



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# USAID IMPACT EVALUATION OF THE *MAKHALIDWE ATHU* PROJECT (ZAMBIA)

GC-10F-0033M/AID-OAA-M-13-00010

## ENDLINE REPORT (FINAL)

**February 2018**

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by NORC at the University of Chicago. The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>PROJECT BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>EVALUATION QUESTIONS, DESIGN, METHODS AND LIMITATIONS</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>xii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>xiv</b>
<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>xv</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>xvi</b>
<b>AUTHORS</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>I. EVALUATION PURPOSE</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>II. PROJECT BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>III. EVALUATION METHODS &amp; LIMITATIONS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>III.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>III.2. METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>IV. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>IV.1. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>IV.2. RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX A. ENDLINE INSTRUMENTS</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>A1. SCRIPT FOR PHONE CALL</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>A2. PARENT/CAREGIVER HOUSEHOLD SURVEY INSTRUMENT</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>A3. EGRA/STUDENT SURVEY INSTRUMENT</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>ANNEX B. INTENT TO TREAT VERSUS TREATMENT ON THE TREATED</b> ....	<b>57</b>
<b>ANNEX C. DATA COLLECTION</b> .....	<b>60</b>
<b>C1. SAMPLE DESIGN</b> .....	<b>60</b>
<b>C2. BASELINE DATA COLLECTION</b> .....	<b>61</b>
<b>C3. UPTAKE SURVEY</b> .....	<b>61</b>
<b>C4. ENDLINE DATA COLLECTION</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>ANNEX D. UPTAKE REPORT</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>ANNEX E. FRACTIONS OF STUDENTS REACHING MEANINGFUL THRESHOLDS</b> .....	<b>90</b>
<b>ANNEX F. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS</b> .....	<b>95</b>
<b>ANNEX G. VALUE-ADDED MODELS</b> .....	<b>98</b>
<b>ANNEX H. ATTITUDES TOWARDS READING AND READING HABITS</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>ANNEX I. SCALE-UP COST ESTIMATE</b> .....	<b>113</b>
<b>ANNEX J. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b> .....	<b>118</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Endline data collection results.....	7
Table 2.	Evaluation Design Matrix.....	8
Table 3.	EGRA scores at baseline and endline by experimental group.....	11
Table 4.	Spillover effects: Participation of other children in reading SMS.....	19
Table 5.	Program gains in EGRA scores per USD 10 spent.....	21
Table 6.	Survey results.....	72
Table 7.	How often does the respondent have clear phone reception? .....	73
Table 8.	Number of days a week messages are received from MA.....	74
Table 9.	How often can someone in the household open messages? .....	74
Table 10.	Frequency at which messages are shown to child by whether or not the mother can read. ....	74
Table 11.	Frequency at which messages are shown to child by whether or not the father can read. ....	75
Table 12.	Frequency at which messages are shown to child by whether or not the oldest sibling can read.....	75
Table 13.	How reading happens by whether or not the mother can read. ....	76
Table 14.	How reading happens by whether or not the father can read. ....	76
Table 15.	How reading happens by whether or not the oldest sibling can read. ....	76
Table 16.	Does the child use the provided notebook to record stories (by whether or not the child knows how to read)?.....	77
Table 17.	How do you listen to the recording? .....	77
Table 18.	How do you discuss the stories? (Multiple responses allowed) .....	78
Table 19.	Who participates in these discussions? (Multiple responses allowed).....	78
Table A1.	Respondent's relationship to child.....	82
Table A2.	Who else participates in MA activities with child? (Multiple responses allowed).....	82
Table A3.	Meetings' attendance.....	82
Table A4.	Who attended the first MA meeting, if respondent did not attend? (Multiple responses allowed).....	83
Table A5.	How prepared did you feel after this meeting to open and read SMS stories? .....	83
Table A6.	Average number of additional MA meetings attended by someone in household.....	83
Table A7.	Whether respondent personally attended additional meetings.....	83
Table A8.	Who attended other MA meetings, if respondent did not attend? (Multiple responses allowed).....	84
Table A9.	What was learned at MA meeting? (Multiple responses allowed) .....	84
Table A10.	Usefulness of meetings.....	84
Table A11.	Why did no one in household attend meetings? .....	85
Table A12.	Problems with phone .....	85
Table A13.	Owner of cell phone used to received messages.....	85
Table A14.	Number of days a week messages are received from MA.....	85
Table A15.	Are you able to read and understand the SMS stories on your own? .....	85
Table A16.	Last week, what days of the week did you or someone else help your child read the SMS stories? (Multiple responses allowed) .....	86
Table A17.	In general, how does reading happen? .....	86
Table A18.	Average number of minutes spent reading one SMS story with child, by gender of the child .....	86
Table A19.	What prevented you or someone else from reading with your child last week? (Multiple responses allowed) .....	86
Table A20.	Child uses the provided notebook to record stories, by gender of the child .....	87
Table A21.	Who writes down stories in the notebook by gender of the child.....	87
Table A22.	When does the child write the story in their notebook? .....	87

Table A23. Who reads SMS stories from the notebook? (Multiple responses allowed) .....	87
Table A24. Someone in household listens to voice recording .....	87
Table A25. How do you listen to the recording? .....	88
Table A26. How do you listen to the recording? .....	88
Table A27. How do you discuss the stories? (Multiple responses allowed) .....	88
Table A28. How often do you discuss stories with the child? .....	88
Table A29. How easy are the stories for the child to read, by gender of the child.....	88
Table A30. How easy are the stories for the child to understand, by gender of the child.....	89
Table A31. How enjoyable does the child find the stories, by gender of the child.....	89
Table A32. How helpful would you say this program is in helping your child learn to read?.....	89
Table A33. Story submission and broadcast awareness.....	89

**Table C2: Sections of the parent/caregiver survey**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Introduction and Consent</b>	Consent to participate in the study Consent to administer EGRA to child
<b>B</b>	<b>Home Literacy Environment</b>	Frequency at which parents read with child Time and frequency child reads on his/her own Participation in community reading activities Parent attitudes and confidence for helping child learn to read
<b>C</b>	<b>Participation in MA</b>	Level of involvement with: SMS, audio recordings of stories, meetings, how the materials are used at home and by whom, suggestions for program improvement
<b>D</b>	<b>Program Substitution</b>	Other SMS programs to which the households are subscribed

As many of the survey questions were taken from past rounds of data collection, translation was minimal. INESOR completed translation of new questions and verified the past translations of previous work. To ensure high quality data, NORC deployed tablet data collection. Both English and Chinyanga versions of the parent questionnaire were programmed into the Nfield application by NORC’s programming consultant, Moses Gitau. NORC and INESOR tested the instruments extensively on tablets prior to its deployment in the field. All instruments were reviewed by a local IRB (ERES Converge) as well as by NORC’s IRB.

## **2. Training**

The training was held for a period of eight days in Chipata from January 7th to January 14th, 2017. A total of 45 trainees attended the training out of which 8 supervisors and 32 enumerators were selected. The training was led by Alice Michelazzi, Sr. Evaluation Specialist and Kayla Nachtsheim, Data Capture Specialist of School-to-School International (all EGRA sessions) and Stacy Pancratz, survey specialist of NORC (all questionnaire sections) with support from INESOR. An initial “bootcamp” was conducted for new enumerators (enumerators that had not participated in the baseline data collection) on the first day of the training in order to familiarize them to EGRA rules and procedures as well as to tablet use. Starting from the second day of training, all enumerators worked together on EGRA and questionnaires (student and parent).

For the training of EGRA subtasks, the various subtasks goals and rules were presented in English to the group and then practice was conducted in the local language (Chinyanja). The student and parent questionnaires were first reviewed on paper to familiarize the team with the components and skip patterns of the survey. Afterwards, the full team reviewed the tablet versions of the surveys question by question, establishing a consensus on what data was meant to be captured by each question and the best translation into Chinyanja to do this (as a verification of the translation already completed prior to training).

The same marking conventions established at baseline were adopted at endline in order to ensure comparability of results. In particular:

- In the non-word reading and the oral reading fluency subtasks enumerators were prompted to consider syllabicated words as wrong.

- “L” and “R” letter substitution were marked as correct in non-word reading and oral reading fluency subtasks.
- In the oral-reading comprehension and listening comprehension sub-task, enumerators were prompted to consider as wrong, answers given in a language different than Chinyanja if the pupil did not self-correct after being prompted to answer in Chinyanja

During the review of the student questionnaire, enumerators that had participated in baseline activities shared that the show card with the three smiley faces was unclear to students and explaining the faces and their significance to the children was time consuming. With this feedback, NORC decided to drop the use of the show card and instead administer the response options verbally to the child.

Practice of EGRA and the questionnaires continued throughout the week including demonstrations by pairs with review following each subtask. Three enumerator agreement exercises were conducted during the training to determine the participants’ inter-rater reliability (IRR). A quiz took place on day six of the training. A full agenda for the training is in Table C3.

**Table C3: Endline Data Collection Training Schedule Fieldwork**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Activities Covered</b>
Day 1	<b>Bootcamp for new enumerators</b> Introductions Summary of Makhalidwe Athu Project What is EGRA? Tablet use
Day 2	Overview of the enumerators’ manual, principles of data collection (NORC) Orientation to Print subtask Letter Sound Identification subtask Non-Word Decoding subtask
Day 3	Oral Reading Passage subtask Oral Reading Comprehension subtask Listening Comprehension subtask EGRA Practice Student Questionnaire (NORC) IRR
Day 4	EGRA and Student Questionnaire practice Enumerator Agreement Practice
Day 5	Parent Questionnaire (NORC) Teams and logistics Calling procedures (NORC)
Day 6	School Practice Feedback from school practice QUIZ

Day	Activities Covered
Day 7	Review of Quiz Roles during data collection EGRA practice
Day 8	EGRA on paper (with selected enumerators) How to provide feedback Role of supervisors Preparation of materials

Field work started on the 16th of January, 2017 and ended on the 4th of February, 2017. We had a total of eight teams with each team consisting of a supervisor and four enumerators. There were four teams in Lundazi and another four in Chipata. A total of 80 schools were visited in Chipata and Lundazi districts.

This was the first time that the field teams were prepared to administer the parent survey and the EGRA/student questionnaire during the same field visit (as opposed to two field visits during the baseline). Overall the combined approach proved to be more cost-effective and efficient. Interviewing the parents first and seeking their consent immediately prior to interviewing the child also gave a sense of assurance to the children.

In January and February 2017, enumerators visited schools and households to conduct the EGRA and parent and student surveys. Two days prior to a team's visit to a school and community, enumerators were assigned to call or text parents notifying them of the visit and asking them to be at school on that day with their child. Reaching parents by phone proved to be difficult. Phones could not be reached because they were turned off, the network was bad, or the parent did not answer. Learning this issue early on, the teams adapted, asking any parent they were able to reach by phone to spread the word throughout the community of the team's visit. The MA program households were usually well aware of the other participating households. From previous rounds of data collection as well as social networks of the field team, teams were also able to call and notify head teachers prior to the school visit.

The one-year time lapse between the baseline and endline had a direct impact on the response rate, as demonstrated in Table 1C4, resulting from attrition for various reasons. In total 1,942 caregivers were surveyed at baseline and endline. These 1,942 caregivers correspond to 2,091 children (there are more students than caregivers because 149 siblings were also interviewed). Table 1C4 shows final disposition codes for the caregiver data at the children level. Out of these 2,091 children for which there is caregiver data, 2,054 were interviewed for the EGRA and student survey at endline. Along these lines, the completion rate for the caregivers was 87 percent, and for the students 86 percent.

**Table C4. Endline Caregiver Interview Completion Rates**

	N	Percent
Completed	2,091	87.2
Not locatable	231	9.6
Refused	28	1.2
Child transferred/dropped	4	0.2
Other	43	1.8
Total	2,397	100

Source: Own calculations using MA endline data

The STS and NORC team followed field work at the schools for 5 days; one or two teams were visited each day. During the field visits STS EGRA specialists and NORC survey specialist conducted observations on:

- EGRA administration: each enumerator was observed once and feedback was provided. When an enumerator produced a sub-par performance, STS conducted a second observation and feedback was shared with team supervisors to ensure ongoing monitoring.
- Space setting and organization of activities at the school
- Use of materials by enumerators (EGRA stimuli, tablets, adequate provisions of incentives for children being assessed, supervisor control sheets, enumerator control sheets)
- EGRA home visits

### **3. Data Quality Review**

The STS team worked with field data manager hired by INESOR, Vincent Kapotwe, to monitor data quality. Daily tasks included:

- Cross-checking between downloaded data, supervisor control sheets, and the student sample.
- Monitoring disposition codes were correctly added to all students in the original student sample.
- Recording invalid cases and duplicates to be deleted.

Ms Nachtsheim, the data capture specialist from STS worked with INESOR field data manager to establish a daily data intake process.

- Master tracker: This document was used to record the number of assessments conducted by school. This document was also used to track the number of disposition codes that supervisors added in Tangerine for students who were not assessed due to illness, absence, disability, parent refusal, not locatable at school or home, or for other reasons. Any changes to the codes that supervisors entered (for example if a child marked as not assessed for “other” reasons but was actually ill) were also included in this document.
- Daily issues tracker: This document was used to record duplicate cases due to assessor errors that needed to be deleted, as well as other errors that needed to be addressed during data cleaning.



#### 4. Challenges and Lessons Learned

While overall the fieldwork can be described as a success, there were a number challenges, lessons and opportunities for improvement. During field work, the following observations were made:

Long distances and bad roads: Some schools are located far from Lundazi and Chipata towns and require travel on poorly maintained roads.

Solution: The teams used 4x4 vehicles to navigate the poor conditions of the roads. It is also advisable that in the future, fieldwork should be undertaken during the dry season, which occurs May through October each year.

Farming activities: During the rainy season, most parents are occupied with tending to their field during the morning, requiring their child or an enumerator to find them there for the interview. This cost the child or the enumerator significant amount of time.

Solution: The team should consider undertaking fieldwork during the dry season. During this period farming activities are not so intensive so it is easier for the parent to participate in the survey.

Poor phone network: A number of schools were located in areas with very poor phone reception; therefore communication by phone was difficult. This affected making appointments with parents and even head teachers.

Solution: The solution was two-fold:

1. Where the team was able to reach the head teacher, he or she was asked to contact the parents and notify them of the survey team's visit date;
2. Where even the head teacher was impossible to contact, the teams could physically pass through the school on the way back from another school visit, or the teams used contacts from office of the District Education Board (DEB) to send messages through the school network.

Timing/School Calendar: Field work started on the opening day of school, hence there was poor turnout at the first schools visited. A number of non-interviews were due to the fact that the children were still on holiday.

Solution: Fieldwork involving both learners and teachers should not start until after at least two weeks of the opening of the schools.

Language Barrier: Most of the pupils in Lundazi were at a disadvantage in terms of the Chinyanja language because they speak Tumbuka at home and are also taught in Tumbuka at school.

Solution: The language barrier in most Lundazi schools should be put into consideration of future questionnaire translations. Enumerators with Tumbuka skills should be allocated to visit these schools.

Recommendations of practices to continue in possible future waves of data collection:

- The involvement of school teachers as enumerators should be promoted in order to have enumerators with enough experience working with children and with the Zambian new curriculum for reading (i.e. letter sounds). The teachers were also knowledgeable about the school system and often helped set school appointments by tapping into their social networks.