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**5. Research process**

* 1. Respondents by type (e.g. girl, teacher) and state
	2. Number of interviews by state/state and level of privacy
	3. Number of interviews by respondent type by enumerator variables? [sex, age, type (PO, professional researcher, research assistant)]
	4. Instruments completed (data missing) by state/state

Other tables included in this section: Distribution of girls interviewed by age, Schools and school level data (rural/urban, primary/secondary)

**5.1 Survey respondents by State**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Girls | Teachers | Community Circle Members | Head teachers | SMC chairs | Girls’ club matrons |
| Bauchi | 105 | 56 | 35 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| FCT | 35 | 20 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Gombe | 96 | 43 | 30 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Kaduna | 115 | 58 | 21 | 12 | 11 | 12 |
| Katsina | 120 | 60 | 36 | 12 | 11 | 12 |
| Nasarawa | 39 | 20 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Niger | 55 | 38 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Plateau | 64 | 36 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| **Total** | 629 | 331 | 186 | 72 | 70 | 71 |

**5.2 Interviews by privacy level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Girls | Teachers | Community Circle Members | Head teachers | SMC chairs | Girls’ club matrons |
| Total privacy | 566 | 325 | 180 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| Partial privacy | 56 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Little/no privacy | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| No data | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 629 | 331 | 186 | 72 | 70 | 71 |

**Distribution of girls interviewed by age**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Age | Number | % |
| 6 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 8 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 9 | 2 | 0.3 |
| 10 | 34 | 5 |
| 11 | 39 | 6 |
| 12 | 108 | 17 |
| 13 | 89 | 14 |
| 14 | 94 | 15 |
| 15 | 87 | 14 |
| 16 | 61 | 10 |
| 17 | 25 | 4 |
| 18 | 23 | 4 |
| 19 | 13 | 2 |
| 20 | 3 | 0.5 |
| 22 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 30 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 33 | 1 | 0.2 |
| Refuse to answer | 6 | 1 |
| Don’t know | 27 | 4 |
| No data | 13 | 2 |
| Total | 629 | 100 |

**Schools and school level data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Schools in sample | School admin data | LGEA admin data | Data on school based interventions |
| Bauchi | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 |
| FCT | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Gombe | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 |
| Kaduna | 12 | 12 | 4 | 12 |
| Katsina | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 |
| Nasarawa | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Niger | 8 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| Plateau | 8 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Total | 72 | 72 | 31 | 72 |

**Rural/Urban**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Rural | Semi-urban | Urban | Total Schools in sample |
| Bauchi | 9 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| FCT | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Gombe | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| Kaduna | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Katsina | 1 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Nasarawa | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Niger | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| Plateau | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| Total | 47 | 21 | 4 | 72 |

**Primary/Secondary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary | Secondary | Total Schools in sample |
| Bauchi | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| FCT | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Gombe | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Kaduna | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Katsina | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Nasarawa | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Niger | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Plateau | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 36 | 36 | 72 |

**6. Intervention**

* 1. Intervention variable by state and urban/rural
	2. 3 Intervention Sub-indexes by state
	3. Each component of each sub-index by state[[1]](#footnote-1)
	4. Correlations within and between sub-indexes to see whether some schools tend to have stronger interventions in all measures it just some External interventions by state/state and urban/rural
	5. Relationship between TEGINT interventions and other external organisations/interventions at school level (correlation?)
	6. **Intervention variable by state and urban/rural**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **state** | **Intervention Index[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| Bauchi | 0.561 |
| FCT | 0.549 |
| Gombe | 0.651 |
| Kaduna | 0.619 |
| Katsina | 0.628 |
| Nasarawa | 0.647 |
| Niger | 0.613 |
| Plateau | 0.666 |
|  |  |
| Urban | 0.629 |
| Rural | 0.613 |
|  |  |
| Overall | 0.619 |

Louise: Interventions strongest in Plateau and weakest in FCT but within a narrow range indicating equitable distribution of interventions across project states and rural/urban locations.

* 1. **3 Sub-indexes by state**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| state | Girls clubs  | Teacher training[[3]](#footnote-3) | SBMC support[[4]](#footnote-4) |
| Bauchi | .552 | .596  | .526 |
| FCT | .546 | .609 | .466 |
| Gombe | .577 | .824 | .579 |
| Kaduna | .513 | .742 | .700 |
| Katsina | .529 | .762 | .679 |
| Nasarawa | .516 | .750 | .821 |
| Niger | .506 | .797 | .605 |
| Plateau | .618 | .675 | .774 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Overall | .546 | .726 | .639 |

* 1. **Correlations within and between sub-indexes to see whether some schools tend to have stronger interventions in all measures it just some External interventions by state/state and urban/rural**

There is no significant relationship between intervention sub-indexes.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Girls’ club subindex** | **Teacher training subindex** | **SMC support subindex** |
| **Girls’ club subindex** | 1.0000 |  |  |
| **Teacher training subindex** | -0.0452 P=0.7062  | 1.0000 |  |
| **SMC support subindex** | -0.0058 P=0.9612  | 0.1292P=0.2795  | 1.0000 |

**7. Changes in school gender profile**

* 1. Mean school gender profile 2008 and 2012 by state/state and urban/rural (and overall) (do a statistical test to measure significance?)
	2. analyse the change for each component of the gender (i.e. enrolment change 2008-2012 by state and overall)
	3. Comparisons of TEGINT schools change with state-wide change (using govt stats collected) for each component and gender profile
	4. Correlation between gender profile change and intervention index (and sub-indexes) – overall and urban/rural

**7.1 Mean school gender profile and components 2008 and 2012**

**Summary tables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definition for endline (for baseline data used from 4 years earlier) | Baseline | Endline |
| **Primary schools** |
| Gender Profile Score[[5]](#footnote-5) | Index incorporating the components below | 0.908 | 1.016 |
| GPI enrolment | Gender parity in girls to boys enrolled in Classes 1-7 in 2012. Weighted x1 | 0.793 | 0.932 |
| GPI attendance | Gender parity in the proportions of girls to boys enrolled in Classes 1-7 in 2012 who were attending on February 15th 2012. Weighted x2 | 0.967 | 0.979 |
| GPI progression  | The proportion of all girls enrolled in a school who are enrolled in P6 compared with the proportion of all boys enrolled in a school who are enrolled in P6). Weighted x2  | 0.906 | 1.101 |
| GPI exam entry  | Proportion of girls enrolled in P6 who are entered for the P6 exam compared with proportion of boys enrolled in P6 who are entered for the P6 exam). Weighted x2. | 1.035 | 1.128 |
| **Secondary schools** |
| Gender Profile Score[[6]](#footnote-6) | Index incorporating the components below | 0.829 | 0.845 |
| GPI enrolment | Gender parity in girls to boys enrolled in JSS 1-3 in 2012. Weighted x1 | 0.465 | 0.703 |
| GPI progression | The proportion of all girls enrolled in JSS1 who are enrolled in JSS 3 compared with the proportion of all boys enrolled in JSS1 who are enrolled in JSS 3). Weighted x2  | 0.895 | 0.879 |
| GPI Completion | The proportion of all girls enrolled in JSS1 who are entered for the exam in JSS 3 compared with the proportion of all boys enrolled in JSS1 who are entered for the exam in JSS 3). Weighted x2 | 0.747 | 1.019 |
| GPI Performance | The proportion of girls entered for the JSS3 exam who pass in all subjects compared with the proportion of boys entered for the JSS3 exam who pass in all subjects). Weighted x3. | 1.059 | 1.001 |

**Gender Profile Score by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.885 | 1.015  |
| Rural | 0.871 | 0.894 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 0.916 | 0.935 |
| FCT | 0.919 | 0.788 |
| Gombe | 0.656 | 1.013 |
| Kaduna | 0.941 | 0.867 |
| Katsina | 0.785 | 0.965 |
| Nasarawa | 1.045 | 1.004 |
| Niger | 0.886 | 0.780 |
| Plateau | 1.105 | 1.076 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 0.875 | 0.934 |

1. **Enrolment**

**GPI enrolment by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.684 | 0.886 |
| Rural | 0.654 | 0.794 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 0.558 | 0.794 |
| FCT | 0.851 | 0.797 |
| Gombe | 0.489 | 0.797 |
| Kaduna | 0.775 | 0.861 |
| Katsina | 0.669 | 0.830 |
| Nasarawa | 0.883 | 1.001 |
| Niger | 0.552 | 0.670 |
| Plateau | 1.017 | 0.904 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 0.657 | 0.824 |

**Primary school enrolment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean number of girls enrolled: Baseline 2008  | Mean number of girls enrolled: Endline 2012 |
|  | TEGINT schoolsMean (number of schools with full data available) | All schools in LGEAs in state |  TEGINT schools Mean (number of schools with full data available) | All schools in LGEAs in state |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 144 (4) |  | 303 (4) |  |
| FCT | 300 (2) |  | 241 (2) |  |
| Gombe | 142 (6) |  | 202 (5) |  |
| Kaduna | 182 (4) |  | 153 (6) |  |
| Katsina | 1140 (6) |  | 1261 (6) |  |
| Nasarawa | 504 (1) |  | 204 (2) |  |
| Niger | 111 (1) |  | 124 (3) |  |
| Plateau | 261 (1) |  | 102 (2) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 419 (25) |  | 406 (30) |  |

Baseline to endline change in **primary** school enrolment: % change in enrolment TEGINT schools and state wide and % change in GPI enrolment TEGINT schools and state wide

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % change in primary school enrolment | % change in GPI enrolment |
|  |  TEGINT schools | All schools in state |  TEGINT schools | All schools in state |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bauchi | +110% |  | -6% |  |
| FCT | -20% |  | 42% |  |
| Gombe | 42% |  | 63% |  |
| Kaduna | -16% |  | 11% |  |
| Katsina | 11% |  | 24% |  |
| Nasarawa | -60% |  | 13% |  |
| Niger | 12% |  | 21% |  |
| Plateau | -60% |  | -11% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | -3% |  | 25% |  |

Secondary school enrolment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean number of girls enrolled: Baseline 2008  | Mean number of girls enrolled: Endline 2012 |
|  | TEGINT schoolsMean (number of schools with full data available) | All schools in LGEAs in state |  TEGINT schools Mean (number of schools with full data available) | All schools in LGEAs in state |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 95 (4) |  | 137 (6) |  |
| FCT | 316(2) |  | 235 (2) |  |
| Gombe | 68 (2) |  | 120 (4) |  |
| Kaduna | 254 (6) |  | 272 (6) |  |
| Katsina | 806 (6) |  | 2233 (6) |  |
| Nasarawa | - (0) |  | 109 (2) |  |
| Niger | 231 (2) |  | 89 (3) |  |
| Plateau | 116 (3) |  | 78 (4) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 333 (25) |  | 533 (33) |  |

Baseline to endline change in **secondary** school enrolment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | %Change in enrolment |
|  |  TEGINT schools |
| Bauchi | 44% |
| FCT | -26% |
| Gombe | 76% |
| Kaduna | 7% |
| Katsina | 177% |
| Nasarawa | n/a |
| Niger | -61% |
| Plateau | -33% |
|  |  |
| Overall | 60% |

1. **Attendance (primary school only)**

**GPI attendance by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 1.020 | 1.011 |
| Rural | 0.942 | 0.947 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 1.021 | 0.832 |
| FCT | 1.061 | 0.998 |
| Gombe | 0.845 | 0.973 |
| Kaduna | 0.970 | 0.963 |
| Katsina | 1.008 | 0.980 |
| Nasarawa | n/a | 0.961 |
| Niger | 1.124 | 1.106 |
| Plateau | 0.932 | 1.232 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 0.967 | 0.979 |

Primary school attendance rates[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number (%) of girls attending: 2008 | Number (%) of girls attending: 2012 |
|  |  TEGINT schools | All schools in state |  TEGINT schools | All schools in state |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 128(89%) |  | 198(65%) |  |
| FCT | 213(71%) |  | 186(77%) |  |
| Gombe | 93(65%) |  | 183(91%) |  |
| Kaduna | 170(93%) |  | 131(86%) |  |
| Katsina | 1077(94%) |  | 1215(96%) |  |
| Nasarawa | 446(88%) |  | 181(89%) |  |
| Niger | 121(109%) |  | 107(86%) |  |
| Plateau | 261(100%) |  | 124(122%) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 379 (90%) |  | 369(91%) |  |

Baseline to endline change in **primary** school attendance rates: TEGINT schools and state wide

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % change in primary school attendance as a proportion of enrolment baseline/endline | % change in GPI attendance |
|  |  TEGINT schools | All schools in state |  TEGINT schools | All schools in state |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bauchi | -27% |  | -19% |  |
| FCT | 8% |  | -6% |  |
| Gombe | 40% |  | 15% |  |
| Kaduna | -7% |  | -1% |  |
| Katsina | 2% |  | -3% |  |
| Nasarawa | 1% |  |  |  |
| Niger | -21% |  | -2% |  |
| Plateau | 22% |  | 32% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 1% |  | 1% |  |

1. **Progression**

**GPI progression by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.990 | 1.010 |
| Rural | 0.848 | 0.988 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 0.933 | 1.003 |
| FCT | 0.866 | 0.835 |
| Gombe | 0.843 | 1.226 |
| Kaduna | 0.914 | 0.927 |
| Katsina | 0.899 | 0.994 |
| Nasarawa | 1.359 | 1.054 |
| Niger | 0.809 | 0.869 |
| Plateau | 1.007 | 0.921 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 0.901 | 0.995 |

1. **Exam entry (primary school only)**

**GPI exam entry by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.966 | 1.068 |
| Rural | 1.061 | 1.156 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 1.102 | 1.396 |
| FCT | 1.100 | 0.857 |
| Gombe | 0.931 | 1.098 |
| Kaduna | 1.070 | 0.833 |
| Katsina | 0.929 | n/a |
| Nasarawa | 0.972 | 1.193 |
| Niger | 1.153 | 1.127 |
| Plateau | 1.116 | 1.382 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 1.035 | 1.128 |

**GPI passing exams by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.89 | 1.14 |
| Rural | n/a | 1.28 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| FCT | n/a | 1.25 |
| Gombe | 1.01 | 0.99 |
| Kaduna | 0.78 | 2.02 |
| Katsina | 0.98 | 1.12 |
| Nasarawa | 1.00 | 1.10 |
| Niger | 1.15 | 1.32 |
| Plateau | 1.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 1.25 | 1.24 |

**Primary school attainment rates - that is number of girls passing all subjects as a proportion of all those entered[[8]](#footnote-8)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Girls’ pass rate: Baseline | Girls’ pass rate: Endline |
|  |  TEGINT schools (2008) | All schools in state (2008) |  TEGINT schools (2011) | All schools in state (2011) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 100% |  | 100% |  |
| FCT | 13% |  | 55% |  |
| Gombe | 87% |  | 96% |  |
| Kaduna | 68% |  | 80% |  |
| Katsina |  |  |  |  |
| Nasarawa | 84% |  | 77% |  |
| Niger | 62% |  | 52% |  |
| Plateau | 86% |  | 100 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 77% |  | 83% |  |

Baseline to endline change in **primary** school pass rates: TEGINT schools and state wide

|  |
| --- |
| % change in girls’ pass rates |
|  |  TEGINT schools (ratio) – baseline to endline | TEGINT schools (difference) baseline to endline |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 0% | 0% |
| FCT | 323% | 42% |
| Gombe | 10% | 9% |
| Kaduna | 18% | 12% |
| Katsina | -% | -% |
| Nasarawa | -8% | -7% |
| Niger | -16% | -10% |
| Plateau | 16% | 14% |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 8% | 6% |

1. **Completion (Secondary schools only)**

**GPI completion by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.747 | 0.943 |
| Rural | 0.720 | 1.046 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 0.722 | 0.830 |
| FCT | 0.671 | 0.993 |
| Gombe | 0.689 | 0.905 |
| Kaduna | 0.767 | 1.094 |
| Katsina | 0.584 | 1.004 |
| Nasarawa | 1.000 | 1.085 |
| Niger | 0.835 | 0.920 |
| Plateau | n/a | 1.356 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 0.747 | 1.019 |

**F: Performance (Secondary schools only)**

**GPI performance by urban/rural location and state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline | Endline |
|  |  |  |
| Urban | 1.088 | 1.224 |
| Rural | 1.046 | 0.904 |
|  |  |  |
| Bauchi | 1.063 | 0.978 |
| FCT | 0.988 | 1.570 |
| Gombe | 1.051 | 0.938 |
| Kaduna | 1.127 | 0.966 |
| Katsina | 0.893 | 1.139 |
| Nasarawa | 0.994 | 0.722 |
| Niger | 1.103 | 0.973 |
| Plateau | n/a | 0.792 |
|  |  |  |
| Overall | 1.058 | 1.001 |

**8. Girls’ empowerment**

* 1. Girls’ empowerment indicator by state (construct this as per composite indicator document)
	2. Girls’ empowerment indicator by urban/rural
	3. Girls’ empowerment composite by intervention variable
	4. Girls’ empowerment composite by gender profile
	5. Obstacles identified girls by state/state 2008 & 2012 (do a statistical test to measure significance?)
	6. Solutions identified by girls by state 2008-2012 (do a statistical test to measure significance?)
	7. knowledge of HIV , attitudes towards HIV (non-discrimination, negotiating safer sex), knowledge of and attitudes towards gender equity and violence, level of confidence in dealing with gender based violence, by state and overall
	8. Changes in obstacles and solutions cited by girls, by girls’ club intervention sub-index (and other sub-indexes?), and amount of exchange visits
	9. Correlation between components of girls’ empowerment

**8.1 Girls’ empowerment index by state**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State** |  **Mean Index of girls’ empowerment** |
| Bauchi | 0.416 |
| FCT | 0.433 |
| Gombe | 0.452 |
| Kaduna | 0.543 |
| Katsina | 0.642 |
| Nasarawa | 0.549 |
| Niger | 0.536 |
| Plateau | 0.453 |
| Total | 0.507 |

**8.2 Girls empowerment indicator by rural/urban location of the school**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Location of schools | Mean Index of girls’ empowerment |
| Rural | 0.478 |
| Semi-Urban | 0.548 |
| Urban | 0.626 |
| Total | 0.507 |

* 1. **Girls’ empowerment composite by intervention variable**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | P value |
| Girls’ empowerment by intervention index | 0.0875  | 0.4649 |
| Girls’ empowerment by girls’ club component | -0.1199  | 0.3157 |
| Girls’ empowerment by teacher training component | 0.1980  | 0.0954 (significant at 10%) |
| Girls’ empowerment by SMC training component | 0.1526  | 0.2006 |

**8.4 Girls’ empowerment composite by gender profile**

Is there a relationship between how well a school scores on the gender profile and the level of girls’ empowerment? In other words, if girls go to schools that are more equitable in terms of enrolling and progressing girls and boys are they able to articulate more views about empowerment or does the level of girls’ empowerment increase as the gender profile increases?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sample size | 72 |
| Correlation coefficient: Girls’ empowerment by gender profile  | -0.0746 |
| Significance | Not significant (p = 0.5424) |

There is no relationship between girls’ empowerment and gender parity at school (as measured by the gender profile).

**8.5 Obstacles identified at baseline (2008) and endline (2012)**

Have the obstacles girls identified to leaving school changed since 2008?

### Girls’ views on the obstacles that will prevent them from achieving their desired level of education

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline\* % who mentioned (N=605)** | **Endline % who mentioned (N=629)** |
| Early marriage | 41 | 28 |
| Poverty | 69 | 30 |
| Parents withdraw from school | 34 | 17 |
| Old for class | 8 | 5 |
| Lack of facilities (including teachers) | 30 | 7 |
| Distance from school | 18 | 7 |
| Ill health | 40 | 16 |
| Pregnancy | 29 | 16 |
| Bad experiences at school | Not included as a category in baseline | 1 |
| Other: Failure in final exam | Not included as a category in baseline | 1 |
| Other: Distractions associated with friendships or sexual relationships | Not included as a category in baseline | 1 |

**Mean range of obstacles identified by girls by schools in each state (2008 & 2012)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **State** | **Baseline** **Mean number of obstacles girls identify** | **Endline****Mean number of obstacles girls identify** |
| Bauchi | 0.106 | 0.389 |
| FCT | 0.350 | 0.250 |
| Gombe | 0.197 | 0361 |
| Kaduna | 0.351 | 0.389 |
| Katsina | 0.619 | 0.778 |
| Nasarawa | 0.503 | 0.583 |
| Niger | 0.196 | 0.125 |
| Plateau | 0.619 | 0.208 |
| All states | 0.336 | 0.403 |

**8.6 Solutions identified at baseline (2008) and endline (2012)[[9]](#footnote-9)**

Have the solutions[[10]](#footnote-10) girls identified to overcoming obstacles to leaving school changed since 2008?

**Mean range of solutions identified by girls by schools in each state (2008 & 2012)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **State** | **Baseline** **Mean number of solutions girls identify** | **Endline****Mean number of solutions girls identify** |
| Bauchi | 0.118 | 0.138 |
| FCT | 0.546 | 0.018 |
| Gombe | 0.417 | 0.149 |
| Kaduna | 0.841 | 0.211 |
| Katsina | 0.767 | 0.349 |
| Nasarawa | 0.696 | 0.105 |
| Niger | 0.213 | 0.070 |
| Plateau | 0.811 | 0.131 |
| All states | 0.519 | 0.178 |

**8.7 Girls’ knowledge of HIV and gender inclusive attitudes with regard to discrimination against people with HIV and girls/women**

Each girl’s responses with regard to the information she had received on HIV and gender/girls’ rights, attitudes with regard to HIV, gender and confidence in dealing with gender based violence were scored. Means for the girls in each state were calculated.

**Girls mean scores for information received on HIV and gender, and attitudes with regard to HIV, gender and confidence in dealing with gender based violence**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| state | HIV Knowledge | HIV Attitudes | Gender Knowledge | Gender Attitudes | Confidence in challenging gender violence |
| Bauchi | 0.521 | 0.250 | 0.100 | 0.650 | 0.250 |
| FCT | 0.375 | 0.250 | 0.050 | 0.775 | 0.500 |
| Gombe | 0.479 | 0.500 | 0.233 | 0.608 | 0.375 |
| Kaduna | 0.646 | 0.417 | 0.383 | 0.750 | 0.917 |
| Katsina | 0.771 | 0.542 | 0.767 | 0.513 | 0.750 |
| Nasarawa | 0.313 | 0.250 | 0.650 | 0.700 | 0.875 |
| Niger | 0.469 | 0.500 | 0.475 | 0.913 | 0.813 |
| Plateau | 0.375 | 0.125 | 0.075 | 0.650 | 0.625 |
| **overall mean** | **0.535** | **0.382** | **0.347** | **0.676** | **0.612** |

**Percentage of girls interviewed for endline by information received on HIV**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Information on HIV** | **% say have received information** |
| How HIV is transmitted | 64 |
| How HIV is prevented | 53 |
| Knowledge of condoms | 9 |
| Where to get help | 23 |
| Stigma and discrimination | 24 |
| Where nearest counselling & testing is | 21 |
| Other: Avoid early sex[[11]](#footnote-11) | 1 |
| Other: Caring for HIV/AIDS affected people | 1 |
| Other: Effects of HIV and AIDS | 1 |
| Other: ARVs & treatment | 0 |
| Other: Signs & symptoms HIV | 0 |

**Knowledge of HIV**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % answering correctly |
|   | Bauchi | FCT | Gombe | Kaduna | Katsina  | Nasarawa | Niger | Plateau | Total |
| A healthy looking person can have HIV or AIDS | 69.6%(71/102) | 52.9% (18/34) | 73.7%(70/95) | 49.6% (57/115) | 87.4%(104/119) | 66.7%(26/39) | 65.5%(36/55) | 60.9%(39/64) | 67.6% (421/623) |
| HIV or AIDS cannot be transmitted by mosquito | 41.2% (42/102) | 50%(17/34) | 35.1%(33/94) | 40.9%(47/115) | 63% (75/119) | 43.6%(17/39) | 32.7%(18/55) | 28.1%(18/64) | 42.9%(267/622) |
| HIV or AIDS can be prevented by using condoms | 10.8%(11/102) | 47.1%(16/34) | 37.2%(35/94) | 45.2%(52/115) | 50.4%(60/119) | 59%(23/39) | 67.3%(37/55) | 39.1%(25/64) | 41.6%(259/622) |
| HIV or AIDS can be prevented by limiting sexual intercourse to one unifected partner | 80.4%(82/102) | 61.8%(21/34) | 68.1%(64/94) | 77.4%(89/115) | 81.5%(97/119) | 76.9%(30/39) | 60%(33/55) | 53.1% (34/64) | 72.3%(450/622) |

**Knowledge of HIV: Comparisons with national population-based survey (source DHS 2010)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % answering correctly |
|  | Girls in TEGINT | Women aged 15-49, split by demographics  |
|   |  | Girls aged 15-19 | 15-49 Urban | 15-49 Rural | 15-49 North-Central | 15-49 North-East | 15-49 North-West |
| A healthy looking person can have HIV or AIDS | 67.6% | 60.2 | 79.1 | 57.9 | 56.2 | 53.8 | 59.7 |
| HIV or AIDS cannot be transmitted by mosquito | 42.9% | 52.8 | 70.5 | 47.9 | 50.0 | 44.4 | 48.9 |
|  | % answering correctly |  |
|  |  | Women aged 15-49, split by demographics:  |  |
|   | Girls in TEGINT | Girls aged 15-19 | 15-49 Urban | 15-49 Rural | 15-49 North-Central | 15-49 North-East | 15-49 North-West |
| HIV or AIDS can be prevented by using condoms | 41.6 | 48.3 | 63.2 | 47.3 | 48.3 | 38.6 | 46.4 |
| HIV or AIDS can be prevented by limited sexual intercourse to one unifected partner | 72.3 | 63.2 | 74.5 | 64.3 | 62.1 | 62.3 | 66.2 |

**Attitudes toward people living with HIV/AIDS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % whose answers suggest inclusive and tolerant attitudes towards people living with HIV and AIDS |
|   | Bauchi | FCT | Gombe | Kaduna | Katsina  | Nasarawa | Niger | Plateau | Total |
| Inclusion and tolerance to community members with HIV | 51%(52/102) | 55.9%(19/34) | 43.6%(41/94) | 42.6% (49/115) | 69.7%(83/119) | 56.4%(22/39) | 60.0%(33/55) | 35.9%(23/64) | 51.8%(322/622) |
| Inclusion and tolerance to family members with HIV | 15.7%(16/102) | 35.3%(12/34) | 37.2%(35/94) | 29.6%(34/115) | 16.8%(20/119) | 41.0%(16/39) | 34.5%(19/55) | 34.4%(22/64) | 28.0%(174/622) |

**Attitudes toward people living with HIV/AIDS: Comparisons with national population-based survey (source DHS 2010)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % answering correctly |
|  | Girls in TEGINT | Women aged 15-49, split by demographics  |
|   |  | Girls aged 15-19 | 15-49Urban | 15-49Rural | Primary education  | Lowest wealth quintile | All women |
| Inclusion and tolerance to community members with HIV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inclusion and tolerance to family members with HIV | 28.0 | 58.4 | 66.5 | 56.5 | 58.3 | 52.4 | 60.4 |

**Information received by girls on girls’/women’s rights**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % say have received information on: |
|   | Bauchi | FCT | Gombe | Kaduna | Katsina  | Nasarawa | Niger | Plateau |  Total |
| Girls have the right to stay in & return to school | 68.8% | 60% | 71.2% | 49.0% | 97.5% | 95.2% | 84.2% | 75.7% | 74.8% |
| Girls do not have to be married before 18 | 14.1% | 40% | 31.8% | 39.0% | 85.7% | 85.7% | 36.8% | 56.8% | 49.9% |
| Women can participate in school governing bodies | 9.4% | 35.0% | 48.5% | 39.0% | 98.3% | 71.4% | 44.7% | 37.8% | 53.1% |
| Women can hold senior positions in government | 6.2% | 30% | 40.9% | 38.0% | 98.3% | 66.7% | 47.4% | 43.2% | 51.5% |

**Girls’ attitudes towards gender equality, women’s rights, violence and bodily integrity**

|  |
| --- |
| % girls surveyed who have positive attitudes  |
|   | Bauchi | FCT | Gombe | Kaduna | Katsina  | Nasarawa | Niger | Plateau |  Total |
| **Challenging gender discrimination** |
| Girls can lead a school as well as boys | 27.0% | 52.9% | 36.2% | 71.3% | 45.8% | 43.6% | 60.0% | 48.4% | 47.8% |
| Women can engage in politics on equal terms to men | 74.0% | 70.6% | 50.0% | 88.7% | 32.5% | 76.9% | 83.6% | 78.1% | 66.3% |
| Girls should be supported to take any career they wish | 100% | 94.1% | 83.9% | 94.8% | 64.2% | 74.4% | 90.9% | 58.7% | 82.7% |
| A woman driving a truck should be respected | 29.0% | 73.5% | 24.7% | 83.5% | 35.8% | 69.2% | 80.0% | 75.0% | 54.0% |
| Girls and boys have an equal right to education | 91.0% | 91.2% | 80.6% | 84.3% | 88.3% | 79.5% | 92.7% | 73.4% | 85.3% |
| Gender inequality should be ended | 77.0% | 73.5% | 87.1% | 80.9% | 76.7% | 66.7% | 83.6% | 49.2% | 76.1% |
| **Challenging violence** |
| It is not okay for teachers to whip a girl who comes late to school because she was caring for a sick relative  | 95.0% | 73.5% | 64.5% | 89.6% | 31.7% | 82.1% | 67.3% | 90.6% | 72.3% |
| Teachers who have a sexual relationship with a school pupil should be dismissed and never be allowed to teach again | 95.0% | 91.2% | 86.0% | 93.9% | 91.6% | 76.9% | 83.6% | 68.8% | 87.7% |
| It is not a girls fault if a man or boy makes unwanted sexual advances towards her | 54.0% | 70.6% | 52.7% | 68.7% | 39.2% | 69.2% | 61.8% | 67.2% | 57.6% |
| Girls should be allowed to return to school after giving birth | 61.0% | 85.3% | 78.5% | 76.5% | 77.5% | 79.5% | 80.0% | 82.8% | 76.1% |
| **Right to bodily integrity** |
| If a husband has a sexually transmitted disease, his wife is justified in refusing to have sex with him  | 61.8% | 64.7% | 53.2% | 72.2% | 64.7% | 76.9% | 76.4% | 60.9% | 65.3% |
| If a husband has a sexually transmitted disease, his wife is justified in asking that they use a condom | 13.7% | 47.1% | 36.2% | 73.0% | 87.4% | 56.4% | 74.5% | 37.5% | 54.5% |

**Attitudes toward bodily integrity: Comparisons with national population-based survey (source DHS 2010)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % answering correctly |  |
|  |  | Women aged 15-49, split by demographics:  |
|   | Girls in TEGINT | Girls aged 15-19 | 15-49 Urban | 15-49 Rural | 15-49 North-Central | 15-49 North-East | 15-49 North-West | Lowest wealth quintile |
| If a husband has a sexually transmitted disease, his wife is justified in refusing to have sex with him  | 65.3 | 72.2 | 82.2 | 80.3 | 79.9 | 79.3 | 83.8 | 77.2 |
| If a husband has a sexually transmitted disease, his wife is justified in asking that they use a condom | 54.5 | 61.9 | 78.7 | 64.3 | 68.0 | 60.1 | 64.6 | 52.2 |

**Percentage of girls surveyed by knowledge and confidence to deal with sexual assault or gender based violence**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % girls by response to attempted rape by man |
|   | Bauchi | FCT | Gombe | Kaduna | Katsina  | Nasarawa | Niger | Plateau |  Total |
| Tel l a friend | 35% | 14.7%  | 8.7% | 13% | 67% | 25.6% | 23.6% | 14.1% | 28.0% |
| Tell mother/father/guardian | 55.6%  | 2.9%  | 42.4% | 20.9% | 95.7% | 5.1% | 25.5%  | 9.4%  | 40.9% |
| Tell teacher | 32.3%  | 8.8%  | 30.4% | 35.7%  | 65.2%  | 23.1%  | 36.4%  | 6.3% | 34.6% |
| Tell matron of girls’ club | 0%  | 17.6%  | 7.6%  | 10.4% | 75%  | 10.3%  | 30.9%  | 7.8%  | 22.5%  |
| Tell police | 1.0%  | 0.0% | 12.0%  | 3.5%  | 70.4%  | 0.0%  | 3.6%  | 1.6%  | 16.3%  |
| Tell village chair | 1.0%  | 0% | 1.0% | 0% | 0% | 2.6% | 1.8% | 0% | 0.7%  |
| Tell close relatives | 0% | 2.9% | 4.3% | 0.9% | 1.7%  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.3%  |
| Tell no one | 20.2%  | 32.4%  | 9.8%  | 11.3%  | 6.1%  | 2.6%  | 21.8%  | 3.1%  | 12.2%  |

* 1. **Changes in obstacles and solutions cited by girls, by girls’ club intervention sub-index (and other sub-indexes?), and amount of exchange visits**

There are no statistically significant relationships between the intervention strength and the change in range of obstacles or solutions cited by girls between baseline and endline.

**9. Girls’ clubs**

* 1. Schools by state and interventions concerning girls clubs organisation - – ie how long girls’ club has been running (from PO instrument, how often it meets (from Matron instrument), how long exchange programme running and the number of visits arranged (from PO instrument
	2. Qualification of matron & range of activities by state and urban/rural
	3. Mean class position[[12]](#footnote-12) of club members and non-club members (urban/rural and total)
	4. Reasons for joining girls’ clubs by urban/rural
	5. Length & breadth of activities of girls’ clubs by state (7.1 & 7.2) by school gender profile 2012 and change in gender profile since 2008
	6. Girls’ empowerment composite by girls in and out of clubs and urban-rural
	7. Girls’ empowerment composite by length of intervention & form (7.1 & 7.2)
	8. Obstacles & solutions by girls in & out of clubs
	9. Changes in obstacles and solutions cited by girls, by club member/non club member (NOTE If this is too complicated then leave)
	10. knowledge of HIV , attitudes towards HIV (non-discrimination, negotiating safer sex), knowledge of and attitudes towards gender equity and violence, level of confidence in dealing with gender based violence, overall, club member/non-club member and intensity of involvement (length of membership, regularity of attendance) (can we somehow try and ‘control’ for class position?)
	11. Level of difference between girls in and out of clubs by other components of the intervention variable, by gender profile, and other interventions in the school.
	12. **Schools by district and interventions concerning girls clubs organisation - – ie how long girls’ club has been running (from PO instrument, how often it meets (from Matron instrument), how long exchange programme running and the number of visits arranged (from PO instrument**

Girls in and out of clubs by reasons they think girls’ clubs have helped them

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % mentioning |
|  | Girls in clubs | Girls out of clubs | % all girls |
| Friendship | 26.8 | 1.2 | 16.9 |
| Reading & writing skills | 32.2 | 0.4 | 19.9 |
| Material things | 29.4 | 1.7 | 18.6 |
| Money raising skills | 19.5 | 0.8 | 12.2 |
| Having fun | 41.0 | 2.5 | 26.1 |
| Exchange visits | 22.3 | 0.0 | 13.7 |
| Confidence | 36.1 | 1.2 | 22.6 |
| Learning about gender and girls’ rights/HIV/violence etc. | 47.8 | 1.7 | 29.9 |
| Learning other skills | 26.2 | 1.2 | 16.5 |
| Other | 23.9 | 1.2 | 15.1 |
| Don’t know | 4.9 | 0.4 | 3.2 |
| Refuse to answer | 3.9 | 0.0 | 2.4 |

**9.3 Class position of girls in and out of clubs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Mean class position  |
| Girls in clubs | 0.25 |
| Girls out of clubs | 0.23 |

This means on average a girls’ club member is 25th in a class of 100. A girl not in a club is 23rd. Therefore we can say that class position may not be a predictor for being selected for a club, i.e. teachers are not necessarily selecting the highest performing pupils (nor the lowest performing). However, we are not confident about the reliability of this data, since class size data does not seem to be robust.

**9.4 Reasons for joining girls’ clubs**

Girls’ reasons for joining clubs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  Number (%) girls responding |
| Friends are members | 24.7% |
| Teacher told her to join | 27.8% |
| Benefits of being a member (e.g. fun activities, new knowledge, learn skills, material help) | 84.4% |
| Likes the matron | 18.2% |
| Other: Status of club members | 1.0% |
| Other: Curiosity | 0.8% |
| Other: Uncategorised | 0.0% |

Reasons for joining girls’ club by urban/rural location of school

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % girls at urban schools mention | % girls at rural schools mention |
| Friends are members | 46.6% | 13.1% |
| Teacher told her to join | 42.9% | 19.8% |
| Benefits of being a member (e.g. fun activities, new knowledge, learn skills, material help) | 92.5% | 80.2% |
| Likes the matron | 40.6% | 6.4% |
| Other: Status of club members | 1.5% | 0.8% |
| Other: Curiosity | 0.0% | 1.2 |
| Other: Uncategorised | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Girls not in clubs on reasons they have not joined

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  Number (%) girls responding |
| Was not invited to join  | 37.3%  |
| Have too many chores to do at home  | 15.7%  |
| Parents don’t want me to be a member  | 6.7%  |
| Not interested in what they do  | 9.0%  |
| Play sport when they meet  | 0.8% |
| Other: Member of other club | 4.5% |
| Other: Don't know about what club does or how to become member | 4.5% |
| Other: No time (reasons other than chores e.g. Hawking/farmwork/other responsibilities) | 2.2% |
| Other: Illness | 0.8% |
| Other: Asked to leave club (e.g. Lateness or poor attendance) | 3.0% |
| Other: Uncategorised | 3.0%  |

**9.6 Girls empowerment composite by girls in and out of clubs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Mean empowerment index: |
|  | Girls in clubs | Girls out of clubs |
| All schools | 0.564  | 0.555  |

Correlation between being in a club and level of empowerment in urban and rural schools

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  | Correlation cooefficient (between being in a club and level of empowerment) | Significance |
| Urban | -0.1579  | 0.3305 (Not significant)  |
| Rural | 0.1093  | 0.0318 (Significant at 5%) |

Girls in clubs are more empowered than those not in clubs in rural schools. However there is no such relationship in urban schools.

**9.8 Obstacles and solutions by girls in and out of clubs**

Section 8 gave a descriptive account of the obstacles and solutions mentioned by girls in the baseline & the endline. In this section we look at whether there is a statistical relationship between being in or out of a club and identifying particular obstacles or solutions.

**Obstacles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | % girls in clubs mention (N=) | % girls out of clubs mention (n=) | Significance in variation |
| Early marriage  | 25.7% (99) | 31.7% (77) | p=10% \* |
| Pregnancy | 17.4% (67) | 14.8% (36) | p=39% |
| Ill health  | 18.4% (71) | 11.5% (28) | p=2% \*\* |
| Poverty | 33.0% (127) | 25.9% (63) | p=6% \* |
| Parents withdrawing me from school  | 16.4% (63) | 16.9% (41) | p=86% |
| Too old for secondary school  | 5.7% (22) | 4.1% (10) | p=1% \*\*\* |
| Lack of school facilities  | 8.0% (31) | 4.9% (12) | p = 13% |
| Distance from school  | 9.0% (35) | 4.9% (12) | P = 5% \*\* |
| Bad experiences at school | 1.0% (4) | 1.2% (3) | - |
| Work on family farm/ | 0.3% (1) | 0.0% (0) | - |
| Failure in final exam | 1.0% (5) | 2.0% (5) | - |
| Distractions associated with friendship | 0.8% (3) | 0.8% (2) | - |
| Lack of motivation | 0.3% (1) | 0.0% (0) | - |

**Solutions**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | % girls in clubs mention (n=) | % girls out of clubs mention(N=) | Significance |
|  Sponsorship  | 30.6% (118) | 24.7% (60) | p= 10% \* |
| Provision of school facilities  | 15.1% (58) | 8.6% (21) | p=2% \*\* |
|  Stop early marriage  | 22.3% (86) | 25.9% (63) | p=30% |
| Abolish fees and levies  | 14.8% (57) | 9.1% (22) | p=3% \*\* |
|  Sexual reproductive health education  | 20.0% (77) | 9.5% (23) | p=<1% \*\*\* |
|  Enlightenment of parents  | 23.6% (91) | 18.9% (46) | p=16% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Membership of club and range of obstacles cited | 0.0649  | 10% \* |
| Membership of club and range of solutions cited | 0.1301  | 2% \*\* |

More obstacles and solutions are cited by girls club members than non-club members. There is a stronger relationship in terms of solutions articulated by girls.

**9.9 Comparison of obstacles & solutions cited by girls in baseline and endline**

We compare girls out of clubs at the endline, with the group that is similar to them, that is all girls in the baseline, for whom there were no clubs

**Obstacles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | girls in baseline | girls out of clubs in endline | girls in clubs in endline |
|  | % mentioning | % mentioning  | T test of variation in difference & significance[[13]](#footnote-13) | % mentioning  | T test of variation in difference & significance |
| Early marriage  | 45.9 | 31.7 |  | 25.7 |  |
| Pregnancy | 32.9 | 14.8 |  | 17.4 |  |
| Ill health  | 46.4 | 11.5 |  | 18.4 |  |
| Poverty | 70.7 | 25.9 |  | 33.0 |  |
| Parents withdrawing me from school  | 38.9 | 16.9 |  | 16.4 |  |
| Too old for secondary school  | 8.3 | 4.1 |  | 5.7 |  |
| Lack of school facilities  | 34.7 | 4.9 |  | 8.1 |  |
| Distance from school  | 17.9 | 4.9 |  | 9.1 |  |

**Solutions**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | girls in baseline | girls out of clubs in endline | girls in clubs in endline |
|  | % mentioning | % mentioning  | T test of variation in difference & significance | % mentioning  | T test of variation in difference & significance |
| Sponsorship  | 74.4 | 24.7 |  | 30.7 |  |
| Provision of school facilities  | 46.9 | 8.6 |  | 15.0 |  |
| Stop early marriage  | 57.2 | 25.9 |  | 22.3 |  |
| Abolish fees and levies  | 55.4 | 9.1 |  | 14.8 |  |
| Sexual reproductive health education  | 51.3 | 9.5 |  | 20.0 |  |
| Enlightenment of parents  | 57.8 | 18.9 |  | 23.6 |  |

**9.10 Knowledge of and attitudes towards HIV, gender and violence**

We analysed the data to look at level of involvement in the girls’ club by various aspects of knowledge of HIV and gender

We also considered girls’ level of involvement in girls’ clubs by their likelihood express views favourable to gender equality, inclusion of people with HIV and AIDS and confidence in dealing with gender based violence.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Questions posed in survey of girls | Correlation co-efficient for girls with higher levels of involvement in clubs to answer positively | Significance |
| Questions regarding gender equality and women’s rights | -0.07 | 0.13 |
| Confidence in dealing with gender based violence | 0.11 | 0.04 \*\* |

Girls’ level of involvement in clubs and knowledge

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Questions posed in survey of girls | Correlation co-efficient (levels of involvement in clubs and knowledge) | Significance |
| Knowledge of HIV and AIDs | 0.19 | 0.00 \*\*\* |
| Knowledge of gender and women’s rights | 0.39 | 0.00 \*\*\* |

Girls who are more involved in girls clubs demonstrate more confidence to deal with gender violence and better knowledge of HIV and gender.

**10. Teachers**

* 1. School PTR by state/state 2012 & change since 2008
	2. Schools level of qualification and m/f of teachers by state/state and; changes since 2008
	3. Schools by state/state teacher component of intervention variable & level of teacher qualification & m/f
	4. Schools by state/state intervention variable & level of teacher qualification & m/f
	5. School teacher qualification level 2012 by girls’ empowerment variable (correlation);
	6. School teacher qualification level increase 2008-2012 by girls’ empowerment variable (correlation);
	7. School teacher qualification level by gender profile (correlation)
	8. Teacher engagement index by state/state
	9. Teacher engagement index components by state
	10. Teacher engagement index by teacher qualification profile (correlation)
	11. Teacher intervention sub-index and teacher engagement index (correlation)
	12. Overall intervention index and teacher engagement index (correlation)
	13. Teacher engagement index and girls’ empowerment index correlation
	14. Girls’ knowledge of HIV , attitudes towards HIV (non-discrimination, negotiating safer sex) by girls’ reports of being taught about HIV, level of teacher training on HIV, girls’ club intervention sub-index?
	15. Girls’ knowledge of and attitudes towards gender equity and violence by girls’ reports of being taught about gender, level of teacher training on gender (and gender training for SMCs, parents, community circles)
	16. Girls’ level of confidence in dealing with gender based violence by girls’ reports of being taught about gender, level of teacher training on gender (and gender training for SMCs, parents, community circles), girls’ club intervention sub-index?
	17. schools by state/state, teacher qualification level and teacher empowerment variable
	18. correlation: school teacher engagement level and girls’ empowerment level
	19. correlation: teacher engagement variable and level of difference between girls in and out go clubs

**10. 1 Pupil – teacher ratio at schools in the baseline and endline by district**

###  Pupil teacher ratios, 2002 , 2008 and 2012 in schools in which TEGINT is working by state

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2008[[14]](#footnote-14) | 2012 | Change since 2008 |
| Bauchi | 16 | 37 | +21 |
| FCT | 39 | 98 | +59 |
| Gombe | 37 | 34 | -3 |
| Kaduna | 60 | 36 | -24 |
| Katsina | 235 | 196 | -39 |
| Nasarawa | 14 | 11 | -3 |
| Niger | n/a | 22 | - |
| Plateau | 17 | 17 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Primary | 45 | 54 | +9 |
| JSS | 130 | 74 | -56 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 84 | 64 | -20 |

**Female/male teacher ratio baseline/endline[[15]](#footnote-15)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| state | female/male ratio baseline | female/male ratio endline | change |
| Bauchi | 1.69 | 0.68 | -1.01 |
| FCT | 0.67 | 1.26 | 0.59 |
| Gombe | 0.20 | 0.26 | 0.06 |
| Kaduna | 1.47 | 0.90 | -0.57 |
| Katsina | 0.63 | 0.86 | 0.23 |
| Nasarawa | 3.00 | 1.44 | -1.56 |
| Niger | 1.50 | 0.60 | -0.9 |
| Plateau | 1.10 | 0.58 | -0.52 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Rural | 1.44 | 0.85 | -0.59 |
| Urban | 0.73 | 0.83 | 0.10 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 1.12 | 0.84 | -0.28 |

**10.2 Changes in teacher qualification (2008) baseline/endline (2012) ie numbers of teachers in each band of qualification (baseline & endline)overall and by state. Note matched schools in sample**

% of teachers with qualifications baseline and endline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % teachers with qualification at Baseline  | % teachers with qualification at Endline |
| Qual | TSC 2 (SSCE GCE) | OND | HND, Degree (Diploma) | Tot | TSC 2 | OND | HND, Degree | Tot |
| Bauchi | 24% | 69% | 7% | 100% | 2% | 96% | 2% | 100% |
| FCT | 0% | 67% | 33% | 100% | 11% | 51% | 38% | 100% |
| Gombe | 47% | 51% | 2% | 100% | 58% | 30% | 12% | 100% |
| Kaduna | 6% | 71% | 24% | 100% | 14% | 53% | 34% | 100% |
| Katsina | 0% | 88% | 12% | 100% | 27% | 43% | 30% | 100% |
| Nasarawa | 18% | 72% | 11% | 100% | 17% | 33% | 50% | 100% |
| Niger | 21% | 53% | 26% | 100% | 19% | 60% | 21% | 100% |
| Plateau | 11% | 65% | 24% | 100% | 12% | 6% | 82% | 100% |
| Total | **15%** | **71%** | **14%** | 100% | **7%** | **82%** | **10%** | 100% |

% change in teacher qualifications baseline/endline

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TSC 2 | OND | HND, Degree | Total |
| Bauchi | -22% | 27% | -5% | 0% |
| FCT | 11% | -16% | 5% | 0% |
| Gombe | 11% | -20% | 9% | 0% |
| Kaduna | 8% | -18% | 10% | 0% |
| Katsina | 27% | -45% | 18% | 0% |
| Nasarawa | -1% | -39% | 39% | 0% |
| Niger | -2% | 7% | -5% | 0% |
| Plateau | 1% | -59% | 58% | 0% |
| Total | -7% | 11% | -4% | 0% |

Summary of qualifications for men and women by school level

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % teachers with qualification at Baseline  | % teachers with qualification at Endline |
| Qual | TSC 2 | OND | HND,Degree | Tot | TSC 2 | OND | HND, Degree | Tot |
| **Primary** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women | 20% | 77% | 2% | 100% | 39% | 54% | 6% | 100% |
| Men  | 22% | 71% | 7% | 100% | 37% | 51% | 11% | 100% |
| All | 21% | 74% | 5% | 100% | 38% | 53% | 9% | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Secondary** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women | 3% | 70% | 27% | 100% | 0% | 90% | 10% | 100% |
| Men | 7% | 67% | 26% | 100% | 0% | 90% | 10% | 100% |
| All | 6% | 68% | 27% | 100% | 0% | 90% | 10% | 100% |

Women teacher’s qualifications at primary school

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % teachers with qualification at Baseline  | % teachers with qualification at Endline |
| Qual | TSC 2 | OND | HND, Degree | Tot | TSC 2 | OND | HND, Degree | Tot |
| Bauchi | 56% | 44% | 0% | 100% | 15% | 85% | 0% | 100% |
| FCT | 0% | 94% | 6% | 100% | 50% | 25% | 25% | 100% |
| Gombe | 37% | 63% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Kaduna | 16% | 79% | 5% | 100% | 45% | 52% | 3% | 100% |
| Katsina | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 61% | 33% | 7% | 100% |
| Nasarawa | 33% | 54% | 13% | 100% | 18% | 45% | 36% | 100% |
| Niger | 42% | 53% | 5% | 100% | 25% | 75% | 0% | 100% |
| Plateau | 83% | 17% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Total | **20%** | **77%** | **2%** | 100% | **39%** | **54%** | **6%** | 100% |

Men teacher’s qualifications at primary school

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % teachers with qualification at Baseline  | % teachers with qualification at Endline |
| Qual | TSC 2 | OND | HND, Degree | Tot | TSC 2 | OND | HND, degree | Tot |
| Bauchi | 33% | 62% | 5% | 100% | 32% | 64% | 4% | 100% |
| FCT | 0% | 86% | 14% | 100% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 100% |
| Gombe | 57% | 42% | 1% | 100% | 88% | 12% | 0% | 100% |
| Kaduna | 11% | 86% | 3% | 100% | 12% | 81% | 8% | 100% |
| Katsina | 0% | 93% | 7% | 100% | 31% | 42% | 27% | 100% |
| Nasarawa | 18% | 73% | 9% | 100% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 100% |
| Niger | 36% | 39% | 25% | 100% | 33% | 67% | 0% | 100% |
| Plateau | 5% | 84% | 11% | 100% | 33% | 0% | 67% | 100% |
| Total | **22%** | **71%** | **7%** | 100% | **37%** | **51%** | **11%** | 100% |

* 1. **Teacher training sub-index by state**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State** | **mean**  |
| Bauchi | 0.596 |
| FCT | 0.609 |
| Gombe | 0.824 |
| Kaduna | 0.742 |
| Katsina | 0.762 |
| Nasarawa | 0.750 |
| Niger | 0.797 |
| Plateau | 0.675 |
| Total | 0.726 |

**10.4 Significance levels between teacher qualification and various components of the intervention index**

We looked at whether there was a relationship between the overall intervention index and the qualification level of teachers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Correlation | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Intervention index and teacher qualifications | 0.002 | 0.98 |
| Girls clubs component of intervention index and teacher qualifications | 0.11 | 0.37 |
| Teacher training component of intervention index and teacher qualifications | 0.0086  | 0.9448 |
| SMC training and teacher qualifications | -0.20 | 0.10 |

There is no statistically significant relationship between the strength of intervention and teacher qualifications in a school. This is the same for the components of the intervention (girls’ clubs and teacher training). However, it appears that there is a significant native relationship between the SMC intervention and teacher qualifications. That is, there has been a higher level of work with SMCs in schools where teachers have lower qualifications.

* 1. **Teacher qualification level by girls’ empowerment index.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation co-efficient between Teacher qualification level and girls’ empowerment index | Significance |
| Questions regarding gender equality and women’s rights | 0.0575 | 0.64 |

There is no statistically significant relationship between teacher qualificiations and girls empowerment.

**10.7. School teacher qualification level by gender profile (correlation)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Teacher qualification score and Gender profile | -0.1260  | 0.3172 |

There is no significant relationship between a school’s gender profile and the school’s overall teacher qualification score.

* 1. **Teacher engagement index**

This looked at the extent to which teachers had been able to put their training in participatory methods, HIV and gender into practice.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State** | **mean**  |
| Bauchi | 0.684 |
| FCT | 0.573 |
| Gombe | 0.639 |
| Kaduna | 0.600 |
| Katsina | 0.889 |
| Nasarawa | 0.669 |
| Niger | 0.659 |
| Plateau | 0.604 |
| Total | 0.678 |

**11. School management and community mobilisation**

* 1. Changes in gender management profile 2008-2012 by state/state
	2. Changes in gender management profile 2008-2012 by intervention variable and its components
	3. Changes in gender management profile since 2008 in relation to the range of other organisations working in the school
	4. Schools capacity to respond to gender based violence by state
	5. Girls’ capacity to report violence by schools’ capacity to respond
	6. Change in GMP by change in GP
	7. Change in GMP by Change in girls speaking out (obstacles and solutions)
	8. Change in GMP by girls’ empowerment index

**11.1** C**hanges in GMP by state[[16]](#footnote-16)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State | Baseline GMP | Endline GMP | Increase in the mean GMP between the baseline and the endline (%) |
| Bauchi | 0.51 | 0.42 | -9% |
| FCT | 0.53 | 0.42 | -11% |
| Gombe | 0.38 | 0.61 | 23% |
| Kaduna | 0.63 | 0.54 | -9% |
| Katsina | 0.39 | 0.60 | 20% |
| Nasarawa | 0.67 | 0.59 | -7% |
| Niger | 0.46 | 0.47 | 1% |
| Plateau | 0.27 | 0.63 | 36% |
| Total | 0.46 | 0.54 | 8% |

**11.2 Gender management profile by intervention index**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Correlation | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Intervention index and size of gender management profile | 0.5156 |  0.0000 (significant at 1%) |
| Girls clubs component of intervention index and gender management profile | 0.0267 | 0.8239 (not significiant) |
| Teacher training component of intervention index and gender management profile | 0.4956 | 0.0000 (significant at 1%) |
| SMC training component of the intervention and gender management profile | 0.5381 | 0.0000 (significant at 1%) |

Interestingly it can be seen that the schools that are taking more action on girls’ education are those that have had the most intensive intervention. When broken down into intervention areas the relationship with teacher training and support to SMCs is strong, but there is no relationship between school action on gender and strength of the girls’ club intervention.

**11.4 Schools capacity to respond to gender based violence by state**

Reports of violence/abuse against girls in the last school year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % responding |
|  | Community circle members | Head teacher | SMC member |
| Yes | 8 | 11 | 13 |
| No | 89 | 85 | 86 |
| Don’t know | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Correlations of responses between groups of whether there have been any reports of violence in the school in the past school year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Head teacher and community circle member | 0.47 | 0.0003 |
| Head teacher and SMC member | 0.29 | 0.0312 |
| Community circle member and SMC member | 0.0952 | 0.4812 |

There is a strong consistency in responses between head teachers and community circle members, and between head teachers and SMC members. However, responses between CC and SMC members are not consistent within a school location.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  Numberof schools where SMC mention specific action taken on gender based violence of the total number who (N=9) | Number of community circle members mention action  (N=14)  | Number of schools where head teacher mentions action (N=8)  |
| Report to VEO/village chair  | 3 [33%] | 4 [29%] | 3 (38%) |
| Report to School Committee  | 3 33%] | 2 [14%] | 6 (75%) |
| Expulsion | 4 44%] | 1 [7%] | 0 (0%) |
| Suspension | 3 33%] | 2 [14%] | 1 (13%) |
| Physical punishment  | 2 [22%] | 2 [14%] | 1 (13%) |
| Warning | 2 [22%] | 3 [21%] | 4 (50%) |
| Improve security  | 1 [11%] | 3 [21%] | 2 (25%) |
| Counselling | 2 [22%] | 3 [21%] | 7 (88%) |
| Perpetrator sent away/banishment  | 0 (0%) | 1 [7%] | 1 (13%) |
| Perpetrator ostracised/frozen out  | 0 (0%) | 1 [7%] | 0 (0) |
| Victim sent away/banishment  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Victim ostracised/frozen out  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Fine (community)  | 0 (0%) | 1 [7%] | 2 (25%) |
| Police/legal redress  | 2 [22%] | 2 [14%] | 3 (38%) |
| Religious sanctions  | 0 (0%) | 2 [14%] | 0 (0) |
| Forced to marry  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0) | 1 (13%) |
| Other (please specify)  | 2 [22%] | 1 [7%] | 2 (25%) (counselled the parents; girl taken to the father for...) |
| Don’t know  | - | - |  |
| Refuse to answer  | - | - |  |

**By state: mean % of responses that are formal overall**

(this table cannot be done because numbers are too small)

* 1. **Change in GMP by Change in GP**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Change in GMP by change in GP | -0.1257 | 0.3793 |

There is no significant relationship between improving school management on gender and improvement in gender parity in girls opportunities and outcomes at school.

* 1. **Change in GMP by Change in girls speaking out (obstacles and solutions)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Change in GMP by change in obstacles cited | 0.0277  | 0.8212 |
| Change in GMP by change in solutions cited | 0.1937  | 0.1107 |

There is no significant relationship between improving school management on gender and improvement in girls speaking out. However the relationship is very nearly significiant (at 11%) for girls citing more solutions.

* 1. **Change in GMP by girls’ empowerment index**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlation coefficient | Significance |
| Change in GMP by girls empowerment | -0.0228  | 0.8524 |

There is no relationship between improvement in gender management and girls empowerment.

**12. School funding**

12.1 Changes in levies charged by state/state & reasons given, according to girls, parents, others

12.2 Change in levies by intervention and components

12.3 Change in levies by SMC training on budget tracking/resource mobilisation/school management and planning

12.4 Schools by state/state extent of increase/decrease of levies & distribution of qualified teachers 2011-2012

12.5 schools by state/state , increase or decrease in levies and teacher empowerment

12.6 Change in levies by some aspect of GP e.g. drop out, progression?

**12.1 Changes in levies charged according to girls, head teachers, SMC members (number of schools) IN PERCENTAGES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SMC  | Head teachers  | Girls  | Number of schools where> 50% girls agree on direction of levies |
| Levies gone up | 19% | 22% | 22% | 19% |
| Levies gone down | 7% | 3% | 1% | 1% |
| Levies stayed the same | 74% | 75% | 71% | 71% |
| Unclear (by school) | n/a | n/a | 6% | n/a |
| **Total** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **n/a** |

**By state**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Percentage SMC members noting levies have increased (total interviewed) | Percentage girl noting levies have increased | Percentage headteachers noting levies have increased (total interviewed) |
| Bauchi | 13 | 23 | 8 |
| FCT | 0 | 31 | 50 |
| Gombe | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| Kaduna | 46 | 64 | 58 |
| Katsina | 18 | 3 | 0 |
| Nasarawa | 50 | 18 | 75 |
| Niger | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| Plateau | 25 | 51 | 12 |
| **Overall mean** | **19%** | **22%** | **22%** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Percentage SMC members noting levies have decreased | Percentage girl noting levies have decreased | Percentage headteachers noting levies have decreased |
| Bauchi | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| FCT | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gombe | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Kaduna | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| Katsina | 9 | 7 | 0 |
| Nasarawa | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Niger | 20 | 1 | 12 |
| Plateau | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| **Overall mean** | **7%** | **1%** | **3%** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Percentage SMC members noting levies have stayed the same | Percentage girl noting levies have stayed the same | Percentage headteachers noting levies stayed the same |
| Bauchi | 80 | 70 | 84 |
| FCT | 100 | 69 | 50 |
| Gombe | 100 | 64 | 83 |
| Kaduna | 46 | 33 | 42 |
| Katsina | 73 | 90 | 100 |
| Nasarawa | 50 | 48 | 25 |
| Niger | 80 | 98 | 76 |
| Plateau | 75 | 45 | 88 |
| **Overall mean** | **74%** | **71%** | **75%** |

**Reasons given for increase in levies, in percentage**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  Percentage SMC members (total numbers responding to question either yes or no in brackets) (N=15) | Percentage headteachers (total numbers responding to question either yes or no in brackets) (N=17) |
| Inflation | 53%  | 38%  |
| Reduction in government development grant to school | 60%  | 31%  |
| Reduction in subvention to school  | 47%  | 20%  |
| School running costs are going up because our school plan is more ambitious (e.g. we want to repair building, provide one textbook per pupil, organise extra-curricular activities) | 79%  | 71%  |
| Other  | 50%  | 56%  |
| Don’t know | 0%  | n/a |
| Refuse to answer  | 0%  | n/a |

**Reasons given for decrease in levies, in percentage**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  Percentage SMC members (N=4) | Percentage headteachers (N=4) |
| We have made demands associated with the right to free education | 50%  | 0%  |
| The school has become aware that poorer families can’t afford levies  | 50%  | 33%  |
| Subvention has gone up  | 0%  | 0%  |
| Government development grant has gone up  | 0%  | 50%  |
| Running costs have reduced (reduced expenditure or activities)  | 0%  | 0%  |
| Other  | 50%  | 50%  |
| Don’t know  | 0%  | 0%  |
| Refuse to answer  | 0%  | 0%  |

**13. Community Circles**

* 1. Views of community circle members on HIV and gender equity by state/state
	2. Similarities/differences in views of community circle members & girls on HIV& gender equity and related to interventions
	3. Action on violence (separately from SMC above?)
	4. Community circle views relating to training received
	5. **Similarities/differences in views of community circle members & girls on HIV& gender equity and related to interventions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % answering correctly, or with positive attitudes that challenge gender or HIV discrimination and violence |
|  | Community Circle members | Girls  |
| **Knowledge of HIV**  |   |   |
| A healthy looking person can have HIV or AIDS  | 88% | 68% |
| HIV or AIDS can be transmitted by mosquito  | 78% | 43% |
| HIV or AIDS can be prevented by using condoms  | 67% | 42% |
| HIV or AIDS can be prevented by limited sexual intercourse to one uninfected partner  | 87% | 72% |
| **Attitudes to HIV** |  |  |
| Inclusion and tolerance to community members with HIV  | 81% | 52% |
| Inclusion and tolerance to family members with HIV  | 55% | 28% |
| **Attitudes on Girls and Women’s rights**  |  |  |
| Girls can lead a school as well as boys  | 57% | 48% |
| Women can engage in politics on equal terms as men  | 81% | 66% |
| Girls should be supported to take any career they wish  | 96% | 83% |
| A woman driving a truck should be respected  | 64% | 54% |
| Girls and boys have an equal right to education  | 96% | 85% |
| Gender inequality should be ended  | 80% | 76% |
| **Attitudes to bodily integrity** |  |  |
| Women’s rights to refuse sex if husband infected  | 72% | 65% |
| Women’s rights to request condom if husband infected  | 79% | 54% |
| **Attitudes to violence** |  |  |
| It is not okay for teachers to whip a girl who comes late to school because she was caring for a sick relative  | 71% | 72% |
| Teachers who have a sexual relationship with a school pupil should be dismissed and never be allowed to teach again | 85% | 88% |
| It is not a girls fault if a man or boy makes unwanted sexual advances towards her | 59% | 58% |
| Girls should be allowed to return to school after giving birth | 96% | 76% |

**Appendix**

**Composite variables**

We suggestthe following composite variables (which bring together information from lots of different sources) for analysing the data. Each of these indicators is at school level, so each school will have a ‘score’ on:

* The strength of the TEGINT intervention (intervention index)
* How well girls do relative to boys in school (gender profile score)
* How active the school is on girls’ education (gender management profile score)
* How ‘empowered’ the girls are (Girls’ empowerment index)
* How well qualified the teachers are (teacher qualification profile score)
* How engaged the teachers are (Teacher engagement index)

We will use correlations, cross-tabs etc. to look at the relationships between these interventions, processes and outcomes.

1. **Intervention Index (school level)**  - *A composite which looks at how 3 main project interventions have worked together i.e. Girls clubs, teacher INSET & training for SMCs & community circles. (We will also look at each of these intervention variables separately and whether the correlate with each other.* Calculate from:

*Sub-index: Girls’ clubs*

* + how long girls’ club has been running (from Matron instrument)
	+ how often it meets (Matron instrument)
	+ how long exchange programme running and the number of visits arranged (from PO instrument)
	+ number of girls attending last 2 meetings? (matron)
	+ range of activities covered in girls’ club (M)

*Sub-index: Teacher training*

* + how long, and how much training in HIV (from PO instrument, HT & T instruments)
	+ how long, and how much training in gender (from PO instrument, HT & T instruments), `
	+ how long and how much training in participatory teaching (from PO, HT & T instruments),

*Sub-index: SMC support*

* + how long and how much training for SMC (from PO, SMC, HT )
	+ how much training given to community circle (C)
1. **Gender profile** – *used in the baseline (without ‘repetition’). Will enable us to calculate girls’ enrolment, progression & attainment relative to boys comparing the baseline, endline, by state/state, and in terms of what girls say & other composite variables.*

##

## Tanzania

* Gender parity in girls to boys enrolled in Classes 1-7 in 2012.
* Gender parity in the proportions of girls to boys enrolled in Classes 1-7 in 2012 who were attending on February 15th 2012.
* Gender parity in proportions of girls compared with proportions of boys who progressed from junior primary (Class 1) to senior primary (Class 5) between 2008 and 2012.
* Gender parity in the proportion of Class 7 girls compared with Class 7 boys who were entered for end of primary school exams in 2011.
* Gender parity in the proportions of girls compared with boys entered for Class 7 exams who then passed Class 7 exams in 2011.
* Gender parity in proportions of girls compared with proportions of boys who were retained between Class 1 in 2005 and Class 7 in 2011.
* Gender parity in proportions of girls compared with proportions of boys who progressed from Class 2 (in 2005) and went on to pass Class 7 exams (in 2011).

(enrolment indicators weighted x 1; attendance, progression and exam entry indicators weighted x 2; indicators related to the *passing* of exams weighted x 3).

## Nigeria

Primary schools:

* GPI enrolment. Weighted x1
* GPI attendance. Weighted x2
* GPI progression (the proportion of all girls enrolled in a school who are enrolled in P6 compared with the proportion of all boys enrolled in a school who are enrolled in P6). Weighted x2
* GPI exam entry (proportion of girls enrolled in P6 who are entered for the P6 exam compared with proportion of boys enrolled in P6 who are entered for the P6 exam). Weighted x2.

 JSS schools:

* GPI enrolment. Weighted x1
* GPI progression (the proportion of all girls enrolled in JSS1 who are enrolled in JSS 3 compared with the proportion of all boys enrolled in JSS1 who are enrolled in JSS 3). Weighted x2
* GPI Completion (the proportion of all girls enrolled in JSS1 who are entered for the exam in JSS 3 compared with the proportion of all boys enrolled in JSS1 who are entered for the exam in JSS 3). Weighted x2

GPI Performance (the proportion of girls entered for the JSS3 exam who pass in all subjects compared with the proportion of boys entered for the JSS3 exam who pass in all subjects). Weighted x3.

1. **Gender management profile** – *used in the baseline. Will enable us to calculate activities of SMC, HT in outreach, training, responses to violence, presence of women in key committees. Can calculate how these have changed relative to baseline, by state/state, and in terms of what girls say, & other composite variables.*

From interviews with head teachers

* Work with the following disadvantaged groups in the community on girls’ education in 2011:
	+ Pastoralists/ nomads
	+ Families who have children living with a disability
	+ Families who cannot pay school fees
	+ Girls involved in hawking or household chores
	+ Orphans or vulnerable children
	+ Children infected with or affected by HIV/ AIDS
	+ Children of internally displaced persons or refugees
* Provision of workshops for teachers, parents and SMC members on school funding, employing teachers, improving girls’ enrolment and attendance and HIV/ AIDS.

From interviews with teachers

* Averages were calculated for all teachers interviewed within each school on the extent to which they had received training on HIV/AIDS and gender and education/ girls’ schooling *in the last 3 years*. Data on the extent to which training received had been put into practice was also included.

From interviews with SMC members

* SMC members’ attendance at workshops on: HIV/AIDS, gender, school management, the Millennium Development Goals/ Education for All, reproductive health, budget tracking and resource mobilisation *in the last 3 years*.
* SMC work on girls’ education with key disadvantaged groups in the community (as listed above for head teachers)
* SMC action in 2011 in the following areas:
	+ Monitoring school enrolments
	+ Checking on attendance
	+ Monitoring numbers passing exams
	+ Checking on gender balance in exam passes
	+ Contacting families where children do not attend
	+ Ensuring teachers both teach lessons and mark homework
	+ Encouraging action on HIV/AIDS and gender equality
	+ *Other – e.g. providing school lunches*

From interviews with girls

As with data for teachers, averages were calculated for all (usually 10) girls interviewed in each school on the extent to which:

* detailed information on HIV/AIDS had been given (e.g. information on HIV transmission and prevention, use of condoms, where to get help, and stigma and discrimination);

detailed information on girls’ and women’s rights had been given (e.g. the right to stay at school, not to be married before 18, to participate in school governing bodies and to hold senior positions within government).

1. **Girls’ empowerment index** – *new indicator will help us bring together information on girls’ confidence. Allows us to see whether project interventions align with particular levels of girls’ empowerment, how gender profiles and teacher qualifications align with girls’ empowerment. We will look at this both as a composite and look at the component parts for each girl.*

Construct this from

* the range of obstacles and solutions girls identify – weight solutions x 2 if they identify political solutions like abolishing fees, ending early marriage, provision of facilities, sex education & enlightenment. Weight sponsorship x1; (code others options when reviewed)
* knowledge of HIV , attitudes towards HIV (non-discrimination, negotiating safer sex)
* knowledge of and attitudes towards gender equity and violence
* level of confidence in dealing with gender based violence.
1. **Teachers’ qualification profile** – *used in baseline. Bands schools in terms of the proportion of teachers (women and men) with particular levels of qualification. Allows us to see changes from baseline and relationship with other composite variables. Data from A instrument.*

They were calculated as follows *in the baseline*:

No. of teachers in the school with qualification 1 x1

No. of teachers in the school with qualification 2 x2

No. of teachers in the school with qualification 3 x3

No. of teachers in the school with qualification 4 x4

1 is the lowest grade (e.g. in Tanzania IIIB) and 4 is the highest qualification. See below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tanzania | Nigeria |
| 1. IIIB x 1
2. IIIA x 2
3. Diploma x 3
4. Degree x 4
 | 1. SSCE GCE. Weighted x1
2. CERT OND. Weighted x2
3. Diploma. Weighted NCE x3
4. Degree. Weighted x4
 |

Scores for all staff within a school were then summed, giving each school an overarching score for the qualifications/grades of its staff.

*Endline*: We need to construct these indicators in the same way as the baseline for comparability, but have extra/different categories in the instrument as below. We will need to look carefully at the data and consult country teams on how the endline categories map onto the baseline categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tanzania | Nigeria |
| As above plus* Postgraduate qualification
* Other
 | * TSC 2
* OND
* HND
* Degree
* Postgraduate qualification
* Other
 |

1. **Teacher engagement profile** – *new variable. Allows us to see at school level whether teachers have been able to use their training. Can be used in conjunction with other composite variables.*

Construct this from:

* + whether and how (i.e. range of activities) teachers report putting HIV, gender and participatory teaching training into practice (T)
	+ Girls’ experience of participatory teaching (G)
	+ Girls’ reports that they have received information on HIV and gender and the range of topics covered (G)
1. *Sub-index: Girls’ clubs*

	* + how long girls’ club has been running (from Matron instrument)
		+ how often it meets (Matron instrument)
		+ how long exchange programme running and the number of visits arranged (from PO instrument)
		+ number of girls attending last 2 meetings? (matron)
		+ range of activities covered in girls’ club (M)*Sub-index: Teacher training*

	* + how long, and how much training in HIV (from PO instrument, HT & T instruments)
		+ how long, and how much training in gender (from PO instrument, HT & T instruments),
		+ how long and how much training in participatory teaching (from PO, HT & T instruments),*Sub-index: SMC support*

	* + how long and how much training for SMC (from PO, SMC, HT )
		+ how much training given to community circle (C) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Variance is significant at 5% (0.0157) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Variance between states is significant at 1% (0.0005) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Variance between states is significant at 1% (0.0001) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Note: This index is the only one that has not been adjusted to vary between 0 and 1. It has been calculated as a GPI ratio. The gender profile score calculation was slightly adjusted to make it a stronger measure: this was applied to the baseline and endline data so that they are comparable [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Note: This index is the only one that has not been adjusted to vary between 0 and 1. It has been calculated as a GPI ratio. The gender profile score calculation was slightly adjusted to make it a stronger measure: this was applied to the baseline and endline data so that they are comparable [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Number of schools used in calculations same as nos of schools used in primary enrolment table [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Data from some schools had to be taken out of the dataset for these calculations because they were incomplete. We didn’t get chance to find and add the number of schools included in the calculations but can do this if wanted. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Note- for % of girls citing different solutions baseline and endline see 9.9 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Note the solutions were weighted so that more political solutions (end early marriage, abolish fees) were weighted more than sponsorship [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. includes unhelpful/inaccurate messages about promiscuity and HIV [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Look at this in relation to size of class [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Was not possible to do this in the time. Can be done later in week if wanted. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Data had to be calculated from the Endline dataset (using the 2008 data) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Odd data. Extreme outliers were removed (ratios below 1/5 or above 5/1) in order not to bias the results. A total of 28 schools for the baseline and 35 for the endline were analysed. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. There are small differences in the information included in the baseline and endline scores; therefore they are not exactly equivalent. However, because of the large amount of information going into these scores and the fact that they have been normalised 0-1 minimises any effect [↑](#footnote-ref-16)