Community-Based Schools and Institutionalized Access to Education in Rural Afghanistan *Preliminary Findings**

Dana Burde, New York University
Joel Middleton, University of California-Berkeley
Cyrus Samii, New York University

April 2015

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this study came from the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) with additional material assistance from the Assessing Learning and Social Outcomes in Community Based Education in Afghanistan (ALSE) based at New York University and sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Dana Burde (Steinhardt School, New York University), Joel Middleton (Department of Political Science, University of California-Berkeley), and Cyrus Samii (Department of Politics, New York University) drafted the report in 2015. Amy Kapit (ALSE) oversaw data collection, Vedrana Misic (ALSE) oversaw all team operations, Mohammad Amin Sadiqi (ALSE) managed final stage field operations from Kabul. Matthew Lisiecki (consulting data analyst for the project) assisted with quantitative data preparation and analysis. Dr. Saeed Mahmoodi (ALSE) trained the Herat surveyors and managed data collection in the province, and Navid Afzali (consulting for the project) trained surveyors in Ghor and managed data collection there. Renard Sexton (Department of Politics, New York University) contributed to early data gathering, interviews, and field coordination. The evaluation was carried out in close cooperation with CRS-Afghanistan, a member of Partnership for Advancing Community Education in Afghanistan (PACE-A) consortium. We are especially grateful to Rachel Hermes, William Schmitt, Kevin Hartigan, Celeste Gregory and others at CRS for their collaboration and willingness to share data and experiences from their study. Special thanks also to Abdul Arian, Jalal Atayee, and Zia Andar at the Ministry of Education in Afghanistan, Jeannette Liv Ostergaard and Ahmad Parwiz Yosufzai at DANIDA, and Sue Weibe at CIDA for their support. The findings and interpretations in this report are entirely those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of any of the above-named organizations, affiliated entities, or other individuals.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Key Concepts and Definitions	4
	Methodology	
	Results	
	4.1 Geography and Demographics	6
	4.2 Demand Side Factors	9
	4.3 Statistical Analysis	. 14
5	Discussion	. 16
8	Appendix	. 16

1 Introduction

We examine variation in institutionalizing access to primary education in rural communities of Afghanistan's Ghor and Herat provinces that were served by a community-based education program from 2006 to 2011. Our data collection was conducted in 2014, three years after the termination of a USAID-sponsored program that established new community-based education classes in rural Afghan communities. The program had been administered by a consortium of non-governmental organizations (NGOs)---the Partnership for Advancing Community Education in Afghanistan (PACE-A). We focus on whether the PACE-A classes were taken up by the Afghan Ministry of Education (MOE) or not, with implications for sustained access to education.

The type of institutionalization that we study is one that involves the eventual handover of administration from external actors to national governmental institutions. In this particular case, we are speaking of the handover of primary education as administered by international NGOs to the Afghanistan MOE. Other modalities of sustained service provision are conceivable. For example, it is possible that NGOs simply continue indefinitely in a service provider role. Or, it may be that NGOs hand over service provision responsibilities to communities themselves, who then manage the administration of services voluntarily at the community level. Finally, service provision may continue through private sector actors. Our assumptions in developing this study were that handover to a ministry represented the most relevant sustainability mode. This is based on expressed international interests to build Afghanistan's state capacity. It is based on the MOE's own interpretation of NGO-administered community-based education programming as "outreach" that will eventually lead to tying communities into the MOE's system of schools. It is also based on the gradual drawdown of international presence in Afghanistan (primarily military, but this has implications for the scale at which NGOs can work as well). These three factors make sustained NGO service provision less relevant for studying institutionalized access. In addition, the communities receiving these programs are quite poor and therefore very constrained in terms of their ability to provide or purchase education themselves. This lowers the potential for sustainability via community-led or market-based service provision.

Our decision to focus on handover to the MOE does not suggest a wholehearted acceptance of the normative superiority of that option. Indeed, judgment as to how rural Afghan communities may best "be served" when it comes to education must, to some extent, be based on analyses such as the one we conduct here, rather than asserted a priori. In our conclusion we will discuss implications for "handover to the MOE" as a modality for sustainable provision of primary education in rural Afghanistan.

This report complements a 2011 assessment of the six PACE-A classes handed over to the MOE. In those cases, one of the PACE-A classes was converted into an MOE school while the others were ended and the MOE directed students to existing public schools in the vicinity of the communities. The value of our study is that we were able to revisit these and other PACE-A communities three years after that initial assessment. What doing so revealed was that intentions that were stated in 2011 ("directing students to existing public schools") did not always bear out. This is indicative of the importance of leaving a reasonable amount of time between the end of program activities (in this case, programs only ended in 2011) and a sustainability assessment. Early sustainability assessments such as the 2011 report can identify important hurdles that are operative at the moment that a program is completed. But it is still valuable to conduct assessments further out in time so as to obtain a more definitive, and less speculative, picture based on what actually transpired.

The structure of this report is as follows. We first define key concepts, including a definition of what is the nature of community-based schooling and what we mean by sustainability. We then describe our research methodology, which was a mixed-methods approach combining (i) survey interviews in 114 villages that had hosted PACE-A classes as well as (ii) opened-ended, qualitative data gathering in 19 villages, selected in a manner that was representative of different sustainability outcomes. We then turn to a descriptive characterization of sustainability outcomes across the survey villages. We follow that with an analysis of how sustainability outcomes vary with various structural factors (e.g., variation by district government or remoteness of the community) as well as attitudes and opinions of village members toward education. This assessment combines both the survey data and the qualitative interviews. A conclusion section summarizes the findings and draws out implications.

2 Key Concepts and Definitions

We consider access to primary school in rural Afghan villages that had been part of program (PACE-A) that introduced community-based schools. In the most general terms, this study seeks to understand variation in *institutionalizing access* to public services rural communities.² The public service in this case is primary education based on a modern government curriculum for literacy and numeracy. As discussed in the introduction, we assume that the most relevant mechanism for institutionalizing access is through the MOE taking over the administration of

¹ Partnership for Advancing Community Education in Afghanistan (2011). *Handing Over PACE-A Community-Based Classes to the MoE: A Study of Experiences and Outcomes*. Report submitted to the US Agency for International Development, April 2011.

² Future work that we are undertaking also examines sustained quality of service provision, which would be manifested in actual *learning* outcomes. It is possible that access may be sustained by that deterioration in quality could lead to less learning.

primary education in the communities under study. Thus, a community is understood to enjoy *institutionalized access* if either (i) the MOE establishes a new, formal primary school in a community where community-based classes had been operating or (ii) the MOE is operating a formal primary school within very close proximity of the community. For the purposes of the analysis, we defined "very close proximity" to mean within 2.5 kilometers of the community (presumably less than an hour's walk).

Although we use "very close proximity" to refer to schools within 2.5 kilometers of the community, for the vast majority of communities in our sample, institutionalized access occurs at no distance. In other words, for these communities, the school was institutionalized within the village. This applies to 41 out of the 48 communities classified as having institutionalized access. We know from previous research that for each mile (1.6 kilometers) that distance to school increases, girls' enrollment drops by 19 percentage points, compared to 13 for boys, and girls' test scores decrease by 0.24 standard deviations per mile, 0.09 standard deviations more than boys'. Thus, it is critical to keep in mind that we only use the measure of 2.5 kilometers distance to assess institutionalization, not to suggest that this is an appropriate distance for children to walk.

In cases where access is not institutionalized, we have a few possible outcomes. These include (i) an NGO continuing to provide schooling in the community or providing schooling in a nearby community, (ii) the community voluntarily taking over the administration of the school themselves, or, the worst outcome, (iii) no one taking up the administration of primary education and thus a loss of access. We consider all of these outcomes as cases where access to primary education has *not* been institutionalized, but clearly they differ in terms of the implications for children's access to school. Nonetheless, the NGO-provided schools that followed PACE-A in the communities in our study areas were operating under contracts of finite duration. By our reasoning, for the NGO to continue programming suggests that the question of institutionalization has not been resolved, but rather "kicked down the road." Our primary interest below is in understanding why some villages enjoy institutionalized access but others do not, and to the extent that they do not, why some end up in the worst position of all (loss of access).

3 Methodology

We focus on the institutionalization of access to education in 114 villages in Ghor and Herat provinces that received community-based schools programming from 2011 to 2013 by Catholic

-

³ Burde, Dana, and Leigh L. Linden (2013). "Bringing Education to Afghan Girls: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Village-Based Schools." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5(3):27-40.

Relief Services (CRS) as part of the PACE-A program. These villages were selected from a list of villages where CRS had run schools as part of the PACE-A program in Ghor and Herat. The list included 226 villages that contained schools in which programming had been completed and where handover had already been due to occur by Fall 2013. CRS performed a security assessment for these 226 villages and determined that over half were located in districts that were too insecure to visit. There were 100 villages on this list that were deemed safe to visit, and we accepted to work in all 100 of these. Implementation of the survey could not begin until Spring 2014 (due to the winter travel constraints). By that time, we added to the list 14 villages that had either passed into the post-handover phase, or had been assessed as part of a 2007-2008 evaluation of the PACE-A program implemented by CRS in Ghor province conducted by Burde and Linden. These villages had not been included in the original list of 226 villages provided by CRS. This brought us to the total study sample size of 114 villages.

The data we analyze are from closed-ended survey interviews with village leaders and members of the school management committee (SMC) that was operative when the community-based school was running in their village. The survey questionnaire contained modules on demographic information, village level institutions, current access to school, attitudes toward education, and the process of handing over community-based schools to the MOE. The survey module is contained as an appendix.

4 Results

4.1 Geography and Demographics

Table 1 shows the distribution of communities included in the study over the institutionalization outcomes and also how demographics and geographic concentration vary across these outcomes. MOE institutionalization occurred in 48 cases, accounting for 42% of the sample and thus a bit less than half of the communities. It should be noted, however, that even when schools are institutionalized, they do not necessarily fully function. Indeed, a 2013 study by the Afghan Analysts Network (AAN) on education in Ghor province reported high levels of teacher absenteeism and large numbers of closed MOE schools throughout the province because of the security situation. According to the AAN, girls' schools in Taliban-controlled districts, in particular, have been abandoned, and the female education system exists "only on paper" (p. 4). ⁵ Among non-institutionalization outcomes, the outcome of no NGO or community administration of classes was the most common, accounting for 28 cases or 25% of the overall sample. NGO

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ali, Obaid (2013). *Pupils as Pawns: Plundered education in Ghor*. Afghan Analysts Network, retrieved from https://www.afghanistan-analysts.org/pupils-as-pawns-plundered-education-in-ghor/.

and Village administration of classes accounted for 20 (18%) and 18 (16%) of cases, respectively. The table shows that Dulaina and Chaghcharan in Ghor province contained concentrations of both the best (MOE institutionalization) and worst (no continuing administration) outcomes, whereas Shahrak district in Ghor contained the highest concentration of NGO and Village administration outcomes. We also see that continued NGO administration tended to occur more regularly in predominately Pashtun rather than Tajik communities, which is where other outcomes tended to be concentrated (owing, presumably, to their predominance in the overall sample). There are no evident patterns in overall numbers of households across the different outcomes, although there is some indication that MOE institutionalization tended to occur in communities with more school age children. This makes perfect sense, of course, and is consistent with the idea that MOE institutionalization was at least somewhat needs-targeted. Cases of continued NGO administration differ a bit in terms of the primary occupations of community members, with livestock rearing being more common in those cases, and this is likely based on the ethnic and regional differences that distinguish communities with ongoing NGO administration from the other communities. We do not see any apparent patterns with respect to the rate of labor outmigration (a potential indicator of demand for education).

Table 1: Basic village characteristics over institutionalization outcomes

Cases No. 48 20 18 28 Province & District Ghor: Chaghchran No. 11 2 5 4 Ghor: Chaghchran No. 11 2 5 4 Ghor: Dowlatyar No. 6 2 4 6 Ghor: Dulaina No. 22 0 2 22 Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 Ghor: Shahrak No. 1 4 1 0 Ghor: Shahrak No. 1 3 1 0 Herat: Adraskan No. 3 4 1 0 Herat: Guzara No. 1			Institu	ıtionaliz	zation Ou	ıtcome
No. 48 20 18 28 28 36 42 18 16 25						
Province & District Ghor: Chaghchran No. 11 2 5 4 6 6 22 4 6 6 23 10 28 15 6 6 22 2 4 6 6 20 6 6 20 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	Cases	No				
Province & District Ghor: Chaghchran No. 11 2 5 4 6 6 23 10 22 22 13 6 13 10 22 22 22 13 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	Cuses					
Ghor: Chaghchran No. 11 2 5 4 Ghor: Dowlatyar No. 6 23 10 28 15 Ghor: Dowlatyar No. 6 2 4 6 % 13 10 22 22 Ghor: Dulaina No. 22 0 2 13 % 46 0 11 48 Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 % 10 45 28 7 Herat: Adraskan No. 3 4 1 0 % 6 20 6 0 Herat: Guzara No. 1 3 1 0 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Largest ethnic group Aimaq No. 0 0 0 0 Aimaq	Province & District			10	10	
Shor: Dowlatyar		No.	11	2	5	4
Ghor: Dowlatyar No. 6 2 4 6 Ghor: Dulaina No. 22 0 2 13 Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 Herat: Adraskan No. 3 4 1 0 Herat: Guzara No. 1 3 1 0 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 0 2 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 0 2 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 0 2 Largest ethnic group Aimaq No. 0	Gnor. Gnagneman					-
Short: Dulaina	Ghor: Dowlatvar				_	_
Ghor: Dulaina No. 22 0 2 13 Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 % 10 45 28 7 Herat: Adraskan No. 3 4 1 0 Herat: Guzara No. 1 3 1 0 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Aimaq No. 0 0 0 2 Aimaq No. 0 1 0 0 Baluch No. 0 1 0 0 Baluch No. 0 0 1 0 Pashtun No. 3 4 2 2 % 0 0 6 0 1 7 Tajik No. 45 15 15 25 2 1 1		%			22	
Ghor: Shahrak % 46 0 11 48 Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 % 10 45 28 7 Herat: Adraskan No. 3 4 1 0 % 6 20 6 0 Herat: Guzara No. 1 3 1 0 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Ko 0 0 0 0 7 Largest ethnic group Aimaq No. 0 1 0 0 Aimaq No. 0 1 0<	Ghor: Dulaina	No.				
Ghor: Shahrak No. 5 9 5 2 Herat: Adraskan No. 3 4 1 0 Herat: Guzara No. 1 3 1 0 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Herat: Injil No. 0 0 0 2 Largest ethnic group No. 0 1 0 0 Aimaq No. 0 1 0 0 Baluch No. 0 0 1 0 Pashtun No. 0 0 1 0 Pashtun No. 3 4 2 2 % 0 0 6 0 0 Pashtun No. 45 15 15 25 % 6 20 11 7 7 7 83 93 93 Population size No. households Mean		%		0	11	
Herat: Adraskan	Ghor: Shahrak	No.		9	5	
Herat: Adraskan		%	10	45	28	
Herat: Guzara	Herat: Adraskan			_	_	
Herat: Guzara		%		20	6	
Herat: Injil	Herat: Guzara					
Herat: Injil				_	_	
% 0 0 0 0 7 Largest ethnic group No. 0 1 0 0 Aimaq No. 0 1 0 0 Baluch No. 0 0 1 0 Pashtun No. 3 4 2 2 % 6 20 11 7 Tajik No. 45 15 15 25 % 94 75 83 93 Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 55 71 92 75 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer	Herat: Iniil					
Largest ethnic group	1101411 111111					
Aimaq	Largest ethnic group	, ,				<u> </u>
Baluch Mo. 0 0 1 0		No.	0	1	0	0
Baluch No. 0 0 1 0 Pashtun No. 3 4 2 2 % 6 20 11 7 Tajik No. 45 15 15 25 % 94 75 83 93 Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 No. households Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 55 71 92 75 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 70 60 60 70 60 60 70 60 60 70 60 70 60 70 60 70 60 70 60 70 60 60	1					
Pashtun % 0 0 6 0 No. 3 4 2 2 % 6 20 11 7 Tajik No. 45 15 15 25 % 94 75 83 93 Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 SD 55 71 92 75 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89	Baluch					
Pashtun No. 3 4 2 2 % 6 20 11 7 Tajik No. 45 15 15 25 % 94 75 83 93 Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 SD 55 71 92 75 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 No 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 7 60 60 7 7 7 7 7 7 80 80 7 80 80 8 7 83 89 89 1 1 0 1 2 0 0 7 7 7 7 7 7 <td< td=""><td></td><td>%</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>6</td><td></td></td<>		%	-	-	6	
Tajik % 6 20 11 7 No. 45 15 15 25 % 94 75 83 93 Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 SD 55 71 92 75 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 70 60 70 70 60 7 70 <	Pashtun			-		
Tajik No. 45 15 15 25 % 94 75 83 93 Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 SD 55 71 92 75 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 0 1 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	1 40114411			20		
Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 SD 55 71 92 75 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 65 75 75 75 75 75 75 75	Taiik					
Population size No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation No. 1 0 1 2 Most common occupation No. 1 0 1 2 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 0 0 Teacher <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td>		%	_	_		
No. households Mean 86 98 89 73 No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	Population size					
No. boys 6-11 Mean 73 62 65 60 SD 56 42 61 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11 Mean 73 62 65 60 60 60 62 75 75 80 80 75 80 80 75 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	=	Mean	86	98	89	73
No. boys 6-11 Mean SD 56 42 61 62 60 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 56 42 61 62 Most common occupation SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation No. 1 0 1 2 Parmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 % 2 0 0 0	1101110450110145					
SD 56 42 61 62 No. girls 6-11 Mean 68 59 57 56 SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	No. boys 6-11				-	
No. girls 6-11 Mean SD SD 50 59 49 44 45 Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 15 24 6 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 6 5 11 0 0 5 10 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1.0.0000					
SD 50 49 44 45 Most common occupation	No. girls 6-11	~~				
Most common occupation Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	1101 8113 0 11					
Daily Laborer No. 1 0 1 2 % 2 0 6 7 Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	Most common occupation			.,		
Farmer	_	No.	1	0	1	2
Farmer No. 42 15 15 24 % 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	2 411, 2400101					
% 88 75 83 89 Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 % 2 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	Farmer					
Livestock No. 4 5 2 0 % 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	- w					
% 8 25 11 0 Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 % 2 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	Livestock					
Shopkeeper No. 0 0 0 1 % 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 % 2 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11						
% 0 0 0 4 Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 % 2 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	Shopkeeper					
Teacher No. 1 0 0 0 % 2 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	znopacepor					
% 2 0 0 0 Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	Teacher					
Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration Mean 0.08 0.09 0.08 0.11	25461161					
	Pct. HH w/ labor outmigration					

4.2 Demand Side Factors

We analyze the extent to which factors related to the community members' demand for education might have affected the institutionalization outcomes. We have already seen some indication that the institutionalization outcome is related to numbers of school age children, itself an indicator of demand. In this section, we look at additional demand side factors, including community members' interest in formal education and the activeness of community-level institutions that might advocate for the institutionalization of schools in their community.

Tables 2 and 3 provide some insights into the nature of demand on the basis of community members' interest in formal education (that is, government school education). Table 2 shows responses to batteries of questions on whether community members think that education is consistent with their religion, whether there are any social costs or benefits associated with sending kids to school, how much of a priority it is to educate one's children, and whether kids are at risk in trying to go to school. The table indicates that, generally speaking, community members are highly supportive of their children obtaining formal education. Indeed, our interviewees' responses to in-depth questions offer robust data that underscore these findings. A teacher in one village notes, "actually, our people are always insisting and telling us that we have to have a school." Another typical response notes, "People prefer to send their children to all [any] school [rather than keep them at home]. It doesn't matter whether they study religious subjects at mosque or they go to government school." This interviewee describes local tensions with hostile forces (Taliban) and notes that educating girls is so important that parents continue to send their girls to school despite the threat.

Despite interviewees' references to Taliban pressures, in the vast majority of communities, no conflict is perceived between formal education and religion nor does educating one's child seem to carry any social stigma. In very small minorities of communities do we find respondents indicating that education is viewed as secondary to helping around the house or earning income, and only in a small minority of communities did respondents suggest that sending their children to school would carry the risk of bringing harm to their children or themselves. It is difficult to discern whether there are patterns in the responses across the institutionalization outcomes. Thus, Table 3 presents the information from Table 2 in a more summarized form. For each of the four demand themes, we created an index. For each community, the theme's index value was calculated by adding together the responses to each of the theme's questions, with responses to each question scored such that -1 would be assigned to responses least indicative of support for education, 1 would be assigned to responses more

⁶ Interview, December 14, 2014 in Chaghcharan district.

⁷ Interview, December 7, 2014 in Shahrak district.

indicative of support, and intermediate responses evenly spaced between -1 and 1. We indicate for each index the possible range that the value can take. Confirming the impression from Table 2, we see that the indices tend to hover very closely to their maximum possible values. The indices do not reveal any striking trends as we go from MOE institutionalization ("MOE") to the outcome of no continued access ("None"). Based on the results thus far, we do not see that evidence for variation in interest in formal education as an explanation variation in institutionalization outcomes.

Aside from general interest in formal education, another potential demand side factor is the activeness of community organizations. The idea is that communities that are better organized may also be better positioned to communicate their interest in continued access to education for their children. Table 4 tries to address this idea by presenting results on questions about the activeness of the shuras in the sample communities. We see a bit of trend in terms of whether the community hosts its own shura or not, with 79% of villages that received MOE institutionalization of their schools having their own shuras, as compared to somewhat smaller numbers for the villages with non-institutionalization outcomes. Beyond that, we do not see a similar trend in relation to whether shuras are more active in terms of number of meetings or undertaking major projects. An index, constructing using the four variables indicated in the table using the same method as described in the previous paragraph, also shows that there is little to indicate that trends in shura activeness across the institutionalization outcomes.

Our qualitative findings are also inconclusive on this point. In a handful of cases, interviewees believe that strengthening advocacy for education did or could help with securing a government school for the village. One interviewee notes, "We don't have any smart person to go government and request our necessities....We wish we had someone to go before government official and have the government help us." However, at least one fifth of interviewees express frustration that requests for education from the government remain unmet. The former NGO teacher of one village where schooling has been discontinued explains, "the head of Shura came [to speak with the district education director]. I was also with him. We came here and talked and told them that we would not send our students if they merge our [NGO] school. Do not leave us like that." Certainly, not every village that requests an MOE school receives it. Factors such as how well the request is communicated, likely matter, as does the influence of any local strongmen—details which are not included in the interviews.

_

⁸ Interview, December 3, 2014 in Chaghcharan district.

⁹ Interview, December 6, 2014 in Shahrak district.

¹⁰ The 2013 AAN report notes that warlords or strongmen in Ghor keep tight control over their territory, including dictating where buildings such as schools are constructed.

Table 2: Indicators related to demand for education over institutionalization outcomes

Institutionalization Outcome **MOE** NGO Village None Education consistent with religion Sending son to school is doing what Ouran teaches % Sending daughter to school is doing what Quran teaches % Mosque/madrasa better than government school for girls Strongly agree % Agree % Disagree % % Strongly disagree Mosque/madrasa better than government school for boys Strongly agree % Agree % Disagree % Strongly disagree % Quran studies should be only type of education Strongly agree % Agree % Disagree % % Strongly disagree Social costs or benefits of educating children Easier for son to get married if educated Easier for daughter to get married if educated % Educated daughters lower family status % Strongly agree % Agree Disagree % Strongly disagree % Educated sons lowers family status Strongly agree % Agree % Disagree % Strongly disagree % How important is what neighbors think in deciding to send daughter to school? Not important % Somewhat important % Very important % How important is what neighbors think in deciding to send son to school? Not important % Somewhat important % Very important %

Table 2 (continued)

More			Institutionalization Outcome					
Strongly disagree that there is no need for girls education								
Strongly disagree that there is no need for boys education Word important for girls to help around house than go to school Strongly agree Word 6 0 11 4	Education as a priority							
More important for girls to help around house than go to school Strongly agree %	Strongly disagree that there is no need for girls education	%	88	85	94	93		
Strongly agree % 2 0 6 0 Agree % 6 0 111 4 Disagree % 63 50 56 46 More important for boys to help around house than go to school Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 27 30 22 36 Strongly disagree % 0 5 6 0 More important for girls to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 2 5 0 11 11 11 12 12 12 12 12 12	Strongly disagree that there is no need for boys education	%	98	100	100	93		
Agree % 6 0 11 4 Disagree % 29 50 22 50 More important for boys to help around house than go to school Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 0 5 6 0 More important for girls to help with household income than study Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 More important for girls to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 11 1 4 Disagree % 2 7 40 67 25 3 6 1 1 1 4 1 3 6 1 1 4 1 3 6 1 1 4 1 3 6 1 1 4 1 <td>More important for girls to help around house than go to school</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	More important for girls to help around house than go to school							
Disagree	Strongly agree	%	2	0	6	0		
Strongly disagree % 63 50 56 46	Agree	%	6	0	11	4		
More important for boys to help around house than go to school Strongly agree % 0 5 11 4 Disagree % 0 5 5 11 4 Agree % 0 5 5 11 4 Agree % 0 5 5 11 4 Agree % 0 73 55 56 61 Agree % 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 0 11 Agree % 2 7 40 67 25 Agree % 2 7 40 67 25 Agree % 2 7 40 67 25 Agree % 0 0 5 6 0 0 Agree % 0 0 5 6 0 0 Agree % 0 0 5 6 0 0 0 Agree % 0 0 5 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Agree % 0 0 5 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Disagree	%	29	50	22	50		
Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 0 5 11 4 Disagree % 27 30 22 36 Strongly disagree % 73 55 56 61 More important for girls to help with household income than study 8 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 11 Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly agree % 6 0 17 7 Disagree % 13 5 17 21 Strongly disagree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 3 6 39	Strongly disagree	%	63	50	56	46		
Agree % 0 5 11 4 Disagree % 27 30 22 36 Strongly disagree % 73 55 56 61 More important for girls to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 11 11 15 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly disagree % 0 5 6 0 0 4 4 17 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly disagree % 0 5 6 0 0 4 4 17 7 15 33 64 4 17 7 1 15 33 64 4 10 17 7 2 1 17 7 1 11 34 17 3 6	More important for boys to help around house than go to school							
Disagree % 27 30 22 36 Strongly disagree % 73 55 56 61 More important for girls to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 2 5 0 11 Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly agree % 67 45 61 57 Risks of sending kids to school Girls are at risk at school Strongly agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 54 25 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Strongly disagree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 2 0 6 0 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree	Strongly agree	%	0	5	6	0		
Strongly disagree % 73 55 56 61 More important for girls to help with household income than study % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 11 Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly agree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0	Agree	%	0	5	11	4		
More important for girls to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 0 11 Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 0 Agree % 2 0 0 17 7 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 67 45 61 57 Strongly disagree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 14 25 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Strongly agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 10 17 1 4 Disagree % 6 10 11 1 4 Disagree % 10 10 10 10 11 1 4 D	Disagree	%	27	30	22	36		
Strongly agree % 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 11 Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school 8 54 25 39 39 Brongly agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 0 <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>%</td> <td>73</td> <td>55</td> <td>56</td> <td>61</td>	Strongly disagree	%	73	55	56	61		
Strongly agree % 0 0 0 Agree % 2 5 0 11 Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school 8 54 25 39 39 Brongly agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 0 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 67 45 61 57 Risks of sending kids to school Girls are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 0 0 0 Strongly agree % <t< td=""><td></td><td>%</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></t<>		%	0	0	0	0		
Disagree % 27 40 67 25 Strongly disagree % 71 55 33 64 More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 67 45 61 57 Risks of sending kids to school Girls are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 0 0 0 Strongly agree % <t< td=""><td>Agree</td><td>%</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td>11</td></t<>	Agree	%	2	5	0	11		
More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 67 45 61 57 Risks of sending kids to school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly disagree % 0 0	· · ·	%	27	40	67	25		
More important for boys to help with household income than study Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Strongly disagree % 67 45 61 57 Risks of sending kids to school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly disagree % 0 0	Strongly disagree	%	71	55	33	64		
Strongly agree % 0 5 6 0 Agree % 2 0 17 7 Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Risks of sending kids to school Risks of sending kids to school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school 8 54 25 39 39 Brongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11	· · ·							
Agree		%	0	5	6	0		
Disagree % 31 45 17 36 Risks of sending kids to school Girls are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 0 0 0 0 Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 31 40 50 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
Strongly disagree % 67 45 61 57 Risks of sending kids to school Girls are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 22 39 39 39 39 33 65 39 30 39 30 30 30 39 39 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 <td>=</td> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td>45</td> <td>17</td> <td>36</td>	=	%		45	17	36		
Risks of sending kids to school Girls are at risk at school 8 0 0 0 0 Agree 96 13 5 17 21 Disagree 96 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree 96 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school 30 0	· ·							
Girls are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school 35 0 31 40 50 <								
Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school T	· · ·							
Agree % 13 5 17 21 Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school *** *** 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 10 10 17 7 7 7 7 7 8 33 40 22 29 29 29 8 33 40 22 29 29 29 20 61 64 64 64 60 50 61 64 64 64 60 60 60 60 64 </td <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td>	Strongly agree	%	0	0	0	0		
Disagree % 33 65 39 39 Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 0 0 0 0 1 Agree % 0 0 0 0 Disagree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 2 0		%	13	5	17	21		
Strongly disagree % 54 25 39 39 Boys are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 0 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 2 0 6 0	-	%	33	65	39	39		
Boys are at risk at school Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36		%	54	25	39	39		
Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk 8 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk 8 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk 8 50 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 50 39 57 58 50 39 57 58 50 39 57 58 50 39 57 58 50 39 57 58 50 39 57 58 50 39 57 58 50 30 6 0 0 0								
Agree % 6 10 17 7 Disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	•	%	0	0	0	0		
Disagree % 33 40 22 29 Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36		%						
Strongly disagree % 60 50 61 64 Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	=					29		
Sending girls to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	6							
Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	2.2.1.g.y 2.3.4g.11							
Strongly agree % 0 0 0 0 Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	Sending girls to school puts family at risk							
Agree % 10 10 11 4 Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36		%	0	0	0	0		
Disagree % 31 40 50 39 Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36						4		
Strongly disagree % 58 50 39 57 Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	· ·							
Sending boys to school puts family at risk Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36	•							
Strongly agree % 0 0 0 1 Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36		, 0	20	50	27	٠,		
Agree % 2 0 6 0 Disagree % 21 45 17 36		%	0	0	0	1		
Disagree % 21 45 17 36								
ĕ	ě .							
	Strongly disagree	%	75	55	78	61		

Table 3: Index measures of elements of demand for education over institutionalization outcomes

Institutionalization Outcome MOE NGO Village None Perception that education is consistent with *Mean* 2.69 3.36 3.61 2.87 religion index (-5 to 5) SD1.18 1.27 1.51 1.34 Perception of social benefit of education Mean 5.06 5.15 4.98 4.36 index (-6 to 6) SD1.44 1.28 2.05 1.19 Perception that education is a priority index *Mean* 4.94 4.37 4.15 4.60 1.29 (-6 to 6)SD1.23 1.21 1.52 Perception that it is safe to send kids to 2.77 2.43 2.58 Mean 2.35 school (-4 to 4) SD1.41 0.94 1.18 1.24

Table 4: Indicators of shura activity over institutionalization outcomes

		Institutionalization Outcome				
		MOE	NGO	Village	None	
Shura in village rather than shared with another village	%	79	75	72	67	
Number of meetings in past year	Mean	12	14	13	11	
	SD	7	11	11	7	
Major projects undertaken in past year	%	79	90	78	85	
Shura members paid by village member contributions	%	10	5	0	0	
Shura activeness index (-4 to 4)	Mean	-0.25	-0.07	-0.45	-0.55	
	SD	1.12	1.39	1.61	1.23	

4.3 Statistical analysis

Table 5 takes the data presented in the previous tables and submits them to a statistical analysis to assess whether any of the patterns apparent in the tables (of which there were few) might reasonably be construed as systematic. We use a binary outcome that takes the value 1 if the community was host to MOE institutionalization and 0 otherwise, ignoring the various outcomes that may have come about communities without institutionalization. (An analysis that looks at a scale ranging from 1=no continued access to 4=MOE institutionalization indicates precisely the same patterns as what we see here in Table5 with the binary outcome.) We find some indication of gross-level variation across provinces and districts, although with such a small sample size it is not clear that these differences are systematic. The statistical significance for Injil is also suspect, given that it contains only 2 communities in our sample. At the same time, the coefficients for Herat province and then Shahrak and Guzra districts fall just shy of conventional statistical significant thresholds. After accounting for district level differences, it is no longer evident that the apparent trend related to numbers of school age trend is significant. Neither do the other demand side factors provide any significant explanatory power.

Table 5: Correlates of institutionalization (OLS regressions)

Outcome: institutionalization (=1) vs. not (=0)									
Model:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Herat (as compared to Ghor)	-0.20								

Outcome: institutionalization (=1) vs.	HOT (=0)									
Model:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Herat (as compared to Ghor)	-0.20 (0.12)									
Ghor: Dowlatyar ^a		-0.17 (0.16)	-0.15 (0.16)	-0.15 (0.16)	-0.15 (0.16)	-0.27 (0.18)	-0.15 (0.16)	-0.15 (0.17)	-0.16 (0.17)	-0.29 (0.19)
Ghor: Dulaina ^a		0.09 (0.14)	0.07 (0.14)	0.07 (0.14)	0.02 (0.15)	-0.04 (0.16)	0.05 (0.15)	0.07 (0.14)	0.08 (0.15)	-0.08 (0.18)
Ghor: Shahrak ^a		-0.26 (0.15)	-0.28 (0.15)	-0.27 (0.16)	-0.24 (0.16)	-0.37* (0.16)	-0.27 (0.15)	-0.28 (0.15)	-0.27 (0.16)	-0.28 (0.19)
Herat: Adraskan ^a		-0.13 (0.21)	-0.12 (0.21)	-0.01 (0.29)	-0.14 (0.21)	-0.22 (0.22)	-0.12 (0.22)	-0.12 (0.22)	-0.16 (0.22)	-0.08 (0.32)
Herat: Guzara ^a		-0.30 (0.21)	-0.33 (0.24)	-0.27 (0.24)	-0.34 (0.25)	-0.41 (0.25)	-0.30 (0.25)	-0.32 (0.25)	-0.36 (0.23)	-0.38 (0.27)
Herat: Injil ^a		-0.50*** (0.11)	-0.55*** (0.14)	-0.42 (0.26)	-0.54*** (0.14)	-0.58*** (0.14)	-0.53*** (0.15)	-0.55*** (0.15)	-0.59*** (0.16)	-0.34 (0.30)
log(# school age children)			0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)	0.04 (0.08)	0.05 (0.09)
log(# households)			0.07 (0.07)	0.07 (0.08)	0.07 (0.07)	0.07 (0.07)	0.07 (0.07)	0.07 (0.07)	0.08 (0.07)	0.05 (0.08)
Primarily Pashtun or other non-Tajik				-0.13 (0.22)						-0.26 (0.24)
Religious support index					0.05 (0.04)					0.06 (0.05)
Social benefit index						0.05 (0.03)				0.04 (0.04)
Education as priority index							0.01 (0.04)			0.00 (0.05)
Education is safe index								0.00 (0.04)		-0.03 (0.05)
Shura activeness index									0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
Constant	0.45 (0.05)	0.5 (0.11)	0.22 (0.33)	0.22 (0.33)	0.07 (0.33)	0.07 (0.34)	0.15 (0.35)	0.20 (0.35)	0.20 (0.33)	0.05 (0.37)
Observations R-squared	114 0.02	114 0.1	114 0.11	114 0.11	114 0.12	114 0.13	114 0.11	114 0.11	110 0.13	110 0.16

Ordinary least squares regression estimates.

Standard errors in parentheses

(Robust standard errors .)

^{*} p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

^a The comparison condition is Chaghcharan (Ghor province), where 50% of communities had classes institutionalized.

5 Discussion

The analysis presented here represents a first step toward understanding variation in the institutionalization of education following on the introduction of CBE classes. We obtain two important conclusions from the analysis. First, the evidence we gathered suggests that community members in the study area are strongly interested in their children obtaining formal education. Second, the very fact that demand is high nearly across the board means that it cannot explain variation in institutionalization outcomes. Neither does it seem that size of the school age population or the activeness of community institutions (as an indicator for communities' ability to mobilization to lobby for education) explains such variation. We have faint evidence that institutionalization outcomes vary at the provincial and district level, which may be indicative of supply side factors being relevant (that is, factors related to provincial or district level MOE institutions). The fact that institutionalization occurred in less than half of communities implies that demands for education are being left largely unmet. This is an unfortunately reality and it is crucial that we understand how this situation might be changed. As yet our analysis presents few clues for how this situation can be ameliorated. We plan for further analysis of MOE institutions, including capacities and motivations among district and provincial officials, as well as a more thorough analysis of institutionalization decision-making. We hope that these can allow us to understand more clearly why so many communities, despite their apparent interest in formal education, are not able to receive it.

6 Appendix

6.1 Survey questionnaire

Management Information

To be filled by the su	To be filled by the surveyor before the interview:						
1.1. Date	//	1.6. Survey ID:					
(day/month/year)							
1.2 Province Name:		1.7. Enumerator's Name:					
1.3 District Name:		Enumerator's Signature:					
1.4 Village Name:		affirm the information					
		below is complete and					
1.5 Community-		accurate					
based School ID:							

[For this survey, you need to interview ONE village leader (e.g. Arbab or maliq) and ONE CURRENT or PREVIOUS member of the community-based school (CBS) Shura/School Management Committee (SMC) member. We advise that, whenever possible, you interview TWO members of the Village Shura and School Shura/SMC member TOGETHER – in this way, they can help support each other and check their answers (eg, over dates) with each other.

If you are unable to locate a current or previous school shura/SMC member, then you can interview TWO village shura members/ village leaders TOGETHER.

As the last resort, if you are unable to locate two village shuras/village leaders, then you can interview two school shura members/SMC members TOGETHER.

You must ask EVERY question unless there is a note before the question that provides other instructions. If the informant does not know the answer to a question, then select "don't know." Informants should NOT be encouraged in any way to guess or give information they are not confident about.]

SCRIPT FOR INTERVIEW WITH SCHOOL SHURA/SMC MEMBERS:

Hello, my name is _____ and I work with an independent team of researchers. This survey is part of a research study that aims to understand the status of education options previously and currently available in your village, including community-based schools as well as the demand for education by households in the village. We hope to learn information that will contribute to improving educational services in the area.

- All your responses will remain completely ANONYMOUS—I will not record your name or identifying information.
- The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential—it will not be shared with other villagers.
- The information you provide will be combined with that of other shura/SMC members/village leaders in other villages and your responses will never be identified as yours.
- Please answer as honestly and completely as possible.
- You can stop participating in the survey at any time.
- You may skip any question that you do not want to answer; however, the success of this study depends very much on your cooperation.
- The survey takes about 30 minutes to complete.
- Your participation in this survey is voluntary; you do not have to participate; there are no risks or benefits to participation.
- Shall we continue to the survey questions? [Record response below.]
 - 1. Yes [if yes, then proceed with the interview]
 - 2. No [conclude interview]

Section 1. Respondent Information

	Which of the following describes your	What is	Condon (Do not oak just record)
Responde	Which of the following describes your	What is	Gender (Do not ask, just record)
nt	role in the village? Are you a (Read	your	
	all the answer choices and circle all that	age?	
	apply)		
1.	1A.	1B.	1C.
	1. School management committee member		1. Male
	/ school shura member		2. Female
	2. Village shura member		
	3. Arbab		
	4. Maliq		
	5. Other: ()		
2.	2A.	2B.	2C.
	1.School management committee		1. Male
	member/school shura member		2. Female
	2. Village shura member		
	3.Arbab		

			ı	T
		4.Maliq		
		Other: ()		
		,,		
_				
	Section 2.	Demographic Information		
		uld like to ask you a few background questions.		
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
3.	Approxima	ately how many households are there in this villa	ige?	
	1.		-8-1	
		Don't know / not sure		
4.		ately how many villagers live in this village?		
٦.	1.	acty now many vinagers live in this vinage:		
		Don't know / not sure		
_			1	
5.		w many boys between the ages 6 and 11 live in t	nis village?	
	1.			
_		Don't know / not sure		
6.		many girls between the ages 6 and 11 live in the	is village?	
	1.	- <u></u> -		
	2.	Don't know / not sure		
7.	In this villa	age, are there villagers who are? [Read al	l the choice	s and circle all that apply.]
	1.	Farmers		
	2.	Shopkeepers		
		Teachers		
	4.	Traders		
		Civil servants (excluding teachers)		
		Daily Laborers		
		Raise livestock (maldari)		
		Other:		
	0.	Other.		
8.	What is th	ne most common occupation in the village? [Do	not road an	swars. Circle only one answer
0.	choice.	te most common occupation in the vinage. [Do	not icau an	swers. Circle only one answer
	_	Farmer		
	2.	• •		
		Teacher		
	4.	Trader		
	5.	` " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "		
		Daily Laborer		
		Raises livestock (maldari)		
	8.	Other:		
9.	What is the	e most common language spoken in the village?		
	1.	Pashto		
	2.	Dari		
	3.	Other		
10.	About how	many of the villagers speak this as their primar	y language?	
11.	What is the	e next most common language spoken in the vill	age?	
	1.	Pashto		

	3.	Other_		
	4.	No oth	er languages [skip to 13]
12.	About how	many o	f villagers spe	eak this as their primary language?
13.	What are th	ne ethnic	cities in this vi	llage? [Do not read answers. Circle all that apply.]
	1.	Aimaq		
	2.	Baloch	l	
	3.	Hazara	Į.	
	4.	Nurista	ani	
	5.	Pashtu	n	
	6.	Tajik		
	7.	Turkm	en	
		Uzbek		
		Don't l		
	11.	Refuse	d	
	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.	Aimaq Baloch Hazara Nurista Pashtur Tajik Turkm Uzbek Other _ Don't l	n nni n en know	most common ethnicity? [Do not read answers. Circle one choice.] —— many villagers 16 years and older were working away from the village?
		•		
16.	Are the vill	lagers w	orking	? (Read all locations and circle all that apply.)
		1.	In urban area	as in Afghanistan
		2.	In rural areas	s in Afghanistan
		3.	Pakistan	
		4.	Iran	
		5.	Tajikistan	
		6.	•	ntries around the Persian Gulf
		7.		ify:)
		7.	Other (Speci	
	Section 3.	Village 1	Institutions	
	Now. I am	going to	ask vou few 2	general questions about village shuras, their structure and functions.

2. Dari

19

17. Is there a village shura in this village, does this village share a shura with other villages, or is

there no shura that serves this village?

	How often does this payment occur?
	1. Daily
	2. Weekly
	3. Monthly 4. Two months
	5. Every few months 6. Six Months
	7. Yearly 3. Other
20	What is the value of this payment?
_ 0.	1 Afghanis
	2. Don't know
	3. Refuse to answer
21.	What is the total number of men that serve as village shura members/village leaders?
	1
	2. Don't know
	3. Refuse to answer
22.	Do women of the village serve on the village shura?
	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know / not sure
	4. Refuse to answer
22	[if yes] Do wemen and man serve together on the same shure or an separate shures?
4 3.	[if yes] Do women and men serve together on the same shura or on separate shuras? 1. Serve on same shura
	 Serve on separate shuras
	3. Don't know / not sure
	4. Refuse to answer
	4. Ketuse to answer
24.	[if women serve on shura] What is the total number of women that serve as shura members?
	1
	2. Don't know
	3. Refuse to answer
25.	How many meetings of the village shura were held in the past year?
	1
	20

18. Does the village shura receive any payment, including in-kind payment from the village for their

1. No shura

Yes
 No

3. Don't know4. Refuse to answer

work for the village?

Shura in village
 Shares shura with other villages

- 2. Don't know
- 3. Refuse to answer

26.	How	many	people	e attend	led tl	he l	ast	meetii	ıgʻ.	
-----	-----	------	--------	----------	--------	------	-----	--------	------	--

- 1.
- 2. Don't know
- 3. Refuse to answer
- **27.** What are the major activities that village shura has undertaken this year? (Do not read answer choices and mark all that apply.)
 - 1. Irrigation projects
 - 2. Sanitation
 - 3. Electricity
 - 4. Healthcare
 - 5. Road and bridges
 - 6. Mosques
 - 7. Community buildings
 - 8. School
 - 9. Nothing
 - 10. Refuse to answer
 - 11. Don't know

Section 4. Current Access to Education in the VILLAGE

Now, I am going to ask you about the kinds of schooling available to children ages 6 to 11 in and around your village.

- **28.** What types of schools exist in the village for children ages 6-11? (**Do not read choices. Circle all that apply**)
 - 1. Community-based school (CBS)
 - 2. Primary school, grades 1 to 6
 - 3. Local madrassa
 - 4. Mosque school
 - 5. Other ____
 - 6. No school in the village (Go to Section 5)

[ONLY MARK THE I	RELEVA	NT COLUMNS]			
	CBS	Primary school, grades 1-6	Local madrasa	Mosque school	Other
29. About how many boys ages 6-11 attend 4-6 days per week?					
30. About how many adult girls ages 6- 11 attend 4- 6 days per week?					

[Questions 31 through 40 are only if there is CBS or Primary school in the village. If no CBS or Primary school in the village, skip to Section 5]

31. How many teachers teach at	CBS	Primary school, grades 1-6
school? [ONLY MARK	1. One	1. One
THE RELEVANT COLUMN	2. Two	2. Two
CBS or PRIMARY SCHOOL]	3. Three	3. Three
	4. If more than three, how	4. If more than three, how
	many?	many?

Would you please tell me the names of the teacher(s)?	Has this teacher taught at [CBS or primary school] since its inception?	[if no to the previous question] Can you tell me why the original teachers no longer teaches at the school? [enumerator: read the answer choices and mark all that apply]	Do you know how many years of education (teacher) has?
32. Teacher's name:	32A. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know/ not sure	 Teacher moved Village preferred a more highly qualified teacher Village could not pay teacher's salary MoE failed to pay the teacher Teacher quit to do other work Teacher quit for unexplained reasons Other 	32C. 1. Yes → How many? 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure
33. Teacher's name:	33A. 1.Yes 2.No 3. Don't know/ not sure	 Teacher moved Village preferred a more highly qualified teacher Village could not pay teacher's salary MoE failed to pay the teacher Teacher quit to do other work Teacher quit for unexplained reasons Other 	33C. 1. Yes → How many? 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure
34. Teacher's name:	34A. Teacher's name:	34. 1.Yes 2.No 3. Don't know/ not sure	34C. 1. Yes→ How many? 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure

35. Who	administers the CBS, the MoE, an NGO, the village or a combination of these actors?
1.	MoE
	NGO → Can you tell me the name of the NGO?
3.	The village
	Both MoE and NGO
	Both the village and NGO
	The village, MoE and NGO
	Other
	Not sure / don't know
-	VILLAGE ask the following questions, if not, skip to Section 5] Now I am going to ask you e village shura received any request to support with CBS operations.
36. In function	the past year, did the village shura receive any requests from the village to support the CBS
	Yes
	No
	Don't know/not sure
37. [if	yes] Who made the requests? (Read the answer choices and circle all that apply)
_	Parents of children ages 6 to 11
2.	Parents of children ages 12+
3.	Village adults without children
4.	Teacher(s)
5.	Religious leader(s)
6.	NGO worker(s)
7.	Children
8.	Don't know /cannot recall
38. Wł	nat was the most recent request?
	A new CBS class building. Explain
	Request for school improvement
	Request to build latrines
	Bathroom (one for both boys and girls is okay)
	Separate bathroom for girls
	Change the teacher. Explain
	Request for teacher to be paid by the MoE
8.	Other. Explain
39. Co	nsidering the most recent request, did village shura act upon this request?
1.	
	No
	Shura wanted to act but did not know what to do
4.	Don't know/cannot recall
	no] Why did shura not act upon the request?
	Shura do not have enough financial resources
2.	Shura did not agree with the village's request

- 3. Shura have other priorities
- 4. Other _____

Section 5: Current access to education OUTSIDE the village

Now, I would like to know about schools outside your village for children who are ages 6 to 11.

	CBS	Government primary school, grades 1 to 6	Mosque school	Madrassa	Other
41. Are you aware of any CBS, government primary schools or religious schools outside the village that children from here may attend?	41A. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure	41B. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure	41C. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure	41D. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure	41E. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know / not sure
42. How many kilometers away is?	42A. km	42B. km	42Ckm	42Dkm	42Ekm
43. How long does the journey to take on foot?	43A. 1hours 2minute s 3. not walkable	43B. 1hours 2minutes 3. not walkable	43C. 1hours 2minutes 3. not walkable	43D. 1hours 2minutes 3. not walkable	43E. 1hours 2minutes 3. not walkable
44. Who administers, the government, an NGO or another	44A. 1. MoE 2. NGO 3. The village	44B. 1. MoE 2. NGO 3. The village	44C. 1. MoE 2. NGO 3. The village	44D. 1. MoE 2. NGO 3. The village	44E. 1. MoE 2. NGO 3. The village

organization? (circle all that apply)	4. Religious leaders 5. Other	4. Religious leaders 5. Other	4. Religious leaders 5. Other	4. Religiousleaders5. Other	4. Religious leaders 5. Other
45. How many boys from	45A.	45B.	45C.	45D.	45D.
your village age 6 to 11 attendon					
a regular basis, 4 to 6					
days a week? 46. How many	46A.	46B.	46C.	46D.	46E.
girls from your village					
age 6 to 11 attend on					
a regular basis, 4 to 6 days a week?					

Section 6. Attitudes towards Education

People have different ideas about whether it is good for children to go to formal schools run by the government, instead of learning only in mosque schools. I am interested to know your opinion:

- **47.** Some people say that sometimes when children go to government schools it is good because children can have a better future. Others say that sometimes children that attend a government school leave the village when they grow up. Which is closer to your viewer? Do government schools allow children to seek a better future elsewhere? Or do government schools cause a problem because children eventually settle outside the village? (**Circle the response that the respondent agrees with**)
 - 1. Education leads to better future
 - 2. Children settle outside the village
 - 3. Not sure / no opinion
- **48.** Some people say that when children go to government schools, they become disobedient and irresponsible toward their parents. Others say that schools help children to become more obedient and responsible. What do you think? Do government schools make children disobedient and irresponsible?

Or do government schools make children more obedient and responsible? (Circle the response that the respondent agrees with)

- 1. Disobedient and irresponsible
- 2. More obedient and responsible
- 3. Not sure / no opinion
- 49. Some say that if they send their sons to a government school, you are doing what the Qur'an and Hadith teaches. Other people say that going to government school goes against the Qur'an and Hadith. What do you think? Is sending your sons to government school doing what the Qur'an and Hadith teaches or going against the Qur'an and Hadith? (Circle the response that the respondent agrees with)
 - 1. Doing what the Qur'an teaches
 - 2. Going against the Qur'an
 - 3. Not sure / don't know
 - 4. Refuse to answer
- **50**. What about for your daughters? Is sending your daughters to government school doing what the Qur'an and Hadith teaches or going against the Qur'an and Hadith? (Circle the response that the respondent agrees with)
 - 1. Doing what the Qur'an teaches
 - 2. Going against the Qur'an
 - 3. Not sure / don't know
 - 4. Refuse to answer
- **51.** Some people say that if their sons go to government school, they will have an easier time finding a good wife. Others say that going to government school actually makes it harder for the boy to find a good wife. What do you think? If a boy goes to government school, will it make easier or harder to find a good wife? (Circle the response that the respondent agrees with)
 - 1. Easier
 - 2. Harder
 - 3. Neither easier or harder
- **52.** What about for your daughters? Does going to government school make it easier or harder to find a good husband? (Circle the response that the respondent agrees with)
 - 1. Easier
 - 2. Harder
 - 3. Neither easier or harder
- **53.** Now, I'm going to ask your opinion on educating girls. Can you tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree with the statements below? (*Read each statement below, followed by the answer choices. Mark only once choice for each component.*)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know / No answer
a.	Educating girls is not necessary					
b.	Educating girls decreases					

	a household's social status						
с.	Girls should not be educated if there is no separate school for girls in the village						
d.	Girls at school are at risk for being harmed						
e.	Sending girls to school will put their family in danger						
f.	It is more important for girls to help with household chores than to go to school						
g.	It is more important for girls to help with earning household income than to go to school						
h.	It is preferable to send girls to mosque school and/or madrasa than to government school						
disagre	'm going to ask your opinion e, strongly disagree or with the choice. Mark one option for	ne state	ements belo				
carswer	enoice. Mark one option jor	cuen si	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know / No answer
a.	Educating boys is not necess	sary					
b.	Educating boys decreases a household's social status						
c.	Boys should not attend school there is no separate school for boys in the village						
d.	Boys at school are at risk for being harmed	r					
e.	Sending boys to school will their family in danger	put					
f.	It is more important for boys help with household chores to						

	to go to school					
g.	It is more important for boys to					
Ü	-					
	income than to go to school					
h.	It is preferable to send boys to					
11.	-					
	than to government school		_	_	_	
	than to go vermient sensor					
Now, I am girls.	going to ask you about your perception	ons of household	ds' attitude to	wards educc	ating boys and	
	deciding to send girls to school, which what important or not important to hou		-	-	important,	
	T	Very		omewhat	Not	Don't know
		importa	ant ir	nportant	important	/ No answer
	ability of a girls' school in the e/community					
	l expenses (learning material, transpo	rt 🗆				
	opment of households' daughters' y and numeracy skills					
Distar	ace of school from households' home					
Safety	of female children					
What	the neighbors will say or think					
Femal	e children's desire to attend					
Femal	e children's aptitude					
	deciding to send boys to school, whice what important or not important to hou				/ important,	
	1	Very		omewhat	Not	Don't know
		importa	ant ir	nportant	important	/ No answer
	ability of a boys' school in the e/neighborhood					
Schoo etc.)	l expenses (learning material, transpo	rt 🗆				
	opment of households' boys' literacy racy skills	and \square				
	ace of school from households' home					
Safety	of boys					
What	the neighbors will say or think					
Boys'	desire to attend					
Boys'	aptitude					

Let's talk for a moment about the kind of community you think the villagers would like to live in.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ No answer
It is more important to educate boys than girls, and so it is not necessary for girls to have equal access as boys to school.					
Qur'anic education should be the only form of study available to children; math or science education is not important.					
Only men should be responsible for making decisions about their children's education.					
 58. Of the following four, who knows what is be one.) 1. Teachers 2. Parents 3. Government officials 4. Mullahas 	est for childre	n's education?	(Read all choice	ce and circle	
Section 7. CBS Handover A few years ago, CRS, a non-governmental orga your community.	nization estab	olished a comm	nunity-based sc	hool (CBS) in	
 59. Do you know the CBS that I am talking about 1. Yes 2. No [If no, skip to section 8] 3. Don't know/ not sure [If don't know, skip]			
60. What year was the CBS established in yo 1. Year: 2. Don't know / not sure	ur village?				
 61. Does the CBS still exist in the village? 1. Yes [if yes, skip to section 8] 2. No 3. Don't know/ not sure [if not sure 	e, skip to sect	ion 8]			
62. When was the last year the CBS operated	in the village	?			

- 63. Generally speaking, have you ever heard that CBS are sometimes handed over to the MoE?
- 1. Yes
- 2. No [skip to question 67]3. Don't know/not sure [skip to question 67]

- 64. CBS can cease to exist for a variety of reasons. Sometimes it is because the hand over is not attempted. Other times, an attempt is made to hand over the class but it does not work out. Did the class cease to exist because handover was not attempted or because handover did not work out, or was it some other reason?
 - 1. Handover did not work
 - 2. Not attempted
 - 3. Don't know / not sure
- 65. [if not attempted] Can you tell me why the hand over was not attempted? [Read the answer choices

and circle all that apply]

- 1. School was established within 3km of the CBS
- 2. School closed before handover
- 3. Lack of resources within MoE
- 4. Lack of plan for hand over by the MoE
- 5. Lack of plan for handover by shura
- 6. Lack of plan for handover by NGO
- 7. Lack of community support and interest
- 8. MoE did not accept the CBE teacher's qualifications
- 9. Qualified teacher could not be found
- 10. Parents did not like the new teacher
- 11. Village too far from other schools
- 12. Walk to hub school too dangerous for children/teacher
- 13. Other _____
- 14. Don't know/ not sure
- 66. [if did not work out] Did the CBS ever operate under the MoE, even for a short time?
 - 1. Yes
 - 2. No
 - 3. Don't know / not sure
- 67. [if did not work out] Can you tell me why the handover did not work out? [enumerator: read the answer choices and circle all that apply]
 - 1. Problems after handover, unrelated to the handover _____
 - 2. Handover of classes went too quickly
 - 3. Lack of resources within MoE
 - 4. Lack of plan for hand over
 - 5. Lack of community support and interest
 - 6. MoE did not accept the teacher's qualifications
 - 7. Qualified teacher could not be found
 - 8. Parents did not like the new teacher
 - 9. Hub school too far
 - 10. Walk to hub school too dangerous
 - 11. Other _____

We are interested to know how many of the boys and girls continued to attend school after the CBS closed. I am going to ask you about the boys first, then the girls.

68. When the CBS closed, about how many of the boys continued to go to school? All the boys, more than half, about half, less than half, or none of the boys?

1. All the boys
2. More than half of the boys
3. About half of the boys
4. Less than half of the boys
5. None of the boys
6. Other
7. No boys ever attended CBE
8. Don't know/ not sure
69. When the CBS class closed, about how many of the girls continued to go to school? All the girls,
more than half, about half, less than half, or none of the girls?
1. All the girls
2. More than half of the girls
3. About half of the girls
4. Less than half of the girls
· ·
5. None of the girls
6. Other
7. No girls ever attended CBE
8. Don't know/ not sure
Now I am going to ask you whether the shura/village leaders received any request to re-open a CBS in
the village.
70. Since CBS stopped operating in the village, has the shura received request(s) to re-open a school in
the village?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't recall
4. Refuse to answer
71. Since the CBS stopped operating in the village, how many requests has the shura received?
1
2. Don't know / Cannot recall
72. [if more than zero] Who made the most recent request? [Read the answer choices and mark all that
apply]
 Parents of children ages 6 to 10 Parents of children ages 11+
$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}$
3. Village adults without children
4. Teacher(s)
5. Religious leader(s)
6. NGO worker(s)7. Children
8. Don't know /cannot recall
73. Considering the most recent request, what action did the shura take in response to the most recent
request?
1. Discussed it with the DED
2. Discussed it with the PED
3. Discussed it with NSP representative(s)
4. Contacted an NGO. Name:

	74A. DED?	74B. PED?	74C.NSP representative?	74D. NGO
he response of the	1. Not applicable (shura	1. Not applicable (shura	1. Not applicable (shura	1. Not applicable (shura
	did not speak with DED)	did not speak with PED)	did not speak with NSP)	not speak with an NGO
	2. MoE has no resources	2. MoE has no resources	2. NSP has no resources	2. NGO has no resource
	and cannot open a school	and cannot open a	and cannot open a	cannot open a school
	3. MoE plans to open a	school	school	3. NGO plans to open a
	school in the village	3. MoE plans to open a	3. NSP plans to open a	in the village
	4. Don't know/cannot	school in the village	school in the village	4. Don't know/cannot re
	recall	4. Don't know/cannot	4. Don't know/cannot	
		recall	recall	
Section & IF	NO CBS OR PRIMARY	SCHOOL IN VILLAGE.	Villaga's Commitment to	CRS
	CBS require support from			
	ingness and capacity to supp	2	ing to ask you questions	uooni me
	S for children ages 6 to 11 w		would the people of this vil	lage be
	to serve on a <i>school</i> shura to		would the people of this vis	ingo oc
	. Yes	Support III.		
	No			
3	6. Other			
	he people of the village be v		such as a room, for the CB	S?
1	. Yes	-		
2	2. No			
3	6. Other			
	he people of the village be a 1. Yes 2. No 3. Other		re its proper functioning?	
	a village member who is car	bable and willing to be a teac	cher for the class?	
78. Is there		· ·		
1. Yes	_			
1. Yes	_			
 Yes No [s 	skip to 80 below]			
 Yes No [s Other 	skip to 80 below]	10th		
 Yes No [s Othe 	skip to 80 below]	a 12 th grade education?		
 Yes No [s Othe 79. If so, do Yes 	skip to 80 below]	a 12 th grade education?		
 Yes No [s Othe If so, do Yes No 	skip to 80 below]	a 12 th grade education?		

2. Some will not send their girls

4. Separate bathroom for girls

3. Bathroom (one for both boys and girls is okay)

- 5. A new class building6. Teacher is trusted

- Teacher is trusted
 Teacher is from the village
 Teacher must be paid
 Teacher must be provided from outside the village
- 10. Other _____