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# Executive Summary

The evaluation survey was conducted in May 2012 in target provinces of the WE BLOOM project with the objective of assessing the impact of the project on livelihood and participation of the targeted young women and their communities. The specific areas targeted by the project were literacy, life skills, income generation and business skills activities, and participation and empowerment initiatives. The primary tools used were individual interviews with target beneficiaries and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders. Sample size for individual interviews was determined based on statistical requirements, according to which 108 beneficiaries were selected. Some findings from the baseline survey carried out prior to project implementation were also included in the report to provide a benchmark against which to assess the project outcomes.

The results of the survey showed significant changes in livelihood status of beneficiary households, with a remarkable increase in the proportion of households engaged in livestock production activities (increase of 37% for chicken raising and 21% for pig raising), and decreased the amount of time households experience food shortages by one month (2.9 to 1.9 months by the end of project).

Sixty nine percent of all beneficiaries, equivalent to 204 young people (of whom 143 women), who completed the literacy training program demonstrated very good literacy skills, and nearly all young people who had undergone the training (97%) reported applying these skills to daily life and business activities. Most of the respondents (75%) stated that they used their skills to support business activities of the households; 60% reported that they were now able to access information in the community and other places; and over half of the respondents (57%) had improved awareness and adoption of health-related practices. Increased confidence to engage in discussions with others and higher participation in social activities were also mentioned by nearly half of the respondents. In addition to the positive feedback, several issues were raised in both interviews and FGDs. These problems included difficulties faced by teachers in providing training to students at different ability levels in the same class, the challenge with keeping up with lessons for some students, constraints of weather and geography, considering the students’ engagement with livelihood and other activities. Consequently, irregular attendance and dropping out by some students were encountered for all the class, although at low rates.

Results from life skills training evaluation showed that over 80% of respondents, equivalent to 243 young people (of whom 170 women),demonstrated good life skills knowledge while around 10% had moderate knowledge for these topics. Most of the respondents saw themselves as having had a remarkable increase in knowledge after attending the training. Regarding application of life skills, all young people surveyed reported applying these skills in daily life and business activities. Most of the respondents reported that after receiving life skills training, they have better relationships and feel confident to hold discussions on various topics and discuss problems with family members, as well as with middlemen in their business activities; they were highly aware of safe migration practices and were able to advisee others on the topic. An increase in the ability to deal with problems was reported by nearly 40% of the respondents. Moreover, participants in all FGD groups were highly impressed with CARE strategies used to promote life skills, in terms of being highly responsive to issues in the community and the high quality of training methods used.

Related to technical and business skills provided in the training sessions, 80% of respondents who received technical skill training were confident in being able to apply at least three newly acquired livestock raising techniques. For business skills, the corresponding figure was 46%. Regarding adoption of technical skill in livestock-raising, 49% of the trained beneficiaries adopted at least three techniques. Around half of the beneficiaries used their skills to start their own livestock raising (in addition to parents’ livestock), while 54% worked with existing livestock. Interestingly, 9% had carried out animal vaccination as a service for others, and 18% reported purchasing more animals to which to apply their skills. Limited adoptions of business management skills were observed, with 23% of the trained beneficiaries adopted at least three types of business skills. As the result of adopting at least 3 recommended techniques, 45% of trained beneficiaries saw significant improvement in their livestock raising activities. In addition to positive responses, some beneficiaries were concerned about limited capacity, particularly in animal health care and budget planning, lack of capital to scale up businesses, and limited availability of vaccines.

Regarding youth empowerment, 75% of all respondents acknowledged that youth groups were important for them and their communities, and around 56% reported that youth committees were active and functioning. These groups were seen as providing support to other young people in the community, sharing information with community members, and playing a significant role in raising issues facing villagers with local authorities and other key persons in the villages. In addition, there was a doubling of the number of young people participating in meetings with local authorities by the end of project, from 20% at baseline to 40% during the evaluation survey. Around 46% of all respondents reported to be highly confident in expressing their interests or issues to local stakeholders, and 38% mentioned raising issues or problems with their local authorities or other key persons. Related to supportive attitude with their local authority, 57% of respondents reported that local authorities officially recognized youth groups. Providing more opportunities for young people to participate in meetings and other development activities, and valuing youth group activities were reported as benefits of youth groups by 39% and 36% of respondents respectively. Moreover, 53% of the respondents reported that issues related to youth were included in the community development plan, and 68% mentioned that local stakeholders helped to support and disseminate information about youth group activities. However, current youth capacity and activities were not widely valued nor discussed by local authorities, teachers, and household members; and there remains a need for continuing capacity strengthening of youth groups and on-going support in future project activities.

# Introduction

Rural areas in Cambodia are still experiencing high levels of poverty, with economic improvement expected to take several years[[1]](#footnote-1). The major causes of poverty in rural areas include low agricultural productivity and correspondingly limited economies of scale, lack of access to financial services, limited skills to diversify agricultural and off-farm income generation, and lack of long-term business planning at household level. Young people represent a large and increasing proportion of the population in Cambodia[[2]](#footnote-2). This ‘youth bulge’ presents a considerable challenge to the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) and other service providers in meeting the health, education and other social development needs of young people. Gender inequality exacerbate the poverty and deprivation experienced by young women and girls, limiting their access to basic services, their influence over decisions affecting their lives at family, community and governance levels, and the legal protection of their rights. Therefore, young women and girls, especially in rural areas are at far greater risk of exposure to poverty, hazardous work, sexual exploitation and abuse.

In contributing to address above issues, the WE BLOOM project has implemented its activities in 4 communes of Koh Kong province since January 2011. The goal of the project is to improve the livelihood security of marginalised and vulnerable populations. Within this goal, the main purpose is to increase livelihood and participation outcomes for targeted young people. Four main strategies including improved literacy, improved life skills, promoted own-business activities, and youth empowerment, have been undergone by the project.

As part of project completion activities, the evaluation survey was conducted in the target areas in order to assess the outcome and impact of the project interventions on target community over one and a half year. This survey aims to evaluate and assess the change and impact on livelihood and participation outcomes on the targeted young women and their communities at the end of the project, with respect to literacy, life skills, income generation and business skills and activities, and participation and empowerment initiatives.

# Survey Methodology

The survey was divided into three phases: pre-survey, survey and post-survey. The pre-survey phase consisted of sample selection, survey tool design, and logistical arrangements. The survey phase comprised training workshops conducted for data collectors on survey ethics and tools, pre-testing of the questionnaire in the field and the actual field survey. The post-survey phase included data quality checking, data entry and clean up, and data analysis.

# Pre-Survey Phase

The WE BLOOM project targeted two districts with existing CARE programs. The total number of direct beneficiaries of the project is 296 (aged from 15 to 25 years who graduated from the project literacy class, of whom 70% were female). Target household members, teachers and others were indirect beneficiaries of the project. The description of the targeted area is listed in the table below:

Table 1: Description of project areas and beneficiaries

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District | Commune | Village | # of literacy graduate | | # of family | # of livestock graduate |
| Total | Female |
| Botumsakor | Andong Toek | Andong Toek\_Khmer | 26 | 18 | 20 | 10 |
| Andong Toek\_Cham | 14 | 7 | 10 | 5 |
| Chitres | 32 | 22 | 28 | 3 |
| Bray | 23 | 13 | 14 | 5 |
| Bror Teal | 16 | 11 | 16 | 2 |
| Ta Meak | 34 | 22 | 29 | 18 |
| Kondol | Kondol | 18 | 16 | 16 | 8 |
| Sre Ambel | Chi KhorKroam | PrekChik | 16 | 16 | 14 | 4 |
| NeaPisey | 29 | 18 | 21 | 0 |
| Ta Bean | 20 | 14 | 17 | 0 |
| Dong Peng | Ta Thung | 8 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| Ban Theat | 27 | 16 | 24 | 10 |
| Prang | 21 | 18 | 19 | 7 |
| Dong Peng | 12 | 11 | 11 | 6 |
| Total | | **13** | ***296*** | ***208 F*** | ***246*** | **84 F** |

## Sampling Technique

The evaluation survey used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods to capture the information. The primary tools were individual interviews with target beneficiaries and focus group discussion with relevant stakeholders including local authorities and key community member, service providers, and beneficiary groups.

***A- Individual Interview (II)***

A survey of selected beneficiaries was undertaken through face-to-face interviews. A structured questionnaire (tool) was designed for household surveys.

**Sample beneficiary selection:** CARE opted to select a representative sample out of the total targeted area on the basis of which conclusions can be drawn and recommendations can be made about the whole targeted population within a 95 percent confidence limit. Based on optimal statistical requirement with 5% of marginal error and 85% of distribution rate, a total of **108** households of target beneficiaries were randomly selected for individual interviews. The criteria for selecting beneficiaries with this method were that: 1) the beneficiaries received technical and business skills in surveyed village; 2) in cases where there were more than one beneficiary per household, only one beneficiary was selected from the households; and 3) gender representation of the beneficiaries was considered (most were women).

Table 2: Desired sample size with the acceptable margin of error

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project*** | ***Figure*** |
| No. of beneficiaries | 296 |
| Margin of error | 5 % |
| Distribution rate | 85 % |
| **Desired sample size** | **108** |

**Sample location selection:** To arrive at 108 respondents, 10 villages in 3 communes were randomly selected, and around 10 to 12beneficiary households were randomly selected from each of surveyed villages based on the above selection criteria. The number of surveyed villages selected from each commune was proportional to the total number of target villages of the project. Villages with high numbers of beneficiaries in each of all target communes were selected for this evaluation survey.

Table 3: Location selection for evaluation survey

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District | Commune | Village | Selected village | # of selected HH | # of selected HH who received technical training |
| Botumsakor | Andong Toek | Andong Toek\_Khmer | Yes | 12 | 10 |
| Andong Toek\_Cham | Yes | 10 | 5 |
| Chitres | Yes | 10 | 3 |
| Bray | Yes | 10 | 5 |
| Bror Teal |  |  |  |
| Ta Meak | Yes | 12 | 12 |
| Kondol | Kondol |  |  |  |
| SreAmpel | Chi KhorKroam | PrekChik | Yes | 12 | 4 |
| NeaPisey | Yes | 12 | 0 |
| Ta Bean |  |  |  |
| Dong Peng | Ta Thung |  |  |  |
| Ban Theat | Yes | 10 | 10 |
| Prang | Yes | 10 | 7 |
| Dong Peng | Yes | 10 | 6 |
| Total | | **13** | 10 | 108 | 62 |

**B- Focus Group Discussion (FGD)**

FGD methods were applied to capture qualitative information related to the strategies employed in project intervention: changes in livelihood, income generation, business activities, literacy and life skills, youth participation and empowerment initiatives. Feedback on project strategies was also collected.

**T**hree different types of FGD (local authority and key household head group, beneficiary group, and service provider group) were conducted in the two target districts. In total, six FGDs were of all three types were conducted in each district. Each FGD had between six and eight participants. The same guideline for discussion was used for all groups.

Participants for each are described below:

* + **Local authority and households:** Two commune council (CC) members, three village authorities, and three beneficiary household heads were invited from two communes in each target districts for each FGD. Gender representation was considered.
  + **Beneficiaries:** Eight young beneficiaries (including four from youth committees) were invited from two communes of each district for each FGD. Girls were encouraged to participate in this FGD.
  + **Service provider:** Eight service providers including literacy teachers and livestock raising adviser from two surveyed communes were invited for each FGD. Gender representation was considered.

## Tool Design

Tools for qualitative and quantitative survey were revised and developed by the consultant in collaboration with CARE staff. Baseline tools were adopted by making some revisions to make them more appropriate for the WE-BLOOM project. To support development of tools and methodology, proposal documents, project log-frame, and relevant reports, were shared by the project manager with the consultant. Moreover, several discussions between CARE staff and the consultant were held at the CARE head office and field offices to review and finalize the tools and methodology.

**A: Individual Interviews**

Information captured included general household information, literacy and life skills, income generation activities, and participation and support from local authority. This evaluation survey adopted the tools used during the baseline for the Young Women in Business (YWIB) project and WE BLOOM. However, the outcome and impact indicators from the project log-frame were used instead as the key information to be gauged, with some questions revised to be more relevant to WE-BLOOM project.

**B: Focus Group Discussions**

In response to project objectives and outcomes, the structure of each FGD was divided into 3 sections: 1) project strategy, 2) change and improvement, and 3) issues, suggestion or recommendation. Each section covered the information based on project activities or components such as income generation, literacy and life skills, and participation and empowerment initiatives.

## Resources, Planning and Logistic

To carry out the survey, the team was structuredin3 levels: 1) team leader; 2) field supervisor, and 3) data collectors and data entry operators. CARE project manager and PQL staff were co-team leaders and coordinated the survey process, while WE BLOOM staff acted as the field supervisors, facilitating field interviews and directly supervising data collectors. The consultant worked closely with the survey team leader and field supervisors to provide technical support during the survey process and to facilitate FGD.

Two survey teams were organized, with each comprising one field supervisor and three data collector. These groups were managed and supported by the survey team leader. In total, the survey team consisted of six data collectors, two field supervisors, one team leaders, one technical support person from CARE and one consultant.

Figure 1: Structure of survey teams
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A detailed plan was developed by the survey team leader (project manager) with the help of the consultant. The plan also listed down the possible difficulties which could be encountered during the survey. Interviews and FGD for each village were scheduled with their relative geographical locations in mind, so that resources and time could be used effectively.

Prior to data collection training, logistical arrangement including recruitment of data collectors, listing of survey locations, selection of beneficiaries for household survey, informing authorities of field surveys, and survey material preparation, were undertaken by CARE project and PQL staff.Data collectors were recruited by CARE from a pool of candidates with previous experience with conducting surveys for CARE, and data entry persons were managed by the consultant.

# Survey Phase

The survey phase began with training of data collectors on survey ethics and the survey questionnaires, followed by pre-testing of the questionnaire in the field. A strategy was developed to conduct the survey process by using resources effectively, with the geographical locations and local conditions of the targeted area in mind.

## Data Collection Training

A two-day training for data collectors was conducted before and after field pre-testing. CARE staff and the consultant were key facilitators during training. Training was conducted to build the capacity of data collection team on the concepts of the WE BLOOM project, survey ethics, data collection techniques, survey tools, qualitative guideline, and field survey management. Lecture instruction, group discussion, and role play were used during training.

During training, the data collectors were taught the concept and importance of obtaining informed consent from respondents in any survey. They were also made aware of the importance of maintaining anonymity of respondents and confidentiality of the information collected. The session also focused on the methods of data collection, including how to approach a respondent, how to pose a question to a respondent and how to deal with refusals. Data collectors were trained on the various questions in the questionnaire. In this training session, the meaning of each question and the concepts listed in the questionnaire were explained to each data collector. There were also advised on how to ask every question listed in the questionnaire, how to probe further on certain questions and when to stop.

## Field-Pre Testing

On the day following the training, field pre-testing was conducted at a nearby target location to check the quality of the questionnaires and to provide data collectors with an opportunity for field practices. In addition to survey respondents, ten individuals were selected for field pre-testing. Field supervisors and team leaders monitored the process and the quality of the field survey.

The pre-test was classified into two sessions. In first session, pairs of data collector interviewed households. Afterwards, all survey team members provided feedback on their interviews. The team leader and consultant were responsible for facilitating the feedback discussion. During the second session, each data collector was asked to interview a household. The following day, final feedback was given, in the same way as previously, along with a one-day refreshing training. Comments and feedback were used to improve the final version of the questionnaire.

During pre-testing, data collectors were instructed to focus on key points including the best way of introducing themselves to respondents and explaining the objectives of the survey, how to ask questions, how to keep questions simple for the respondents, and on ensuring consistency of the questions.

## Field Survey

After finalizing the tools, the survey team started interviewing the households and conducting FGD according to the prepared plans. On average, five households were interviewed by each data collector per day, and one FGD of around 2 hours was conducted by each pair of facilitators. Over the survey period, six FGDs and 108individual interviews were conducted.

Field supervisors were in charge of communicating with local authorities and monitoring the process of the interviews in the fields to ensure that all activities went as planned. In addition, field supervisors checked the quality of collected data and discussed with data collectors any issues encountered each day as well as activity plans for the following days.

# Post-Survey Phase

The post-survey phase comprised consistency checking of the collected data from the field, followed by data entry and data analysis for report writing.

## Data Cleaning and Entry

Data was “cleaned” for any inconsistencies to increase accuracy and to ensure a complete dataset for analysis. Data was first cleaned in the field after collection by field supervisors. To check the quality of the collected data, a few questions to check the consistency of the data were added to the questionnaire.

MS Access Software was used to build a data entry template. The collected data was entered after completing field survey. The data was thoroughly checked by the survey consultant. The entered data was further exported into SPSS software for final data cleaning and analysis.

## Data Analysis and Reporting

Statistical procedures including frequency, cross-tabulation, multiple responses, numeric descriptive statistics, and independent-sample T-Test were applied as party of quantitative data analysis. For qualitative data, FGD transcripts were coded and synthesized to identify patterns in the information and to explore the similarities and differences between groups.

In addition, findings obtained during the baseline survey were used to examine the progress and outcome of the project intervention. The outputs of quantitative data analysis were in the form of tables or graphics for presentation, whereas findings of qualitative data were written as narrations and linked to those from quantitative data. A template for reports was developed based on the areas of information to be captured and the objectives of the project.

# Survey Findings

The findings of the evaluation survey are organized into four sections based on the types of the information and project outcomes. These sections comprise a household’s demographic, literacy and life skills, technical skills and business activities, and youth participation.

# Household Demographics

The household demographic information describes the living standard of the population within the project targeted area. It also helps conveys the level and intensity of vulnerability of the population targeted by the project. The profile of the targeted population is presented as general household information, educational level of household members, and occupations of the household income earners.

## Household Information

There were no significant differences on the household family size, number of households engaged in income generation and migration status of the households between end of project evaluation survey and baseline survey results. The average family size of target households is 6 members, of whom56% are female. The figure of family size is higher than the average for all of Cambodia (4.7 members per family)[[3]](#footnote-3). Around 19% of all respondents had at least one family member had migrated away; and 7% were direct beneficiaries of the project. Based on district data book 2009, poor households in target communes were 30.3% compared to 27.4% in whole Cambodia.

Table 4: The household information in the targeted areas

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Household member information | Figure |
| Average household size | 6.3 |
| Average of female family members | 3.5 |
| Percentage of female-headed family | 31.5 |
| Percentage of families with members who had migrated away | 19.4 |
| Percentage of beneficiaries who had migrated away | 7.4 |
| Percentage of poor household in target areas | 30.3[[4]](#footnote-4) |

## Educational attainment of households

The educational standard of the population is an indicator its potential to progress up the economic ladder. The section describes the level of education obtained by household members in target areas.

High rates of illiteracy predominated in the target areas, particularly among women.Around42% of the population in target areas had never attended school, and this figure was 45% for females. The level of illiteracy in target areas of the project was remarkably higher than the national average for rural areas of Cambodia (24% for female and 12% for male)[[5]](#footnote-5). The results were consistent with those reported in FGD with target stakeholders, who were concerned about the high rate of illiteracy in their areas. Stakeholders were very responsive to the goals of the project related to promotion of literacy skill especially among youth.

Figure 2: Level of standard education of household members (%)

## Occupation of the Households

Questions related to sources of incomes were asked during interviews. This information provides an indirect measurement of the economic standard and the income earning opportunities available in the target regions. From the project implementation point of view the information on occupational status assisted in determining the extent of community participation in project activities.

Varieties of income sources including farming activities, fishing, provision of manual labor, own business activities, and other temporary jobs were queried during the survey. There were significant increases in the proportion of households engaged in income generation activities in some areas, especially own business activities. On average, 3.0sources of income were reported by each household at the end of project compared to 2.7 sources at the beginning of the project. Rice farming, livestock raising, fishing, and provision of manual labor were the predominant jobs in target areas in nearly half of all surveyed households.

Interestingly, the proportion of household engaged in chicken and pig raising increased significantly from 18% and 31% to 52%, respectively, by the end of project relative to baseline survey. A similar trend was also observed for those who engaged in small-scale trading activities. In contrast, a decline was observed for laborers. These findings demonstrate a positive outcome of the project in engaging household members, especially young women, in own business activities.

Figure 3: Occupations of the households in target areas (%)

## Food Situation of the Household

A question on the duration of food shortages during the reference period of 12 months prior to the survey was added to the survey questionnaire. The question was framed to attain an understanding of food security in the region and assist in assessing the outcome of project intervention in contributing to food availability in the households. It was found that households in targeted villages regarded themselves as food-secure if they had not encountered a lack of daily food consumption, particularly rice, within the year.

The average duration of food shortages of beneficiary households has significantly declined by the end of project, by one month (from 2.9 months to 1.9 months) over the course of the year. Meanwhile, the proportion of households who encountered no food shortages had increased from 30% to 43%. Moreover, the proportion of the beneficiary households who faced between 4 and 6 months of food shortages within the year had declined remarkably. It appears that these households had reduced their number of food-insecure months, which explains the increase in the number of households in the 1-3 months of annual food shortages.

Figure 4 : Duration of food shortage in target households

Natural calamities like heavy rain, low production in both fishing and rice crops, large family size, small agricultural land for crop production, sickness of family members, and no alternative income sources were among the reasons considered to be behind food shortages. To deal with this problem, the majority of households often borrowed money from micro-finance institutions and neighbour. Selling labour and borrowing food or rice from their neighbour or relatives were also reported as a way of coping with food shortages.

# 

# Literacy and Life skills

Improving literacy skills and other life skills of young people are the main strategies of the project. The findings on the extent to which these skills are improved and adopted for daily activities and business activities, the constraints or problems encountered in receiving these skills, and the suggestion from target stakeholder to improve or enhance future similar project intervention, are described in the following sections. To capture this information, direct beneficiaries were targeted by the survey.

Key indicators under these sections are that:

* 250 young people (gender) (70%) demonstrating functional literacy
* 280 young people(gender) (80%) reporting improved life skills

## Literacy skill

To improve the literacy of young people who dropped out or had never attended school, the project provided short-term and intensive literacy training (4 months) on reading, writing, and numeracy based on curricula produced by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport in Cambodia. To assess the outcome of these activities, questions regarding knowledge of reading, writing, and numeric calculations as well as application of gained knowledge and related issues were posed to beneficiaries during evaluation survey interviews.

**Outcome of literacy training:**

****In assessing level of literacy skills, the respondents were asked to demonstrate their knowledge by attempting three different exercises of increasing levels of difficulty for each topic (reading, writing, and mathematics). The results are categorized into four literacy level: 1) “Unable to read or calculate” is defined as those who could not do any portion of the exercises; 2) “Little reading or calculating” is defined as those who could do only one of the three exercises; 3) “Good reading or calculating” is defined as those who performed only 2 out of the 3 exercises; and 4) “Very good or outstanding level of reading or calculating” is defined as those who could perform all exercises.

Over 70% of the beneficiaries demonstrated high reading or mathematical abilities (level 4) by the end of project compared to 0 % at baseline, while around 10% demonstrated poor knowledge (level1) in these fields. On the other hand, there was a strong correlation between the level of mathematical and reading abilities. In addition, one third of all beneficiaries perceived themselves as having highly improved literacy and numeracy skills, compared to before the training, and nearly half (46%) stated that they saw some improvement. Around 15% were unsatisfied with limited or minor improvement after the training.

Overall, 69 % of all beneficiaries, equivalent to 204 young people[[6]](#footnote-6) (of whom 143 women) who completed the literacy-training program demonstrated sufficient literacy skills (both reading and mathematics). This result shows the positive outcome of the project as defined by the project indicator.

Figure 5 : Demonstrated literacy level of the beneficiaries (%)

**Literacy: Mathematic**

**Literacy: Reading**

Regarding adoption of literacy skills, nearly all of the young people who had undergone the training (97%) reported applying these skills to daily life and business activities. A variety of activities were mentioned during both the interviews and FGD.

Most of the respondents (75%) stated that they used their skills to conduct business activities of the households. For example, in cases where products were sold, the newly acquired skills were used to calculate the amount of income gained from products, while previously middle-men usually made the calculations. Now, they were confident enough to negotiate the price of products with the buyers. In addition, 60% reported that they were now able to access information in the community and other places. For example, they could read the information disseminated by local authorities and others on information boards, and they were able to complete forms required of their households by local authorities. In addition, over half of the respondents (57%) reported that due to improved literacy, their awareness and adoption of health-related practices had improved. For instance, they reported having better personal hygiene practices, including proper hand washing, and drinking only safe water. Increased confidence to engage in discussions with others and higher participation in social activities were also mentioned as the result of improved literacy skills by some respondents. This finding stems from the fact that the literacy training included general knowledge on hygiene, sanitation, healthcare, communication, and other areas in addition to actual reading and writing skills.

Figure 6: Activities or events where literacy skills of beneficiaries were used (N=105)

**Positively perceived strategies in literacy training:**

CARE strategies for literacy training were highly acknowledged by the stakeholders in being **highly responsive** to issues in the community, **appropriate process for beneficiary selection**, and **high quality of training techniques used**.

Participants in all FGD mentioned that improving literacy skills of young people was highly responsive and fit well with some of the challenges facing in their community. They agreed that poor literacy levels were critical issues in their community as the majority of their community members were poorly educated or never attended schools, and these were the main reasons leading to poor quality of life.

Regarding beneficiary selection, most participants in FGD appreciated that there were relevant mechanisms in selecting beneficiaries, specifically young people, for the project. They were aware that at the start of project activities, there was a dissemination meeting with all relevant stakeholders including project staff, local authorities, community members, and literacy teachers to share information about project activities with the community. In addition, they understood that several agreed-upon criteria were established by the stakeholders to select young people to participate in the literacy program.

In term of training methods, the FGD groups, especially youth groups, reported that the teachers were qualified to teach in these areas; the training methods were mixed of practical (role plays) and theoretical exercises during the class; the topics covered were not only literacy skills, but also general knowledge (including health care, communication, domestic violence, and others), and training materials provided were sufficient for both students and teachers. In addition, participants of all FGD were satisfied with the strategies of dealing with issues or problems in the class. For instance, established youth committee groups performed an important supporting function by providing extra training to young people who had difficulties keeping up with the lessons. Moreover, the student’s family head was contacted in case of irregular attendance.

The teacher discussion groups readily recognized the quality of the literacy class as most of the students from received significant literacy skill over a short period of training and it is normally expected that a longer period of time is required to achieve similar results at a public school. Additionally, the teacher’s group in Sre Ambel district reported that after completing the literacy class, some students (3 or 4 individuals) chose to further continue their education at an official school in Grade 4 or 5 (late primary school) with official admission and recognition by the school principal. Another teacher mentioned that he replicated the training methods from the literacy classes particularly those on practical teaching methods and role-plays, in their official schools. Monitoring support carried out by project staff and the technical persons from provincial office of education in Koh Kong during the training were highly acknowledged by the teachers as these activities encouraged and motivated them to commit to the program and to ensure a high quality of training.

**Challenges and suggestions for literacy training**

In addition to the positive feedback described above, several issues were raised in both interview and FGDs. These problems included difficulty in providing the training by teachers for students at different levels in the same class, the challenge with keeping up with lessons for some students, constraints of weather and geographu, considering the students’ engagement with livelihood and other activities. Consequently, irregular attendance and dropping out by some students were encountered for all the class, although at low rates.

According to individual interviews, around 80% encountered at least one problem during the class. Nearly one third of all the respondents reported not being able to keep up with the lesson during class, and a similar number were concerned about the high level of difficulty of the lesson. Constraints due to weather, classes being held at night, and needing to travel long distances to attend classes were raised by around 30%. Other problems, including the short duration of the training and being too occupied with livelihood activities, were raised by a minority of the respondents.

Figure 7: Problems raised by respondents in literacy class (N=108)

According to FGD findings, all FGD reported that some of the young people in community who were fit with the criteria to participate in the training did not participate because of their engagement in livelihood activities. Dropout and irregular attendance during the class were also encountered in all target areas, with 27% of all registered participants for the literacy class were dropping out over the course of the class[[7]](#footnote-7). These issues were not significantly associated with the initial level of literacy.

In addition, the teachers and beneficiaries noted that the length of the literacy training was not sufficient for some students, particularly those who had never attended school before. A commonly faced difficulty in teaching was the different levels of literacy among students, particularly for those who were attending irregularly. To deal with problems, the teachers provided extra training and asked for support from other young people who had the required skills. Other students had expected to receive vocational skills from the project and therefore did not pay attention to the class or dropped out. Additionally, teachers in all target areas felt that incentives offered to them were low.

One beneficiary group in Sre Ambel district was disappointed that certain topics had been removed from the curriculum. For example, the topic called “The palm tree and its importance” had been cancelled. The respondents felt that young people should be aware of the tree and its many uses in daily life, for instance in house and boat construction. The tree is also a symbol of the Cambodian nation. However, it was also recognized that cancelled topics were briefly touched upon by the instructors.

In response to the problems described above, teachers suggested that the training could be extended to 6 months. Beneficiaries suggested that the training should being at the lowest level and the students should be split according to their initial level of literacy. Some beneficiaries suggested the training be conducted during the dry season rather than the rainy season.

## Life skills

****To improve life skills in the community, particularly among young people, the project provided practical training sessions on three different life skill topics including *building self-confidence and good communication*, *solving conflicts and problems*, and *“understanding safe migration”*. All literacy students as well as other community members participated in these activities with direct facilitation by the project staff. The findings on the effectiveness of life skill improvements and their application, perceived quality of the training, and suggestions for future similar project intervention are described below.

**Outcomes from life skill training**

To assess the improvement in knowledge and capacity of life skills, several capacity assessment questions from pre-post test adopted during life skill training programs were put into the questionnaire, covering the three main areas of life skills promoted by the project. Due to a complete change in the questions, the information from baseline cannot be used for comparison. Instead, direct questions on change or improvement were captured in this evaluation survey. The number of correct answers were added up and classified into three level: 1) “Good life skills” was defined as those who answered correctly at least 4 out of 5 questions; 2) “Moderate life skills” is defined as those who answered correctly 3 out of 5 questions; and 3) “Limited/poor life skills” is defined as those who answered 2 or less out of 5 questions correctly.

According to the results of the capacity assessment through individual interviews during the evaluation survey, over 80% of all respondents demonstrated good life skills knowledge while around 10% had moderate knowledge for these fields. Strong correlations between different types of life skills were observed, indicating that the target respondents were well aware of all promoted life skills. In addition, the perception of level of improvement or change was also captured, showing that most of the respondents saw themselves as having remarkable increase in knowledge after attending the training. Nearly half of all respondents perceived as having achieved a moderate level of improvement whereas another 39% described a high level of change in their life skills.

Figure 8: Perceived improvement of life skills (N=108)

Figure 9: Proportion of the respondents by different level of life skills (N=108)

Overall, 82% of all beneficiaries, i.e. 243 young people[[8]](#footnote-8) of whom 170 were young women, who completed the life skills training demonstrated good or outstanding knowledge of the life skill topics covered. This result shows the positive outcome of the project as described by the project indicator.

Regarding the application of life skills, all young people surveyed reported applying these skills in daily life and business activities. A variety of activities and events were mentioned during individual interviews and FGD. According to individual interviews, most of the respondents reported that after receiving life skills training, they have better relationships and feel confident to have discussions on various topics with family, as well as with middlemen for their business activities. They were highly aware of safe migration practices and able to advisee other people. They were had courage to discuss problems with their parents and others. Ability to deal with problems was found to be reported by nearly 40% of the respondents as well.

According to the FGDs, some participants reported that there were remarkable changes in behaviours of the community members. Some households were observed to have better hygiene and health-related practice (e.g. hand washing and drinking safe water); young people were more involved in social and development activities; domestic violence was reduced; and community members became aware of safe migration practices. A young woman from FGD in Sre Ambel districts related that after the life skills training her friend became confident enough to discuss issues and give advice to her parents when they argued.

Figure 10: Activities or occasions where life skills learned by beneficiaries are applied (N=108)

**Positively perceived strategies obtained in life skills training**

Participants in all FGD groups were highly impressed with CARE strategies to promote life skills for community members, particularly young people, in terms of being **highly responsive** to issues in the community and the **high quality of training methods** used. They stated that improving life skills of young people fits well with issues encountered by their communities, as life skill knowledge and empowerment in social participation were very limited in target areas. They added that the topics introduced during life skills training were reflective of real issues in the community, including domestic violence and migration.

Participants in all FGDs shared similar opinions on training methods for life skills, including that the topics covered during training were very interesting, and techniques were easily transferrable and practical rather than theoretical. They added that the topics were taught in the form of stories and role-plays, and that these methods were very attractive to all students. They mentioned that due to good facilitation and transferring techniques, most of participants had the chance to express their opinions or issues during the training events, to participate in role-plays, and to easily gain knowledge from the training. Based on observations during FGDs as well as individual interviews, the activities related to life skills were frequently brought up by participants across the different stakeholder areas, and these topics were commonly mixed with such topics as literacy and business activities.

**Reported challenges and feedback on life skills training**

During individual interviews, a third of the respondents raised problems which came up during life skills training. Constraints related to the distant location of the training facilities and inclement weather were mentioned by the highest proportion of the respondents (16%), whereas difficulties in catching up with the lessons and participating in role-play were brought up by less than 10%.

Figure 11: Problems raised by respondents on life skills training (N=108)

Considering the significant outcome of this activity, the youth groups suggested having more life skills training on additional topics. It was suggested that enough training materials particularly those used for role-plays be made available, to help make the activities more attractive and more practical.

# Income Generation Activities

Improving and increasing job opportunities for young women by engaging them in own-business activities was the main strategy of the project. To implement these activities, the project had provided training to selected young women in the areas of technical skills related to raising livestock, business skills including business concepts and management, and on-going technical support. To evaluate the outcomes of these activities, questions related to the status of business activities and application of the skills learned were asked in this study. The data illustrates the extent to which benchmark indicator figures were achieved. These benchmarks are outlined below:

* 60 young women (80%) practicing their technical skills, 3, 6 and 12 months after training
* 45 young women (60%) practicing their business skills, 3, 6 and 12 months after training
* 24 young women (80%) maintaining small business operations 6 months after starting operations
* 24 young women (80%) reporting improved incomes and confidence after 3, 6 and 12 months of business

## Technical skill

The project reports shows that 84 young women, equivalent to 28.4% of all project beneficiaries, received technical skills training on livestock raising from the project. However, the remaining young women who did not receive this training did receive vocational skill training from another CARE project, the YWIB project. Based on the baseline survey, none of the beneficiaries received any vocational training before the project. Based on the results from market assessment, the project promoted own-business activities through chicken and pig raising for target young women

**Outcome of technical livestock training**

Of the beneficiaries receiving technical training, around 56% received pig raising training while the remainder attended chicken raising training. Topics covered in the training included fencing techniques, feed preparation, breeding selection, vaccination techniques, and livestock care. Respondents were quizzed on applicable techniques during this study to test their confidence with the techniques in running their own-business activities.

Figure 12: Number of applicable livestock techniques (N=76)

Around 80% of trained beneficiaries, equivalent to 67 young women, were confident in being able to apply at least 3 livestock raising techniques. On average 4 out of 6 different techniques were applicable by the beneficiaries. These results were very consistent with those for pre-post test in the training, showing that the knowledge on technical skills had significantly increased from 39% to 84%.

Regarding the types of techniques, fencing and feed making techniques would be confidently to applied by most (over 70%) of the respondents who received the training while vaccination technique and animal treatment were mentioned by fewer respondents (57% and 33% respectively). Technical knowledge received and the perceived levels of knowledge improvement were also measured, with one third of the respondents expressing a high level of improvement after the training, while around 60% reported a moderate improvement. The findings indicate the significant improvement on technical skills received from the project.

Figure 13: Applicable livestock techniques reported by the beneficiaries (N=76)

**Challenges and suggestion for technical training**

In addition to positive feedback on appropriateness of methods used, several issues were raised by nearly 60% of the beneficiaries who attended the training. Around one fourth of the trained beneficiaries were concerned about the difficult vaccination technique, and 13% mentioned about the difficulty level of the lessons. Another challenge raised both in FGDs and individual interview was the lack of capital to carry out business activities. Additionally, the participants, especially young women, stated that their technical skills were insufficiently developed because of the limited duration.

Figure 14: Problems raised by the beneficiaries on technical training (N=76)

## Business skill

****Apart from technical skill training, the project also provided beneficiaries with business training that focussed on making a good small business planning by reflecting on existing and current rural livestock activities or looking for other possible livelihood alternatives. The main topics of this training included business ideas selection, budget planning, tips for business success, bookkeeping, marketing, costing and pricing and daily expenses and saving. Based on the project report, 77 young women from technical training also received business skill training. Questions on the level of interest and applicability of technical and business skills were asked during this study to gauge the confidence and willingness to apply acquired skills to run own-business activities.

**Outcomes from business skill training**

Forty six percent of the respondents were confident and able to apply at least three types of business skills to their business or other activities. Number of applicable skills was on average 2 to 3 types among the 6 introduced business skills.

Figure 15: Number of applicable business skill (N=56)

Most of the respondents (75%) who received business training reported that they were able to use the skill on “daily expenses and saving”, followed by the skills on “Bookkeeping”. Other business management skills including “marketing”, “budget planning”, and “tips for business success” were reported as interesting and applicable by fewer beneficiaries (less than 35% each). These findings indicate the limitation in business activities, of most beneficiaries in target areas due to the fact that: 1)-habit of never applying/recording the bookkeeping, 2)-appropriate time/duration to use these skills (i.e. base on previous LEAD monitoring, we found that young people could use/apply learnt business skills when they have started their livestock/business activity at least after 2 or 3 months), and 3)-This type of business topics training were first to hear for young learners and invisible where this is absolute different from the livestock training topics.

Regarding adoption of business skills, most beneficiaries who received business skills training (86%) reported adopting at least one type of skill to their daily life or business activities, while 56% practiced more than one type and **only 22% adopted at least 3 types**. The skills on “daily expense and saving” and “ Bookkeeping” was adopted by a higher proportion while other levels of business management including “marketing”, “business success”, “business idea selection”, and “budget planning” were mentioned by small proportion of the beneficiaries (less than 25%). The findings indicate limited adoption of the skills or knowledge of business management by most beneficiaries.

Figure 16: Number of adopted business skills (N=56)

Figure 17: Types of business skills were applicable and adopted by the beneficiaries (N=56)

**Challenges and suggestions on business skill training**

Regarding feedback on business skill training, over 80% the respondents who participated mentioned at least one criticism, with one third reporting that the curriculum was difficult to understand. A lack of capital that would be needed to apply the acquired business skills was a concern for the largest proportion (39%). Other problems, including use of difficult technical terms, short duration of training, a lack of specific skills or confidence, were brought up by less than 20% of respondents.

Figure 18: Problems raised by the beneficiaries on business skills training (N=51)

These findings indicate the limitations of business skills acquired during training. Business management skills including financial management, the tips for business success, and marketing, were not well received by the participants. However, business skills related to “income-expense preparation” were appreciate by the beneficiaries.

## Adoption of technical skills for income generation

The skills on livestock raising techniques were further expected to be adopted for own-business activities. Levels of adoption varied among the different types of techniques. On average 2 to 3 introduced techniques were adopted, and nearly 90% of trained beneficiaries adopted at least one technique, while 70% applied more than one technique, **and nearly half (49%) adopted at least 3 techniques**. Fencing techniques and breeding selection were the common techniques adopted by a high proportion (over half) of beneficiaries, followed by vaccination techniques and feed making.

Figure : Number of adopted techniques (N=76)

Figure 20: Types of livestock techniques adopted by beneficiaries (N=76)

In terms of activities for adopting these skills, around half of the beneficiaries who received technical training used their skills to start their own livestock raising (in addition to parents’ livestock), while 54% worked with existing livestock. Interestingly, 9% experienced providing the service of animal vaccination for others, and 18% reported purchasing more animals to which to apply their adopted skills. The results indicate the positive outcome of the trainings provided by the project.

Figure 21: Type of activities for technical skill adoptions (N=76)

It was not possible to evaluate the direct effect on income from these activities because the training on livestock raising had just finished 3 to 4 month prior to the evaluation survey. Therefore most of the beneficiaries were still in the first round of livestock raising activities after the training. To assess any increases in income due to adoption of learned techniques, the criteria for beneficiaries considered having an improved business activities were: 1) having a higher number of animals after the training; 2) starting own livestock raising; 3) purchasing more animals; or 4) providing services related to livestock raising for other households. **With at least three adopted techniques, 45% of the trained beneficiaries met at least one improvement criterion for their business activities**. This initial finding indicates that there was a significant effect of the project on improving business activities during the project period. However, this study could not draw a firm conclusion on increase in income, as an additional assessment of practical issues or problem encountered after implementing the activities is required, as well as the needs for improvement to continue their adoption or to scale up the activities.

Besides livestock raising activities, 67% of all the respondents reported applying the knowledge and skills learned from the project to other jobs and income generation activities. Knowledge on “numeric calculations” and “communication with other people” were adopted by around 60% and 48%, respectively. Preparing documents in business was also adopted by some respondents.

Figure 22: Knowledge and skills of literacy and life skills applied to income generation (N=108)

Apart from skill adoptions and their positive outcomes, problems encountered in running own-business activities were also brought up during the survey. 60% mentioned at least one problem. Lack of capital to scale up businesses and limited availability of vaccines were highly regarded by the highest proportion of the beneficiaries (around 30% each) while a lack of materials for making animal feed, and a lack of skills were highlighted by some beneficiaries. Around 10%, particularly those engaged in pig raising, mentioned a low market demand for their products. The results show limited access to finances for raising capital as well as limited available livestock related products, such as vaccines, in target areas.

Figure 23: Problems encountered in livestock raising activities (N=71)

Most beneficiaries applied skills learned from the project to their livestock raising activities to some extent. A significant improvement in livestock raising activities by 63% of the beneficiaries who adopted more than one recommended technique was observed, which included an increase in the number of animals raised, starting new activities, and providing services related to animal health to others. However, not many of the introduced techniques were adopted, which was mainly attributed to limited access to animal raising facilities, lack of capital and limited skills in general.

# Youth Empowerment and Participation

Youth empowerment was the cross-cutting strategy used in the project and has been promoted through youth committee establishment, capacity building, and facilitation support to encourage young people become engaged in social and development activities in target areas. This section presents the results of youth activities and their function, as well as support provided by local actors. Attitudes and behaviours of local stakeholders as well as their supports toward young people are captured. Key indicators in this section are stated below:

* 10 youth-identified initiatives implemented by local actors (e.g. CC)
* 50 young people (70%) (gender) reporting improved confidence in representing their interests to local stakeholders
* 70% of CC members in targeted communes report a positive attitude change towards the interests of young people
* 50% of young people (gender) and adults reporting tangible benefits from empowerment initiatives

## Youth committee functioning

During the project period, youth committee groups of total 52 members (40 were female) were established with support from the project in terms of capacity building and on-going technical support for their involvement in development activities. The members of these committees were elected by young peoples as well as community members in target areas.

****According to individual interviews with target beneficiaries, most of the respondents (86%) were aware of the youth committee in their areas; around 30% of the respondents reported being members of such committee. By the end of project, 63% of respondents were able to list at least one activity implemented by this group since establishment, compared to almost nil (2%) at baseline survey. Participating in meetings with local authorities, conducting promotion meeting in the village such as health care promotion and domestic violence, and preparing meeting of various groups, were reported by around one third of the respondents as being among the activities carried out by the youth committee.

Figure 24: Activities of the youth committees in the community (N=103)

Over half of all respondents reported that youth groups had raised at least one issue during village meeting or meeting with authorities, with the number of issues raised by youth groups ranging from 1 to 5 issues (2 issues on average). Over 10% of respondents reported 6 issues and these issues were taken into consideration and supported by local authorities and other key persons. Issues included health-related issues, environmental issues, literacy training, gender equality, domestic violence, and safe drinking water.

Figure 25: Perceived issues raised by youth groups and authority support (N=108)

Regarding the perceived quality of youth committee activities, 75% of all respondents acknowledged that youth groups were important for them and their communities, and they are directly benefitted by these groups. Moreover, around 56% reported that these committees were active and functioning. They had the view that these groups often supported other young people in the community, sharing information with other community members, and playing a significant role in raising issues facing villagers with local authorities and other key persons in the villages.

Besides good functioning, some of the issues faced by youth groups were limited capacity and lack of confidence. FGD participants mentioned that youth groups were not yet strong enough to fully discuss their issues during meetings with local authorities and other stakeholders. They added that these groups may stop functioning after the end of the project if no other support becomes available. In response to these issues, additional capacity building, on-going support, regular coordination meetings, and connections to other development agencies as well as local authorities, were suggested as solutions.

The findings indicate that youth groups were functioning well in the community, and they were highly valued and recognized by other young people for their provided support and their involvement in community development activities. However, the capacity of youth groups was still limited and would require further strengthening and support.

## Youth participation

Another key project activity was to promote the participation of young people during community development activities. The goal of this activity is to provide an enabling environment or space for young people to raise their issues with local authorities and other key persons, and to engage them in development activities.

Figure 26: Level of confidence in expressing own interests to local stakeholder (N=100)

There was a doubling of the number of young people participating meetings with local authorities by the end of project, from 20% at baseline to 40% during the evaluation survey. Around 66% reported to have participated in youth group meetings.

Moreover, around 46% of all respondents reported to be highly confident in expressing their interests or issues to local stakeholders, and 38% mentioned raising issues with their local authorities or others.

Figure 27: Participation of young people in meetings with local authorities

Overall, the results illustrate the significant improvement of the level of participation of young people in community development activities in both quantity and quality. Young people became more confident in expressing their opinions and concerns to local stakeholders. However, the proportion of young people in the community who participated in development activities was still limited (less than 50%).

## Supportive attitude and action of local stakeholders

Local authorities were expected to contribute to capacity building of young people by providing facilitation and a supportive atmosphere for activities for young people in the target regions. In this survey, respondents were asked about behaviours and attitudes of authorities towards issues raised, adding items to the development plan, and their support for youth activities.

According to individual interviews, over 75% had experienced at least one instance of a supportive attitude with their local authority towards young people in their community. The majority of respondents (57%) reported that the local authority showed recognition of the youth group. Providing more opportunities for young people to participate in meetings and other development activities, and valuing youth group activities was reported by 39% and 36% of respondents respectively. Moreover, over half (53%) of the respondents reported that youth related issues were included in the community development plan whereas 68% mentioned that local stakeholders helped to support and disseminate information about youth groups activities.

Figure 28: Supportive attitude of local authorities towards young people (N=108)

These finding were very consistent with those from FGD. For instance, the local authorities in Botumsakor district claimed that the presence of youth groups were important for the community as youth groups played their significant activities to support authorities to disseminate the information to the community, to promote awareness raising, and to support to other youth. One girl from FGD with youth groups in Sre Ambel observed that some of their local authorities seemed to consider some of the issues raised by youth groups, but there was no obvious action in response due to budget constraints.

However, current youth capacity and activities were not widely valued or brought up by local stakeholders. For example, youth parents from FGD in Botumskor reported that they did not know what the youth group did, besides their activities to support other youth. Participants from youth groups also mentioned that there was limited participation among community members during meetings or awareness raising events facilitated by youth groups. Some felt that certain community members treated them as having little knowledge and capacity, and only barely literate. In addition, some young people participating in the FGD were concerned that when youth representatives stated their opinions or raised issues during meetings, local authorities were disinterested in what was being said. In the FGD with teacher groups, teachers did not mention youth group activities, and did not show interest in or awareness of youth activities in their community.

Overall, the results indicate that the youth groups were recognized by most as important resources for community development activities. However, it is the facts that duration of the project intervention on youth empowerment were not sufficient, information on youth activities was not widely disseminated in the community, and their capacities and activities were not widely known and acknowledged by local stakeholders including household members, teachers, and local authorities. There was limited support from parents and local authorities in terms of encouragement and other supportive actions. Therefore, there remains a need for continuing the capacity strengthening of youth groups and on-going support in future project activities.

# Conclusion and Recommendation

# Overall conclusion

There was a significant association between increased knowledge gained from the project and positive changes in the socio-economic status of beneficiary households in target areas. Due to project intervention, beneficiaries were found to adopt knowledge and skills in their daily lives, including in income generating activities. These outcomes contributed remarkably to improved work quality and increased job opportunities for young people in target areas, and eventually contributed to reducing the duration of food shortages of households in target areas.

Through literacy training, most of the young people targeted achieved improved literacy, and this skill was applied to daily activities including income generation. Moreover, the model of training in term of training methods, mechanisms for dealing with problems during the class, and monitoring support from the project were highly appreciated by the teachers and young people in the community. However, mixing students with different starting levels of literacy, dropping out and irregular attendance of students are some of the main issues to consider in future project interventions.

Regarding life skills training, most of the targeted young people as well as other community members demonstrated strong improvement in communicating with others, exhibiting confidence in bringing up and dealing with problems, being aware of safe migration practices, and other areas. Due to this intervention, obvious changes in the lives of target community members, particularly young people, occurred in the form of improved interactive communication between young people and others, more participation by young people in social and development activities, reduced domestic violence, more supportive activities among youth groups, and a good understanding and improved practices in safe migration by community members. In addition, there was a high level of satisfaction among beneficiaries and other stakeholders on the methods used in life skills training.

There were significant improvements in technical skills of beneficiaries while less success was observed for business management skills. Technical skills were adopted by most of trained young women in own-business activities and service provision, but the adoption rates had consistently declined with higher numbers of the techniques adopted. As a result, significant impacts were seen by some of the beneficiaries in terms of an increase in numbers of animals raised, starting new activities, and providing services related to animal health to others. Outcomes of the activities regarding effect on direct income cannot be captured as the evaluation was conducted shortly after the completion of training, while livestock raising activities were still in relatively early stages. The findings also highlighted that there was a limited level of adoption of recommended techniques, which may be associated with the high level of difficulty of some technical topics, short duration of the training provided, hurdles in raising capital, limited access to facilities, and minimal on-going technical supports.

From within a short period from establishment, youth groups were functioning well over the course the project period in terms of providing support to other youths, actively and effectively participating in awareness raising in target communities and participating in development activities. However, the capacity of these groups regarding their facilitation skills and confidence to discuss or debate with senior members of the community or authority figures was an area requiring further efforts. In addition, there was limited support from local actors including local authorities and other community members in promoting and encouraging the activities of youth groups in target communities.

# Recommendations

As a result of an in-depth analysis of the objectives, the study has formulated the following recommendations.

* Based on the issues encountered during literacy training, it is suggested participation of individuals from vulnerable groups who were unable to participate or were underrepresented in this activity be promoted. To deal with this issue, in addition to existing strategies adopted by the project, the starting literacy level of participants should be assessed and extra attention be provided to those at the lowest level before combining all students into a single class
* As target stakeholders were highly impressed by the life skills training, particularly by methods used and the significant outcomes, good practices and the model of life skills training should be documented in the form of a training manual and shared with other NGOs or related service providers..
* In addition to existing strategies done by the project on technical monitoring support for own-business activities, there should be feedback sessions to share the lessons learned on challenges and best practices among the beneficiaries and other community members. Moreover, based on concerns raised, there should be mechanisms to facilitate raising of capital and improving access to facilities and services such as vaccines, technical advisor, and animal varieties, to carry out and scale-up business activities.
* Regarding youth empowerment activities, the sustainability of such activities beyond the duration of the project must be considered. This could be achieved by engaging and promoting youth group activities among other NGOs and local actors, and demonstrating their both their achievements and the areas to address to improve capacity, as part of the exit strategy of the project.

# Limitations of the Study

* The survey was conducted just three months after the project activities had ended, which was a constraint in assessing the longer-term outcomes and impacts of the project. For example, the improvement in direct income could not be estimated as the activities were still being carried out by beneficiaries. The level of sustainability of adoption of skills learned, particularly technical and business skills, and of the newly formed youth groups cannot be gauged.
* There was limited participation by local authorities, especially commune council members, in the survey process because the survey was conducted during the commune election campaign. This constraint could limit the information gathered on local actor perception and actions in promoting youth empowerment and participation in social and development activities in target community.
* Frequent and heavy rain was also a constraint during the implementation of the survey. However, the mechanisms to deal with this problem including flexible plan for interview, transport facility preparation (car), support from the staff for interview, and others were well thought out in advance by project staff, so these issues did not affect the overall survey process significantly.
* Some of the selected respondents could not be approached due to their participation in the livelihood activities during the survey. In this case, reserved samples of the nearby sample in the same location were identified in advance.
* Activities of young people participation or engagement in raising awareness in the communities is ongoing especially after the period of evaluation survey. So limited information was collected in this regards.

# Annexes

# Indicative based finding

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sections | Key findings |
| Overall Change | * Remarkable increase in the proportion of households engaged in chicken raising by 37% and by 21% for pig raising by the end of project. * The average duration of food shortages of beneficiary households has significantly declined from 2.9 months to 1.9 months * 45% of trained beneficiaries, 31 young women, saw significant improvement in livestock raising activities as a result of adopting at least three techniques. * At least 6 issues were raised by youth groups. These issues included health-related issues, environmental issues, literacy training, gender equality, domestic violence, and safe drinking water. |
| Literacy | * 69% of all beneficiaries, 204 young people (of whom 143 women), demonstrated outstanding literacy skills (both reading and mathematic) * 97% of young people who had undergone the training reported applying these skills to daily life and business activities. |
| Lifeskills | * 87% of all beneficiaries, 258 young people (of whom 180 young women), saw themselves as having had a remarkable increase in life skills knowledge. * 82% of all beneficiaries, 243 young people (of whom 170 women), demonstrated good life skills. * All young people surveyed practiced these skills in daily life and business activities. |
| Technical skills | * 80% of trained beneficiaries, 67 young women, were confident in being able to apply at least three newly acquired livestock raising techniques. * 49% of the trained beneficiaries, 41 young women, practiced at least three newly acquired livestock raising techniques. |
| Business skills | * 46% of trained beneficiaries, 35 young women, were confident in being able to apply at least three newly acquired business skills. * 23% of the trained beneficiaries, 18 young women, practices at least three type of business skill |
| Youth empowerment | * 75% of all respondents acknowledged that youth groups were important for them and their communities. * 56% of all respondents reported that youth committees were active and functioning. * Double increases from 20% to 40% were observed for young people participating meetings with local authorities by the end of project. |
| Supportive attitude from local authorities | * 57% reported that the local authority showed recognition of the youth group. * 39% reported that the local authority provided more opportunities for young people to participate in meetings and other development. * 36% reported that the local authority valued youth group activities for their involvement in community development. * 53% reported that youth related issues were included in the community development plan. * 68% mentioned that local stakeholders helped to support and disseminate information about youth group activities. |

# Summary of respondent perceptions of strategies

A: Literacy skill

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positively perceived strategies | |
| * All relevant stakeholders were aware of project strategies and activities, and the information about the project was widely disseminated within the community. * Different stakeholders of the project were highly aware of criteria for beneficiary selection and participated in the process of selecting beneficiaries. * Mechanisms to deal with challenges such as support from youth group, extra training, and communicating with families of beneficiaries, were appreciated by local stakeholders, particularly young people. * Monitoring visits and supports from the project staff and relevant technical persons from PoE during literacy training were highly acknowledged by the teachers. * Quality and outcome of the training were valued and recognized by the teachers and school principal. The training model was replicated in regular schools. | |
| Problems/Challenge | Suggestion/Recommendation |
| * Teacher group complained about difficulty in providing training to students of different literacy levels * Youth group mentioned about constraints due to weather (rain), long distance to training location and timing * Some participant in FGD reported about limited encouragement from some parents to attain literacy, particularly for women * The participant from all FGD raised that some students participated in livelihood activities during training, so it causes irregular attendance * Both teacher and young people group raised that some students (less than 30%) irregularly attended or dropped out the class during literacy training. | * Participants from young people and teacher group suggested that the literacy training should be spilt the class into two sections to accommodate students with different abilities, or literacy curriculum should include a very primary letter/symbol spelling program for never enrolled school for around 2 to 4 weeks before integrating them in to one class with others. * The teacher groups suggested having greater incentives (e.g. higher payment rate) for teachers for example, to around 60% of the salary rate in public schools. * Young people group suggested that all lessons of literacy skills should be kept for future class, rather than dropping some parts. * Teacher groups suggested that duration of training should be increased to around 6 months or longer. * Household members suggested that the upper age limit for attending the training should be raised, so older people could participate in this training. |

B: Life skills

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Perceived good strategies | |
| * All relevant stakeholders were very satisfied with life skills training provided in terms of the relevance of topics and methods used for training. | |
| Problems/Challenge | Suggestion/Recommendation |
| * No | * Young people suggested to have additional topics for life skills training events * Young people suggested that training materials, especially those for role-plays, should be sufficient to make activities more appealing |

C: Technical skills

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positively perceived strategies | |
| * The technical training methods were appropriate for participants as they combined with theory with field practices. | |
| Problems/Challenge | Suggestion/Recommendation |
| * Some of young people raised that the topics on treatment and vaccination techniques was a bit difficult for participants to grasp because of newly topic and technical terms. * FGDs and interview concerned that lack of capital was the constraint in starting or scaling up business activities | * Young people suggested to support in term of capital for livestock raising * More technical training is suggested by some young people to fill out the gaps of their capacity * There was a request from young people group in Sre Ambel district on including male participants in livestock and business training. |

# Activities of field survey

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Activities** | **Location** | **Responsible** | **Date** |
|  | **Pre-Field Survey** |  |  |  |
| 1 | Discussion and agreement | PP | Project | 29 May 12 |
| 2 | Prepare survey protocol and tools | PP | Consultant | 8-11 May 12 |
|  | **Field Survey** |  |  |  |
| 3 | Training for data collection | KK | Consultant & Project | 15 May 12 |
| 4 | Field pre-testing and revision | KK | Consultant | 16 May 12 |
| 5 | Training for data collection | KK | Consultant & Project | 17 May 12 |
| 6 | Actual individual interview | KK | Project | 18-21 May 12 |
| 7 | 3 FGD in Sre Ampel district | KK | Project & Consultant | 18 May 12 |
| 8 | 3 FGD in Botumsakor district | KK | Project & Consultant | 19 May 12 |
|  | **Post-Field Survey** |  |  |  |
| 9 | Data entry for individual interview and FGD | PP | Consultant | 22-24 May 12 |
| 10 | Data analysis | PP | Consultant | 25-26 May 12 |
| 11 | Draft Report writing | PP | Consultant | 27-30 May 12 |
| 12 | Feedback on draft report | PP | Project | 01-05 June 12 |
| 13 | Finalize the report | PP | Consultant | 12 June 12 |

# Quantitative Tool

**WEBLOOM**

**Questionnaire for Individual Interview**

We are researchers from …………………………………., carrying out a study on the socio-economic and income generation activities of young people in Koh Kong province. The information you give us will help to assess the outcome and impact of the project on target beneficiaries (young people) in this area. Also, the results from this survey will be used to improve and enhance future project intervention. **All the information you will give will be kept strictly confidential and used for research purpose only.**

**IDENTIFICATION**

QID No.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Name of Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of interview: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_\_\_

District: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Commune: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Village: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**1. HOUSEHOLD DEMOGRAPHIC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 | Name of the beneficiary…………………………… Sex: Male—1, Female—2 Age:……yrs Code: .............. | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Name of household head: ……………………………Sex: Male—1, Female—2 Age: ……yrs | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Total member in the household: Total………..prs, Female: ………prs, Disable……..prs | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | What business(s)/income generation activities do the household own? | | | | | |  |
| Rice growing--1□ | Cash crop growing--2 □ | | Chicken raising--3□ | | |  |
| Pig raising--4□ | Cattle raising--5 □ | | Mushroom growing--6 □ | | |  |
| Vegetable growing--7 □ | Fishing--8 □ | | Food processing--9 □ | | |  |
| Handmade craft--10 □ | Sewing--11 □ | | Souvenir making--12 □ | | |  |
| Beauty and saloon--13 □ | Tourist guide--14 □ | | Beer promoter--15 □ | | |  |
| Garment worker--16□ | Casino worker--17□ | | Government official—18 □ | | |  |
| Sell labou--19 □ | Tourist guide--20 □ | | Fishery worker--21 □ | | |  |
| NGO worker—22 □ | Farm worker—23 □ | | Domestic worker—24 □ | | |  |
| Sweat shop-25 □ | Construction worker--26 □ | | Other—99□……….. | | |  |
| 1.5 | What is the main job providing main source of income to the household: | | | | | ………….… |  |
| 1.6 | How many members in your family migrated: | | | | | | |
| Total:………….…prs | | Female:………..…prs | | Disable:…………prs | | |

**2. FOOD SITUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | How many months was your household experience food shortage for supporting the food requirements of the household members? | | | | | ………………….months |  |
|  | What was the reason behind the food shortage in the household? (Multiple choice) | | | | | |  |
| Large family size --1□ | Drought/flood—2 □ | | | Pest damage—3 □ | |  |
| Small land for production—4 □ | Low yield—5 □ | | | Lack of inputs—6 □ | |  |
| Lack of village credit—7 □ | Others—99 □…………..… | | |  | |  |
|  | What is the main reason behind food shortage? (put above code) ................................... | | | | | |  |
|  | How did you deal with the problems of food shortage? (multiple choice) | | | | | |  |
| Borrow money—1 □ | | Labour sold—2 □ | Migration—3 □ | | |  |
| Borrow /loan rice from neighbour—4 □ | | Borrow or loan rice from rice bank—5 □ | | | |  |
| Go to forest to seek for food—6 □ | | Pray—7 □ | Others—99 □…………..… | | |  |
|  | What is the main coping mechanism to deal with this problem? (put above code) ................................... | | | | | |  |

**Literacy and lifeskill (please ask only from young people)**

1.2 280 young people (gender) (80%) reporting improved lifeskills 3, 6 and 12 months after training

1.2.4. 250 young people (gender)(70%) demonstrating functional literacy at the end of the course

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Are you able to read?  (Please asked the respondent to read 3 sentence separately) | | | | No—1 | | Little—2 | | Some—3 | Yes—3 |  |
|  | Are you able to write?  (Please asked the respondent to write 3 sentence separately) | | | | No—1 | | Little—2 | | Some—3 | Yes—3 |  |
|  | Are your literacy skills improve currently compared to that before project?  No improve—1, Little improve—2, Some improve—3, High improve—4  If yes, in why ways? ………………………………………………………………………………………….. | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | How did you apply this knowledge for your daily life? | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Support in business 🞎 | | More participate in social activities 🞎 | | | Access to information 🞎 | | | | |  |
| Help to learn new skill 🞎 | | Build confidence 🞎 | | | Others 🞎…………… | | | | |  |
| Please give some example:.................................................................................................................................  ……………………………………………………………………………………………. | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What are your challenges or problem in attending literacy training and applying it? | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Lessons is difficult to understand □ | High technique manual □ | | Short-term training □ | | | | Lack of practice □ | | |  |
| Cannot keep on lesson□ | Lack of materials□ | | Not encourage from parent □ | | | | Others□......................... | | |  |
| Please give example: ……………………………………………………………………………………………  ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….. | | | | | | | | | |  |

4. Life skills

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | To build self-confident before doing something:  A: “Encourage ourselves” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  B: “Dare to speak or communicate with other” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  C: “Dare to speak or communicate with other” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  D: “Value ourselves and other” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  Please give overall rate: Poor—1, Moderate—2, High—3 | |  |
|  | To build go behaviour/attitude in living with others  A: “Good behaviour” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  B: “Listen to parent and elder” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  C: “Help other people” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  D: “Good relationship with other” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  E: “Solidarity” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  Please give overall rate: Poor—1, Moderate—2, High—3 | |  |
|  | To build good relationship with others  A: “Careful listen to other” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  B: “Not criticise other ideas” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  C: “Use good body language” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3  Please give overall rate: Poor—1, Moderate—2, High—3 | |  |
|  | Please read the sentence and answer the question on “Problem solving” as below: | |  |
|  | “I believe that women cannot solve the problem as men” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “I don’t want to discuss or solve when I have problems” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “I need to find out the problem more deeper and find out more information before deciding to deal with the problem” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “I list down activities for problem solving” Agree—1, Disagree—2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “Once I have problem I ask for help from my friend” Agree—1, Disagree—2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | Please read the sentence and answer the question on “Safe migration” as below: | |  |
|  | “I believe that living home to work in other place is safe” Agree—1, Disagree —2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “Only men who need to work other place or other country” Agree—1, Disagree—2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “Working in other place or other country can cause problem like cheating, jail, drug abuse” Agree—1, Disagree—2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “When someone ask me to work outside, I will go if I get high wage” Agree—1, Disagree—2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | “I need to discuss with parent or authority before deciding to work outside” Agree—1, Disagree—2, Don’t know—3 | |  |
|  | How did you use lifeskills for your daily life? | |  |
| Encourage ourselves and build confidence🞎 | More confident in showing interest or issues 🞎 |  |
| Better in communication with other🞎 | Better in dealing with conflict🞎 |  |
| More understanding on safe migration 🞎 | Others 🞎 …………………………………… |  |
|  | Are your life skills improve currently compared to that before project?  No improve—1, Little improve—2, Some improve—3, High improve—4 | |  |
|  | In what way? | |  |
| Better behaviour in living with family 🞎 | More understanding on safe migration 🞎 |  |
| Better behaviour in living with others 🞎 | More confident in showing interest or issues 🞎 |  |
| Better in communication with other🞎 | Better in dealing with conflict🞎 |  |
| Better health care🞎 | Others 🞎 …………………………………… |  |
|  | How did you use lifeskills for your own business? (please ask one by one answer) | |  |
| Encourage ourselves and build confidence 🞎 | Better in communication with other🞎 |  |
| Better in dealing with conflict🞎 | Others 🞎 …………………………………… |  |
|  | How did you use lifeskills for your participation in social activities or development? | |  |
| Being able to discuss with parent 🞎 | Being able to educate others about migration 🞎 |  |
| More confident in expressing the ideas 🞎 | Better communication with others 🞎 |  |
| Others 🞎 …………………………………… | |  |
|  | Did you have the problem in learning lifeskill trainings? Yes—1, No—2 | |  |
|  | If yes, please give example? ……………………………………………………………………………………….. | |  |

**5. Business Activities (Technical and Business)**

- P1. 40 young women (80%) reporting improved incomes and confidence after 3, 6 and 12 months of business

1.3 60 young women (80%) practicing their technical skills, 3, 6 and 12 months after training

1.4 45 young women (60%) practicing their business skills, 3, 6 and 12 months after training

2.1 24 young women (80%) maintaining small business operations 6 months after starting operations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Did you (young people) receive livestock training from which project? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **If no > 5.19** |
| WE BLOOM—1 | | | | YWiB—2 | | | | | | | Never—3 | | | | | | |
|  | If yes, what skill do you have? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Chicken raising□ | | | | Pig raising□ | | | | | Others□ | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | If yes, what trained techniques did you interested? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Fencing □ | | Feeding □ | | | | | Maintenance □ | | | | | | Seed selection □ | | | | |  |
| Vaccination □ | | | | Treatment □ | | | | | | | Others □................................................ | | | | | | |  |
|  | Which skill do you think you are confident and able to apply for your own business? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Fencing □ | | Feeding □ | | | | | Maintenance □ | | | | | | Seed selection □ | | | | |  |
| Vaccination □ | | | | Treatment □ | | | | | | | Others □................................................ | | | | | | |  |
|  | How do you feel about the skill improvement after the training?  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………  ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| No improve—1 | | | Little improve—2 | | | | | Some improved—3 | | | | | | high improved—4 | | | |  |
|  | What problems did you faced in participating training? Yes—1, No—2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Lessons is difficult to understand□ | | | High technique manual□ | | | | | Short-term training□ | | | | | | Lack of practice□ | | | |  |
| Limited skill□ | Not confident□ | | | | | Lack of capital □ | | | | Limited support□ | | | | | | Lack of credit□ | |  |
| Pest attack □ | Natural disaster □ | | | | | Other□ ………………………………………………. | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What skill did you apply for your own business activities? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Fencing □ | | Feeding □ | | | | | Maintenance □ | | | | | | Seed selection □ | | | | |  |
| Vaccination □ | | Treatment □ | | | | | No practice □ | | | | | | Others □................................... | | | | |  |
|  | If not practice, why? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Lack of capital□ | | | Not enough skill □ | | | | | Not allow from parent□ | | | | | | Lack of confidence□ | | | |  |
| Lack of labor□ | | Don’t know □ | | | | | Poor market □ | | | | | | Other □ | | | | |  |
|  | If practice, in what ways? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Start own raising□ | | | | Work on existing □ | | | | | | | Buy more animal□ | | | | | | |  |
| Raise animal for other □ | | | | Vaccination service □ | | | | | | | Other □ ………………………………….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | What are the plan for your business activities? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Borrow money for raising□ | | | | Learn more technique□ | | | | | | | Buy more animal□ | | | | | | |  |
| No plan □ | | | | Other □ ………………………………….. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Number of chicken raised: Before project: …………………………. After project: …………………………… | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Number of pig raised: Before project: …………………………. After project: …………………………… | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What problems did you face in running the business? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| No enough skill—□ | | | | | Lack of capital in expand—□ | | | | | | | Difficult to find animal—□ | | | | | |  |
| Low market demand—□ | | | | | Difficult to get input □ | | | | | | | No problem □ | | | | | |  |
| Others—□ ……..… | | | | |  | | | | | | |  | | | | | |  |
|  | **Do you (young people in the household) receive any business skill?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes--1** | | **No—2** | **If 2 > 5.19** |
|  | If yes, what skills did you have? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Business idea selection □ | | | | Budget management□ | | | | | Tips for business success □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Bookkeeping □ | | | | Marketing □ | | | | | Daily expense and savings □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Other□…………………………………………………………..…. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What skills do you think you are confident and able to apply? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Business idea selection □ | | | | Budget management□ | | | | | Tips for business success □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Bookkeeping □ | | | | Marketing □ | | | | | Daily expense and savings □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Other□…………………………………………………………..…. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What skills did you apply for your business or daily activities? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Business idea selection □ | | | | Budget management□ | | | | | Tips for business success □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Bookkeeping □ | | | | Marketing □ | | | | | Daily expense and savings □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Other□…………………………………………………………..…. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What problems did you faced in participating training? No—1, Yes—2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Lessons is difficult to understand□ | | | High technique manual□ | | | | | Short-term training□ | | | | | | Lack of practice□ | | | |  |
| Limited skill□ | Not confident□ | | | | | Lack of capital □ | | | | Limited support□ | | | | | | Lack of credit□ | |  |
| Other□ ………………………………………………. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | **Do you have any other job besides livestock raising?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes--1** | | **No—2** | **If 2 > 6.1** |
|  | If yes, what job? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Sewing □ | | | | Casino worker□ | | | | | Beer promoter□ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Tourist guide□ | | | | Govt staff □ | | | | | NGO staff □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Farm worker□ | | | | Fishing worker □ | | | | | Domestic worker □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Shop worker□ | | | | Sugarcane farm worker □ | | | | | Others □ ………… | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | **Did you apply the skill learned from CARE for these works?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes--1** | | **No—2** | **If 2 >6.1** |
| If yes, in what way? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Calculation □ | | | | Literacy □ | | | | | Communication □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Confident to speak □ | | | | Bookkeeping □ | | | | | Problem solving □ | | | | | | | | |  |
| Other□…………………………………………………………..…. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |

**6. Young people participation and supportive action by local behaviour**

P2. 10 youth-identified initiatives actioned by local actors (CCs, etc)

3.2 50 young people (70%) (gender) reporting improved confidence to represent their interests to local stakeholders

3.3 70% of CC members in targeted communes report a positive attitude change towards the interests of young people

3.4 50% of young people (gender) and adults reporting tangible benefits from empowerment initiatives

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Do you know there’s any youth committee group in your community? | | | | | | | Yes—1 | | No--2 | | | | Don’t know--99 | |  |
|  | Are you the member of this group? | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes—1 | | No—2 |  |
|  | What did the group members do during last 3 months? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Support on literacy to other youth—1 🞎 | | | Organize the group meeting—2 🞎 | | | | | Joint the meeting with local authorities--3 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Facilitate to raise the issues—4 🞎 | | | Village promotion—5 🞎 | | | | | Networking with CC/other—6 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Don’t know—97 🞎 | | | Nothing—98 🞎 | | | | | Others-99 🞎……….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | What types of issues raised among youth groups? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Hygiene and sanitation—1 🞎 | | | Poor literacy—2 🞎 | | | | | Lack of technical--3 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Business activities—4 🞎 | | | Gender—5 🞎 | | | | | Business skill—6 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Environment—7 🞎 | | | Job opportunity—8 🞎 | | | | | Information raising—9 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Don’t know—97 🞎 | | | Nothing—98 🞎 | | | | | Others-99 🞎……….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | What types of issues were acknowledged and supported by CC and others? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Hygiene and sanitation—1 🞎 | | | Poor literacy—2 🞎 | | | | | Lack of technical--3 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Business activities—4 🞎 | | | Gender—5 🞎 | | | | | Business skill—6 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Environment—7 🞎 | | | Job opportunity—8 🞎 | | | | | Information raising—9 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Don’t know—97 🞎 | | | Nothing—98 🞎 | | | | | Others-99 🞎……….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | Do you think this group is active in your community? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Highly active—1, | | Some active—2, | | | | Little/no active—3, | | | | | Don’t know--99 | | | |  |
|  | If yes, please give the reason? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Participate in CDA—1 🞎 | | | Support to other youth—2 🞎 | | | | | Share information to com--3 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Raise Ideas in meeting—4 🞎 | | | Village promotion—5 🞎 | | | | | Networking with CC/other—6 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Don’t know—97 🞎 | | | Nothing—98 🞎 | | | | | Others-99 🞎……….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | What type of support from local authority/government to this group? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Recognition—1 🞎 | | | Disseminate the work of this group—2 🞎 | | | | | Facilitate in communicate with institutions--3 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Help to facilitate business activities—4 🞎 | | | Provide technical support—5 🞎 | | | | | Facilitate for marketing network—6 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Don’t know—97 🞎 | | | Nothing—98 🞎 | | | | | Others-99 🞎……….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | How important is it to have this group in your community in respect to empowerment initiatives? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| No —1 | Little—2 | | | | High important—3 | | | | | Very important—4 | | | | |  |
| If yes, in what ways? …………………………………………………………………………………………………  If no, why not? …………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Didyou(young people) have opportunity/ever participated in the local authority/cc meeting? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Opportunity but did not participate—1 | | | | Participated—2 | | | | No opportunity—3 | | | | | | |  |
|  | Did you ever participate in the meeting with youth group? | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes—1 | | No—2 |  |
|  | Have you ever raised any issues or interest to local authority or other? | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes—1 | | No—2 |  |
|  | If yes, what issue: ………………………………………………………………………………………. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | How was you confident in raising this issue or your interests? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| No confident—1 | Little—2 | | | | High confident—3 | | | | | Very high confident--4 | | | | |  |
| Why? ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | What do you think about the attitude of local authorities toward youth groups? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Provide more opportunity 🞎 | | | Recognize youth group 🞎 | | | | | Aware of youth issues 🞎 | | | | | | |  |
| Aware of gender 🞎 | | | Value youth groups 🞎 | | | | | Others 🞎 …………………….. | | | | | | |  |
|  | Did the authorities include the young people activities in village or **commune development plan**? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Yes—1 | | | No—2 | | | | | Don’t know—99 | | | | | | |  |
|  | Did the local authority help to disseminate/support the activities of young people in the village? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Yes—1 | | | No—2 | | | | | Don’t know—99 | | | | | | |  |
|  | What are your suggestion?  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….  …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |

# Qualitative Tool

**FGD Guideline for Evaluation Survey**

Location: District: ……………………………. Commune: ………………………. Village: ……………………………….

Target group: Authority/Key community—1, Beneficiaries—2, Service providers (trainers)—3

FGD Date: ……………………………………..…… Facilitator: …………………………………………………………….

FGD Participation:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Name | Sex | Role in community | Signature |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |

1. **Intervention strategies**
   * + 1. Targeting beneficiaries (All)
          - Do you know the process of selecting beneficiaries for the project (literacy and lifeskill, technical skill, business skill)? Please describe (criteria and steps)? Are you satisfied with this selection? Why? Please give example?
          - Who participated in the selection of beneficiaries? How did they participate in this process? What do you think about the quality of these participations?
          - Do you think all marginalized and vulnerable young people in project areas benefit from the project? If no, what is percentage of these people did not? Why not?
2. Improving literacy and life skill: (Beneficiaries and Service Provider)
   * + - * Do you think the training methods including handout/manual, duration, place, and demonstration techniques on **literacy** are appropriate or consistent with young people? Why (please give example)? Are there any limitations on participation level of young people in this training? If yes, why? Do you think this activity was highly responsive to the issues faced by community? Why?
         * Do you think the training methods including handout/manual, duration, place, and demonstration techniques on **life skill** are appropriate or consistent with young people? Why (please give example)? Are there any limitations on participation level of young people in this training? If yes, why? Do you think this activity was highly responsive to the issues faced by community? Why?
3. Promoting business activities: (Beneficiaries & authorities and households)
   * + - * What technical skills did the young people received? Which skills/topic are fixed or appropriate with the beneficiary condition? And which was not? (Please explain based on capital or resource, capacity, market demand, environmental condition). Are such technical training methods as training manual, duration and location, transferring techniques, and others appropriate for the young people? Why (please give some example of positive and negative points)? Do you think this activity was highly responsive to the issues faced by community? Why?
         * What business skills did the young people received? Which skills/topic are fixed or appropriate with the beneficiary condition? And which was not? (Please explain based on capital or resource, capacity, market demand, environmental condition).Are such technical training methods as training manual, duration and location, transferring techniques, and others appropriate for the young people? Why (please give some example of positive and negative points)? Do you think this activity was highly responsive to the issues faced by community? Why?
4. Promoting for social inclusion and local authority involvement: (Beneficiary & Authority & HH)
   * + - * Are there any activities from the project to promote the participation of young people in development activities? If yes, in what way? Do you think these activities are good enough to promote these participations? *(Ex. Establishment, meeting, , participation, ….)*
         * Are there any activities from the project to promote the involvement of local authorities to encourage and promote business activities and social inclusion of young people? If yes, in what way? Do you think these activities are good enough to deal with the issues of young people?
         * Are there any participation from other relevant stakeholders to encourage and promote business activities and social inclusion of young people? If yes, what are they and in what way? Do you think their involvements are important to deal with the issues of young people? Why? Please give example?
         * Project target mostly on women beneficiaries. What do you thinks about this strategy? Are you satisfied with this? Why?
5. **Improvement/change due to project intervention**
   * + 1. Literacy and life skill (All)
          - What are the changes on literacy and life skill of young people currently compared to those before project intervention? In what way did they apply their literacy skill (ex: business, higher education, vocational training, accessing to information, reading)?
       2. Technical and business skill training (Beneficiary & HH and authority)
          - What are the changes on technical skills of young people currently compared to those before project intervention? In what techniques did they change? Why? How did they apply these skills for income generation activities?
          - What are the changes on business skills of young people currently compared to those before project intervention? In what field did they change? How did they apply this skill for income generation activities?
          - What are the changes or improvement on income generation of young people currently compared to those before project intervention (type of business, amount of income, business skill improvement, scope of business, market networking, and others)? Is it due to project intervention? How?
       3. Participation in social or development activities (Beneficiary & HH and authority)
          - What change on capacity of youth committee member due to project intervention compared to those before intervention? What activities that have been done by youth committee group? Do these activities respond to the issues in the community? How many times for each activity? How many people involved? Who?
          - **Please lists down the issues or interests raised by youth group during the project period? What feedback did they receive after raising these issues? What issues are put into CC or other stakeholder action?**
          - Will the youth committee continue to work after project completion? How? What activities will continue? What cannot? Why?
       4. Local authority involvement (Beneficiary & HH and authority)
          - What did the authority do to (what are the changes on the attitudes and practice of local authority) provide positive atmosphere for activities of young people (social inclusion, livelihood, others,…) compared to those prior to project intervention? In what ways? Please give example?
          - What are the contributions of other stakeholders (relevant government department) in promoting business activities and social inclusion of young women?
       5. Food security improvement and migration (Beneficiary & HH and authority)
          - What are the changes on food availability and diet, and household daily expense currently compared to those before project intervention (less or more)? Was this change due to project intervention? How?
          - What are the changes on migration activities in the location currently compared to these before project intervention? Was it change due to project intervention (please explain)?
6. **Suggestion and recommendation for future:** (All)
   * + 1. Please list downs the issues or problem encountered in each section of project strategies and give practical example for these issues?
       2. Based on above the issues, please provide any suggestion or recommendation to improve current project intervention.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Areas | Issues-Suggestion/Recommendation |
| 1- Target beneficiaries | |
| - Selection procedure (step and criteria) |  |
| - Participation from community |  |
| - Others |  |
| 2- Literacy and life skill | |
| - Training methods |  |
| - Participation level |  |
| - Others |  |
| 3. Business activities | |
| - Business skill (types) |  |
| - Training methods |  |
| - Outside support |  |
| 4. Social inclusion and support from local stakeholders | |
| - Youth committee activities: |  |
| - Involvement from local authority: |  |
| - Involvement from other stakeholders: |  |
| - Others |  |
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