTION	Observation	Recommendation
	One third of interviews in Belize recorded as having problems.	Also, in next field test ask same question to primary caretaker for comparison.
<p><b>FL7.</b> WHAT IS THE MAIN LANGUAGE YOU SPEAK AT HOME?</p>	Some experts thought younger child respondents might not be able to identify languages	<p>Include list of relevant languages when asking the question</p> <p>Also, in next field test ask same question to primary caretaker for comparison.</p>
<p><b>FL8.</b> I AM NOW GOING TO ASK YOU TO TRY TO READ A SHORT STORY AND THEN WE WILL TALK ABOUT WHAT YOU HAVE READ.</p> <p>WHAT LANGUAGE WOULD YOU LIKE TO USE TO READ YOUR STORY?</p>		Retain

## Annex B: Observations and recommendations from the Kenya field test by question

Question	Observation	Recommendation
<p><b>PR1.</b> NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT LEARNING ACTIVITIES AT HOME.</p> <p>HOW MANY CHILDREN'S BOOKS OR PICTURE BOOKS DO YOU HAVE FOR <i>(name)</i>?</p>	<p>The question does not specifically address which types of books are to be included and which are not.</p> <p>30% of respondents asked for clarification or were unsure of their answer</p>	<p>Reword and retain</p> <p>EXCLUDING SCHOOL TEXT BOOKS AND HOLY BOOKS, HOW MANY CHILDREN'S BOOKS OR PICTURE BOOKS DO YOU HAVE FOR <i>(name)</i> AT HOME?</p>
<p><b>PR2.</b> ARE THERE ANY OTHER READING MATERIALS AT HOME SUCH AS NEWSPAPERS OR MAGAZINES?</p>		Omit
<p><b>PR3.</b></p> <p>[A] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID <i>(name)</i> READ BOOKS AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>[B] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID SOMEONE READ TO <i>(name)</i> AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>[C] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID SOMEONE TELL <i>(name)</i> STORIES AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p>	<p>Mothers /caretakers are more likely to say their child 'read books at home every day' than the child.</p> <p>Interviewers were more likely to have problems asking these questions to the mother/caretaker and the mother/caretaker was more likely to have problems responding than when these questions were asked to the child.</p> <p>Some parents may consider homework as reading books at home.</p> <p>There is a specific Luo term for the practice of telling stories to children</p>	<p>Ask these questions to the child with only 'Yes' and 'No' responses.</p>
<p><b>PR4.</b> WHICH LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK MOST OF THE TIME WITH <i>(name)</i>?</p>	<p>Respondents and interviewers wanted to have more than one answer (up to 3) to reflect multi-language environment.</p>	<p>Ask the question to the child</p>
<p><b>PR5.</b> DOES <i>(name)</i> ATTEND A GOVERNMENT OR PUBLIC SCHOOL, A SCHOOL RUN BY A RELIGIOUS BODY OR A SCHOOL RUN BY ANOTHER ORGANISATION?</p>	<p>The choice should be just public or private.</p>	<p>Omit as included on MICS Education module</p>
<p><b>PR6.</b> WHAT LANGUAGE DOES <i>(name's)</i> TEACHER(S) USE MOST OFTEN WHEN TEACHING IN CLASS?</p>	<p>Parents do not always know the answer and ask the children.</p>	<p>Ask the question to the child</p>
<p><b>PR7.</b> DOES <i>(name)</i> EVER HAVE ANY HOMEWORK?</p>	<p>PR7-11 showed little discrimination in answers, 70% of respondents answered 'Yes' to all 5 questions.</p>	<p>Retain</p>
<p><b>PR8.</b> DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CHECK THAT <i>(name)</i> HAS COMPLETED HIS /HER HOMEWORK?</p>	<p>Consider changing the order to PR7, PR8, PR10, PR9, PR11.</p>	<p>Omit and replace with question on helping with homework</p>
<p><b>PR9.</b> DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD TALK TO <i>(name)</i> ABOUT WHAT HE/SHE IS LEARNING AT SCHOOL?</p>	<p>Need to clarify the difference between this question and PR11.</p>	<p>Omit</p>

Question	Observation	Recommendation
<p><b>PR10.</b> DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD HELP (<i>name</i>) WITH HIS/HER SCHOOLWORK?</p>	<p>Problem that the questionnaire printed for the field test says 'Homework' and not 'Schoolwork', annoying respondents who have said 'No' to PR7. Need to explain clearly the difference between schoolwork &amp; homework.</p>	<p>Retain and reword DOES ANYONE (WITHIN OR OUTSIDE THE HOUSEHOLD) HELP (<i>name</i>) WITH HIS/HER HOMEWORK?</p>
<p><b>PR11.</b> DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD DISCUSS WITH (<i>name</i>) HOW WELL HE /SHE IS DOING AT SCHOOL?</p>	<p>Need to clarify the difference between this question and PR9.</p>	<p>Omit</p>
<p><b>PR12.</b> DO YOU CURRENTLY PAY ANYONE TO PROVIDE TUTORING FOR (<i>name</i>) OUTSIDE OF REGULAR SCHOOL HOURS?</p>		<p>Omit</p>
<p><b>PR13.</b> DOES (<i>name's</i>) SCHOOL HAVE A PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION (PTA) OR A BOARD OF MANAGEMENT (BOM)?</p>	<p>Needs to be separate questions for PTA and BOM. Also spell out the terms rather than use acronyms.  20% of respondents asked for clarification or were unsure of their answer</p>	<p>Reword and retain DOES (<i>name's</i>) SCHOOL HAVE:  [A] A (<i>Parent Teacher Association/local term</i>)?  [B] A (<i>School Management Committee/local term</i>)?  Needs to be customised for each country</p>
<p><b>PR14.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU ATTENDED A MEETING CALLED BY (<i>name's</i>) SCHOOL PTA OR BOM?  <i>Probe if 'no'</i> – IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAS ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD ATTENDED A MEETING CALLED BY (<i>name's</i>) SCHOOL PTA OR BOM?</p>		<p>Reword and retain IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, HAVE YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD ATTENDED A MEETING CALLED BY THE (<i>Parent Teacher Association/local term</i>) OR THE (<i>School Management Committee/local term</i>)?  Needs to be customised for each country</p>
<p><b>PR15.</b> IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU OR ANY ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD GONE TO (<i>name's</i>) SCHOOL:  [A] FOR A SCHOOL ASSEMBLY, A SCHOOL CELEBRATION, PERFORMANCE OR SPORTS EVENT  [B] TO COLLECT OR RETURN (<i>name's</i>) SCHOOL REPORT OR REPORT CARD  [C] TO DISCUSS (<i>name's</i>) PROGRESS WITH (<i>name's</i>) TEACHERS  [D] TO HELP WITH ACTIVITIES</p>	<p>Suggest highlighting the time period as this varies with different questions.  List of activities for PR19A is too long and some get missed when the question is asked.  For PR19D consider including a list of activities in the interviewers manual and defining participation. 20% of respondents asked for clarification or were unsure of their answer.  A quarter of respondents answered 'Yes' to all parts of the question, 40% gave at least 2 'No's.</p>	<p>Retain all except PR15D.</p>
<p><b>PR16.</b> DO YOU KNOW WHAT A SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS?</p>	<p>A lot of discussion during training and in debriefing sessions to agree on a translation for 'School Development</p>	<p>Omit</p>

Question	Observation	Recommendation
	Plan' (the term in English was not thought to be in common use) but respondents often seemed to understand this to mean general development activities for the school. PR16 not necessary – could go straight to PR17.	
<b>PR17.</b> DO YOU KNOW IF ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL HAD A SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE LAST SCHOOL YEAR?	A quarter of respondents were either unsure of their answer or gave an answer that as hard to code.	Omit
<b>PR18.</b> DID YOU ATTEND ANY MEETING THAT DISCUSSED THE PREPARATION OF THIS PLAN  <i>Probe if 'no'</i> – DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD ATTEND ANY MEETING THAT DISCUSSED THE PREPARATION OF THIS PLAN?		Ask as reworded question immediately after the question on attending PTA/SMC meeting:  DURING ANY OF THESE MEETINGS, WAS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSED:  [A] A PLAN FOR IMPROVING ( <i>NAME'S</i> ) SCHOOL PERFORMANCE?  [B] SCHOOL BUDGET OR USE OF FUNDS RECEIVED BY ( <i>NAME'S</i> ) SCHOOL?
<b>PR19.</b> THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL. HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD ANY INFORMATION ABOUT THIS SCHOOL'S  [A] EXAMINATION SUCCESS  [B] PUPIL ATTENDANCE  [C] TEACHER ATTENDANCE  [D] BUDGET OR FUNDS RECEIVED  [E] ANY TYPE OF INFORMATION WITH COMPARISON TO OTHER SCHOOLS OR TO THE DISTRICT'S AVERAGE	All schools in Kenya are rated on their examination success and each schools rating is well known. A quarter of respondents answered 'Yes' to all parts of the question, 40% gave at least 2 'No's. 20% of respondents asked for clarification or gave an answer that was hard to code for PR19B. Take out the skip instruction at the side of PR19D question – causes PR19E to be missed. Schools in Kenya all publish their budgets PR19E is complicated to translate and should come before PR19D to avoid the skip. 20% of respondents asked for clarification or were unsure of their answer.	Retain without PR19D & PR19E and reword  IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD ANY INFORMATION ABOUT ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL ON:  [A] EXAMINATION RESULTS?  [B] PUPIL ABSENTEEISM (STUDENTS MISSING SCHOOL DAYS/BEING ABSENT FROM SCHOOL)?  [C] PUPIL REPETITION OR DROPOUT (STUDENTS REPEATING A GRADE OR DROPPING OUT FROM SCHOOL)?  [D] TEACHER ABSENTEEISM (TEACHERS MISSING SCHOOL DAYS/BEING ABSENT FROM THE CLASSROOM)?
<b>PR20.</b> YOU HAVE TOLD ME THAT YOU HAVE SEEN OR HEARD INFORMATION ABOUT THE BUDGET OR THE FUNDS RECEIVED BY ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL. HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED IN ANY FORMAL DISCUSSION REGARDING THE USE OF THESE FUNDS?		Omit
<b>PR21.</b> IN THE LAST SCHOOL TERM WAS ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL EVER CLOSED WHEN IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN OPEN?	Suggest highlighting the time period as this varies with different questions. 16% of respondents asked for clarification of the question.	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, DID ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL CLOSE ON SCHOOL DAYS DUE TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING REASONS:  [A] NATURAL DISASTERS (FLOOD, CYCLONE, EPIDEMICS...)?

Question	Observation	Recommendation
		[B] MAN-MADE DISASTERS (FIRE, BUILDING COLLAPSE, RIOTS, WAR...)?  [C] TEACHER STRIKE OR TEACHER ABSENTEEISM?  [D] OTHER?
<b>PR22.</b> FOR HOW MANY DAYS WAS ( <i>name's</i> ) SCHOOL CLOSED? <i>Circle 98 for 'Don't Know'</i>		Omit
<b>PR23.</b> WHEN THIS HAPPENED DID YOU CONTACT THE HEADMASTER, ANY OTHER EDUCATION OFFICIAL, OR THE BOM/PTA ( <i>if appropriate</i> ) ABOUT THIS?  <i>Probe if 'no' – DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD CONTACT ANY EDUCATIONAL OFFICIAL ABOUT THIS?</i>	Almost 20% of respondents had problems with this question, interrupting, asking for clarification of being unsure of the answer.	Retain and reword WHEN THIS HAPPENED DID YOU OR ANY OTHER ADULT MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD CONTACT THE SCHOOL HEADMASTER, ANY OTHER EDUCATION OFFICIAL, OR THE ( <i>School Parent Teacher association/local term</i> ) OR ( <i>School Management Committee/local term</i> )?  Needs to be customised for each country
<b>PR24.</b> IN THE LAST SCHOOL TERM HAVE ANY OF ( <i>name's</i> ) TEACHERS MISSED ANY SCHOOL DAYS?	Suggest highlighting the time period as this varies with different questions. Some parents may refer to the child to give an answer and in the absence of the child may not be able to answer.	Omit
<b>PR25.</b> DID YOU CONTACT THE HEADMASTER, ANY OTHER EDUCATION OFFICIAL, OR THE BOM/PTA ( <i>if appropriate</i> ) ABOUT THIS?  <i>Probe if 'no' – DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD CONTACT ANY EDUCATIONAL OFFICIAL ABOUT THIS?</i>	Almost a quarter of respondents had problems with this question, interrupting or asking for clarification.	Omit

QUESTION	OBSERVATION	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>FL1.</b> FIRST WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT READING.</p> <p>[D] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID YOU READ BOOKS AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>[E] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID SOMEONE READ TO YOU AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p> <p>[C] IN THE LAST WEEK HOW OFTEN DID SOMEONE TELL YOU STORIES AT HOME? WAS IT NEVER, SOME DAYS OR EVERY DAY?</p>	<p>FL1 to FL4 can be asked in any language –continue using the language used to establish rapport. Mothers /caretakers are more likely to say their child ‘read books at home every day’ than the child.</p> <p>Interviewers were more likely to have problems asking these questions to the mother/caretaker and the mother/caretaker was more likely to have problems responding than when these questions were asked to the child.</p> <p>There is a specific Luo term for the practice of telling stories to children</p>	<p>Retain as questions for child with only Yes/No responses.</p>
<p><b>FL2.</b> WHICH LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK MOST OF THE TIME AT HOME? IS IT (<i>choose from list</i>)?</p>	<p>Respondents want to give more than one answer (up to three) to reflect multi-language environment.</p>	<p>Retain and clarify only the language spoken most of the time should be coded. List of languages to be customised for each country</p>
<p><b>FL3.</b> WHAT LANGUAGE DOES YOUR TEACHER(S) USE MOST OF THE TIME WHEN TEACHING YOU IN CLASS? IS IT (<i>choose from list</i>)</p>	<p>Respondents want to give more than one answer (up to three) to reflect multi-language environment.</p>	<p>Retain and clarify only the language spoken most of the time should be coded. List of languages to be customised for each country</p>
<p><b>FL4.</b> NOW I AM GOING TO GIVE YOU A SHORT STORY TO READ. I HAVE A STORY IN ENGLISH AND ONE IN KISWAHILI. WHICH ONE WOULD YOU LIKE TO READ?</p>		<p>Retain with language options customised for each country</p>

Annex C: Modules for Parental Involvement and Foundational Learning in MICS6 (May 2017)

See <[mics.unicef.org/tools](http://mics.unicef.org/tools)> for latest questionnaires

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT		PR
<b>PR1.</b> Check CB3: Child's age?	AGE 5-6 YEARS ..... 1 AGE 7-14 YEARS ..... 2 AGE 15-17 YEARS ..... 3	1 ⇒ End  3 ⇒ End
<b>PR2.</b> At the end of this interview I will ask you if I can talk to ( <i>name</i> ). If (he/she) is close, can you please ask (him/her) to stay here. If ( <i>name</i> ) is not with you at the moment could I ask that you now arrange for (him/her) to return? If that is not possible, we will later discuss a convenient time for me to call back.		
<b>PR3.</b> Excluding school text books and holy books, how many books do you have for ( <i>name</i> ) to read at home?	NONE..... 00 NUMBER OF BOOKS ..... <u>0</u> ___ TEN OR MORE BOOKS ..... 10	
<b>PR4.</b> Check CB7: Did the child attend any school?  CHECK ED9 IN THE EDUCATION MODULE IN THE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CHILD IF CB7 WAS NOT ASKED.	YES, CB7/ED9=1 ..... 1 NO, CB7/ED9=2 OR BLANK..... 2	2 ⇒ End
<b>PR5.</b> Does ( <i>name</i> ) ever have homework?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DK ..... 8	2 ⇒ PR7 8 ⇒ PR7
<b>PR6.</b> Does anyone help ( <i>name</i> ) with homework?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DK ..... 8	
<b>PR7.</b> Does ( <i>name</i> )'s school have a school governing body in which parents can participate (such as <b>parent teacher association</b> or <b>school management committee / use local terms</b> )?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DK ..... 8	2 ⇒ PR10 8 ⇒ PR10
<b>PR8.</b> In the last 12 months, have you or any other adult from your household attended a meeting called by this school governing body?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DK ..... 8	2 ⇒ PR10 8 ⇒ PR10

<p><b>PR9.</b> During any of these meetings, was any of the following discussed:</p> <p>[A] A plan for addressing key education issues faced by <i>(name)</i>'s school?</p> <p>[B] School budget or use of funds received by <i>(name)</i>'s school?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">YES NO DK</p> <p>PLAN FOR ADDRESSING SCHOOL'S ISSUES ..... 1 2 8</p> <p>SCHOOL BUDGET..... 1 2 8</p>	
<p><b>PR10.</b> In the last 12 months, have you or any other adult from your household received a <b>school or student report card</b> for <i>(name)</i>?</p>	<p>YES ..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 2</p> <p>DK..... 8</p>	
<p><b>PR11.</b> In the last 12 months, have you or any adult from your household gone to <i>(name)</i>'s school for any of the following reasons?</p> <p>[A] A school celebration or a sport event?</p> <p>[B] To discuss <i>(name)</i>'s progress with (his/her) teachers?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">YES NO DK</p> <p>CELEBRATION OR SPORT EVENT ..... 1 2 8</p> <p>TO DISCUSS PROGRESS WITH TEACHERS ..... 1 2 8</p>	
<p><b>PR12.</b> In the last 12 months, has <i>(name)</i>'s school been closed on a school day due to any of the following reasons:</p> <p>[A] Natural disasters, such as flood, cyclone, epidemics or similar?</p> <p>[B] Man-made disasters, such as fire, building collapse, riots or similar?</p> <p>[C] Teacher strike?</p> <p>[X] Other?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">YES NO DK</p> <p>NATURAL DISASTERS ..... 1 2 8</p> <p>MAN-MADE DISASTERS ..... 1 2 8</p> <p>TEACHER STRIKE ..... 1 2 8</p> <p>OTHER ..... 1 2 8</p>	
<p><b>PR13.</b> In the last 12 months, was <i>(name)</i> unable to attend class due to (his/her) teacher being absent?</p>	<p>YES ..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 2</p> <p>DK..... 8</p>	
<p><b>PR14.</b> Check PR12[C] and PR13: Any 'Yes' recorded?</p>	<p>YES, PR12[C]=1 OR PR13=1 ..... 1</p> <p>NO..... 2</p>	2⇒End
<p><b>PR15.</b> When <i>(teacher strike / teacher absence)</i> happened did you or any other adult member of your household contact any school officials or school governing body representatives?</p>	<p>YES ..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 2</p> <p>DK..... 8</p>	



**FOUNDATIONAL LEARNING SKILLS**

**FL**

<b>FL0.</b> Check CB3: Child's age?	AGE 5-6 YEARS ..... 1 AGE 7-14 YEARS ..... 2 AGE 15-17 YEARS ..... 3	1 ⇨ End  3 ⇨ End
<p><b>FL1.</b> Now I would like to talk to (<i>name</i>). I will ask (him/her) a few questions about (himself/herself) and about reading, and then ask (him/her) to complete a few reading and number activities.</p> <p>These are not school tests and the results will not be shared with anyone, including other parents or the school.</p> <p>You will not benefit directly from participating and I am not trained to tell you how well (<i>name</i>) has performed.</p> <p>The activities are to help us find out how well children in this country are learning to read and to use numbers so that improvements can be made.</p> <p>This will take about 20 minutes. Again, all the information we obtain will remain strictly confidential and anonymous.</p>		
May I talk to ( <i>name</i> )?	YES, PERMISSION IS GIVEN..... 1 NO, PERMISSION IS NOT GIVEN ..... 2	2 ⇨ FL28

<b>FL2.</b> Record the time.	HOURS AND MINUTES ... __ __ : __ __	
<p><b>FL3.</b> My name is (<i>your name</i>). I would like to tell you a bit about myself.</p> <p>Could you tell me a little bit about yourself?</p> <p><i>When the child is comfortable, continue with the verbal consent:</i></p> <p>Let me tell you why I am here today. I am from <b>National Statistical Office</b>. I am part of a team trying to find out how children are learning to read and to use numbers. We are also talking to some of the children about this and asking them to do some reading and number activities. (Your mother/<i>Name of caretaker</i>) has said that you can decide if you want to help us. If you wish to help us, I will ask you some questions and give you some activities to do. I will explain each activity, and you can ask me questions any time. You do not have to do anything that you do not want to do. After we begin, if you do not want to answer a question or you do not want to continue that is alright.</p>		
Are you ready to get started?	YES, PERMISSION IS GIVEN..... 1 NO, PERMISSION IS NOT GIVEN ..... 2	1 ⇨ FL4 2 ⇨ FL28

- FL4.** Before you start with the reading and number activities, tick each box to show that:
- You are not alone with the child unless they are at least visible to an adult known to the child.
  - You have engaged the child in conversation and built rapport, e.g. using an Icebreaker.
  - The child is sat comfortably, able to use the Reading & Numbers Book without difficulty while you can see which page is open.

<b>FL5.</b> Remember you can ask me a question at any time if there is something you do not understand. You can ask me to stop at any time.		
<b>FL6.</b> First we are going to talk about reading.  [A] Do you read books at home?  [B] Does someone read to you at home?	YES NO  READS BOOKS AT HOME..1 2  READ TO AT HOME.... 1 2	
<b>FL7.</b> Which language do you speak most of the time at home?  <i>Probe if necessary and read the listed languages.</i>	LANGUAGE 1 ..... 1 LANGUAGE 2 ..... 2 LANGUAGE 3 ..... 3  OTHER ( <i>specify</i> ) ..... 6 DK ..... 8	
<b>FL8.</b> Check CB7: Did the child attend any school?  <i>CHECK ED9 IN THE EDUCATION MODULE IN THE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CHILD IF CB7 WAS NOT ASKED.</i>	YES, CB7/ED9=1 ..... 1 NO, CB7/ED9=2 OR BLANK 2	1 ⇒FL9
<b>FL8A.</b> Check FL7: Is READING & NUMBER BOOK available in the language spoken at home?	YES, FL7=1, 2 OR 3 ..... 1 NO, FL7=6 OR 8 ..... 2	1 ⇒FL10B 2 ⇒FL23
<b>FL9.</b> What language do your teachers use most of the time when teaching you in class?  <i>Probe if necessary and name the listed languages.</i>	LANGUAGE 1 ..... 1 LANGUAGE 2 ..... 2 LANGUAGE 3 ..... 3  OTHER ( <i>specify</i> ) ..... 6 DK ..... 8	1 ⇒FL10A 2 ⇒FL10A 3 ⇒FL10A  6 ⇒FL23 8 ⇒FL23
<b>FL10A.</b> Now I am going to give you a short story to read in ( <i>Language recorded in FL9</i> ). Would you like to start reading the story?  <b>FL10B.</b> Now I am going to give you a short story to read in ( <i>Language recorded in FL7</i> ). Would you like to start reading the story?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2	2 ⇒FL23
<b>FL11.</b> Check CB3: Child's age?	AGE 7-9 YEARS..... 1 AGE 10-14 YEARS..... 2	1 ⇒FL13
<b>FL12.</b> Check CB7: Did the child attend any school?  <i>CHECK ED9 IN THE EDUCATION MODULE IN THE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CHILD IF CB7 WAS NOT ASKED.</i>	YES, CB7/ED9=1 ..... 1 NO, CB7/ED9=2 OR BLANK 2	1 ⇒FL19

**FL13.** Give the child the *READING & NUMBER BOOK*.

Open the page showing the reading practice item and say:

Now we are going to do some reading. *Point to the sentence.* I would like you to read this aloud. Then I may ask you a question.

*Sam is a cat. Tina is a dog. Sam is 5. Tina is 6.*

<p><b>FL14.</b> Did the child read every word in the practice correctly?</p>	<p>YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2</p>	<p>2 ⇒FL23</p>
<p><b>FL15.</b> Once the reading is done, ask: <b>How old is Sam?</b></p>	<p><b>SAM IS 5 YEARS OLD</b> ..... 1 OTHER ANSWERS ..... 2 NO ANSWER AFTER 5 SECONDS ..... 3</p>	<p>1 ⇒FL17</p>
<p><b>FL16.</b> Say: <b>Sam is 5 years old.</b>  <i>and go to FL23.</i></p>		<p>⇒FL23</p>
<p><b>FL17.</b> Here is another question: <b>Who is older: Sam or Tina?</b></p>	<p><b>TINA IS OLDER (THAN SAM)</b> ..... 1 OTHER ANSWERS ..... 2 NO ANSWER AFTER 5 SECONDS ..... 3</p>	<p>1 ⇒FL19</p>
<p><b>FL18.</b> Say: <b>Tina is older than Sam. Tina is 6 and Sam is 5.</b>  <i>and go to FL23.</i></p>		<p>⇒FL23</p>

<p><b>FL19.</b> Turn the page to reveal the reading passage.</p> <p>Thank you. Now I want you to try this.</p> <p>Here is a story. I want you to read it aloud as carefully as you can.</p> <p>You will start here (<i>point to the first word on the first line</i>) and you will read line by line (<i>point to the direction for reading each line</i>).</p> <p>When you finish I will ask you some questions about what you have read.</p> <p>If you come to a word you do not know, go onto the next word.</p> <p>Put your finger on the first word. Ready? Begin.</p>	Moses	is	in	class	two.	One	day,
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Moses	was	going	home	from	school.	He
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	saw	some	red	flower s	on	the	way.
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	The	flower s	were	near	a	tomato	farm.
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	Moses	wanted	to	get	some	flower s	for
	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
	his	mother .	Moses	ran	fast	across	the
	36	37	38	39	40	41	42
	farm	to	get	the	flowers.	He	fell
	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
	down	near	a	banana	tree.	Moses	started
	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
	crying.	The	farmer	saw	him	and	came.
57	58	59	60	61	62	63	
He	gave	Moses	many	flowers.	Moses	was	
64	65	66	67	68	69	70	
very	happy.						
71	72						
<b>FL20.</b> Results of the child's reading.	LAST WORD ATTEMPTED..... NUMBER __ __						
	TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS INCORRECT OR MISSED..... NUMBER __ __						
<b>FL21.</b> How well did the child read the story?	THE CHILD READ AT LEAST ONE WORD CORRECT..... 1						2 ⇒FL23  3 ⇒FL23
	THE CHILD DID NOT READ ANY WORD CORRECTLY..... 2						
	THE CHILD DID NOT TRY TO READ THE STORY ..... 3						

<p><b>FL22.</b> Now I am going to ask you a few questions about what you have read.</p> <p><i>If the child does not provide a response after a few seconds, repeat the question. If the child seems unable to provide an answer after repeating the question, mark 'No response' and say: Thank you. That is ok. We will move on.</i></p> <p><i>Make sure the child can still see the passage and ask:</i></p> <p>[A] <b>What class is Moses in?</b></p> <p>[B] <b>What did Moses see on the way home?</b></p> <p>[C] <b>Why did Moses start crying?</b></p> <p>[D] <b>Where did Moses fall (down)?</b></p> <p>[E] <b>Why was Moses happy?</b></p>	<p>CORRECT ((<b>MOSES IS</b>) <b>IN CLASS TWO</b>).... 1  INCORRECT ..... 2  NO RESPONSE / SAYS 'I DON'T KNOW' ... 3</p> <p>CORRECT (<b>HE SAW SOME FLOWERS</b>) ..... 1  INCORRECT ..... 2  NO RESPONSE / SAYS 'I DON'T KNOW' ... 3</p> <p>CORRECT (<b>BECAUSE HE FELL</b>)..... 1  INCORRECT ..... 2  NO RESPONSE / SAYS 'I DON'T KNOW' ... 3</p> <p>CORRECT ((<b>MOSES FELL DOWN</b>) <b>NEAR A BANANA TREE</b>)..... 1  INCORRECT ..... 2  NO RESPONSE / SAYS 'I DON'T KNOW' ... 3</p> <p>CORRECT (<b>BECAUSE THE FARMER GAVE HIM MANY FLOWERS. / BECAUSE HE HAD FLOWERS TO GIVE TO HIS MOTHER</b>)..... 1  INCORRECT ..... 2  NO RESPONSE / SAYS 'I DON'T KNOW' ... 3</p>	
--	--	--

<p><b>FL23.</b> Turn the page in the Reading &amp; Numbers Book so the child is looking at the list of numbers. Make sure the child is looking at this page.</p> <p>Now here are some numbers. I want you to point to each number and tell me what the number is.</p> <p><i>Point to the first number and say:</i></p> <p>Start here.</p> <p><i>If the child stops on a number for a while, tell the child what the number is, mark the number as 'No Attempt', point to the next number and say:</i></p> <p>What is this number?</p> <p><b>STOP RULE</b> <i>If the child does not attempt to read 2 consecutive numbers, say:</i></p> <p>Thank you. That is ok. We will go to the next activity.</p>	<p><b>9</b> CORRECT ..... 1 INCORRECT ..... 2 NO ATTEMPT ..... 3</p> <p><b>12</b> CORRECT ..... 1 INCORRECT ..... 2 NO ATTEMPT ..... 3</p> <p><b>30</b> CORRECT ..... 1 INCORRECT ..... 2 NO ATTEMPT ..... 3</p> <p><b>48</b> CORRECT ..... 1 INCORRECT ..... 2 NO ATTEMPT ..... 3</p> <p><b>74</b> CORRECT ..... 1 INCORRECT ..... 2 NO ATTEMPT ..... 3</p> <p><b>731</b> CORRECT ..... 1 INCORRECT ..... 2 NO ATTEMPT ..... 3</p>	
<p><b>FL23A.</b> Check FL23: Did the child correctly identify two of the first three numbers (9, 12 and 30)?</p>	<p>YES, AT LEAST TWO CORRECT ..... 1 NO, AT LEAST 2 INCORRECT OR WITH NO ATTEMPT ..... 2</p>	<p>2 ⇒ FL28</p>
<p><b>FL24.</b> Turn the page so the child is looking at the first pair of numbers. Make sure the child is looking at this page. Say:</p> <p>Look at these numbers. Tell me which one is bigger.</p> <p><i>Record the child's answer before turning the page in the book and repeating the question for the next pair of numbers.</i></p> <p><i>If the child does not provide a response after a few seconds, repeat the question. If the child seems unable to provide an answer after repeating the question, mark a 'Z' for the answer on the appropriate row on the questionnaire, turn the booklet page and show the child the next pair of numbers.</i></p> <p><i>If the child does not attempt 2 consecutive pairs, say:</i></p> <p>Thank you. That is ok. We will go to the next activity.</p>	<p>7      5      _____</p> <p>11     24     _____</p> <p>58     49     _____</p> <p>65     67     _____</p> <p>146    154    _____</p>	

**FL25.** Give the child a pencil and paper. Turn the page so the child is looking at the first addition. Make sure the child is looking at this page. Say:

Look at this sum. How much is (**number plus number**)? Tell me the answer. You can use the pencil and paper if it helps you.

*Record the child's answer before turning the page in the book and repeating the question for the next sum.*

*If the child does not provide a response after a few seconds, repeat the question. If the child seems unable to provide an answer after repeating the question, mark a 'Z' for the answer on the appropriate row on the questionnaire, turn the booklet page and show the child the next addition.*

*If the child does not attempt 2 consecutive pairs, say:*

Thank you. That is ok. We will go to the next activity.

$$3 + 2 = \underline{\quad}$$

$$8 + 6 = \underline{\quad}$$

$$7 + 3 = \underline{\quad}$$

$$13 + 6 = \underline{\quad}$$

$$12 + 24 = \underline{\quad}$$

**FL26.** Turn the page to the practice sheet for missing numbers. Say:

Here are some numbers. 1, 2, and 4. What number goes here?

*If the child answers **correctly** say:*

That's correct, 3. Let's do another one.

*If the child answers **incorrectly**, do not explain the child how to get the correct answer. Just say:*

The number 3 goes here. Say the numbers with me. (*Point to each number*) 1, 2, 3, 4. 3 goes here. Let's do another one.

*Now turn the page to the next practice sheet. Say:*

Here are some more numbers. 5, 10, 15 and \_\_\_\_\_. What number goes here?

*If the child answers **correctly** say:*

That's correct, 20. Now I want you to try this on your own

*If the child answers **incorrectly** say:*

The number 20 goes here. Say the numbers with me. (*Point to each number*) 5, 10, 15, 20. 20 goes here. Now I want you to try this on your own.

<p><b>FL27.</b> Now turn the page in the Reading &amp; Numbers Book with the first missing number activity. Say:</p> <p>Here are some more numbers. Tell me what number goes here (pointing to the missing number).</p> <p>Record the child's answer before turning the page in the book and repeating the question.</p> <p>If the child does not provide a response after a few seconds, repeat the question. If the child seems unable to provide an answer after repeating the question, mark a 'Z' for the answer on the appropriate row on the questionnaire.</p> <p>If the child does not attempt 2 consecutive activities, say:</p> <p>Thank you. That is ok.</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">___</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">14</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">___</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">___</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">___</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">___</td> </tr> </table>	5	6	7	___	14	15	___	17	20	___	40	50	2	4	6	___	5	8	11	___	
5	6	7	___																			
14	15	___	17																			
20	___	40	50																			
2	4	6	___																			
5	8	11	___																			

<p><b>FL28.</b> Result of interview with child.</p> <p>Discuss any result not completed with Supervisor.</p>	<p>COMPLETED.....01</p> <p>NOT AT HOME .....02</p> <p>MOTHER / CARETAKER REFUSED .....03</p> <p>CHILD REFUSED.....04</p> <p>PARTLY COMPLETED .....05</p> <p>INCAPACITATED.....06</p> <p>OTHER (specify) _____ 96</p>	
--	--	--



<b>FS11.</b> <i>Record the time.</i>	HOURS AND MINUTES..... ____ : ____	
<b>FS12.</b> <i>Language of the Questionnaire.</i>	ENGLISH ..... 1 LANGUAGE 2 ..... 2 LANGUAGE 3 ..... 3	
<b>FS13.</b> <i>Language of the Interview.</i>	ENGLISH ..... 1 LANGUAGE 2 ..... 2 LANGUAGE 3 ..... 3  OTHER LANGUAGE (specify) _____ 6	
<b>FS14.</b> <i>Native language of the Respondent.</i>	ENGLISH ..... 1 LANGUAGE 2 ..... 2 LANGUAGE 3 ..... 3  OTHER LANGUAGE (specify) _____ 6	
<b>FS15.</b> <i>Was a translator used for any parts of this questionnaire?</i>	YES, THE ENTIRE QUESTIONNAIRE ..... 1 YES, PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE... 2 NO, NOT USED ..... 3	
<p><b>FS16.</b> <i>Thank the respondent and the child for her/his cooperation.</i></p> <p><i>Proceed to complete the result in FS17 in the 5-17 CHILD INFORMATION PANEL and then go to the HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE and complete HH56.</i></p> <p><i>Make arrangements for the administration of the remaining questionnaire(s) in this household.</i></p>		

## Annex D: List of MICS6 indicators on Parental Involvement and Foundational Learning Skills

LITERACY AND EDUCATION					
7.20	Availability of information on children's school performance	PR	Number of children age 7-14 enrolled in schools providing student report cards to parents	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school	
7.21	Opportunity to participate in School Management	PR	Number of children age 7-14 enrolled in schools whose governing body includes parents	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school	
7.22	Participation in school management	PR	Number of children age 7-14 attending school whose household member participated in school governing body meetings	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school	
7.23	Effective participation in school management	PR	Number of children age 7-14 attending school whose household member discussed key education/financial issues during school governing body meetings	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school	
7.24	Discussion with teachers regarding children's progress	PR	Number of children age 7-14 attending school whose household member discussed child's progress with teachers	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school	
7.25	Contact with school concerning teacher absence/strike	PR	Number of children age 7-14 attending school whose household member contacted school representatives when school was closed and/or class didn't take place because of teacher absence/strike	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school who couldn't attend class and/or whose school was closed due to teacher absence/strike	
7.26	Support with homework	PR	Number of children age 7-14 attending school who receive help with homework	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school who have homework	
7.27	Availability of books at home	PR	Number of children 7-14 years who have three or more books to read at home	Total number of children age 7-14 years	
7.28	Reading habit at home	FL	Number of children 7-14 years who read books or are read to at home	Total number of children age 7-14 years	
7.29	School and home languages	FL	Number of children age 7-14 attending school whose home language is used at school	Total number of children age 7-14 attending school	
7.30	Children with foundational reading and number skills	FL	Number of children 7-14 years who successfully complete (a) three foundational reading tasks (b) four foundational number tasks	Total number of children age 7-14 years	SDG Indicator 4.1.1

For information on the report, please contact:

United Nations Children's Fund

Data and Analytics Section

Division of Data, Research and Policy

3 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA

Tel: +1 (212)-326-7000

Email: [mics@unicef.org](mailto:mics@unicef.org)