

PN-ACW-290

The Effect of Nonformal Education on Civic Participation in Senegal:
The Findings of a Five-Region Survey

Prepared for and Funded by USAID

By Michelle Kuenzi

May 2001

This publication was made possible through support provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of P.O. No. 685-O-00-01-00102-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Introduction.....	7
Literature Review.....	7
Hypotheses.....	9
Why Senegal.....	9
The Nonformal Education Programs of Study.....	11
Survey Method and Sample.....	12
Characteristics of the Sample.....	13
Distribution of Nonformal Education in the Sample.....	13
Gender Representation in the Sample.....	14
Age Representation in the Sample.....	14
Distribution of Ethnolinguistic Groups in the Sample.....	14
Survey Results.....	16
Bivariate Analyses of Nonformal Education and Its Effects.....	16
Effects of NFE on Community Participation and Leadership.....	16
Electoral Participation.....	19
Political Interest and Engagement.....	19
Political Efficacy.....	20
Progressiveness (Authoritarianism).....	20
Trust.....	21
Individualism/Social Distance.....	22
Support For Democratic Values.....	22
Locus of Control.....	23
Summary of Results for All Respondents.....	25
Summary of Results for Women Respondents.....	27
Selective Multivariate Analyses.....	29
Community Participation and Leadership.....	29
Interest and Engagement in Politics.....	31
Efficacy.....	33
Progressiveness.....	33
Trust.....	33
Individualization/Social Distance.....	34
Support For Democratic Values.....	35
Locus of Control.....	37
Electoral Participation.....	38
Registering To Vote.....	39
Discussion.....	41
Implications.....	44
Conclusion.....	46
Appendices.....	47
Appendix A: Summary of Results for Programs.....	47
Appendix B: Questionnaire in English.....	59
Appendix C: Questionnaire in French.....	78
Appendix D: Project Description.....	103
Appendix E: Effects of Programs on Community Participation.....	109
Appendix F: Probability Tables for Community Participation.....	111
Appendix G: Probability Tables for Political Engagement.....	114
Appendix H: Probability Tables for Progressiveness.....	117

Appendix I: Probability Tables for Democratic Values.....	119
Appendix J: Probability Tables for Electoral Participation	122
Appendix K: Probability Tables for Registering to Vote	124
Appendix L: Villages Covered in the Study	126
References.....	129

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the many people who contributed to the successful completion of this project. Boubacar Tall did an exceptional job acting as project coordinator. Not only did he oversee much of the data collection, but he also offered helpful comments and advise at each stage of the research project. It is hard to imagine how the survey could have been administered without all of his efforts. The interviews were conducted by eight enumerators: Saidou Norou Sall, Hamet Ly, Rougiatou Dia, Penda Sy, Cheikh Seck, Cheikh Aidara, Fatou Diop and Saliou Ciss. Saidou Norou Sall's diligent and careful work during the project was much appreciated. Alhousseynou Sy meticulously entered the data from the questionnaires. Sidy Cissokho, Alioune Ndiaye, Marie-Claire Sow and Roger Yochelson at USAID were very helpful and supportive throughout the research effort, as was the entire USAID team.

Michael Bratton offered excellent advice with regard to the research and sampling design and questionnaire. Mark Jones also offered many helpful suggestions and responded to numerous questions during the course of the project. I am very grateful to Brian Silver for providing comments on a draft of the report.

Thanks are due to the leadership of PIP and all the members of PIP who facilitated our work, especially Ismaila Diawo and Moussa Niang. I thank Thierno Ba for making our research in PIP villages possible. The leadership of Tostan was extremely supportive of our efforts. Meissa Diegne served as a much needed resource person for the team while we worked in Thies, and Molly Melching and Abdoulaye Thiam generously made available their assistance and cooperation. Saidou Balde of Tostan assisted us during part of our work in St. Louis. Those at DAEB were very helpful and forthcoming with information. The staff members at the Bureau of Statistics were also helpful. The members of PAPA have always graciously provided assistance and information upon my visits to this organization. I wish to especially thank Mr. Monteiro, Abdoulaye Conte, and Mr. Diagne. My thanks to the leadership of PAPF for allowing our research to be conducted and to the PAPF teachers who facilitated our research in the villages of study. The members of CIED were helpful throughout the project. The people in the villages included in our study made conducting this research not only possible but also a pleasure. It is impossible for me to express sufficient gratitude to the innumerable people in all of the villages of study who freely and generously offered their assistance to the research team. I do take this opportunity, however, to offer my heartfelt thanks to them.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the relationship between civic participation and orientation and nonformal education (NFE) among villagers in five regions of Senegal. The results of a survey involving a probability sample of 1484 Senegalese citizens drawn in the regions of Thies, St. Louis, Diourbel, Louga and Kaolack are presented. The study focuses on four organizations that work in the area of NFE: The Programme Intégré de Podor (PIP), a Senegalese non-governmental organization (NGO), Tostan, an international NGO, and PAPA and PAPF, two large-scale governmental programs.

Among the more important findings of this study is that NFE has a strong, positive impact on levels of community participation. Indeed, those with NFE are more likely than those without NFE to report: 1) cooperating with others to solve a community problem; 2) belonging to a community organization; 3) holding a leadership position within an organization; 4) attending organizational meetings at least occasionally; 5) speaking out at meetings at least occasionally; and 6) getting together with others to raise an issue. NFE is also positively related to the number of community organizations to which an individual belongs. The relationship between NFE and community participation is strong and robust. First, nearly all of the indicators of community involvement register statistically significant relationships across all of the programs and subgroups examined. Second, years of nonformal education has statistically significant relationships with all of the community participation indicators in multivariate analyses which control for formal education, gender, age, ethnicity, and income. Third, the index of community involvement and leadership is related to years of NFE and all of the individual programs in multivariate analyses that included the control variables. Thus, the relationship between NFE and community participation remains statistically significant across different model specifications and statistical tests. The findings indicate that NFE significantly increases the likelihood that one will be highly engaged in the community.

NFE also has a positive impact on political participation. NFE has a statistically significant positive relationship with interest and engagement in politics. Those who have nonformal education are more likely to report that they discuss politics with others and belong to a political party. NFE also increases the likelihood that one will register to vote. Participation in all of the individual programs under study is positively associated with registering to vote. On the other hand, there does not appear to be a relationship between feelings of political efficacy and NFE.

Those with NFE also tend to have more progressive views on political and social issues than do those without NFE. NFE has a statistically significant positive effect on level of progressiveness. In other words, NFE has a negative relationship with level of authoritarianism/traditionalism. NFE is also positively associated with having different opinions and beliefs than one's relatives, friends, fellow villagers, and fellow countrymen, which tends to support the notion that NFE increases one's sense of autonomy and independence. NFE is also found to have a positive relationship with support for democratic values, although the relationship is not as strong as with authoritarianism/traditionalism.

Women are overrepresented in NFE programs partly because of their exclusion from formal education. Thus, NFE is in some ways a compensatory measure taken to help improve the situation of women. The results of this study indicate that NFE makes a significant contribution to the empowerment of women. NFE increases the probability that women will participate in the community and take on leadership positions. NFE also increases the likelihood that women will become politically active. As noted, participation in community organizations leads women to

acquire civic skills and generally renders them more efficacious in the political realm. Hence, it is likely that the initial effects of NFE will be built upon by women's experiences in community organizations and activities.

While it is true that analyses of large samples tend to show even small relationships, nearly all of the relationships identified in the analyses of all respondents are also statistically significant when these analyses are restricted to small subgroups of the sample. Moreover, the findings of the bivariate analyses are largely consistent with those of the multivariate analyses.

INTRODUCTION

Education has been considered an important factor in the establishment and consolidation of democratic forms of government, and many researchers have attempted to document the impact of formal education on democratization and democratic consolidation. Little attention has been paid to the relationship between nonformal education¹ (NFE) and democracy. However, given the prominence that NFE has gained in countries with non-performing formal educational systems, this inattention is unmerited. Recently, NFE has come under siege. Many have pointed to the failure of literacy campaigns to decrease illiteracy rates by any significant margin. Others have noted the high dropout rates that characterize literacy programs and the tendency for those trained to lapse back into illiteracy. The supportive role NFE could play in the promotion civil society, civic orientation and democratic attitudes has been neglected in most evaluations of NFE programs. The purpose of this report is, therefore, not to evaluate the extent to which NFE programs transmit literacy skills. Rather, the objective of the study is to assess the effects of NFE on civic participation and orientation in rural Senegal. The results of a survey involving a probability sample of 1484 Senegalese citizens drawn in the regions of Thies, St. Louis, Diourbel, Louga and Kaolack will be presented. This report contains:

- brief review of the literature
- statement of hypotheses
- description of the study context
- description of the programs studied
- description of the survey method
- description of the characteristics of the sample
- results of bivariate analyses
- multivariate analyses where bivariate results are more carefully scrutinized
- general discussion of survey results and their implications

LITERATURE REVIEW

Hadenius sums up the rationale of the modernization theorists well: "...the belief was that economic and social development would result in greater literacy and a generally higher educational level among the masses of the population, which would promote openness and deeper insight into political issues" (1992, 78). Consciousness and openness, emanating not only from literacy, but also from exposure to mass media, along with other positive aspects of modernization, such as industrialization and urbanization, would pave the way for the formation of democratic regimes (Hadenius, 1992, p. 78-9).

Lerner's *The Passing of Traditional Society* (1958) is an excellent exemplar of the modernization school of thought. Lerner contends, "Thus literacy becomes the sociological pivot in the activation of psychic mobility, the publicly shared skill which binds modern man's varied daily round into a consistent participant lifestyle" (1958, 64). In his study which involved data from 54 countries, Lerner finds that the correlations of literacy with urbanism, voting, and media are .64, .80, and .82, respectively (1958, 58). Similarly, Lipset also argues that the levels of economic development and education help determine whether democracy will take root in a

¹ The nonformal education programs to which I will be referring are those intended to impart basic literacy and numeracy skills on participants, usually adults who have been left out of formal educational systems, or dropouts from formal schools.

particular country. Lipset contends that the empirical evidence supports the notion that higher educational levels facilitate the establishment of democratic forms of governance. He notes that, at the time, the lowest literacy rate for the more democratic European countries was 96%, while the average for the less democratic countries was 85%. In Latin America, the average of the less dictatorial countries was 74%, while that for the more dictatorial countries was 46%. Further, Lipset argues that the relationship between education and democratic attitudes within countries is especially strong, and cites several national studies (1959, 56).

Education is an important component of civic culture. While the time frame required to develop a civic culture is, according to Almond and Verba, a long one, they duly note that many of the "new nations" do not have this kind of time to dedicate to the development of a civic culture. In such a case, Almond and Verba see education as the best substitute for time. Indeed, according to their data, education is the most important determinant of political attitudes (1965, 370). However, Almond and Verba go on to point out that while education can help to supply an individual with important political skills and knowledge, it cannot completely supplant the other components of the socialization process in terms of inculcating democratic attitudes and behavior (1965, 370-371).

Hadenius reconsiders the tenets of modernization theory and attempts to test the relationship between democracy and 17 of the variables associated with modernization including exposure to the media, level of education and literacy. Employing an index of democracy based on the dimensions of elections and political liberties, Hadenius regresses these indicators against degree of democracy for one hundred and thirty-two of the world's third world countries. He finds that the literacy rate is the most definitive of the predictors of democracy (although, as he continues his analyses, the effects of literacy wash out a bit) (Hadenius, 1992). Given his method of stepwise regression, the conclusions he draws are not that firm, however.

At the level of the individual, numerous studies have linked education to democratic behavior and attitudes. In several U.S. studies, education has been shown to increase political participation in the form of voting (e.g., see Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). Gibson et al. (1992) attempt to assess the extent to which the "cultural requisites to democracy" exist in the former USSR by looking at levels of "support for core democratic rights, liberties, and institutions" (329). Based on survey data of 504 Moscow Oblast citizens, they find, "The best predictors of attitudes toward general democratic values are education, gender, and age. The better educated, males, and the young tended to be more supportive of democratic institutions and processes" (329). However, among the explanatory variables just mentioned they find that "the strongest predictor of democratic attitudes is level of education..." (359). Similarly, based on their public opinion survey of seven republics of the former Soviet Union, Finifter and Mickiewicz (1992) find that the more educated, men, and the young are most likely to support political change.

Still, the effect of education on democratic orientation is not completely straightforward. While most U.S. studies support the notion that education promotes political tolerance and democratic political values (e.g., see Prothro and Grigg 1960; McClosky 1964; Lawrence 1976), in their study of political culture in Zambia, Bratton and Liatto-Katunda (1994) found that, on average, respondents with higher levels of education tended to be less tolerant than their less well-educated counterparts. Bratton et al. (1999) had similar findings in their study of Ghana. People may indeed become more tolerant of those from the outside because of the vicarious experiences made possible through reading, as Oxenham (1980) and Lerner (1958) suggest. However, Street (1995) notes that in the current international political and social climate, non-literate people are being denigrated as the result of the extreme rhetoric employed in literacy campaigns. It seems that

such rhetoric could only heighten the intolerance of those who have achieved some education toward those who have not.

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Based on the literature and the author's own past exploratory research on NFE, it was hypothesized that:

- 1) On average, Senegalese villagers who have participated in a NFE program will exhibit higher levels of civic participation than their counterparts who have not participated in a nonformal education program.
 - a) On average, those who have participated in NFE will exhibit higher levels of community participation and leadership than those who have never participated in an NFE program will.
 - b) On average, those with NFE will be more engaged and interested in the political sphere than will those without NFE.
 - c) On average, those with nonformal education will have higher levels of electoral participation than those without NFE.
- 2) On average, those with nonformal education will feel more politically efficacious than those without nonformal education.
- 3) On average, those with NFE will express more democratic and progressive (i.e., less authoritarian and traditional) attitudes than those without NFE.
- 4) On average, those who have had NFE will exhibit more interpersonal trust than those without NFE will.
- 5) On average, those who have had NFE will exhibit more individualism than will those without NFE.
- 6) On average, those with NFE will be more supportive of democratic values than will those without NFE.
- 7) On average, those who have had NFE are more likely to have an internal locus of control than those who have not; that is, those with NFE see themselves as having a much greater role in determining their life situation than those without NFE.

WHY SENEGAL?

The remarkable political events that occurred just over a year ago render this moment an ideal time to examine these relationships in Senegal. The outcome of Senegal's 2000 presidential election stunned international and national observers alike. In the second round of Senegal's presidential election, long-standing opposition leader, Abdoulaye Wade, defeated the incumbent Abdou Diouf. At the time of his defeat, Abdou Diouf had been president for 19 years, and his party, the Socialist Party (PS), had been in power for 40. Already being a "semidemocracy" (Coulon 1990), Senegal did not undergo a democratic transition in the early 1990s, but the government did implement several reforms that appeared to strengthen democratic institutions

(Villalón 1994). However, both the 1993 and 1998 elections were a great disappointment as no alternation of power took place, and abuses were alleged. Ironically, Senegalese citizens appeared to have a great deal of mistrust toward the entire political system at a time when the dominant party, the PS, was liberalizing itself out of power. The victory of Abdoulaye Wade in the presidential election of 2000 was a watershed moment in Senegal's political history. After nearly 40 years of de facto one-party rule by the PS, this event seemed to catapult Senegal from semi-democratic to democratic status.² Given the fragility of democratic advances in Africa, distilling the factors that could facilitate or impede democratic processes in Senegal is critical.

The history of its educational system also renders Senegal a perfect case in which to examine the aforementioned issues. Having been a French colony for three centuries, many of the institutions of the small, coastal West African country of Senegal resemble those of France. Since education is one of the principal ways through which culture is transmitted, the French established an educational system in Senegal modeled after that in France. Formal education in Senegal continues to be conducted in French and resembles the French school system. Ironically, much of the Senegalese population is incapable of using French as an effective means of communication. Dr. Fagerberg-Diallo notes that "...roughly 75% of the population in Senegal is not capable of using French as a language through which they have access to information, whether it be written or oral" (1993:4). Currently, six years of primary schooling is officially compulsory for children of seven to 13 years of age. In fact, according to Africa South of the Sahara, 58% of those in this age group were enrolled in primary schools in 1992. The difference between primary and secondary school attendance rates is instructive, however. Secondary school, which students usually begin at age 13, is comprised of a four-year and three-year cycle. In 1992, only 16% of those in the eligible age group were enrolled in secondary school (1997, 834). Unfortunately, students leaving primary school may not have even fully developed and consolidated their literacy and numeracy skills. While the formal education system has created a Senegalese elite, nearly 70 percent of the population of Senegal does not possess basic literacy skills. Among women, 77.2 percent are not literate (Direction de l'Alphabetisation et de l'Education de Base 1995). Nonformal education programs have emerged to fill the gaps left by the formal education system. These programs are conducted in African languages and usually informed by the culture and exigencies of the target populations. Most of these programs are administered by both national and international nongovernmental organizations, although the Senegalese government has begun to become active in the nonformal education sector.

Many of the modernization theorists appear to have conflated the effect of literacy with that of schooling. Literacy is the building block of most types of education. Based on their study of the effects of the three different literacies operative among the Vai of Liberia³ (n=650), Scribner and Cole (1981) conclude that one cannot separate the effects of literacy from the manner in which it is used. They distinguish between schooled and nonschooled literacy. Scribner and Cole (1981), like Street (1995), point out that much more than simply reading and writing is learned in school. It is, therefore, often difficult to distinguish between the effects of literacy and the particular social conditions associated with an educational experience, whether nonformal or formal. Hence, it is important to determine whether nonformal education programs tend to have the same type of effects on democratic orientations as formal schooling.

² Following the 1993 elections, Villalón (1994) observed that Senegal had nearly all of the accoutrements of a democracy except an alternation in power. Of course, as Villalón observes, power alternation is considered a critical requisite for full democratic status.

³ The three literacies are 1) Vai literacy based on the Vai script, 2) Arabic/Qur'anic literacy, and 3) English literacy learned in public schools.

THE NFE PROGRAMS OF STUDY

The study focuses on four NFE programs, each of which is characterized by attributes that make it especially interesting for examination and comparison.

PIP The Programme Intégré de Podor (PIP), a Senegalese non-governmental organization (NGO), has had a strong presence in the Fouta Tooro, where it was established in 1975 as a measure to help counter the negative effects of the Sahelian drought. PIP is active in two departments in St. Louis: Podor and Matam. Although PIP's activities initially centered on ameliorating physical infrastructure and hydraulics, its scope of activity has expanded to include work in the areas of health, agro-forestry, savings and credit, environmental protection, and literacy. Since it began working in the area of literacy in 1986, it has been responsible for training upwards of 37,537 people. PIP has worked almost exclusively in the area of Pulaar literacy (classes are taught in Pulaar in 96 percent of its centers) and has had the benefit of having its work supported by a zealous and dynamic Pulaar literacy movement. The PIP methodology is comprised of three levels. In the first level, one masters writing, reading and very basic arithmetic. This part of the program lasts 240 hours. In the second level, one masters grammar, spelling and more advanced arithmetic. This phase is estimated to take 240 hours to complete. Most centers administer the first two phases of the program. In the third level, one engages in more advanced study of the subjects mentioned and begins the study of different topical areas such as health, the environment, community management, etc. While some have claimed the PIP program can be done in six months, the duration of most classes seems to be two years. Aside from decreasing the illiteracy rates in the Fouta and transmitting reading writing, and math skills, PIP has two rather interesting goals: 1) "reinforcing the cultural identity of the populations," and 2) "opening a window to the world."⁴

Tostan Tostan, an international NGO, has been a prominent actor in the area of nonformal education for the last ten years. During this time, Tostan has trained over 18,834 adult villagers in nine regions of Senegal. Working mostly in Wolof and Pulaar, Tostan has a solid curriculum and pedagogy. The basic Tostan program is comprised of six modules, each of which represents a thematic area such as problem solving, health, leadership or financial management. Each module lasts two months, and the timeline for the basic program is 24 months.⁵ Tostan has also produced four continued education modules, including one on human rights. One of Tostan's goals is to "promote self-development through the use of adapted educational materials."

PAPA and PAPF Only recently has the Senegalese government become a notable force in the area of basic literacy and nonformal education. In 1993, the Senegalese government created a five-year action plan that included as one of its planks the reduction in the illiteracy rate by five percent each year. Two of the large scale efforts initiated in the area of nonformal education include *Projet d'Appui au Plan d'Action en matière d'éducation non formelle* (PAPA) and *Projet Alphabétisation Priorité Femmes* (PAPF). PAPA covers the regions of Ziguinchor, Kaolack, Tambacounda, Thies, and Saint Louis, while PAPF covers the remaining five regions: Diourbel, Fatick, Kolda, Louga, and Dakar. Both PAPA and PAPF adhere to the strategy "*faire faire*." That is, instead of administering literacy classes themselves, PAPA and PAPF use local

⁴ Some of the information on PIP was gleaned from an assessment of *Union pour la Solidarité et l'Entraide* by Jose Ruijter (1997).

⁵ Traditionally, the basic program took 18 months to complete. However, according to the most recent information I have received, the basic program now takes 24 months to complete.

"*opérateurs*" or organizations to implement the classes in the field and thereby promote civil society. Since it began to administer its programs in 1996, PAPA has trained more than 200,000 adults. Although PAPA has recently developed a model curriculum, basically the local organizations have total freedom in choosing the curriculum and content for the classes they administer. PAPA's program follows two different timelines. Some classes meet five months a year for two years while others meet for only six months during one year. PAPP's major objective is to train 135,000 people between fifteen and thirty-nine years of age of whom 75 percent should be women (PAPA's objective was to have classes of at least 65% women). PAPP also offers models of ideal programs, but freedom is left to the local *opérateur* to establish the timeline and content of the program. Until recently, *opérateurs* have administered the program in 10 months, 12 months, or, at most, 18 months. PAPP is contemplating changing to a 24-month model.

METHOD AND SAMPLE

A multi-stage, stratified, area cluster probability sample design was employed in this study. The design was intended to generate a sample that would allow one to assess the effects of the four different NFE programs in the rural areas of the five regions mentioned above. These five regions were selected because they have a fairly high concentration of literacy programs and also contain largely the same ethnolinguistic groups. Senegalese citizens who were at least 18 years old and who lived in rural areas in the five regions of study comprised the target population.

The village constituted the primary sampling unit (PSU). Selection of PSUs was stratified by region and NFE program. Villages were selected with probability proportionate to size (PPS). In other words, the probability of selection associated with any particular village was exactly proportional to its share of the total population. Sampling lists containing the PAPA villages were created for the regions of Thies, St. Louis, and Kaolack. Sampling lists containing Tostan villages were created for St. Louis, Thies, and Diourbel. Sampling lists containing PAPP villages were created for Louga and Diourbel. Finally, a sampling list of PIP villages was created for the Region of St. Louis. From these sampling lists, which included basic demographic information on each village, villages were selected with PPS in excel. "Control" sampling lists were also created for the five regions covered in the study.

Of course, in order to create these sampling lists, lists of all of the villages that have participated in the literacy programs of PIP, TOSTAN, PAPP, and PAPA had to be obtained or constructed. Unfortunately, PAPA does not have a comprehensive list of the villages that have had the PAPA program. All of the IDEN Departmental representatives in the regions of interest were contacted and asked for this information and visits were made to each office. Most of the lists associated with the other organizations required some organization, aggregation and follow-up. In short, creating the sampling frame involved many steps, and, in a few cases, we could not be sure that our lists were completely exhaustive.

One thousand four hundred and eighty four questionnaires were administered in 94 villages randomly selected with PPS in St. Louis, Thies, Louga, Diourbel and Kaolack. These villages included "treatment" villages (i.e., NFE villages) and control villages (see Appendix D for the distribution of the respondents by NFE program and region). In the NFE villages, a list of all those who had participated in the relevant NFE program was constructed with the aid of the person/people in charge of the class in that village or someone else knowledgeable about the program. Twelve of those who had participated in the program were randomly drawn from that

list. In each NFE village, four “control” households were randomly selected through a walking pattern (*pas de sondage*) (see Appendix D for a description of the “*pas de sondage*”). In the control villages, sixteen households were randomly selected in one of two ways. Households were either selected via the walking pattern or, when the village did not contain a large number of households, a list of households was created with the help of a knowledgeable villager, usually the chief of the village. Sixteen households were then randomly selected from the list.

This method of selection was chosen to minimize threats to the validity of the study. On the one hand, had we chosen all of those in the “control” group⁶ from the NFE villages, one could have argued that those who live in a village where there is an NFE village but did not participate in it are somehow different than those in the NFE program from the start. Hence, any differences between NFE and non-NFE respondents could be attributed to differences that preceded the NFE program. On the other hand, had we chosen all of our respondents from non-NFE villages, one could claim that differences in villages were responsible for the observed differences between “treatment” and “control” groups. In fact, both types of control respondents are found in the sample. In addition, the threats just mentioned seem minimal. Those non-NFE respondents coming from NFE villages often had plans to participate in a literacy class in the near future or simply did not join the original class because they were not in the village at the time the class began. In addition, Tostan explicitly trains program participants to share information gleaned in class with others in the village. This diffusion of messages militates against finding differences when respondents come from NFE villages. In the case of the non-NFE villages, many of the villages had requested classes. In other cases, classes had just begun at the time of the survey.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Seven hundred and nine respondents are classified as *not* having had NFE and constitute the “control” group (48 percent of the sample), while 774 respondents are classified as having had NFE (52% of the sample) and constitute the treatment group. Included in the non-NFE, or “control” group, are 25 respondents who have had some type of nonformal education training. However, because the training was not supplied by one of our programs of interest, they cannot be included in the treatment group. The mean years of NFE among those with NFE is 2.4 years with a standard deviation of 1.6 years. The overall sample mean was 1.27 years with a standard deviation of 1.7 years. The most NFE any respondent reported having is 10 years.⁷

Women comprise seventy-two percent of the sample. Women constitute an even larger percentage of those with NFE. As we can see in Table 1, 83 percent of the NFE respondents are women compared to only 60 percent in the non-NFE group. The overrepresentation of women among those with NFE is not difficult to explain given that the vast majority of the participants in the programs under study are women.

⁶ Although the term “control group” is usually used in experiments, I use the terms “control group” and “comparison group” interchangeably throughout the text to refer those who have not had any NFE through one of the four programs under study.

⁷ Collecting precise data on the amount of time spent in class was not easy. Although respondents were asked about each increment of time spent in class (i.e. respondents were asked about the number of months a year, weeks a month, days a week, and hours a day), the most accurate information respondents gave seemed to be about the years in class. If a class met for nine months out of the year for two years, for most respondents, they have had two years of NFE. Indeed, most classes did not meet every month of the year. Moreover, across all of the programs, respondents seemed to inflate the amount of time spent in class.

Table 1: Crosstabulation of Gender and NFE

Gender	Respondents without NFE	Respondents with NFE
Male	40%	17%
Female	60	83
Totals	(709) 100%	(773)* 100%

*Figure in parentheses is the base from which percentages are calculated.

The average age for the sample is 32 years. At around 13 years, the standard deviation is quite high. However, at 29 years with a standard deviation of 10 years, the mean age of NFE respondents was lower than that of non-NFE respondents. For the non-NFE group, the average age is 36 years with a rather high standard deviation of 15 years. In order to clarify the relationship between age and NFE, respondents were classified into one of the following categories, depending on their age: 1) 18 to 20 years, 2) 21 to 35 years, 3) 36 to 49 years, and 4) 50 years and older.

Table 2: Percentage of Respondents in Age Categories

Age	Frequency	Percent
18 to 20	333	22.62
21 to 35	657	44.63
35 to 49	307	20.86
50+	175	11.89
Total	1472	100

We can see from Table 2 that the modal category is 21 to 35 years of age as forty-five percent of our sample falls into that category. It is important to see how NFE relates to these categories.

Table 3: Crosstabulation of Age Categories and NFE

Age Category	Respondents without NFE	Respondents with NFE
18 to 20	17%	28%
21 to 35	41	48
35 to 49	23	19
50+	19	5
Totals	(700) 100	(771)* 100

*Figure in parentheses is the base from which percentages are calculated.

As we can see from the table, those in the younger age categories are slightly overrepresented among the NFE respondents, while the opposite is the case for those from the category representing the oldest respondents. In fact, the distribution of age is not all surprising; younger people tend to participate in NFE programs at higher rates than older people do, and this reality is reflected in our sample.

How NFE is distributed across ethnolinguistic group is also important to examine.

Table 4: Crosstabulation of Ethnolinguistic Group and NFE

Ethnolinguistic Group	Respondents without NFE	Respondents with NFE
Pulaar	34%	52%
Wolof	44	30
Serer	13	13
Other	8	5
Totals	(709) 100%	(774)* 100%

*Figure in parentheses is the base from which percentages are calculated.

As can be seen from Table 4, 52 percent of the respondents with NFE are Pulaar speakers. Pulaar speakers are highly represented in the sample because one of the programs of great interest, PIP, works almost exclusively among Pulaar speakers. Moreover, a large number of the Tostan participants in the regions of interest are Pulaar-speakers, and the other two programs have at least some classes in Pulaar villages. Pulaar-speakers have in many ways spearheaded the literacy movement in Senegal, and thus it is perhaps not surprising that they are highly represented in the sample. Indeed, since the ethnolinguistic composition of the control and treatment sampling lists was not the same and villages were drawn randomly, the distribution of respondents across ethnolinguistic groups is not symmetrical.⁸ The same explanation is also relevant to the distribution of NFE respondents across regions.

Table 5: Crosstabulation of Region and NFE

Region	Respondents without NFE	Respondents with NFE
Diourbel	15%	9%
Thies	30	28
St. Louis	29	46
Louga	12	9
Kaolack	14	8
Totals	(709) 100%	(774) 100%

As is clear from Table 5, the respondents from Saint Louis are over-represented in the treatment group. Such is the case because PIP works nearly exclusively in Saint Louis, Tostan's program is very prominent there, and PAPA also operates in Saint Louis.

⁸ In bivariate analyses, we look at specific subgroups and therefore physically "control" for ethnicity and region in many analyses. In multivariate analyses, we control for ethnicity statistically.

RESULTS OF THE BIVARIATE ANALYSES⁹

In these analyses, those who have participated in one of the four programs of interest (had NFE) are compared with those who have not had NFE through one of the four programs. The bivariate tests are actually quite conservative in some ways. Those with less than a year of NFE are still included in the "treatment" group. Moreover, those respondents with no more than a year of literacy training comprise 28% of the treatment group.

First, the differences between those with NFE and those without NFE are examined for all respondents (see Table 8, which presents of the summary of results). Second, since many programs target women, the differences are examined specifically for women (see Table 9 for the summary of results for women respondents). The effects of the individual programs are also examined in the bivariate analyses (see Appendix A, which contains tables summarizing all of the results for the individual programs). For the specific programs, the objective is to compare those who have participated in the program with those who reasonably could have, but did not. That is, I want to compare those who have participated in the program with those who resemble them in terms of key characteristics even in the bivariate analyses.¹⁰ Therefore, the analyses involving PIP are confined to Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis. I also look simply at the subgroup of women Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis. In the case of Tostan, I look specifically at the subgroup of women in Diourbel and Thies since the vast majority of participants in the Tostan program are female and since all of the participants in these two regions were trained in Wolof. I also look at the effects of Tostan training on the subgroup of Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis. In this case, the analyses are not restricted to just women. In the case of PAPP, the analyses involved women in the regions where PAPP is active: Louga and Diourbel. When looking at PAPA, the analyses are restricted to women in the regions where PAPA is active: St. Louis, Thies, and Kaolack.¹¹ While the intention is to render the comparison groups as similar as possible, in some cases the sizes of the subgroups are relatively small and, therefore, relationships are more difficult to detect.

I) Civic Engagement

A) Community Participation

It was hypothesized that those villagers in the regions of study with NFE would exhibit higher levels of community participation than their counterparts without NFE. This hypothesis is strongly supported by the results of the bivariate analyses. One indicator of community participation is whether people have ever cooperated to solve a community problem. The chi square test of independence is used to determine whether relationships are statistically significant in these bivariate analyses. The percentage difference of those reporting to have cooperated to solve a community problem between those with NFE and those without is large and statistically significant ($p=.000$) (see Table 8). Although only 38 percent of those without NFE report having cooperated to solve a community problem, 58 percent of those with nonformal education report

⁹ The 0.05 level of significance will serve as the benchmark of significance.

¹⁰ It should also be noted that in the analyses individual programs and subgroups, only those who had the specific program being examined and those with no NFE at all were included. Hence, even those who had NFE from a program other than one of the four were excluded.

¹¹ The overwhelming majority of participants in both PAPA and PAPP are women. Indeed, 87 percent of the respondents who have had PAPP training are women and 92 percent of those with PAPA training are women.

having done so. The relationship remains statistically significant when the analysis is restricted to women (see Table 9): while only 35 percent of women without NFE report having cooperated, 56 percent of women with NFE report having done so. This relationship between NFE and cooperation to solve a community problem is replicated across all four of the programs and all of the subgroups of interest (see tables in Appendix A). Among women in Diourbel and Thies, the difference in the percentage of those reporting having cooperated between the group with Tostan training and the group without Tostan training is thirty percent (see Table A.4).

The cooperation indicator is considered a key indicator since it is through collective action that the general welfare of communities can be pursued. While the relationship between having NFE and responding affirmatively to the cooperation question seemed strong and consistent, it could be the case that more active people tend to get involved in NFE. Under this scenario, those with nonformal education exhibited high levels of community participation before ever becoming involved in a NFE program. In order to assess the extent to which “selection” poses a threat to the findings, I examine the level of cooperation at different levels of NFE.

The first level of NFE is comprised of those who have had one year or less of nonformal education (but more than zero years). It is worth noting that this group contains 33 respondents who have had less than six months of NFE. The second group contains those who have had no more than two years but more than one (in reality, all of those in this group have had two years of NFE). The third group contains those who have had no more than three years but more than two years. And, finally, the fourth group is comprised of those who have had more than three years of NFE. Below is a cross tabulation of the cooperation responses and level of literacy.

Table 6: Crosstabulation of Cooperating to Solve Community Problem and Level of NFE

Reported Cooperating with Others	0 years of NFE	0<NFE≤1	1<NFE≤2	2<NFE≤3	Over 3 years of NFE
No	61%	58%	38%	34%	33%
Yes	39	42	62	66	67
Totals	(706)* 100	(216) 100	(293) 100	(122) 100	(143) 100

*number in parentheses serves as the base from which the percentages are calculated

The idea that selection and not NFE may be responsible for the high level of cooperation among NFE respondents is not supported by this crosstabulation. Were selection responsible for the effects we are attributing to NFE, we would expect those in the first level of NFE to have a similar rate of cooperation as those in the other groups. In fact, we see in Table 6 that the rate of cooperation of those with little NFE is not a lot greater than that of those without any NFE. The percentage of those reporting cooperation increases by twenty percent when one moves to the level of two years of NFE, and increases slightly as we move to the next two levels of NFE. In this case, two years of NFE seems like a threshold.

Membership in a community organization is also an indicator of community participation. Those respondents with NFE are more likely to be members of community organizations than are those without NFE. Indeed, there is a statistically significant relationship between having NFE and reporting that one is a member of a community organization ($p=.000$). Eighty-six percent of those with NFE report belonging to a community organization while only 61 percent of those in the “control” group (i.e., those without NFE) do. The relationship is still statistically significant

when the analysis is restricted to only women ($p=.000$). Each individual NFE program registers a significant relationship with membership in a community organization as those in each of the programs are more likely to belong to a community organization than their counterparts in the control group.

Respondents were also asked if they occupied a leadership position in the associations to which they belonged (Question 21D). As we see in Table 8, while only 19 percent of those without NFE report that they occupy a leadership position, 47 percent of those with NFE do. This relationship is almost perfectly replicated when we look at only the women respondents. The difference between “treatment” and “control” groups is perhaps most salient in the case of Pulaar speakers in Saint Louis. Only 17 percent of those without PIP report occupying leadership positions compared to 57 percent of those with PIP training. The relationship is largely the same when the analysis is restricted to just women (see Table A.2).

Attending community meetings is also related to NFE; those respondents with NFE are more likely to attend community meetings at least occasionally than are their counterparts in the control group. When one looks at the subgroups, the relationship holds for all of the programs but PAPP. It is worth noting that rate of reported attendance is very high for the women with PAPP: 93 percent report attending at least on occasion. However, because the level of reported attendance in the comparison group is very high as well (87), no relationship is detected.

Respondents were also asked about the frequency with which they speak out at meetings. There is a big difference between the proportion of NFE and non-NFE respondents who report that they never speak out. Thus, we specifically compare the percent of both groups that report ever speaking out at meetings. While only 43 percent of those without NFE report speaking out at meetings at least occasionally, 67 percent of those with NFE do. The difference between NFE and non-NFE respondents is also large and statistically significant when we look at just women; while only 32 percent of those without NFE report that they speak out at meetings at least occasionally (i.e., do not respond never), 63 percent of those with NFE report doing so. The relationship between speaking out and nonformal education is statistically significant for all four of the programs and for all of the subgroups. Once again, among the subgroup of women in Diourbel and Thies, the difference between those with Tostan and those without is striking: only 28 percent of those in the control group report speaking in meetings at least occasionally compared to 75 percent in the Tostan group, for a difference of 47 percent.

I was also interested in whether respondents had gotten together with others to raise issues. The chi square test of independence reveals that there is a statistically significant relationship between reporting to have raised an issue at least once and having NFE. As can be seen in Table 8, 71 percent of those with NFE report that they have gotten together with others to raise an issue compared to 52 percent of those with no NFE. Similarly, 69 percent of women with NFE report raising an issue compared to only 47 percent of women without NFE. This relationship is statistically significant across all of the programs and subgroups.

Since a flourishing civil society is an important requisite for a healthy democracy, I was interested in assessing the number of organizations to which people belonged. We asked about membership in up to three organizations. As can be seen in the cross tabulation below, the percentage of respondents with NFE exceeds the corresponding percentage of non-NFE respondents for every number but zero. The relationship between number of organizations to which one belongs and NFE is statistically significant when the analysis is restricted to just women (see Table 7) and is statistically significant for all of the individual programs of study.

Table 7: Crosstabulation of Number of Community Organizations in which one has Membership and NFE

Number of Organizations	Respondents without NFE	Respondents with NFE
0	39	14
1	46	48
2	11	26
3	3	12
Totals	(707) 100%	(773) 100%

Pearson $\chi^2(3) = 176.0594$ $p = .000$

B. Electoral Participation

It was hypothesized that, on average, levels of electoral participation would be higher among those with NFE than among those without. The bivariate analyses indicate that the only relationship that exists with NFE in this area is that with being registered to vote. As noted earlier, younger people are overrepresented in the group which has had NFE, and age has a statistically significant, positive relationship with electoral participation (many of the respondents in the NFE group were not of age to vote in some of the elections about which we ask).

As we can see from Table 8, when we restrict our analysis to women, the relationship between registering to vote and NFE is no longer statistically significant. Being registered to vote is related to participation in Tostan, as we see in Table A.4, for the regions of Thies and Diourbel. However, the bivariate analyses do not show any of the other specific programs to have a statistically significant relationship with being registered to vote. Reporting having voted in the first round of the presidential election, in the second round of the presidential election, and in the parliamentary elections are also indicators of electoral participation. Chi square tests of independence show all of these indicators to be independent of NFE and all of the individual programs. Voting in local elections is independent of NFE and PAPA. The relationship between this indicator and participation in PAPF is statistically significant but a smaller percentage of those with PAPF than those without PAPF report being registered to vote. The same is the case for PIP when we restrict the test to only women in Saint Louis and for Tostan when we restrict the test to St. Louis. The most likely explanation for these results is that age is a confounding factor, and there are forces much more prominent than NFE driving voting behavior in local elections. The multivariate relationships allow the confounding effects of age to be addressed.

C. Political Interest and Engagement

Respondents were also asked other questions intended to tap their level of political engagement. Being at least somewhat interested in politics is not statistically significantly related to the general NFE variable. However, having PAPA training is related to this variable: those respondents who have had PAPA training are more likely to report being at least somewhat interested in politics than those respondents with no NFE. PAPF training is also related to this variable, but a smaller percentage of those with PAPF claim to be at least somewhat interested in politics than those without PAPF. The variable discussing politics at least sometimes (see Question 70) is statistically significant with the aggregate NFE variable when all respondents are included in the analysis and when one looks at only women. Those with NFE are more likely to report

discussing politics at least sometimes than are those without NFE. There is also a statistically significant association between discussing politics and all of the program variables except PAPP. That these political variables do not have the expected relationship is actually not surprising given that PAPP's respondents have the lowest average age (although PIP's mean is nearly exactly the same).

Whether or not one feels close to a party or not is also related to NFE. Those with NFE are more likely to feel close to a political party those in the control group are. This relationship is statistically significant for all of the specific programs except PAPP. Since this is the program with the lowest average age, controlling for age is especially important. When one restricts the analysis of PIP to only women, this relationship is also not statistically significant. In fact, average age is nearly the same for PIP as for PAPP, and it was felt that controlling for age would probably change to nature of the results. When logit models were run that controlled for age, the relationship was indeed statistically significant for PIP but not for PAPP.

2) Political Efficacy

It was hypothesized that those with NFE would tend to feel more politically efficacious than would those without NFE. The findings from the bivariate analyses do not offer support for this hypothesis. Paired statements were used to assess respondents' feelings of efficacy (see Questions 45-48 in Appendices B or C). For example, respondents were asked to choose between these two statements:

- 1) In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinions of others.
- 2) As far as politics are concerned, friends and neighbors do not listen to me.

Feeling capable of influencing the political opinions of others, as measured by this question, is not related to the general NFE variable, years of NFE, or any of the specific programs, even when one just looks at various subgroups therein. Respondents were also asked about the extent to which they were able to understand the way government operates (see question 46). No relationship between feeling like one is generally able to understand the way government operates and NFE is found, nor are any statistically significant relationships found between this indicator and any of the four programs. Respondents were also asked about whether they felt that they could make elected representatives listen to them. Again, feeling capable of making elected representatives listen is not significantly related to NFE or participation in any of the individual programs. Finally, respondents were asked to chose between:

- 1) No matter who we vote for, things will not get any better in the future.
- 2) We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives.

Opting for the second declaration is not related to NFE or participation in any of the individual programs.

3) Progressiveness or Authoritarianism/Traditionalism

It was hypothesized that those respondents with NFE would be more progressive (or less authoritarian and less traditional) than their counterparts without NFE. This hypothesis is supported. Respondents were also asked a set of questions that were intended to measure their level of progressiveness or authoritarianism and traditionalism. For example, respondents were asked to choose between the declaration that all members of a family should hold the same

political opinions and the declaration that all family members should be free to make up their own minds on political issues (see Question 69 in Appendices B or C). Those with NFE are more likely to choose the declaration that family members should be free to make up their own minds than are those without NFE. The relationship between NFE and choosing free to make up own mind is statistically significant, as are those between choosing free to make up own mind and PIP (although when we restrict the analysis to women it is not) Tostan and PAPF. Participation in PAPA is not related to this indicator.

With the next indicator (see Question 70 in Appendices B or C), we attempt to see whether the respondent believes that a married woman should vote the way her husband does or that everyone should decide for him/herself for whom to vote. This indicator is related to NFE generally, participation in PIP, and participation in Tostan, with a higher percentage of those in the treatment groups choosing that everyone should make their own choice than of the comparison group. This indicator is independent of PAPA and PAPF.

The third indicator of “progressiveness” (see Question 71) again focuses on views toward women. Respondents were asked to choose between two declarations:

- 1) A woman’s place is in the home; women should not try to speak out about politics.
- 2) A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics even if her husband disagrees.

Those with NFE are more likely to opt for the second declaration than are those in the control group. NFE has a statistically significant relationship with this indicator when all respondents are included in the test as well as when the test is restricted to just women, and all of the programs register a significant relationship with this indicator except PAPA.

Two indicators are intended to measure the extent to which people are open to change (see Questions 72-3). Respondents were asked to select the statement with which they agreed most between the following two:

- 1) Our customs and ethnic heritage are things that have made us great, and certain people should be made to show greater respect for them.
- 2) We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development.

Those with NFE are more likely to opt for the second declaration than are those in the control group. This indicator is related to NFE when one looks at all respondents and when only women are included in the analysis. As for individual programs, participation in PIP and PAPA are related to this indicator, while participation Tostan and PAPF are not.

The next indicator deals with the types of values to be nurtured in children: obedience and respect for authority or curiosity and open-mindedness (the latter option representing the progressive choice). Those with NFE are more likely to choose that curiosity and open-mindedness are the most important values to nurture in children than are those without NFE. Bivariate analyses showed this indicator to be related to NFE both when we looked at all respondents and just women, PIP and Tostan for the region of St. Louis (the relationship was not statistically significant when we looked at women in the regions of Thies and Diourbel).

4) Trust

It was hypothesized that interpersonal trust would increase with NFE. This hypothesis finds little support in the results of the bivariate analyses. Again, forced choice questions were used to

measure levels of trust. Respondents were asked whether they thought that nobody is going to care much about what happens to you or that you could depend on people to help you, when in a pinch. In fact, those with NFE are *less* likely to opt for the more trusting response than those without NFE, and the relationship between the general NFE variable and this indicator is statistically significant (see Question 53). Respondents were then asked if generally speaking, most people can be trusted or if you can't be too careful in dealing with people (see Question 54). This second indicator does not register a significant relationship with any of the programs except PIP. When the test for PIP is restricted to just women, the relationship with PIP is statistically significant, but the percentage of those with PIP who opt for the more trusting response is smaller than that of the control group. Moreover, although the other programs do not register significant relationships, for both the subgroups of Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis and women in Diourbel and Thies, those with Tostan are less likely to choose the trusting response than are those in the control group. Finally, respondents were asked whether people were more inclined to help others or to look out for themselves. Participation in Tostan has a significant association with the third indicator of interpersonal trust for the subgroup of Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis, with a higher percentage of the Tostan group choosing the trusting response (i.e., that people are more inclined to help others).

5) Individualism/Social Distance

It was also hypothesized that those who participated in NFE programs would exhibit higher levels of individualism than would those who have not participated in NFE programs. The respondents were therefore asked about the frequency with which they perceived that their opinions differed from (1) their relatives, (2) their friends, (3) other people in the village, and (4) other people in the country. In the bivariate analyses we look specifically at those who feel like their opinions differ from the relevant group at least on occasion (i.e., those who did *not* choose "never"). Those with NFE are much more likely to report that their views differ at least occasionally from their relatives, friends, fellow villagers and fellow Senegalese than are the respondents in the control group. When we look at women in Diourbel and Thies (see table A4), we see that only 59 percent of those without Tostan report that their opinions ever differ from their families, compared to 88 percent of those with Tostan. With the exception of PAPA, NFE and all of the individual program variables are found to be associated with all of these indicators. Although chi square tests of significance indicate that all of these indicators are independent of participation in PAPA, those who have PAPA are more likely to report having opinions that at least occasionally differ from the aforementioned reference groups than are those in the comparison group.

6) Support for Democratic Values

It was hypothesized that those with NFE would, on average, exhibit higher levels of political tolerance than those without NFE, although the relationship was not thought to be straightforward. Based on survey data from other countries in Africa, the author suspected that those with NFE would feel that those without NFE, or those who are not literate, should not have the right to vote. On the other hand, it was hypothesized that those with NFE would, on average, be more supportive of democratic values than those who do not have NFE. Five indicators are used to measure support for democratic values. The hypotheses find only mixed support in the results of the bivariate analyses. First, respondents were asked whether those who are not literate should have the right to vote (see Question 49). When we look at all respondents, the percent of NFE and non-NFE respondents who think that those who are not literate should have a right to vote is identical. In fact, the only statistically significant relationship that is found is that with Tostan when one looks at the subgroup of Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis. In this subgroup, although 82

percent of those without Tostan feel that those who are not literate should have the right to vote, only 72 percent of those with Tostan feel this way.

Similarly, respondents were asked to choose between the following declarations:

- 1) All people should be permitted to vote, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.
- 2) Only those who are sufficiently well-educated should vote.

NFE is related to this indicator, with a larger percentage of NFE respondents choosing the first option than of non-NFE respondents. That is, those with NFE tend to opt for the more tolerant declaration with greater relative frequency than do those without NFE. The relationship remains statistically significant when the analysis is restricted to only women. However, the only individual program with which this indicator is statistically significant in bivariate analyses is Tostan, and then it is only statistically significant for subgroup of females in Thies and Diourbel (See Table A.4).

Respondents were also asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "If people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party" (see Question 50A). Those who have NFE are much more likely to disagree with this statement than those in the control group. The relationship between this indicator and NFE is statistically significant, with, among women, only 12 percent of those in the non-NFE group disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with this statement, compared to 26 percent of those in the NFE group. This relationship is statistically significant for all of the programs and subgroups at which we looked with the exception of PAPA.

Respondents were also asked if they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "To compromise with one's opponents is dangerous because you betray your own side." The relationship between having NFE and this indicator is in fact statistically significant when all respondents are included in the test but a smaller percentage of those in the NFE group than those in the control group chose the more democratic response. When the analysis is restricted to women, however, the relationship is not statistically significant. The relationship is not statistically significant for any of the individual programs. The fifth indicator is also based on a forced choice question (see Question 51) which asked about people's rights to express dissenting views. While a few the relationships between NFE participation and this indicator approach significance, none are in fact statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

6) Locus of Control

It was hypothesized that, on average, people with NFE would be more likely to exhibit an internal locus of control than would those without NFE. That is, NFE is theorized to have an empowering effect on people. Therefore, people who have NFE, it is thought, are more likely to feel that they are active agents in creating their own life conditions than are those without NFE. This hypothesis finds some support in the results of the bivariate analyses.

The first indicator pertains to whether respondents see the government as being primarily responsible for their well-being or if they see themselves as being primarily responsible (see Question 67). Although the general NFE variable is not related to this indicator, participation in PAPA is, as is participation in Tostan for women in Diourbel and Thies. That is, those who have PAPA training are more likely to see themselves as responsible for their own well-being than are their counterparts in the control group. Among the subgroup of women in Diourbel and Thies,

those with Tostan training are also more likely to see themselves as opposed to the government as responsible for their well-being than are those in the comparison group.

The next indicator is based on a question in which respondents had to choose between whether accidental events or they themselves were primarily responsible for the way their lives had gone (See Question 64). Only participation in Tostan is related to this indicator, and this relationship is statistically significant among Pulaar-speakers in St. Louis. Among respondents in this subgroup, we can see that while only 33 percent of those without Tostan feel they are primarily responsible for what has happened in their lives, 49 percent of those who have Tostan feel this way.

The third indicator was based on a question in which respondents either had to choose between the declarations that they were often unable to protect their interests from bad luck happenings or almost certain to make their plans work (Question 65). No statistically significant relationships are found between this indicator and participation in NFE or the individual programs.

Finally, the last indicator of locus of control was based on the forced choice question:

- 1) Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.
- 2) With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.

While this indicator is not related to the aggregate NFE variable or participation in PAPA and PAPF, it is related to participation in PIP and Tostan across all of the subgroups examined. Those with PIP training are much more likely to choose the declaration that goals can be obtained through work and effort than are those in the comparison group. When we look at Pulaar speakers in St. Louis, we see that although only 59 percent of those without NFE choose this response, 78 percent of those with PIP do, and 71 percent of those with Tostan do.

Although I do not report the results of these analyses, perhaps it is worth noting that I used logit to examine the effect of years of NFE on all of the indicators included in the bivariate analyses. In these multivariate analyses, I controlled for potentially confounding variables such as income, age, gender, years of formal education, and ethnolinguistic group. All of the relationships found to be statistically significant in the bivariate analyses for the aggregate NFE variable are also statistically significant in the multivariate analyses¹² and, not surprisingly, several relationships that do not appear statistically significant in the bivariate are statistically significant once controls are introduced. More specifically, three of the voting variables are related to years of nonformal education in the hypothesized direction. In any case, the bivariate relationships will be more carefully scrutinized in multivariate analyses below.

Also, to be fair, it should be emphasized that, in the bivariate analyses, we could not control for the number of years one participated in the program and average number of years participated in the program is lowest for PAPA.

¹² I should note that in the case of one indicator of progressiveness, years of NFE and the ethnicity variables together seemed to engender some collinearity problems, and therefore the coefficient for years NFE was not significant when the ethnic variables were included in the equation. When the ethnic variables were dropped, it was highly significant.

Table 8: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having NFE and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for All Respondents

	Those without NFE		Those with NFE	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	707	39	773	58*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	709	61	774	86*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	708	83	774	93*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	594	43	724	67*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	709	52	774	71*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	708	19	773	47*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	709	66	774	71*
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	463	82	549	84
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	463	79	548	81
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	461	64	549	64
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	463	54	551	52
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	705	75	773	79
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	709	67	774	77*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	701	64	771	71*
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	684	80	763	82
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	683	49	767	45
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	682	70	767	70
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	691	80	766	78
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	694	61	772	72*
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	698	34	771	44*
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	644	34	670	47*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	691	52	769	60*
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-mindedness." (Question 73)	694	47	769	59*

Trust

Percent choosing, "For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch." (Question 53)	699	81	769	75*
Percent choosing, "Generally speaking, most people can be trusted." (Question 54)	676	31	762	27
Percent that thinks that "people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves." (Question 55)	695	45	767	44

Individualism/Cultural Distance

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A)	709	68	774	89*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B)	709	67	774	79*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C)	708	64	774	79*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D)	709	63	773	77*

Support for Democratic Values

Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49)	702	75	771	75
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A)	692	19	760	28
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E)	684	37	754	30*
Percent choosing, "All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election." (Question 52)	698	44	772	52*
Percent choosing, "If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them." (Question 51)	678	74	768	77

Locus of control

Percent choosing, "People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life." (Question 67)	698	57	769	52
Percent choosing "For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me." (Question 64)	675	36	757	38
Percent choosing, "When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work." (Question 65)	678	68	763	69
Percent choosing, "With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals." (Question 66)	697	74	770	79

*Difference in percentages between non-NFE and NFE respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table 9: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having NFE and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Female Respondents

	Those without NFE		Those with NFE	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	426	35	639	56*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	428	68	640	86*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	427	82	640	92*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	354	32	593	63*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	428	47	640	69*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	427	16	639	43*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	428	64	640	68
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	273	84	438	84
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	273	79	437	81
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	272	60	438	62
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	272	51	440	49
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	425	78	639	79
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	438	64	640	76*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	421	57	637	71*
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	413	78	629	81
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	416	48	633	45
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	410	70	634	71
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	416	76	633	77
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	418	55	638	71*
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	423	26	637	39*
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	390	32	568	48*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	402	51	572	62*
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-	403	48	571	56*

mindedness.” (Question 73)

Trust

Percent choosing, “For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.” (Question 53) 424 77 637 77

Percent choosing, “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.” (Question 54) 408 32 631 26*

Percent that thinks that “people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves.” (Question 55) 419 48 634 47

Individualism/Cultural Distance

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A) 428 65 640 82*

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B) 428 64 640 77*

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C) 427 59 640 78*

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D) 428 59 639 75*

Support for Democratic Values

Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49) 423 73 638 74

DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A) 420 12 628 26*

DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E) 414 35 627 31

Percent choosing, “All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.” (Question 52) 420 43 639 49*

Percent choosing, “If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.” (Question 51) 405 71 636 77

Locus of control

Percent choosing, “People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.” (Question 67) 423 48 635 52

Percent choosing “For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.” (Question 64) 408 34 626 37

Percent choosing, “When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.” (Question 65) 406 67 630 70

Percent choosing, “With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.” (Question 66) 421 73 637 78*

*Difference in percentages between non-NFE and NFE respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

SELECTIVE MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Multivariate analyses are used to check whether the results observed are actually due to variables not included in the analyses, such as age, income, gender, ethnolinguistic identity, and years of formal education.¹³ Also, it is important to see if the introduction of controls allows certain relationships to be detected that were not detected in the bivariate analyses. Indices were created from the indicators of the constructs enumerated in the first half of the report. Thus, there are indices for community participation, political interest/engagement, electoral participation, political efficacy, trust, progressiveness/authoritarianism, distance/individualization, support for democratic values, and locus of control.

Community Participation and Leadership

Although all of the indicators of community participation are related to NFE and all of the individual programs, I want to see how variables such as gender, age, ethnicity, income and formal schooling affect the observed relationships. An index of community participation was created by adding all of the indicators of community participation included in the bivariate analyses except number of organizations. Because the community participation variable is qualitative and ordinal in nature, ordinal logit is used to estimate the effects of the variables of interest on community participation.

Table 10: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Community Participation

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.4797326	.0352627	13.605	0.00
Years of formal Schooling	.0469452	.0154943	3.030	0.002
Income	.1034965	.0337887	3.063	0.002
Age	.0297359	.0040764	7.295	0.000
Gender	-.1049871	.118248	-0.888	0.375
Pulaar	.1949008	.132342	1.473	0.141
Wolof	-.1661589	.1348258	-1.232	0.218

Number of observations = 1313
 chi2(7) = 286.02
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -2290.1121
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0588

The estimated model is statistically significant. As is evident in Table 10, the estimated coefficients for the explanatory variables years of NFE, years of formal education, income and age of respondent are all statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The estimated coefficients for gender and ethnicity¹⁴ are not statistically significant.

¹³ Years of NFE and years of formal education are moderately correlated (r=0.1143).

¹⁴ In order to control for ethnolinguistic group in this model, dummy variables (i.e., variables that take on the value of 0 or 1 depending on whether they have the attribute of interest) were used for two out of the

As we can see in Table 10, the relationship between years of NFE and community participation is highly statistically significant in the hypothesized direction when other variables are controlled for. Years of formal education, income and age also have a positive impact on likelihood of participating in the community. Thus, it appears that those with more resources, be they social or financial, are more likely to be involved in the community. That age is associated with community involvement is not surprising given the way prestige and responsibilities increase concomitantly with age in traditional culture.

Since it is hard to assess the effects of NFE on community participation in the above model in any precise way, I examine how the likelihood of someone receiving the highest score possible on the community participation scale changes when the values for all of the explanatory variables but years of NFE are held constant.¹⁵ The sample mean is used for formal education and age, while the modal category was used for income. In Table 11, the effects of NFE on the likelihood of having the highest level of community participation possible as measured on our scale is examined for Pulaar women (see Appendix G for the effects for the other groups represented in the sample, such as Pulaar men, Wolof women, Wolof men and Serer women). Since formal education is of interest as well, changes in the likelihood of high community participation are also examined at different levels of formal education while the other variables, including NFE, are held constant.

Table 11: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Community Participation for Pulaar Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of High Community Participation Level for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of High Community Participation Level for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.09	.07 to .11	.14	.12 to .17
1	.13	.11 to .16	.15	.12 to .17
1.27	.15	.13 to .18	.15	.12 to .18
1.7	.18	.15 to .21	.15	.13 to .18
2	.20	.17 to .23	.15	.13 to .18
2.4	.23	.20 to .27	.16	.13 to .18
3	.29	.25 to .33	.16	.13 to .19
4	.40	.34 to .46	.17	.14 to .20
6	.63	.55 to .71	.18	.15 to .21
6.6	.69	.61 to .77	.18	.15 to .22
7	.73	.65 to .81	.19	.15 to .23

three major ethnolinguistic groups covered in the study (the other ethnic groups are grouped with Serer since they represented only 6 percent of the sample). Hence, two of the control variables in this model represent ethnic groups. One of the three variables representing ethnicity is, of course, always excluded from the model as including it would create a situation of perfect multicollinearity and estimation would be impossible. In addition, to avoid collinearity problems, I could not control for region and ethnicity in the same model. I felt ethnolinguistic group was more pertinent than region.

¹⁵ CLARIFY was the software package used to calculate the marginal probabilities: Michael Tomz, Jason Wittenberg, and Gary King (1999). CLARIFY: Software for Interpreting and Presenting Statistical Results. Version 1.2.1 Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, June 1. <http://gking.harvard.edu/>.

10	.92	.87 to .95	.21	.16 to .26
12	*	*	.22	.16 to .29
20	*	*	.30	.18 to .43

From the table, it is evident that NFE increases the likelihood of having a very high level of community participation at an increasing rate. The likelihood of a high level of community participation increases by only four percent with the first year of NFE but increases by another seven percent with an additional year of NFE. The likelihood of engaging in all of the behaviors associated with community participation is about 15 percent at the mean number of years of NFE. We can also see that each year of NFE has a larger effect on community participation than formal education.

Seeing if the individual programs included in the study are also related to community participation in the direction hypothesized once controls are introduced is important too. All of the individual programs have a statistically significant positive effect on the likelihood of participating in the community (see Appendix F).

Interest/Engagement in Politics

The values of three of the indicators discussed earlier were added to create the index of interest/engagement in politics: 1) whether one is at least somewhat interested in politics, 2) whether one discusses politics at least sometimes, and 3) whether one feels close to a political party. Ordinal logit is used to assess the effects of years of NFE on interest in politics while controlling for other variables.

Table 12: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Interest/Engagement in Politics

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.1330273	.0337306	3.944	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.0617147	.0175218	3.522	0.000
Income	.0032822	.0346427	0.095	0.925
Age	.0139456	.0043083	3.237	0.001
Gender	-.1407957	.1256722	-1.120	0.263
Pulaar	-.1029323	.1417747	-0.726	0.468
Wolof	.1164601	.1466133	0.794	0.427

Number of observations= 1306
chi2(7) = 40.29
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log Likelihood = -1528.8728
Pseudo R2 = 0.0130

As we can see from Table 12, the estimated coefficients for years of nonformal education, years of formal schooling and age are all statistically significant, as is the model as a whole. Years of

NFE increases the probability that one will be interested and engaged in politics, as does formal schooling. This finding is consistent with the vast literature relating education to political participation. Curiously, income does not appear related to interest in politics. When multivariate models are used to assess the effects of the individual programs, years of PIP, Tostan, and PAPA all have a statistically significant positive effect on the probability of being interested and engaged in politics, although PAPF does not.

Once again, in order to better understand the effects of NFE on the probability of being engaged in politics, the effects of different levels of NFE on the probability of being highly engaged in politics are examined while all of the control variables are held constant. Since formal education is of interest as well, changes in the likelihood of engagement are also examined at different levels of formal education while the other variables, including NFE, are held constant. Table 13 displays the probabilities for Wolof men (please see Appendix G for the probability tables of other subgroups included in the sample).

Table 13: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Engaged in Politics for Wolof Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.53	.46 to .60	.55	.48 to .61
1	.57	.50 to .63	.57	.50 to .63
1.27	.58	.51 to .64	.57	.51 to .63
1.7	.59	.52 to .65	.58	.51 to .64
2	.60	.53 to .66	.58	.51 to .64
2.4	.61	.55 to .68	.59	.52 to .65
3	.63	.56 to .70	.60	.53 to .66
4	.66	.58 to .73	.61	.54 to .67
6	.72	.62 to .80	.64	.56 to .71
6.6	.73	.63 to .81	.65	.57 to .72
7	.74	.64 to .82	.65	.57 to .72
10	.81	.69 to .89	.69	.60 to .77
12	*	*	.72	.62 to .80
20	*	*	.80	.68 to .89

As we can see in Table 13, the probability of having all three attributes of high political engagement increases by about three percent with each year of NFE. At the mean level of NFE for the sample, the probability of having such high engagement is about 58 percent for Wolof men. At the mean level of NFE among those with NFE (2.4 years), it is about 61 percent. The difference in the probability of exhibiting a high level of political engagement between someone with no NFE and someone with the maximum number of years is 28 percent. On the other hand, we can see the probability of having high political engagement increases by only between one and two percent for each year of formal education.

Efficacy

All four of the political efficacy indicators were added to create the political efficacy index. It was thought that multivariate analysis might clarify the relationship between feelings of political efficacy and NFE. However, none of the estimated coefficients in this model are statistically significant. Moreover, the model is not statistically significant. When ordinal logit is used to assess the effects for the individual programs, both Tostan and PAPF are found to have statistically significant positive effect on the likelihood of feeling politically efficacious. However, the models are not statistically significant.

Authoritarianism/Progressiveness

The progressiveness/authoritarianism index was created by adding the values of all of the indicators discussed under this rubric in the bivariate analyses. Again, ordinal logit is used to assess the effects of years of NFE and other control variables on progressiveness.

Table 14: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Progressiveness/ Authoritarianism

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.2280247	.0318937	7.150	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.1007465	.016055	6.275	0.000
Income	.0571908	.0337995	1.692	0.091
Age	-.0003694	.0040779	-0.091	0.928
Gender	-.3322897	.1189151	-2.794	0.005
Pulaar	.5838433	.138931	4.202	0.000
Wolof	.0869429	.1423636	0.611	0.541

Number of observations: 1250
chi2(7) = 152.19
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log Likelihood = -2041.63
Pseudo R2 = 0.0359

From Table 14, we can see that nonformal education increases the likelihood that one will express progressive ideas. The estimated coefficients for years of formal schooling, gender, and the Pulaar variable are also statistically significant. Formal schooling also has a positive effect on the likelihood of being progressive. That gender has a negative coefficient reflects the fact that the women in the sample tend to opt for responses that indicate a less progressive/more authoritarian orientation with greater frequency than do men. This finding is consistent with other studies that find that women are more conservative than men are (e.g., Gibson et al. 1992; Finifter and Mickiewicz 1992). The positive relationship for Pulaar reflects the fact that Pulaar respondents opted for responses that indicate a more progressive orientation with greater frequency than did Wolof and Serer respondents and those in other ethnic groups. When similar multivariate models were run for the individual programs, only Tostan and PIP were found to have a positive impact

on the probability of having progressive attitudes. In order to see the effects of NFE on the probability of having a progressive orientation with greater clarity, once again the changes in the probability of scoring highly on the progressive/authoritarian scale are examined at different levels of NFE while the values for the other explanatory variables are held constant. The same is done for formal education.

Table 15: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation in Politics for Pulaar Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.32	.25 to .39	.34	.28 to .41
1	.37	.30 to .44	.37	.30 to .43
1.27	.38	.32 to .45	.37	.31 to .44
1.7	.41	.34 to .48	.38	.32 to .45
2	.42	.35 to .49	.39	.32 to .46
2.4	.44	.37 to .52	.40	.34 to .47
3	.48	.40 to .56	.41	.34 to .49
4	.53	.44 to .63	.44	.36 to .51
6	.64	.53 to .77	.49	.41 to .57
6.6	.67	.55 to .81	.50	.42 to .59
7	.69	.56 to .83	.51	.43 to .60
10	.81	.60 to 1	.59	.48 to .70
12	*	*	.63	.52 to .76
20	*	*	.79	.58 to .99

From the table, we can see that NFE has a substantial impact on the likelihood of having a progressive social orientation: with each year of NFE, the likelihood increases by around five percent. After a two year NFE program, the likelihood of having a progressive social orientation is 42 percent. By contrast, after two years of formal education, the likelihood would be around 39 percent. We can see that one year of NFE has a greater impact on the likelihood of having progressive social values than does one year of formal education.

Trust

The trust index was created by adding the values of the trust indicators. Neither the aggregate years of NFE variable nor any of the individual program variables are related to interpersonal trust as measured by the trust index.

Social Distance/Individualization

The individualization index is an index created by adding all of the values of the indicators for individualization that were examined in the bivariate analyses. Ordinal logit is used to assess the effects of years of NFE and other variables on individualization.

Table 16: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Social Distance/Individualization

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.1263885	.0347521	3.637	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.0500165	.0176024	2.841	0.004
Income	.1746412	.03902	4.476	0.000
Age	-.0140643	.0041971	-3.351	0.001
Gender	-.3694644	.1275433	-2.897	0.004
Pulaar	-.2414142	.1469972	-1.642	0.101
Wolof	-.4309615	.149631	-2.880	0.004

Number of observations = 1317
 chi2(7) = 76.06
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -1648.5183
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0225

The estimated coefficients for all but one of the explanatory variables are statistically significant; that is, only the variable representing Pulaar is not statistically significant. We hypothesized that nonformal education would increase “individualization.” People with nonformal education become more aware of themselves and their ideas and therefore acknowledge that their ideas are not always the same as those around them. Years of formal schooling functions in much the same way. Income is a classic force of stratification and differentiation, so it is not all surprising that it is statistically significant in this model. That the coefficient for age is negative is also not surprising since we would expect older people to have more of a traditional, collectivist orientation than younger people. Women have also had less access to the type of experiences that would encourage individualization than men have, so the negative sign in front of the coefficient for gender is not so surprising.

Support for Democratic Values

Since the results of the bivariate analyses do not give a very clear picture of the relationship between nonformal education and support for democratic values, I use multivariate analyses to further examine the relationship. The index of support for democratic values was created by adding all but one of the indicators for democratic values included in the bivariate analyses. The indicator concerning compromise (Question 50E) was *not* found to be related to the other democratic value indicators and was therefore not included in the index. Once again, an ordinal logit model is used to assess the effects of NFE while controlling for years of formal schooling, income, age, gender and ethnicity.

Table 17: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Support for Democratic Values

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.1230921	.032437	3.795	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.1696085	.017439	9.726	0.000
Income	.025961	.0341055	0.761	0.447
Age	.0156833	.0041512	3.778	0.000
Gender	-.4663157	.1215595	-3.836	0.000
Pulaar	.2031153	.1393578	1.458	0.145
Wolof	-.2183639	.14326	-1.524	0.127

Number of observations: 1256
 chi2(7) = 157.27
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -1739.247
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0433

From the table, it is evident that the estimated coefficients for years of NFE, years of formal schooling, age and gender are all statistically significant. Therefore both NFE and formal schooling increase the likelihood that one will support democratic values. Again, that the coefficient for gender is statistically significant is consistent with the findings that women are, on average, more conservative than men are. When similar analyses were done to assess the effects of the individual programs, both years of PIP and years of Tostan were found to have statistically significant effects in the hypothesized direction. Neither years of PAPA nor years of PAPF were found to be related to support for democratic values.

In order to clarify the results of NFE on the probability of supporting democratic values and compare the effects of NFE with formal schooling, the changes in probability of supporting democratic values are examined at levels of NFE with the other explanatory variables held constant. This procedure is repeated for formal education. Although Table 18 displays the probability levels for Wolof women, similar tables for the remaining subgroups are found in Appendix I.

Table 18: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Supportive of Democratic Values for Wolof Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.06	.05 to .08	.06	.04 to .07
1	.07	.05 to .09	.06	.05 to .08

1.27	.07	.06 to .09	.07	.05 to .08
1.7	.08	.06 to .09	.07	.06 to .09
2	.08	.06 to .10	.08	.06 to .09
2.4	.08	.06 to .10	.08	.06 to .10
3	.09	.07 to .11	.09	.07 to .11
4	.10	.07 to .13	.10	.08 to .13
6	.12	.09 to .17	.14	.11 to .17
6.6	.13	.09 to .18	.15	.12 to .19
7	.14	.09 to .20	.16	.12 to .20
10	.19	.11 to .30	.24	.18 to .31
12	*	*	.31	.23 to .40
20	*	*	.63	.48 to .76

As we can see from Table 18, when the values of all other variables are held constant, and years of NFE is 0, the probability of choosing the democratic response for all four of the indicators is only six percent. With each year of NFE, the probability increases by about one percentage point among Wolof women. At the maximum number of NFE years reported, the probability of exhibiting a high level of support for democratic values is 19 percent. Formal education appears to have a stronger effect on support for democratic attitudes than nonformal education. Although there is little change in the probability for supporting democratic attitudes for the first few years of education, the “payoff” of each year of formal education starts to increase after about four years.

Locus of Control

The locus of control index was created by adding all of the individual indicators of locus of control except for the indicator pertaining to individual versus governmental responsibility (Q67). This indicator was dropped because it appeared to tap another dimension of the construct of locus of control than the other four indicators. It was hoped that multivariate analyses would allow one to more thoroughly discern the relationship between nonformal education and locus of control.

Table 19: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Locus of Control

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.0812265	.0315403	2.575	0.010
Years of Formal Schooling	.0267747	.0161042	1.663	0.096
Income	-.0056935	.0339929	-0.167	0.867
Age	.0004261	.0042145	0.101	0.919
Gender	-.1687958	.1232332	-1.370	0.171
Pulaar	.0947635	.1415648	0.669	0.503
Wolof	.4216601	.1451919	2.904	0.004

Number of observations = 1255
chi2(7) = 21.50

Prob > chi2 = 0.0031
 Log Likelihood = -1558.092
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0069

We can see from the Table 19 that only two of the estimated coefficients are statistically significant: years of nonformal education and Wolof. Nonformal education increases the likelihood that people will see themselves as opposed to other people and forces as the primary agent driving their destiny. When similar analyses were done for the individual programs, only years of Tostan had a statistically significant effect on locus of control.

Table 20: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Electoral Participation

Using multivariate analyses to assess the effect of NFE on electoral participation seemed especially important since age was suspected to be a confounding factor in the bivariate analyses. The electoral participation index was created by adding the scores of the four voting indicators.

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.1013724	.0379126	2.674	0.007
Years of Formal Schooling	.0232242	.0200393	1.159	0.246
Income	.0540016	.0394551	1.369	0.171
Age	.0752496	.0063905	11.775	0.000
Gender	.3819316	.150733	2.534	0.011
Pulaar	.0620423	.1739274	0.357	0.721
Wolof	.2379536	.1763575	1.349	0.177

Number of observations= 890
 chi2(7) = 180.09
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -1134.9286
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0735

As is evident from Table 20, the estimated coefficients for nonformal education, age, and gender are statistically significant. Interestingly, while years of nonformal education appears have a positive effect on the probability of voting, formal education does not. As suspected, the relationship between age and voting is statistically significant. When similar analyses were done for the individual programs, PAPA and PAPF were also found to have statistically significant, positive relationships with electoral participation. No relationship was found for PIP. Although years of Tostan did not register a statistically significant relationship with the voting index, whether one participated or not in Tostan was found to have a statistically significant relationship with the voting index.

Table 21: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Electoral Participation for Serer Women

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Highest Level of Electoral Participation	95% Confidence Interval
0	.39	.33 to .47
1	.42	.35 to .49
1.27	.43	.36 to .50
2	.44	.38 to .52
2.4	.45	.38 to .53
3	.47	.39 to .55
4	.49	.41 to .58
6	.54	.44 to .65
10	.64	.47 to .78

As we can see in Table 21, the probability of having the highest level of electoral participation as measured by the voting index increases by about two to three percent with each year of nonformal education.¹⁶ At the average number of years of NFE for the whole sample, 1.27 years, the probability of having a higher level of electoral participation is forty-three percent. After two years of NFE, the probability is forty-four percent. The probability of having a high level of electoral participation increases notably between the minimum and maximum years of NFE. At one year of NFE, the value is 39 percent while at ten years it is 64 percent for a difference of 25 percent (see Appendix J for the probability tables for other subgroups of the sample).

Registering to Vote

Again, since age was an obvious confounding factor in the bivariate analyses, a logit model is used to assess the effects of years of NFE on the probability of registering vote while other variables are controlled for.

Table 22: Logit-Estimated Effects of Nonformal Education and General Control Variables on Registering to Vote

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of nonformal education	.2204829	.0436484	5.051	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.0015913	.019757	0.081	0.936
Income	.1605332	.0508719	3.156	0.002
Age	.0984739	.0078448	12.553	0.000
Gender	.1680074	.158888	1.057	0.290

¹⁶ The respondents in the study sample almost certainly over-reported their electoral participation, and therefore the figures for electoral participation will be somewhat inflated. The inflation of voting rates is common in this type of study (e.g., see Bratton 1999).

Pulaar	.1540842	.1795096	0.858	0.391
Wolof	.0155594	.1835093	0.085	0.932
Constant	-2.832594	.3271469	-8.658	0.000

Number of observations=1319
chi2(7) = 278.53
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log Likelihood = -686.00117
Pseudo R2 = 0.1688

The model as a whole is statistically significant, and three of the seven estimated coefficients are statistically significant: those for years of NFE, age and income. When similar multivariate analyses were done to clarify the relationships of the individual programs, all of the programs were found to have a statistically significant, positive impact on the probability of registering to vote. That NFE and income are statistically significant fits nicely with the resource theory of political participation, according to which, those with the most resources, both social and financial, will be most likely to participate politically. The likelihood of registering to vote is examined at different levels of NFE in Table 23.

Table 23: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Registering to Vote for Pulaar Women

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Registering to Vote	95% Confidence Interval
0	.70	.63 to .75
1	.74	.69 to .79
1.27	.75	.70 to .79
1.7	.77	.72 to .81
2	.78	.74 to .82
2.4	.79	.75 to .83
3	.82	.77 to .85
4	.85	.80 to .88
6	.89	.85 to .93
6.6	.91	.86 to .94
7	.91	.86 to .95
10	.95	.90 to .98

As we can see in Table 23, the likelihood of registering to vote increases by about four percent among Pulaar women for each year of NFE. After a two-year NFE program, the likelihood of registering to vote is 78%. The difference in likelihood of registering to vote at the minimum number of years of NFE is 74 percent, while the likelihood at the maximum number of years reported is 95 percent, for a difference of 21 percent. (See Appendix K for the probability tables of other subgroups in the sample.)

DISCUSSION

Nonformal education works much the same as formal education in instilling democratic attitudes. The results of this study indicate that nonformal education and formal education tend to have similar effects on many political orientations. However, in most cases, one year of NFE has a stronger effect on the orientation of interest than does formal education. Of course, formal education is intended to last much longer than NFE. Moreover, the target populations for these two types of education are different. All of the NFE programs at which I looked targeted adults, but formal education obviously targets children.¹⁷

- **NFE Has a Positive Impact on Community Participation**

The effect of NFE on community participation is perhaps the most notable finding. Those with NFE are more likely than those without NFE to report: 1) cooperating with others to solve a community problem; 2) belonging to a community organization; 3) holding a leadership position within an organization; 4) attending organizational meetings at least occasionally; 5) speaking out at meetings at least occasionally; and 6) getting together with others to raise an issue. NFE is also positively related to the number of community organizations to which an individual belongs.

The relationships involving nonformal education and community participation are strong and robust. First, nearly all of the indicators are statistically significant across all of the programs and subgroups (that is, across ethnolinguistic groups and regions of the country). Second, years of NFE registers statistically significant relationships with all of the indicators of community participation in multivariate analyses that control for formal education, gender, age, ethnicity, and income. Third, years of NFE and all of the individual program variables register statistically significant, positive relationships with the index of community involvement and leadership in multivariate analyses that include the control variables. In other words, each year of NFE increases the probability that one will have a high level of community involvement and leadership.

The findings indicate that the NFE experience engenders something other than collectivism and togetherness. Oxenham (1980) and Ong (1982) have claimed that literacy renders one more self-conscious. Such introspection does not undermine sociability because as one becomes more aware of self, one also becomes more aware in interactions with others. In fact, from the results of this study, it would seem that NFE does increase this type of individual consciousness. As noted earlier, those with nonformal education find that their views differ from those around them with greater frequency than those do those in the control group. At the same time, NFE encourages higher levels of participation in the community and thus encourages interactions with others, perhaps outside the immediate family.

- **NFE Contributes to Women's Empowerment**

Women are overrepresented in NFE programs partly because of their exclusion from formal education. Thus, NFE is in some ways a compensatory measure taken to help improve the situation of women. The results of this study indicate that NFE makes a significant contribution to the empowerment of women. NFE increases the probability that women will participate in the

¹⁷ That is not to say that these organizations did not have components that worked with children. However, I was specifically interested in the programs centered on adults.

community and take on leadership positions. NFE also increases the likelihood that women will become politically active. As noted, participation in community organizations leads women to acquire civic skills and generally renders them more efficacious in the political realm. Hence, it is likely that the initial effects of NFE will be built upon by women's experiences in community organizations and activities.

- **NFE Has a Positive Impact on Political Participation**

NFE does indeed appear to have a positive impact on political participation. Those who have nonformal education are more likely to discuss politics with others and belong to a political party. In multivariate analyses, PAPA, Tostan, and PIP are also found to have a statistically significant, positive relationship with engagement/interest in politics. NFE also increases the likelihood that one will register to vote. Participation in all of the individual programs in the study is positively associated with registering to vote. PAPA and PAPP appear to be the programs most strongly related to electoral participation. Of course, electoral participation and civic participation are not necessarily synonymous in Senegal. In Senegal, citizens tend to pursue narrow individual interests via electoral participation as opposed to more generalized interests. Indeed, the lack of policy debate during electoral campaigns reflects the sometimes personal-interest driven, myopic nature of the political sphere in Senegal.

There does not appear to be a relationship between feelings of political efficacy and NFE. That the effects of nonformal education are ambiguous at most in regard to feelings of political efficacy is perhaps, upon reflection, not so surprising. An empirical evaluation of the performance of the political system would not necessarily lead one to be an optimist about direct change occurring at the level of the community due to electoral behavior. Tostan's objectives are imbued with notions of empowering participants and inspiring the types of feelings of efficacy like those about which we ask, so it is not too surprising that Tostan is one of the programs to show a relationship with this variable in multivariate analyses (the other program showing a relationship is PAPP). Still the relationships appear weak and do not seem to be robust across different specifications of the model. Thus, we cannot speak with much confidence about the relationship between political efficacy and NFE.

- **NFE Promotes Progressive and Democratic Attitudes**

Those who have had NFE are likely to be more progressive and less authoritarian and traditional than those who have not had NFE. The relationships are limited to the programs of Tostan and PIP, but the effects are consistent across regions and ethnolinguistic groups.

What is particularly interesting about the findings regarding the traditionalism/authoritarianism indicators is that a program that does not explicitly attempt to impart social messages tended to have the same effects as one that does. Indeed, it would be hard to argue that these effects are closely tied to the content (i.e., in terms of topics covered in the class) of the program since PIP does not explicitly address these types of issues in its program. However, PIP "facilitators," like those of Tostan, have been trained in participatory methods. Perhaps there is something about having the experience of being part of a participatory learning environment that encourages a more progressive way of thinking. Indeed, perhaps PIP is fulfilling its goal of "opening a window to the world." Although promoting literacy in national languages may not function as the integrative force that the modernization scholars theorized, NFE has seemed to decrease levels of traditionalism and authoritarianism.

NFE also has a positive relationship with support for democratic values, although the relationship was not as strong as with authoritarianism/traditionalism. Once again, when I looked at the individual programs using multivariate analyses, only the programs of PIP and Tostan were found to have a statistically significant relationship with support for democratic values.

Finifter and Mickiewicz (1992) observe:

In general, cultural theories suggest that democratization will develop most rapidly in the nontraditional sectors of the nation—that is, among the young and better-educated; in the cities, rather than in the rural areas; in the service, rather than the agricultural, sectors in the economy; and probably among men, as compared to women (858).

This study covers the most traditional sectors of Senegal. All of the respondents are from rural areas, the vast majority of respondents are women, and the vast majority of the male respondents are farmers. Among those women who did not report being a housewife as their primary occupation, the majority said they were farmers. Hence, the substantial effect NFE has had on those in the most traditional sectors of society seems quite extraordinary and points to the prominent role NFE could play in social transformation more generally.

While the findings do seem to indicate that the content of a program matters vis-à-vis certain types of effects, they also indicate that simply participating in a nonformal education program has important effects. Two years appeared to be the threshold period for many of the important effects of literacy programs to take place. That is an additional year of literacy training still generates desirable effects as does only a year of training, but two years seems to be key for certain effects (*but not all*) to manifest themselves. PAPF is considering moving to a 24 month program. The findings of this study indicate that such a move could be beneficial to participants. Although civic education classes may teach specific lessons on democratic behavior, nonformal education might potentially have a strong impact on democratic orientation without explicitly incorporating political lessons into its curriculum. Of course, were programs to include such lessons, perhaps the impacts would be even greater than that which we have seen in this study.

• **Effects Likely to Intensify Over Time**

It seems reasonable to assume that not all of NFE's effects are immediate or direct. Indeed, participation in the community should mediate and intensify other effects. Brady et al. (1995) find that education increases one's involvement in voluntary organizations and activities, which increases one's civic skills, which in turn increases one's level of political participation. Thus, while NFE may have an immediate impact on political engagement and electoral participation, it is likely to also have a more indirect effect on political participation via community participation. In the long run, participation in the community is theorized to increase interpersonal trust and support for democratic values.

In summary, NFE appears to have the strongest positive effects on:

- Community participation and leadership
- Interest and engagement in politics
- Electoral participation
- Registering to vote
- Progressive and democratic attitudes
- Individualism/Autonomy

While it is true that analyses of larger samples tend to show even small relationships, nearly all of the relationships identified in the analyses of all respondents were also statistically significant when these analyses were restricted to small subgroups of the sample. Moreover, the findings of the bivariate analyses were largely consistent with those of the multivariate analyses.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Most NFE programs have multiple goals, and creating and generating civism is not among the goals stated by many programs. However, the results of this study support the notion that education is intrinsically linked to political orientation. Even a relatively brief exposure to NFE can generate positive effects. This study does not point to any failures among the programs, but rather indicates that more time and attention should be dedicated to the conception and implementation of literacy classes since the role NFE can play in social transformation is potentially substantial. Since most NFE programs were not constructed with the purpose of inspiring democratic behaviors and orientations, it is not really possible to discuss successes and failures across the programs.

- **Participatory Methods, Two-Year Time Frame and Emphasis on the Development of the Individual**

Directly comparing programs is risky because these programs do not have identical target populations and many other factors can explain the differences that we see among them. In addition, all of these programs seem to produce the same types of effects. One can, however, look at program characteristics that seem to produce positive effects. For example, participatory methods and a two-year time frame seem to facilitate the generation of certain types of effects. (Of course, additional years of NFE beyond the two would be very beneficial, but many adults are unable to commit to being in a program over two years.)

Tostan is perhaps the program that shows the most consistent and strongest effects on the variables related to civic orientation and behavior. Indeed, participation in Tostan was found to be related to the majority of the behavioral and attitudinal orientations studied. Tostan's emphasis on the development of the individual appears to yield positive results. If the types of changes reviewed in this report are deemed as desirable, perhaps more NFE programs should adopt the goal of the development of the individual.

PIP's activities appear to have a profound positive effect on levels of community participation in the Fouta. Although experience with PIP is not related to the voting index, participation in PIP is related to political engagement in terms of discussing politics, feeling close to a political party and registering to vote. In addition, PIP seems to have engendered true attitudinal changes in its participants, which is an impressive accomplishment.

PAPF also appears to be instrumental in increasing levels of community participation in the regions it covers. Participation in PAPF seems to have strong, positive effects on electoral participation and registering to vote. Participation in PAPF is related to some of the attitudes of interest in this study, but not all that strongly and consistently. Over time, these effects on attitudes might be intensified for reasons enumerated earlier. In any case, it seems fair to say that this program, which focuses on women, is contributing to the empowerment of women in the regions in which it works.

PAPA, perhaps because of its brief timeline and more dispersed nature, is the program that overall appears to have the smallest effect on the behaviors and attitudes on which this study focused. On the other hand, PAPA does appear to have strong, positive effects on political engagement, electoral participation and registering to vote. Moreover, participation in PAPA does appear to stimulate community participation and leadership.

- **Sensitivity to Needs and Constraints of the Target Population**

In pointing out the benefits associated with a two-year time frame, I do not mean to ignore the burdens and constraints faced by many of those living in rural areas, especially women. Since potential participants face real constraints on their time, those implementing NFE programs must take these constraints into consideration when formulating the program. PIP has a "village" approach, and carefully constructs the literacy program around the needs and availability of those in each village. This approach appears to work well. Making NFE programs as widely accessible as possible so that status differences do not become reinforced while some people are simply left out of the development process altogether is important.

- **Draw on Existing Research and Expertise: Symbiotic Relationships between Organizations**

Those formulating and implementing programs that already exist can draw upon the expertise and resources of NGOs such as Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED/CERFLA), which works in the area of education and research in national languages, particularly Pulaar. ARED's multifarious programs and activities fall into three basic categories: 1) the editing and publishing of books; 2) the development of training modules or educational curriculum to be used by literacy programs throughout the nation of Senegal, and 3) the provision of trainings for literacy teachers. NGOs, like this one, can play a supportive role to the work that is being done in the field and help expand the capacities of local "operators" so that they can better meet the demands and needs in the field.

- **Follow-up Training, Activities and Seminars**

Although increasing the length of basic programs beyond two years might not be desirable given the time constraints of potential participants, follow-up activities could generate some very positive effects. Having an optional additional third year of training in which neophytes can deepen and consolidate their literacy skills and gain knowledge about subjects pertinent to their lives is ideal. Follow-up activities and seminars can help maintain and intensify the momentum created by the programs. Length of exposure to literacy programs seems to be an important factor in the generation of effects. Theoretically, one can imagine many reasons why this might be the case. First, more of the "treatment" may very well produce more of the effect. Second, people would be less likely to lapse into old ways with the continued stimulus of follow-up activities. They would continue to feel connected to forces outside of the village.

- **Materials Intended to Promote Democratic Values**

The results of the analyses pertaining to support for democratic values would indicate that changes in this area take some time. Moreover, if the increase in support for democratic values is really an important goal, more explicit material related to this subject should be introduced in class.

CONCLUSION

NFE walks a line between two forces: being an authentic manifestation of the local culture and serving as “a window to the world.” On the one hand, NFE can serve to affirm and valorize indigenous culture and language. In so doing, NFE can draw upon and reinforce local knowledge and capacities. At the same time, NFE programs can allow people to connect with forces outside of their families and villages and thereby decrease the insularity of villages. Generally speaking, it does seem that people want to connect with something beyond their village and widen their horizons. By allowing people to make this connection and feel this dynamism in their own village, NFE could make migration to cities and towns less attractive.

Some evaluators of NFE programs have been unimpressed by testimonies that increased solidarity and mutual aid resulted from literacy programs. Since cooperation is at the heart of addressing community issues and self-governance, these effects have not received the attention they merit. Indeed, it is human beings inability to voluntarily cooperate to achieve coordinated action in the pursuit of the public good that necessitates government in the first place. What does seem clear from the results of the study is that NFE is about much more than acquiring literacy skills or learning about thematic areas of importance. NFE constitutes a social experience that confers a type of social capital upon the learners and community alike. And it is social capital that Putnam claims is “the key to making democracy work” (1993, 185).

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS

Table A.1: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having PIP Training and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Haalpulaar Respondents in St. Louis

	Those without PIP		Those with PIP	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	140	34	168	46*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	140	62	168	86*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	140	81	168	95*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	115	49	159	71*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	140	54	168	73*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	140	17	168	57*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	140	66	168	67
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	91	79	114	78
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	91	73	113	76
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	91	66	113	55
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	92	60	115	43
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	140	51	168	47
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	140	60	168	74*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	140	54	167	69*
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	138	80	168	79
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	136	44	168	34
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	135	70	168	66
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	137	82	167	77
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	139	68	168	79*
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	139	32	168	50*
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	114	32	85	52*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	140	46	101	60*

Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-mindedness." (Question 73)	139	65	168	79*
Trust				
Percent choosing, "For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch." (Question 53)	140	62	167	58
Percent choosing, "Generally speaking, most people can be trusted." (Question 54)	138	26	167	19
Percent that thinks that "people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves." (Question 55)	138	22	167	25
Individualism/Cultural Distance				
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A)	140	67	168	86*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B)	140	64	168	83*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C)	139	59	168	83*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D)	140	62	168	82*
Support for Democratic Values				
Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49)	136	82	167	80
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A)	138	18	165	33
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E)	138	22	166	21
Percent choosing, "All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election." (Question 52)	139	58	167	68
Percent choosing, "If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them." (Question 51)	137	75	168	80
Locus of control				
Percent choosing, "People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life." (Question 67)	139	50	168	40
Percent choosing "For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me." (Question 64)	140	33	167	38
Percent choosing, "When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work." (Question 65)	139	71	167	71
Percent choosing, "With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals." (Question 66)	140	59	168	78*

*Difference in percentages between non-PIP and PIP respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table A.2: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having PIP Training and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Haalpulaar Women Respondents in St. Louis

	Women without PIP		Women with PIP	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	97	24	114	40*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	97	66	114	84*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	97	79	114	93*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	78	36	106	68*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	97	51	114	69*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	97	18	114	54*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	97	68	114	61
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	66	79	70	81
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	66	71	69	78
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	66	64	69	54
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	66	56	71	35*
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	97	70	114	70
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	97	57	114	71*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	97	55	113	67
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	96	77	114	75
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	96	42	114	34
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	93	70	114	68
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	94	82	114	75
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	97	68	114	76
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	97	29	114	44*
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	83	31	61	57*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	97	44	114	64*
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-	97	68	114	81*

mindedness.” (Question 73)				
Percent choosing, “Thanks to modernization, the caste system is now obsolete.” (Question 74)	95	17	113	18
Trust				
Percent choosing, “For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.” (Question 53)	97	62	114	60
Percent choosing, “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.” (Question 54)	96	30	114	18*
Percent that thinks that “people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves.” (Question 55)	95	23	114	32
Individualism/Cultural Distance				
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A)	97	64	114	83*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B)	97	60	114	80*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C)	96	54	114	80*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D)	97	56	114	78*
Support for Democratic Values				
Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49)	93	80	114	75
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A)	95	14	111	28*
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E)	97	23	113	22
Percent choosing, “All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.” (Question 52)	96	59	114	61
Percent choosing, “If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.” (Question 51)	94	74	114	79
Locus of control				
Percent choosing, “People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.” (Question 67)	97	42	114	41
Percent choosing “For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.” (Question 64)	97	31	114	35
Percent choosing, “When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.” (Question 65)	96	67	114	72
Percent choosing, “With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.” (Question 66)	97	57	114	79*

*Difference in percentages between non-PIP and PIP respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table A.3: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having Tostan Training and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Haalpulaar Respondents in St. Louis

	Respondents without Tostan		Respondents with Tostan	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	140	31	124	59*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	140	62	124	85*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	140	81	124	92*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	115	49	116	77*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	140	54	124	68*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	140	16	123	40*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	140	66	124	63
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	91	79	78	82
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	91	73	78	77
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	91	66	78	56
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	92	60	78	37*
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	140	70	124	73
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	140	60	124	83*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	140	54	124	69*
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	138	80	123	82
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	136	44	124	40
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	135	70	124	75
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	137	82	123	79
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	139	68	124	83*
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	139	32	124	54*
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	114	32	124	48*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	140	46	123	54
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most	139	65	123	82*

important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-mindedness.” (Question 73)

Trust

Percent choosing, “For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.” (Question 53)	140	62	124	58
Percent choosing, “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.” (Question 54)	138	26	124	30
Percent that thinks that “people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves.” (Question 55)	138	22	123	34*

Individualism/Cultural Distance

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A)	140	67	124	90*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B)	140	64	124	83*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C)	139	59	124	85*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D)	140	62	124	81*

Support for Democratic Values

Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49)	136	82	124	72*
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A)	138	18	123	36*
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E)	138	22	123	19
Percent choosing, “All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.” (Question 52)	139	58	124	60
Percent choosing, “If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.” (Question 51)	137	75	123	78

Locus of control

Percent choosing, “People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.” (Question 67)	139	50	124	56
Percent choosing “For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.” (Question 64)	140	33	122	49*
Percent choosing, “When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.” (Question 65)	139	71	124	77
Percent choosing, “With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.” (Question 66)	140	59	124	71*

*Difference in percentages between non-Tostan and Tostan respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table A.4: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having Tostan Training and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Female Respondents in Diourbel & Thies

	Respondents without Tostan		Respondents with Tostan	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	169	39	152	70*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	170	72	152	90*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	169	86	152	97*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	147	28	147	75*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	170	48	152	82*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	169	17	152	56*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	170	62	152	81
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	104	88	123	87
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	104	82	123	84
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	103	64	123	72
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	103	53	123	59
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	168	83	152	81
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	170	66	152	81*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	165	56	151	77*
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	159	83	147	87
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	159	50	149	53
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	158	77	151	70
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	162	75	151	81
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	165	47	152	75*
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	168	23	151	47*
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	157	31	150	55*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	161	59	150	63
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-	164	40	151	43

mindedness.” (Question 73)

Trust

Percent choosing, “For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.” (Question 53)	166	86	150	91
Percent choosing, “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.” (Question 54)	154	37	148	27*
Percent that thinks that “people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves.” (Question 55)	164	65	150	57

Individualism/Cultural Distance

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A)	170	59	152	88*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B)	170	63	152	83*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C)	170	56	152	85*
At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D)	170	56	151	81*

Support for Democratic Values

Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49)	170	67	152	74
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A)	165	11	148	34*
DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E)	162	41	146	45
Percent choosing, “All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.” (Question 52)	166	39	151	50*
Percent choosing, “If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.” (Question 51)	155	70	152	80

Locus of control

Percent choosing, “People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.” (Question 67)	165	50	152	63*
Percent choosing “For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.” (Question 64)	158	27	145	37
Percent choosing, “When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.” (Question 65)	155	65	150	73
Percent choosing, “With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.” (Question 66)	164	79	151	87*

*Difference in percentages between non-Tostan and Tostan respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table A.5: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having PAPA Training and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Regions of Thies, St. Louis and Kaolack

	Respondents without PAPA		Respondents with PAPA	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	309	34	165	49*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	309	66	166	86*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	308	80	166	90*
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	250	33	150	49*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	309	48	166	58*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	308	16	166	31*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	309	64	166	70
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	198	83	115	88
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	198	77	115	86
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	197	60	116	63
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	197	47	116	57
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	308	77	165	85*
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	309	61	166	71*
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	306	54	165	68*
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	298	78	162	85
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	301	46	163	50
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	293	69	161	68
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	300	74	161	75
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	303	57	164	56
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	306	26	165	29
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	278	32	160	37
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	300	50	164	63*
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most	304	49	163	47

important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-mindedness.” (Question 73)

Trust

Percent choosing, “For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.” (Question 53) 306 75 165 82

Percent choosing, “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.” (Question 54) 296 31 162 31

Percent that thinks that “people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves.” (Question 55) 304 42 163 52

Individualism/Cultural Distance

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A) 309 67 166 75

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B) 309 66 166 69

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C) 308 62 166 67

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D) 309 61 166 68

Support for Democratic Values

Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49) 304 75 166 74

DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A) 303 15 164 12

DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E) 305 34 162 33

Percent choosing, “All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.” (Question 52) 302 47 166 41

Percent choosing, “If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.” (Question 51) 293 71 163 69

Locus of control

Percent choosing, “People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.” (Question 67) 306 49 162 46

Percent choosing “For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.” (Question 64) 297 34 162 32

Percent choosing, “When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.” (Question 65) 294 64 162 60

Percent choosing, “With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.” (Question 66) 304 70 164 71

*Difference in percentages between non-PAPA and PAPA respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table A6: Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between Having PAPF Training and Exhibiting Certain Civic Behaviors and Orientations for Respondents in Diourbel & Louga

	Respondents without PAPF		Respondents with PAPF	
	n	%	n	%
Community Participation				
Ever cooperated to solve community problem. (Question 24)	104	34	104	62*
Belong to a community organization. (Question 20)	106	73	104	87*
Attend at least some organizational meetings. (Question 22)	106	87	104	93
Speak out at meetings at least on occasion. (Question 23)	92	24	97	54*
Gotten together with others to raise issue at least once. (Question 38B)	106	42	104	67*
Hold at least one leadership position in an organization. (Question 21D)	106	14	104	43*
Political Participation				
Registered to vote. (Question 27)	106	61	104	63
Voted in first round of presidential election. (2000) (Question 29A)	65	86	66	85
Voted in second round of presidential election (2000) (Question 29B)	65	85	66	82
Voted in parliamentary elections. (1998) (Question 29C)	65	62	66	61
Voted in local elections. (1996) (Question 29 D)	65	63	66	45*
At least somewhat interested in politics. (Question 33)	104	68	104	44
Discuss politics at least sometimes. (Question 34)	104	69	104	74
Feel close to a political party. (Question 35)	102	64	104	69
Political Efficacy				
Percent choosing, "In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinion of others." (Question 45)	102	79	103	83
Percent choosing, "I can usually understand the way government works." (Question 46)	102	55	104	46
Percent choosing, "As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems." (Question 47).	104	74	104	76
Percent choosing, "We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives." (Question 48)	103	80	104	80
Authoritarianism/Traditionalism or Progressiveness				
Percent choosing, "Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues." (Question 69)	102	49	104	71*
Percent choosing, "Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote for him/herself." (Question 70)	104	24	104	30
Percent choosing, "A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees." (Question 71)	101	31	104	47*
Percent choosing, "We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development." (Question 72)	104	54	104	63
Percent choosing, "In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-	102	45	104	51

mindedness.” (Question 73)

Trust

Percent choosing, “For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.” (Question 53) 105 85 104 85

Percent choosing, “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.” (Question 54) 100 35 104 31

Percent that thinks that “people more inclined to help others than to look out for themselves.” (Question 55) 102 65 104 52

Individualism/Cultural Distance

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58A) 106 57 104 77*

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of their relatives. (Question 58B) 106 59 104 74*

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of other people in their village. (Question 58C) 106 49 104 74*

At least occasionally have ideas or opinions that differ from those of most other people in the country. (Question 58D) 106 52 104 72*

Support for Democratic Values

Think those who are not literate should have the right to vote. (Question 49) 106 67 104 74

DISAGREE or strongly disagree that if people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party. (Question 50A) 104 8 101 21*

DISAGREE or strongly disagree that to compromise is dangerous because you betray your own side. (Question 50E) 97 39 102 32

Percent choosing, “All people should be permitted to voted, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.” (Question 52) 105 29 104 38

Percent choosing, “If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.” (Question 51) 100 73 103 76

Locus of control

Percent choosing, “People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.” (Question 67) 104 44 103 58*

Percent choosing “For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.” (Question 64) 100 33 103 36

Percent choosing, “When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.” (Question 65) 100 77 101 73

Percent choosing, “With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.” (Question 66) 104 82 104 83

*Difference in percentages between non-PAPF and PAPF respondents is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

APPENDIX B: ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

CIVIC PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Village Number _____

Respondent Number _____

Civic/Political Attitudes Questionnaire

Hello. My name is [INTERVIEWER: SAY YOUR NAME]. I am working on behalf of _____. I do not represent the government or any other political party. I would like to examine citizens' views on community and political participation in Senegal. As part of this research project, I would like to ask you a few questions. The information that we are gathering will be used in a report for USAID.

There are no right or wrong answers. Instead, we are interested in what you think.

You are not obligated to take part in the survey and you may refuse to answer any particular question. You can stop participating in the interview at any time and previously collected data will not be used. The data emanating from this survey will only be reported in aggregate form. Your name will not be used and your answers will be kept strictly confidential, so you can feel free to answer openly and honestly. The interview will take about one hour. Do you wish to proceed?

[IF YES, FILL IN THE FOLLOWING]

Date _____	Name of Enumerator _____
Region _____	Department _____ Arrondissement _____
Communauté rurale _____	Village _____

1. How old were you at on your last birthday?	
<i>[If respondent cannot answer] In which year were you born?</i>	
<i>[Write in age]</i> _____	
<i>[Write in year born]</i> _____	
Could not determine age <i>[Enter DK for "Don't Know"]</i> _____	

2. [Enumerator: indicate the respondent's gender]:	
Male	0
Female	1

3. What is your marital status? Are you currently:	
Married	1
Never married.	2
Divorced	3
Widowed	4
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

4. Do you have any children? <i>[If No, _____ and go to Q. _____]</i>	
No	0
Yes	1

5. What is your ethnicity?	
HaalPulaar	1
Fulbe	2
Wolof	3
Sonninke	4
Bamabara	5
Majak	6
Serer	7
Other, please specify _____	8
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

6. Now, I have a few questions about the languages you are able to speak. For each of the following languages of communication, please indicate if:

- If you are only able to speak the language.
- You are also able to read a little in the language.
- You are able to write in the language.

A. French	
No proficiency whatsoever	0
You speak French.	1
You speak and read French.	2
You speak, read and write in French.	3
Don't know <i>[Item not to be communicated to the interviewee]</i>	9

Missing data=-9

B. Wolof	
No proficiency whatsoever	0
You speak Wolof.	1
You speak and read Wolof.	2
You speak, read and write in Wolof.	3
Don't know <i>[Item not to be communicated to the interviewee]</i>	9

Missing data=-9

C. Pulaar	
No proficiency whatsoever	0
You speak Pulaar.	1
You speak and read Pulaar.	2
You speak, read and write in Pulaar.	3
Don't know <i>[Item not to be communicated to the interviewee]</i>	9

6D. Serer	
No proficiency whatsoever	0
You speak Serer.	1
You speak and read Serer.	2
You speak, read and write in Serer.	3

Don't know [Item not to be communicated to the interviewee]	9
---	---

6E. Arab	No	Yes	DK
1) You speak Arab.=parlarab	0	1	9
2) You read Arab. =readarab	0	1	9
3) You write Arab. =writearab	0	1	9

6F. Other, specify:	
No proficiency whatsoever	0
You speak _____	1
You speak and read _____	2
You speak, read, and write _____	3
Don't know [Item not to be communicated to the interviewee]	9

7. What is your religion, if any?	
None [PUT 999 POUR Q9]	0
Islam [If Islamic, go to Q9]	1
Catholic [PUT 999 POUR Q9]	2
Protestant (mainstream) [PUT 999 POUR Q9]	3
Protestant (evangelical/pentecostal) [PUT 999 POUR Q9]	4
Traditional religion [PUT 999 POUR Q9]	6
Don't know [PUT 999 POUR Q9]	9

8. To which brotherhood do you belong, if any?	
None	0
Tidjane	1
Mouride	2
Khadir	3
Don't know [Do not read]	9

9. How much formal education have you had?	
No formal schooling	1
Some primary schooling	2
Primary school completed	3
Some high school	4
High school completed	5
Post-secondary qualifications, other than university	6
Some university, college	7
University, college completed	8
Post-graduate	9
Don't know [Do not read]	10

10. How many years of formal education have you had?	
[Enumerator: record the number of years] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	99

Missing data=-9

11. How many years of Coranic schooling have you had?	
[Enumerator: record the number of years; if none, record 0 years] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	99
Missing data=-9	

12. Have you ever had any literacy training in a national language?	
No [If No, enter 00 for questions 13-18.]	0
Yes	1
Don't know [Do not read]	9

13. Who sponsored this literacy program?	
[Enumerator: write down the organization here] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	9

14. In what language were you trained?	
NA	0
Pulaar	1
Wolof	2
Soninke	3
Bambara	4
Majak	5
Serer	6
French	7
Other, specify _____	8
Don't know [Do not read]	9

15. How many years of literacy training have you had?	
[Enumerator: record the number of years] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	99

16. How many months out of the year did your class meet?	
[Enumerator: record the number of months] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	99

17. How many weeks per month did your class meet?	
[Enumerator: record the number of weeks] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	99

18. How many hours per week did your class meet?	
[Enumerator: record the number of hours] _____	
Don't know [Do not read]	99

19. What is your main occupation?	
Unemployed	00
Farmer	01
Informal Marketeer	02
Businessperson	03
Clerical Worker	04
Artisan	05
Domestic Worker	06
Miner	07

Technical Worker	08
Teacher	09
Government Worker	10
NGO Worker	11
Professional	12
Retired	13
Housewife	14
Student	15
Marabout, clergyman	16
Commercial	17
Other [Enumerator: Specify on this line]	99

[Community Involvement]

20. Are you a member of any community association or organization? [If no, continue with question _____].	
No [IF NO, PUT 999 FOR Q'S 24A-D]	0
Yes	1
Don't know [Do not read]	9

<p>21. A. Please list the associations and organizations to which you belong. [ENUMERATOR: USE LINES BELOW].</p>	<p>21. B. What type of association is this?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Village Development Association 2) Youth Group 3) Sports and Cultural Association 4) Women's Group (affiliated with Fédération Nationale des Groupements Féminins) 5) Women's Tontine or credit circle 6) Groupement d'Intérêt Économique (GIE) 7) Religious organization 8) Parent-teacher association (APE) 9) Cellule école milieu 10) Cultural movement or association 11) Local health committee 12) Local water management committee 13) Trade union/farmer organization 14) Other, please specify _____ 	<p>21. C. In the past year, how often have you attended the meetings of your community organizations?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Always 2) Often 3) Sometimes 4) Rarely 5) Never 9) DK (Don't Read) 	<p>21. D. Which leadership position, if any, do you hold or did you hold in any of these organizations?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) None 2) President 3) Vice-President 4) Treasurer 5) Secretary 6) Other, please specify _____ _____ _____
--	--	--	--

22. How often do you attend village-wide meetings: always, often, sometimes, rarely, or never?

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never [IF NEVER PUT 999 FOR Q26]	DK [Do not read]
1	2	3	4	5	9

23. How often do you speak out in public at these meetings: always, often, sometimes, rarely, or never?					
Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	DK [Do not read]
1	2	3	4	5	9

24. A. Have you ever worked or cooperated with others in this village/town to try to solve some of the problems of this village/town?	
No [IF NO, PUT 999 FOR Q24B]	0
Yes	1
Don't know [Do not read]	9

[IF YES] 24. B. Describe:

25. During the last five years, how often have you contacted--that is gone to see or spoken to--any of the following leaders or government officials to obtain help in resolving a personal problem?				
	Never	Only once	Sometimes	Often
A. a village chief	0	1	2	3
B. a member of the rural council	0	1	2	3
C. a National Assembly representative	0	1	2	3
D. the governor	0	1	2	3
E. an official of a government ministry	0	1	2	3
F. a marabout	0	1	2	3
G. the prefet	0	1	2	3
H. the sous-prefet	0	1	2	3
I. some other influential person, please specify	0	1	2	3

26. During the last five years, how often have you contacted--that is gone to see or spoken to--any of the following leaders or government officials to obtain help in resolving a community problem?				
	Never	Only once	Sometimes	Often
A. a village chief	0	1	2	3
B. a member of the rural council	0	1	2	3
C. a National Assembly representative	0	1	2	3
D. the governor	0	1	2	3
E. an official of a government ministry	0	1	2	3
F. a marabout	0	1	2	3
G. the prefet	0	1	2	3
H. the sous-prefet	0	1	2	3
I. some other influential person, please specify	0	1	2	3

Political Participation

27. Are you a registered voter?	
No	0

Yes <i>[If yes, go to Q.]</i>	1
-------------------------------	---

28. <i>[If yes, circle 0 = not applicable.] [If no] Why not?</i>	
Not applicable	0
Missed registration	1
Ill health	2
Absent from area	3
Voter card lost	4
No I.D. card	5
No birth registration	6
Under 18 during registration	7
Not interested in voting	8
Otherwise engaged	9
Other <i>[Specify]</i>	10
<i>[Go to Q.]</i>	

29. Understanding that some Senegalese choose not to vote, let me ask you: Did you vote:	No	Yes
A. In the first round of the Presidential election of February 2000? <i>[Enumerator: Prompt if necessary: that is, the last elections for President.]</i>	0	1
B. In the second round of the Presidential election of March 2000? <i>[Enumerator: Prompt if necessary: that is, the last elections for President.]</i>	0	1
C. In the National Assembly elections of May 1998? <i>[Enumerator: Prompt if necessary: that is, the last elections for Parliament.]</i>	0	1
D. In the local government elections of 1996?	0	1

30. For whom did you vote in the first round of the presidential election of 2000?	
Not Applicable	0
Abdou Diouf	1
Abdoulaye Wade	2
Moustapha Niasse	3
Djibo Ka	4
Ibder de Thiam	5
Ossenyou Fall	6
Cheikh Dieye	7
Mademba Sock	8
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9
Prefer not to say <i>[Do Not Read]</i>	10

32. For whom did you vote in the second round of the presidential election of 2000?	
Not Applicable	0
Abdou Diouf	1
Abdoulaye Wade	2
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

Prefer not to say [Do Not Read]	10
---------------------------------	----

32. When you voted for the National Assembly, did you do it to support an individual or a party?	
Individual	1
Party	2
Don't know [Do not read]	9

33. How interested are you in politics and government?	
Not interested	0
Somewhat interested	1
Very interested	2
Don't know [Do not read]	9

34. How often do you discuss politics and government with other people?	
Never	0
Sometimes	1
Often	2
Don't know [Do not read]	9

35. Do you feel close to a political party ?	
<i>[If No, mark -99 for Q 40 and continue with 41]</i>	
No	0
Yes	1
Don't know [Do not read]	9

36. [IF YES] To which party do you feel close?	
Parti Socialiste (PS)	01
L'Alliance des Forces de Progrès (AFP)	02
Parti Democratique Senegalais (PDS)	03
And Jef/Parti pour la Democratique et le Socialisme (AJ/PADS)	04
Convention des Democratres et des Patriotes/ Garab-gi (CDP-Garab-gi)	05
Defense de l'Unite Senegalaise (DUS)	06
Front pour le Socialisme et la Democratie Benno Jubel (FSD/BJ)	07
Ligue Democratique/Mouvement pour le Parti du Travail (LD/MPT)	08
Mouvement Democratique Populaire (MDP)	09
Mouvement Republicain Senegalais (MRS)	10
Parti Africain de l'Independence (PAI)	11
Parti Democratique Senegalais / Renovation (PDS/R)	12
Parti pour l'Independance et du Travail (PIT)	13
Parti pour la Liberation du Peuple (PLP)	14
Parti Populaire Senegalais (PPS)	15
Parti du Regroupement Africain (PRA)	16
Rassemblement National Democratique (RND)	17
Union Democratique Senegalaise / Renovation (UDS/R)	18
Union Populaire Senegalaise / Renovation (UDS/R)	19
Union Populaire Senegalaise (UPS)	20
URD	21
Other [Enumerator: Specify on this line] _____	22
Don't Know [Do not read]	99
Not Applicable [Do not read]	-99

37. Did your party affiliation change after the most recent presidential election?	
No	0
Yes	1
Not Applicable <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

38. Here is a list of things that people sometimes do as citizens. Please tell me how often you, personally, have done any of these things during the last five years.				
	Never	Only once	Sometimes	Often
A. attending a community meeting	0	1	2	3
B. getting together with others to raise an issue	0	1	2	3
C. attending an election rally	0	1	2	3
D. working for a political candidate or party	0	1	2	3
E. signing a petition	0	1	2	3
F. writing a letter to a newspaper	0	1	2	3
G. attending a demonstration	0	1	2	3

Political Knowledge and Exposure

39. When you hear the word “democracy”, what is the first thing that comes to your mind? <i>[Enumerator: Prompt if necessary: “What, if anything, does ‘democracy’ mean to you?”]</i>	PC

40. People associate democracy with many different meanings such as the ones I will mention now. In order for a society to be called democratic, how important is each of these: [Probe for strength of opinion]					
	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All Important	DK <i>[Do not read]</i>
A. Majority rule	1	2	3	4	9
B. Complete freedom for anyone to criticize the government	1	2	3	4	9
C. Regular elections	1	2	3	4	9
D. At least two political parties competing with each other	1	2	3	4	9
E. Basic necessities like shelter, food and water for everyone	1	2	3	4	9
F. Jobs for everyone	1	2	3	4	9
G. Equality in education	1	2	3	4	9
H. A small income gap between rich and poor	1	2	3	4	9

<i>[Enumerator: Ask only if respondent has some idea what democracy is]</i>	
45. In your opinion, how much of a democracy is Senegal today?	
Not a democracy	0
Major problems, but still a democracy	1
Minor problems, but still a democracy	2
Full democracy	3
Not applicable	9

42. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way democracy works in Senegal? <i>[Enumerator: Probe to see how strongly opinion is held]</i>	
Very dissatisfied	1
Somewhat dissatisfied	2
Somewhat satisfied	3
Very satisfied	4
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

43. Which of these three statements is closest to your own opinion?	
A. Democracy is preferable to any other form of government.	1
B. In certain situations, a non-democratic government can be preferable.	2
C. To people like me, it doesn't matter what form of government we have.	3
Don't Know.	9

44. How often do you get news from:							
	Never	Less than once a month	About once a month	About once a week	Several times a week	Every day	DK <i>[Do not read]</i>
A. The radio?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. Television?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Newspapers?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9

[Political Efficacy]

45. I am now going to give you several pairs of statements. Please tell me which one you agree with most. Choose Statement A or Statement B. [Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinions of others.	2	1
B: As far as politics are concerned, friends and neighbors do not listen to me.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

46.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: The way the government operates sometimes seems so complicated that I cannot really understand what is going on.	2	1
B: I can usually understand the way that government works.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

47.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to	2	1

our problems.		
B: We are usually unable to make our elected representatives listen to us.	3	4
Do not agree with either [Do not read]	5	
Don't know [Do not read]	9	

48.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: No matter who we vote for, things will not get any better in the future.	2	1
B: We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives.	3	4
Do not agree with either [Do not read]	5	
Don't know [Do not read]	9	

[POLITICAL TOLERANCE AND SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATIC VALUES]

49. Should those who are not literate have the right to vote?		
No		0
Yes		1

50. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	DK [Do not read]
A. If people want to form a community organization, they should affiliate with the ruling party.	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. The only way to get along in this world is if we accommodate each other.	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. People are too easily led.	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. In this country, one must be very careful about one says and does regarding politics.	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. To compromise with one's opponents is dangerous because you betray your own side.	1	2	3	4	5	9

51. Now we will return to <u>pairs</u> of statements. Please tell me which one you agree with most. Choose Statement A or Statement B. [Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: It is dangerous and confusing to allow the expression of too many different points of view.	2	1
B: If people have different views than I do, they should be allowed to express them.	3	4
Do not agree with either [Do not read]	5	
Don't know [Do not read]	9	

52.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: All people should be permitted to vote, even if they do not fully understand all the issues in an election.	2	1

B: Only those who are sufficiently well educated should be allowed to vote.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

[TRUST]

[FAITH IN PEOPLE SCALE]

53.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: No one is going to care much about what happens to you, when you get right down to it.	2	1
B: For the most part, you can depend on people to help you out, when you are in a pinch.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

54.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A Generally speaking, most people can be trusted.	2	1
B: Generally speaking, you can't be to careful in dealing with people.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

55. Would you say that most people are more inclined to help others, or more inclined to look out for themselves?		
To help others.		1
To look out for themselves.		2
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>		9

56. I am now going to read you a list of people. I would like to know whether, generally speaking, you trust them to do what is right. <i>[Enumerator: Probe to see whether or not views are held strongly.]</i>					
How much do you trust the following people and institutions?					
	I do not trust them at all	I distrust them somewhat	I trust them somewhat	I trust them a lot	DK <i>[Do not read]</i>
A. Serigne Saliou Mbacke	1	2	3	4	9
B. Serigne Mansour Sy	1	2	3	4	9
C. Secretary of State Idrissa Seck	1	2	3	4	9
D. Premier Ministre Moustapha Niass					
E. President Wade	1	2	3	4	9
F. traditional rulers	1	2	3	4	9
G. the conseil rurale	1	2	3	4	9
H. the police	1	2	3	4	9
I. courts of law	1	2	3	4	9
J. political parties	1	2	3	4	9
K. the army	1	2	3	4	9
L. the douane	1	2	3	4	9
M. the banks	1	2	3	4	9

N. merchants	1	2	3	4	9
O. the Mouride brotherhood	1	2	3	4	9
P. the Tidiane brotherhood	1	2	3	4	9

57. In the past, when you did something which depends upon cooperation with others, did you have the feeling that it surely wouldn't get done or were you sure that it would get done?	
Surely wouldn't get done.	1
Sure it would get done.	2
Don't know. <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

[INDIVIDUALISM]

58. Now, I am going ask you some questions about how frequently you have a certain feeling, and I would like you to tell me if you never, rarely, sometimes, usually, always feel that way.					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
A. According to your general impression, how often do your ideas and opinions about important matters differ from those of your relatives?	0	1	2	3	4
B. How often do your ideas and opinions differ from those of your friends?	0	1	2	3	4
C. How often do your ideas and opinions differ from those of other people in your village?	0	1	2	3	4
D. Those of most people in the country?	0	1	2	3	4

[ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS]

59. Now we will return to <u>pairs</u> of statements. Please tell me which one you agree with most. Choose Statement A or Statement B. <i>[Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]</i>		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: I wish people would be more honest with you.	2	1
B: I find that most people are pretty straight-forward.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

60. <i>[Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]</i>		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Most people are pretty smug about themselves, never really facing their bad points.	2	1
B: Everyone tries to do their best.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

[ACCEPTABILITY TO OTHERS]

61. <i>[Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]</i>		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly

A: I feel "left out," as if people don't want me around.	2	1
B: People seem to like me.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

62. <i>[Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]</i>		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Most people seem to understand me and my way of doing things.	2	1
B: People are quite critical of me.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

63. <i>[Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]</i>		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: People seem to respect my opinion about things.	2	1
B: Often, people do not give my ideas the consideration that they merit.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

[LOCUS OF CONTROL]

64. <i>[Enumerator: Probe: "Do you agree strongly or just somewhat?"]</i>		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: To a great extent, my life is controlled by accidental happenings.	2	1
B: For the most part, I am responsible for what happens to me.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

65.		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Often there is almost no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.	2	1
B: When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

66.		
	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.	2	1
B: With a lot of work and effort, I can obtain nearly all of my goals.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

67.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: People should look after themselves and be responsible for their own success in life.	2	1
B: The government should bear the main responsibility for ensuring the well-being of people.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

[TRADITIONALISM AND AUTHORITARIANISM]

68. Would you say that most men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women, that men and women are equally suited, or that women are better suited than men in this area?	
Men better suited	1
Men and women equally suited	2
Women are better suited	3
Don't know <i>[Do Not Read]</i>	9

69. Again, please choose A or B. <i>[Interviewer: Probe for strength of opinion]</i>	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: All members of a family should hold the same political opinions.	2	1
B: Every family member should be free to make up his or her own mind on political issues.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

70. <i>[Interviewer: Probe for strength of opinion]</i>	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Everyone should decide for whom he or she is going to vote.	2	1
B: A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9	

71.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: A woman's place is in the home; women should not try to speak out about politics.	2	1
B: A woman should exercise her right to speak out about politics, even if her husband disagrees.	3	4
Do not agree with either <i>[Do not read]</i>	5	

Don't know [Do not read]	9
--------------------------	---

72.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Our customs and ethnic heritage are things that have made us great, and certain people should be made to show greater respect for them.	2	1
B: We may need to abandon some of the traditions that have blocked our development.	3	4
Do not agree with either [Do not read]	5	
Don't know [Do not read]	9	

73.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.	2	1
B: In this age of rapid change, the most important virtues for a child to learn are curiosity and open-mindedness.	3	4
Do not agree with either [Do not read]	5	
Don't know [Do not read]	9	

74.	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
A: Thanks to modernization, the caste system is now obsolete.	2	1
B: The system of castes should be maintained in order to keep the social peace.	3	4
Do not agree with either [Do not read]	5	
Don't know [Do not read]	9	

[ETHNIC IDENTITY QUESTIONS]

75. Here are a series of things people might say about how they see their group in relation to other Senegalese. There are no right or wrong answers. We are simply interested in your opinions. Please tell me whether you disagree or agree with these statements. [Enumerator: Probe for strength of opinion]						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	DK [Do not read]
A. You feel proud to be _____.	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. You would want your children to think of themselves as _____.	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Of all the groups in this country, _____ people are the best.	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. You feel much stronger ties to _____s than to other Senegalese.	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. It makes you proud to be called a Senegalese.	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. You would want your children to think of themselves as Senegalese.	1	2	3	4	5	9

76. If you had to chose between these two identities, [the ethnic identity group of the respondent] or Senegalesee, which would you choose ?	
[the ethnic identity group of the respondent]	1
Senegalese	2
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

77. Are _____s' [RESPONDENT'S IDENTITY GROUP] economic conditions worse, the same as, or better than other groups in this country? [Probe for strength of opinion]	
Much worse	1
Worse	2
About the same	3
Better	4
Much better	5
Don't know [Do Not Read]	9

78. In your opinion, how often are _____ people treated unfairly by the government?	
Always	1
To a large extent	2
To some extent	3
Hardly at all	4
Never	5
Don't know [Do Not Read]	9

79A. Do you think that the government represents the interests of all Senegalese, or of one group only?	
All Senegalese [Skip to Q. 94]	1
One group only	2
Don't know [Do Not Read]	9

[If one group] Which group is that?	PC

[EVALUATION OF CURRENT SITUATION]

80. Over the past year, how often, if ever, have you gone without:				
	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
A. Food for your family?	0	1	2	3
B. Water for domestic use?	0	1	2	3
C. Schooling for children?	0	1	2	3
D. Health care for your family?	0	1	2	3

81. To whom do you usually turn when you are unable to get:							
	No-one	Kin	Community group	Private provision	Gov't provision	Illicit provision	Not applicable
A. Food for your family?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. Water for domestic use?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Schooling for children?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9

D. Health care for your family?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

82. How satisfied are you:				
<i>[Enumerator: Probe for strength of opinion]</i>	Not at all satisfied	Not very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
A. with the general state of the Senegalese economy today?	1	2	3	4
B. with your own living conditions today?	1	2	3	4

83. Would you say that your own living conditions are worse, the same, or better than other Senegalese?	
<i>[Enumerator: Probe for strength of opinion]</i>	
Much worse	1
Worse	2
About the same	3
Better	4
Much better	5
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

84. When you look at your life today, how satisfied do you feel compared with five years ago?	
Much less satisfied	1
Slightly less satisfied	2
About the same	3
Slightly more satisfied	4
Much more satisfied	5
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

85. When you look forward at your life's prospects, how satisfied do you expect to be in one year's time?	
Much less satisfied	1
Slightly less satisfied	2
About the same	3
Slightly more satisfied	4
Much more satisfied	5
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

86. In your opinion, who is responsible for the current economic conditions in Senegal?	
The previous government	1
The current government	2
The IMF/World Bank	3
We, the people	4
Structural Adjustment Programme	5
Internal opposition forces	6
International economic forces	7
Other <i>[Specify]</i>	8
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

87. How well would you say the government is handling the following problems?					
	Very Badly	Fairly Badly	Fairly Well	Very Well	DK <i>[Do not read]</i>
A. Creating jobs	1	2	3	4	9
B. Keeping prices low	1	2	3	4	9
C. Narrowing income gaps between different groups	1	2	3	4	9

D. Reducing crime	1	2	3	4	9
E. Addressing the educational needs of all Senegalese	1	2	3	4	9
F. Improving basic health services	1	2	3	4	9
G. Fighting corruption in government	1	2	3	4	9

88. What is your overall assessment of the performance of the current government?	
Very bad	1
Bad	2
Neither bad nor good	3
Good	4
Very good	5
It's too early to say. <i>[Do not read]</i>	6
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9

89. How long do you think it will take:						
	Within two years	Within four years	Within eight years	More than eight years	Never	DK <i>[Do not read]</i>
A. before the government fulfills the promises it has made?	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. before your own living standards meet your expectations?	1	2	3	4	5	9

90. What is your monthly income?	
No income	0
Less than 10,000	1
Between 10,000 and 30,000	2
Between 31,000 and 50,000	3
Between 51,000 and 100,000	4
Between 101,000 and 150,000	5
Between 151,000 and 200,000	6
Between 201,000 and 300,000	7
Between 301,000 and 400,000	8
Between 401,000 and 500,000	9
Between 501,000 and 700,000	10
Between 701,000 and 900,000	11
Between 901,000 and 1,100,000	12
More than 1,100,000	13
Prefer not to say <i>[Do not read]</i>	14
Don't Know <i>[Do not read]</i>	-8

Thank you so much. Your answers have been very helpful. Please be assured that they will remain confidential.

Time Interview Ended <i>[Enumerator: Enter hour and minute, then circle A.M. or P.M.]</i>						A	P
---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

END INTERVIEW

APPENDIX C: FRENCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire sur l'Engagement Civique et Politique

Village n° _____

Répondant n° _____

Procédure de sélection des maisons

Choisir la maison en fonction des pas de sondage établie (troisième maison à droite). S'il n'y a personne dans la maison ainsi sélectionnée, repasser au moins une deuxième fois avant de la substituer par une autre. S'il n'y a personne à la seconde tentative, substituez cette maison par une autre que vous trouverez toujours selon les pas de sondage.

[Enquêteur: Encercler le numero correct pour les tentatives sans succès seulement.]

Tentatives sans succès Raison de la substitution:	Maison 1	Maison 2	Maison 3	Maison 4	Maison 5	Maison 6	Maison 7
A refusé d'être interviewé	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
La personne tirée (procédure de tirage par carte) n'est jamais chez elle	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Maison vide pendant la période de l'enquête	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sourd-muet/ne parle qu'une langue étrangère	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Ne correspond pas à la logique de quota genre	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Autre	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

Introduction

Bonjour, bonsoir, Je m'appelle *[nom de l'enquêteur]*. Je travaille dans le cadre d'une enquête qu'on fait pour mieux vous connaître. Je ne représente pas le gouvernement, ni un parti politique. Je voudrais recueillir l'opinion des citoyens sur la participation politique au Sénégal ainsi que l'engagement communautaire. Les informations recueillies seront utilisées dans un rapport d'enquête par l'USAID et dans la thèse d'une étudiante américaine en sciences politiques.

Les Senegalais ont, chacun, une égale d'être inclus dans cette étude. Votre famille a la chance d'avoir été choisie. Mais nous devons choisir au hasard un adulte parmi vous. Voudriez-vous nous aider à le faire?

[Si l'interview est refusée dans une maison, marchez dans la direction établie par les pas de sondage et substituez par la troisième maison.]

Procédure de sélection du répondant

Enquêteur: encercler le nombre correct

	Homme	Femme
L'interview précédent était avec:	1	2
Cette interview doit être avec:	1	2

S'il vous plaît, indiquez-moi les noms de tous les citoyens Sénégalais de plus de 18 ans vivant présentement dans cette maison. Y compris vous même.

Déterminer le sexe des personnes indiquées. Si c'est au tour d'une femme d'être interviewée, listez uniquement les noms des femmes. Si c'est au tour d'un homme d'être interviewé, listez uniquement les noms des hommes.

Noms des femmes	Noms des hommes
-----------------	-----------------

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10

S'il vous plaît choisissez une carte. La personne qui correspond au numero tiré sera celle qu'on devra interviewer.

RAPPEL: Mettez une croix sur le numero de la personne choisie.

La personne à laquelle je voudrais parler est [lire le nom] _____. Cette personne est-elle presentement à la maison?

Si oui: Puis-je s'il vous plaît l'interviewer maintenant?

Si non: Cette personne reviendra-t-elle ici dans la journée?

Si non: Merci beaucoup. Je vais choisir une autre maison. **Substituez par la prochaine maison selon les pas de sondage. NOTE: VOUS DEVEZ SUBSTITUER DES MAISONS, NON DES INDIVIDUS.**

Si oui: S'il vous plaît, dites à cette personne (absente pour le moment) que je reviendrai pour l'interview à [Indiquer l'heure correcte]. Revenez une fois comme convenu. Si le répondant selectionnée au hasard n'est pas là à votre seconde visite, remplacer ce ménage par la prochaine maison selon les pas de sondage.

Si la personne selectionnée est autre que la personne à laquelle vous vous êtes adressé au depart, repetez l'introduction.

Bonjour, bonsoir, Je m'appelle [nom de l'enquêteur]. Je travaille dans le cadre d'une enquête qu'on fait pour mieux vous connaitre. Je ne représente pas le gouvernement, ni un parti politique. Je voudrais recueillir l'opinion des citoyens sur la participation politique au Sénégal ainsi que l'engagement communautaire. Les informations recueillies seront utilisées dans un rapport d'enquête par l'USAID et dans la thèse d'une étudiante américaine en sciences politiques. Dans le cadre de cette étude je vous saurai gré de bien vouloir répondre à quelques questions. Il n'y a pas de réponses vraies ou fausses. Nous sommes plutôt intéressés par votre point de vue.

Vous n'êtes pas obligé de prendre part à cette enquête et vous avez le loisir de refuser de répondre à telle ou telle question selon votre bon vouloir. Vous pourrez mettre fin à votre participation à l'interview à tout moment, et les informations recueillies ne seront pas utilisées. Les informations issues de cette enquête ne seront présentées que d'une manière globale. Votre nom ne sera mentionné nulle part dans cette enquête et vos réponses resteront confidentielles, donc vous pouvez vous sentir à l'aise et répondre ouvertement et honnêtement. L'interview durera environ une heure. Etes vous d'accord?

Combien de visites ont été faites à la maison ou l'interview a finalement été réalisées?	1	2		
Date de l'interview [Enquêteur: indiquez le jour et le mois]			0	0
Heure à laquelle l'interview a commencée [Indiquez l'heure et les minutes en utilisant le système 24 heures]			X	X

[Si oui, remplissez la case ci-dessous]

Date _____	Nom de l'Enquêteur _____
Région _____	Département _____ Arrondissement _____
Communauté rurale _____	Village _____

Avant de commencer, permettez-moi de vous parler peu de la procédure de l'interview, étant donné que la plupart des gens ne sont pas familiers de ce genre d'enquête. Il vous sera posé deux types de questions dans cette enquête. Dans quelques cas, je vous demanderai de répondre à mes questions avec vos propres mots, tout seul. Dans ces cas-là, j'aurais à transcrire fidèlement votre réponse.

Le deuxième type de questions est différent car là il vous sera donné une série de réponses et on vous demandera de choisir celle que est la plus proche de votre opinion. Il vous sera également prié, souvent, de dire à quel degré vous êtes d'accord ou non, par exemple, afin d'apporter plus de précision. Mais, même si aucune des réponses ne correspond pas textuellement à votre pensée, le choix de celle qui est la plus proche de ce que vous pensez nous permettra de comparer vos réponses plus facilement avec celles d'autres gens.

Questionnaire sur l'engagement civique

[Données démographiques]

Je voudrais, s'il vous plaît, commencer par vous poser quelques questions sur vous-même.

1. Quel âge avez-vous?	
<i>[Si l'enquêté ne peut pas répondre à cette question] En quelle année êtes-vous né?</i>	
<i>[Inscrire l'âge]</i>	_____
<i>[Inscrire l'année de naissance]</i>	_____
Si l'âge est impossible à déterminer <i>[Inscrire NSP pour "Ne Sais Pas"]</i>	
Age <i>[usage officiel seulement]</i>	PC

2. [Enquêteur: indiquez le genre de la répondant]:	
Masculin	0
Féminin	1

3. Quel est votre statut matrimonial? Etes-vous présentement jamais marié(e), marié(e), divorcé(e) ou veuf (veuve) ?	
Jamais marié(e).	1
Marié(e)	2
Divorcé(e)	3
Veuf, veuve	4
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	9

4. Avez-vous des enfants?	
Non	0
Oui	1

5. A quelle ethnie appartenez-vous?	
HaalPulaar	1
Fulbe/Peul	2
Wolof	3
Soninke	4
Bambara	5
Majak	6
Serer	7
Autre, précisez _____	8
Ne sais pas [<i>Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant</i>]	9

6. A présent, j'ai quelques questions à vous poser à propos des langues de communication. Pour chacune de vos langues de communication indiquez si:
- Vous n'avez aucune compétence dans la langue.
 - Vous êtes seulement capable de parler la langue.
 - Vous êtes capable de lire (un peu) dans la langue.
 - Vous êtes capable d'écrire dans la langue.

A. Français	
Aucune compétence	0
Vous parlez le français.	1
Vous parlez et lisez le français.	2
Vous parlez, lisez, et écrivez le français.	3
Ne sais pas [<i>Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant</i>]	9

B. Wolof	
Aucune compétence	0
Vous parlez le wolof.	1
Vous parlez et lisez le wolof.	2
Vous parlez, lisez, et écrivez le wolof.	3
Ne sais pas [<i>Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant</i>]	9

C. Pulaar	
Aucune compétence	0
Vous parlez le pulaar.	1
Vous parlez et lisez le pulaar.	2
Vous parlez, lisez, et écrivez le pulaar.	3
Ne sais pas [<i>Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant</i>]	9

D. Serer	
Aucune compétence	0
Vous parlez le serer.	1
Vous parlez et lisez le serer.	2
Vous parlez, lisez, et écrivez le Serer.	3
Ne sais pas [<i>Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant</i>]	9

E. Autre, précisez:	
Aucune compétence	0
Vous parlez le _____.	1
Vous parlez et lisez le _____.	2

Vous parlez, lisez, et écrivez le _____.	3
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

7. Quelle est votre religion?	
Aucune [Cochez 999 à Q8 et Allez à Q9]	0
Islam [Si c'est l'Islam, allez à Q8]	1
Catholique [Cochez 999 à Q8 et Allez à Q9]	2
Protestante [Cochez 999 à Q8 et Allez à Q9]	3
Religion traditionnelle [Cochez 999 à Q8 et Allez à Q9]	6
Autre, précisez _____	7
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

8. [Si Islam] A quelle confrérie appartenez vous, si tel était le cas?	
Aucune	0
Tidjane	1
Mouride	2
Khadir	3
Autre, précisez _____	4
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9
Pas concerné	999

9. Quel est le niveau académique atteint?	
Pas d'éducation formelle [Mettez 0 à Q10 et allez à Q11]	1
Vous avez fréquenté un peu l'école primaire	2
Vous avez terminé le primaire	3
Vous avez fait un peu le secondaire	4
Vous avez terminé le secondaire	5
Vous avez suivi une formation post-secondaire, non universitaire	6
Vous avez fait un peu l'université	7
Vous avez un diplôme universitaire	8
Vous êtes allé au-delà de la maîtrise	9
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	10

10. Combien d'années avez-vous été à l'école (éducation formelle)?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nombre d'années ici] _____	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

11. Combien d'années d'études coraniques avez-vous fait?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nombre d'années ici; si aucune, indiquez 0] _____	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

12. Avez-vous été alphabétisé dans une langue nationale?	
Non [Si Non, mettez 0 à Qs13 à Q18 et allez à Q 19]	0
Oui	1
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

[Si oui]

13. Quel programme vous a alphabétisé?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nom de l'organisme ici] _____	

Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9
--	---

14. Dans quelle langue avez-vous été alphabétisé?	
Pas concerné	0
Pulaar	1
Wolof	2
Soninke	3
Bambara	4
Majak	5
Serer	6
Français	7
Autre, précisez _____	8
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

15. Combien d'années d'alphabétisation avez-vous eu?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nombre d'années ici] _____	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

16. Combien de mois dans l'année avez-vous fait classe?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nombre de mois ici] _____	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

17. Combien de semaines dans le mois avez-vous fait classe?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nombre de semaines ici] _____	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

18. Combien d'heures par semaine avez-vous fait classe?	
[L'enquêteur: indiquez le nombre d'heures ici] _____	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

A présent, parlons s'il vous plaît de vos activités économiques.

19. Quelle est votre occupation principale?	
Sans emploi	00
Cultivateur	01
Commerçant informel	02
Homme d'affaire, Femme d'affaire	03
Employé de bureau	04
Artisan	05
Travailleur domestique	06
Mineur	07
Technicien/ouvrier	08
Enseignant	09
Fonctionnaire/agent de l'Etat	10
Agent non gouvernemental	11
Professionnel	12
À la retraite	13
Ménagère (femme au foyer)	14
Etudiant, élève	15
Marabout, homme d'église	16
Commerçant(e)	17

20. Etes-vous membre d'une association ou d'une organisation communautaire? [En cas de réponse négative, aller à la question Q22]	
Non	0
Oui	1
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

<p>(Si oui à Q20) 21. A. Indiquez ci-dessous les noms des associations auxquelles vous appartenez. [Enquêteur: utilisez les cases ci-dessous] Nom de l'association :</p>	<p>21. B. Quelle genre d'association est-ce?</p> <p>15) Association villageoise de développement. 16) Mouvement de jeunesse 17) Association sportive et culturelle 18) Groupement de femmes (membre de la fédération nationale des groupements féminins) 19) Tontine de femmes ou groupement de crédit mutuel 20) Groupement d'intérêt économique (G.I.E.) 21) Mouvement religieux (association religieuse) 22) Associations de parents d'élèves (APE) 23) Cellule école milieu 24) Mouvement culturel 25) Comité local de santé communautaire 26) Comité local de gestion de l'eau (ou du forage) 27) Syndicat/organisation paysane 28) Autre, préciser s'il vous plaît _____</p>	<p>21. C. Avez-vous, durant l'année dernière participé aux réunions de votre association communautaire?</p> <p>6) Toujours 7) Souvent 8) De temps en temps 9) Rarement 10) Jamais 9) NSP (à ne pas communiquer)</p>	<p>21. D. Quelle position de responsabilité avez-vous occupé ou occupez-vous dans votre association?</p> <p>7) Président 8) Vice-président 9) Trésorier 10) Secrétaire 11) Aucune 12) Autre (précisez) _____ _____ _____</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>Nom de l'association :</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Association villageoise de développement. 2) Mouvement de jeunesse. 3) Association sportive et culturelle 4) Groupement de femmes (membre de la fédération nationale des groupements féminins) 5) Tontine de femme ou groupement de crédit mutuel 6) Groupement d'intérêt économique (G.I.E.) 7) Mouvement religieux (association religieuse) 8) Associations de parents d'élèves (APE) 9) Cellule école milieu 10) Mouvement culturel 11) Comité local de santé communautaire 12) Comité local de gestion de l'eau (ou du forage) 13) Mouvement syndical de paysans 14) Autre, préciser s'il vous plaît _____ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Toujours 2) Souvent 3) De temps en temps 4) Rarement 5) Jamais 9) NSP 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Président 2) Vice président 3) Trésorier 4) Secrétaire 5) Aucune 6) Autre (précisez) _____
-------------------------------	--	---	--

Nom de l'association :	1) Association villageoise de développement. 2) Mouvement de jeunesse 3) Association sportive et culturelle 4) Groupement de femmes (membre de la fédération nationale des groupements féminins) 5) Tontine de femmes ou groupement de crédit mutuel 6) Groupement d'intérêt économique (G.I.E.) 7) Mouvement religieux (association religieuse) 8) Associations de parents d'élèves (APE) 9) Cellule école milieu 10) Mouvement culturel 11) Comité local de santé communautaire 12) Comité local de gestion de l'eau (ou du forage) 13) Mouvement syndical de paysans 14) Autre, préciser s'il vous plaît _____	1) Toujours 2) Souvent 3) De temps en temps 4) Rarement 5) Jamais 6) NSP	1) Président 2) Vice président 3) Trésorier 4) Secrétaire 5) Aucune 6) Autre (précisez) _____ _____ _____

22. Vous arrive-t-il d'assister aux assemblées villageoises : toujours, souvent, de temps en temps, rarement ou jamais?					
Toujours	Souvent	De temps en temps	Rarement	Jamais <i>[Si Jamais, allez à Q24A]</i>	Ne sait pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>
4	3	2	1	0	9

23. Vous arrive-t-il de prendre la parole lors de ces rencontres: toujours, souvent, de temps en temps, rarement ou jamais?					
Toujours	Souvent	De temps en temps	Rarement	Jamais	Ne sait pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>
4	3	2	1	0	9

24. A. Vous est-il arrivé de travailler ou de coopérer avec d'autres personnes dans ce village/ville pour tenter de résoudre quelques-uns des problèmes du village/ville dans les deux dernières années? <i>[En cas de réponse négative, cocher 00 à Q24B aller à la question 25]</i>	
Non	0
Oui	1

[Si oui] 24. B. Quelle était la nature du problème ?

On peut dire aujourd'hui que tout le monde a des problèmes personnels. Nul ne peut échapper aux difficultés inhérentes à la vie. Quelquefois on est obligé de demander l'aide des autres. Parlons, à présent des problèmes personnels.

25. Combien de fois avez-vous, durant les cinq dernières années, contacté – c'est à dire rencontré ou parlé à – quiconque des leaders, des dirigeants ou des agents de l'Etat ci-après listés pour obtenir de l'aide dans la résolution d'un problème personnel? Vous me direz à chaque fois si c'est jamais, une fois seulement, de temps en temps ou souvent.				
	Jamais	Une fois seulement	De temps en temps	Souvent
A. un chef de village	0	1	2	3
B. un membre de conseil rural	0	1	2	3
C. un député de l'Assemblée Nationale	0	1	2	3
D. le gouverneur	0	1	2	3
E. un agent d'un ministère	0	1	2	3
F. un marabout	0	1	2	3
G. le préfet	0	1	2	3
H. le sous-préfet	0	1	2	3
I. une autre personne influente, précisez _____	0	1	2	3

Parlons, à présent des problèmes de la communauté.

26. Combien de fois avez-vous, durant les cinq dernières années, contacté – c'est à dire rencontré ou parlé à – quiconque des leaders ou des agents de l'état ci-après listés pour obtenir de l'aide dans la résolution d'un problème communautaire?				
	Jamais	Une fois seulement	De temps en temps	Souvent
A. un chef de village	0	1	2	3
B. un membre de conseil rural	0	1	2	3
C. un député de l'Assemblée Nationale	0	1	2	3
D. le gouverneur	0	1	2	3
E. un agent d'un ministère	0	1	2	3
F. un marabout	0	1	2	3
G. le préfet	0	1	2	3
H. le sous-préfet	0	1	2	3
I. une autre personne influente, précisez _____	0	1	2	3

27. Etes-vous inscrit sur les listes électorales?	
Non	0

Oui [Si oui, mettre 0 pour la question 28 et aller à la question Q29]	1
---	---

28. [Si Non] Pourquoi?	
Pas concerné	0
Raté les inscriptions.	1
Problèmes de santé	2
Absent de ma circonscription	3
Perdu ma carte électorale	4
Pas de carte d'identité	5
Pas de bulletin de naissance	6
Moins de 18 ans	7
Pas intéressé par les élections	8
Autrement engagé	9
Autre [Précisez]	10
[Cocher 9 à 29A-D, cocher 0 aux Qs 30, 31, & 32 et aller à Q 33.]	

29. Etant donné qu'il y a des Sénégalais qui choisissent de ne pas voter, dites-moi s'il vous plaît: Avez-vous voté:	Non	Oui
A. Lors du premier tour des élections présidentielles de février 2000? [Si non, cochez 0 pour Q30] <i>[L'enquêteur doit ici si nécessaire préciser qu'il s'agit des dernières élections présidentielles]</i>	0	1
B. Lors du second tour des élections présidentielles de mars 2000? [Si non, cochez 0 pour Q31] <i>[L'enquêteur doit ici si nécessaire préciser qu'il s'agit des dernières élections présidentielles]</i>	0	1
C. Aux élections législatives de mai 1998 ? [Si non, cochez 0 pour Q32] <i>[L'enquêteur doit ici si nécessaire préciser qu'il s'agit des dernières élections législatives]</i>	0	1
D. Aux élections locales de 1996?	0	1

30. [Si oui à 29A] Pour qui avez-vous voté au premier tour des dernières élections présidentielles de Février 2000?	
Non concerné [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	0
Abdou Diouf	1
Abdoulaye Wade	2
Moustapha Niassé	3
Djibo Ka	4
Iba der Thiam	5
Ousseynou Fall	6
Cheikh Ablaye Dieye	7
Mademba Sock	8
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9
Autre [Item à ne pas suggérer au répondant]	10
Vous préférer m'abstenir de répondre. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	11

31. [Si oui à Q29B] Pour qui avez-vous voté au second tour des dernières élections présidentielles de Février 2000?	
Non concerné [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	0
Abdou Diouf	1

Abdoulaye Wade	2
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9
Autre [Item à ne pas suggérer au répondant]	10
Préfère ne rien dire [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	11

32. [Si oui à Q29C] Aux élections législatives, lorsque vous avez voté pour un candidat, l'avez-vous fait pour soutenir un individu ou pour soutenir un parti?	
Non concerné [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	0
L'individu	1
Parti	2
Autre raison énoncée [Item à ne pas suggérer au répondant]	10
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

33. Vous intéressez-vous à la politique et aux affaires gouvernementales? Etes-vous très intéressé, quelque peu intéressé, pas intéressé ?	
Vous n'êtes pas intéressé	0
Vous êtes quelque peu intéressé	1
Vous êtes très intéressé	2
NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

34. Vous arrive-t-il de discuter de politique et d'affaires gouvernementales avec d'autres gens : jamais, de temps en temps, ou souvent?	
Jamais	0
De temps en temps	1
Souvent	2
NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

35. Vous sentez-vous proche d'un parti politique ? [Si Non cochez 00 à Q36 et cochez 9 à Q37 et allez à Q.38]	
Non	0
Oui	1
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

36. [Si oui à la question 35] De quelle formation politique vous sentez-vous le plus proche?	
Non concerné [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	00
Parti Socialiste (PS)	01
L'Alliance des Forces de Progrès (AFP)	02
Parti Démocratique Sénégalais (PDS)	03
And Jef/Parti pour la Démocratie et le Socialisme (AJ/PADS)	04
Convention des Démocrates et des Patriotes/ Garab-gi (CDP-Garab-gi)	05
Défense de l'Unité Sénégalaise (DUS)	06
Front pour le Socialisme et la Démocratie Benno Jubel (FSD/BJ)	07
Ligue Démocratique/Mouvement pour le Parti du Travail (LD/MPT)	08
Mouvement Démocratique Populaire (MDP)	09
Mouvement Républicain Sénégalais (MRS)	10
Parti Africain de l'Indépendance (PAI)	11
Parti Démocratique Sénégalais / Renovation (PDS/R)	12

Parti pour l'Indépendance et du Travail (PIT)	13
Parti pour la Libération du Peuple (PLP)	14
Parti Populaire Sénégalais (PPS)	15
Parti du Regroupement Africain (PRA)	16
Rassemblement National Démocratique (RND)	17
Union Démocratique Sénégalaise / Rénovation (UDS/R)	18
Union Populaire Sénégalaise / Rénovation (UPS/R)	19
Union Populaire Sénégalaise (UPS)	20
Autre [L'enquêteur indique le nom de parti ici] _____	21
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	99

37. [Si oui a Q35] Avez-vous changé de parti politique après les élections présidentielles?	
Non	0
Oui	1
Non concerné [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

38. Il y a ci-dessous une liste de comportements propre à un citoyen. Dites-moi, s'il vous plaît, la fréquence à laquelle vous avez adopté l'un de ces comportements durant les cinq dernières années.				
	Jamais	Une fois seulement	De temps en temps	Souvent
A. Participer à une réunion dans la communauté	0	1	2	3
B. Participer avec d'autres à la soumission d'un problème	0	1	2	3
C. Participer à un meeting politique	0	1	2	3
D. Travailler pour un candidat ou parti politique	0	1	2	3
E. Signer une pétition	0	1	2	3
F. Ecrire une lettre à un journal	0	1	2	3
G. Participer à une marche	0	1	2	3

[Connaissance politique]

39. Lorsque vous entendez le mot « démocratie », qu'est-ce qui vous vient, en premier, à l'esprit ? <i>[L'enquêteur: Si nécessaire: Précisez "que veut dire démocratie pour vous"]</i>	PC	

40. En général, les gens associent la démocratie avec les différents éléments mentionnés ci-après. Pour qu'une société soit dite démocratique, quelle est l'importance de chacun d'entre eux? [Enquêteur: indique la valeur de l'opinion]

	Très important	Important	Pas vraiment important	Pas du tout important	NSP <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>
A. La règle de la majorité	1	2	3	4	9
B. Liberté totale pour quiconque de critiquer le gouvernement	1	2	3	4	9
C. La tenue régulière d'élections	1	2	3	4	9
D. L'existence d'au moins deux partis politiques rivaux.	1	2	3	4	9
E. Les besoins de première nécessité: habitat, nourriture, eau pour tous	1	2	3	4	9
F. Des emplois pour tous	1	2	3	4	9

G. L'équité en matière d'éducation	1	2	3	4	9
H. Une différence négligeable de revenus entre riche et pauvre	1	2	3	4	9

[L'enquêteur ne traite cette question que si la cible a quelque idée de ce qu'est la démocratie]

41. À votre avis, à quel point le Sénégal est-il une démocratie aujourd'hui?

Pas une démocratie.	0
Des problèmes majeurs mais quand même une démocratie	1
Des problèmes mineurs mais quand même une démocratie	2
Démocratie totale	3
Non concerné	9

42. Dans l'ensemble, à quel point êtes-vous satisfait ou insatisfait de la manière dont la démocratie fonctionne au Sénégal?

[Enquêteur: indique la valeur de l'opinion]

Très insatisfait	1
Quelque peu insatisfait	2
Quelque peu satisfait	3
Très satisfait	4
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer à la cible]	9

43. Laquelle des déclarations suivantes se rapproche le plus de ce que vous pensez?

A. La démocratie est préférable à toute autre forme de gouvernement.	1
B. Dans certains cas, un gouvernement non-démocratique est préférable.	2
C. Pour les gens comme moi, la forme de gouvernement importe peu.	3

44. Vous arrive-t-il de vous informer à partir de :

	Jamais	Moins d'une fois par mois	Environ une fois par mois	Environ une fois par semaine	Plusieurs fois par semaine	Tous les jours	NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]
A. La radio?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. La télévision?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Les Journaux?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9

[Efficacité Politique]

45. Je vais, à présent vous proposer, par paires, plusieurs déclarations. Dites-moi s'il vous plaît, sur laquelle des déclarations vous êtes le plus d'accord? Choisissez la déclaration A ou la déclaration B. [Enquêteur: indique la valeur de l'opinion: "Êtes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord?"]

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Je peux influencer les autres, quant à leur opinion, dans une discussion politique entre amis et voisins.	2	1
B: Dès lors qu'il s'agit de politique, mes amis et voisins ne m'écoutent pas.	3	4

C : Vous n'êtes d'accord sur aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

46.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Les façons de faire du gouvernement semblent, quelques fois si compliquées que je ne comprends pas vraiment ce qui se passe.	2	1
B: D'habitude, je peux comprendre la manière dont le gouvernement travaille.	3	4
C : Vous n'êtes d'accord sur aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

47.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: En général, nous sommes capables, en tant que communauté, de faire en sorte que nos élus nous entendent sur nos problèmes.	2	1
B: D'habitude, nous sommes incapables de nous faire entendre par nos élus.	3	4
C : Vous n'êtes d'accord sur aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

48.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Quelque soit celui pour qui nous votons, les choses ne risquent pas de s'arranger dans l'avenir.	2	1
B: Nous sommes en mesure d'utiliser notre pouvoir en tant qu'électeurs pour choisir des dirigeants capables de nous aider à améliorer nos conditions d'existence.	3	4
C : Vous n'êtes d'accord sur aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

Merci beaucoup. Maintenant, dites-moi s'il vous plaît .

49. Ceux qui ne sont ni alphabétisés, ni lettrés devraient-ils avoir le droit de voter?	
Non	0
Oui	1

50. S'il vous plaît, dites-moi si vous êtes d'accord ou pas sur les déclarations suivantes.

[L'enquêteur: indique la valeur de l'opinion]

	Pas du tout d'accord	Pas d'accord	Ni pour, ni contre	D'accord	Tout à fait d'accord	NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]

A. Si les gens veulent créer une association dans leur communauté, ils devraient s'affilier au parti au pouvoir.	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. La seule façon de s'en sortir dans ce monde c'est de s'accommoder les uns les autres.	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Les gens se laissent diriger trop facilement.	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. Dans ce pays, on doit être très prudent sur ce que l'on dit et fait en ce qui concerne la politique.	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. Il est dangereux d'accepter un compromis avec un adversaire car c'est trahir son propre camp.	1	2	3	4	5	9

51. Revenons à présent aux déclarations par paires. Dites-moi s'il vous plaît, sur laquelle des déclarations vous êtes le plus d'accord? Choisissez la déclaration A ou la déclaration B.

[L'enquêteur: indiquez la valeur de l'opinion: "Etes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: C'est dangereux et cela peut prêter à la confusion de permettre l'expression de trop de point de vue ou d'opinion	2	1
B: Si des personnes ont des opinions différentes de la mienne, elles devraient avoir le droit de les exprimer.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord sur aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
D: Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

52.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Tout le monde devrait avoir le droit de voter même ceux qui ne comprennent rien aux enjeux électoraux.	2	1
B: Seuls ceux qui sont suffisamment bien éduqués devraient être autorisés à voter.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
D: Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

53.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Dans le fond, les gens se moquent de ce qui peut vous arriver.	2	1
B: En règle générale, on peut compter sur les autres pour nous venir en aide lorsque nous sommes dans le besoin.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	

D: Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9
---	---

54.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: De manière générale, la plupart des gens sont dignes de confiance.	2	1
B: De manière générale, on n'est jamais trop prudent avec les gens.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
D: Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

55. Diriez-vous que la plupart des gens sont enclins à aider les autres, ou qu'ils s'occupent plutôt de leur propre personne?	
A aider les autres.	1
A s'occuper d'eux-mêmes.	2
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

56. Voici une liste de personnes et d'institutions. Je voudrais savoir à quel point vous faites confiance en leur capacité à faire ce qui est juste. A quel point faites-vous confiance aux personnes et institutions suivantes?					
	Vous ne leur faites pas du tout confiance	Vous vous méfiez quelque peu d'eux	Vous leur faites quelque peu confiance	Vous leur faites entièrement confiance	NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]
A. Serigne Saliou Mbacke	1	2	3	4	9
B. Serigne Mansour Sy	1	2	3	4	9
C. Ministre d'Etat Idressa Seck	1	2	3	4	9
D. Premier Ministre Moustapha Niasse	1	2	3	4	9
E. Le Président Wade	1	2	3	4	9
F. Les chefs traditionnels	1	2	3	4	9
G. Le conseil rural	1	2	3	4	9
H. La police	1	2	3	4	9
I. Les tribunaux	1	2	3	4	9
J. Les partis politiques	1	2	3	4	9
K. L'armée	1	2	3	4	9
L. La douane	1	2	3	4	9
M. Les banques	1	2	3	4	9
N. Les commerçants	1	2	3	4	9
O. La confrérie Mouride	1	2	3	4	9
P. La confrérie Tidiane	1	2	3	4	9

57. Avez-vous eu l'impression, dans le passé, lorsque vous réalisiez des tâches nécessitant la coopération d'autres personnes, que cela n'allait sûrement pas se réaliser, ou que cela allait sûrement se réaliser?	
Cela n'allait sûrement pas se réaliser.	1
Cela allait sûrement se réaliser.	2

Ne sais pas. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9
---	---

[Aliénation Culturelle]

58. A présent, je vais vous poser quelques questions sur la fréquence à laquelle il vous arrive d'éprouver certains sentiments. Vous me direz si cela vous arrive rarement, de temps en temps, souvent, toujours ou jamais?					
	Jamais	Rarement	De temps en temps	Habituellement	Toujours
A. De manière générale, combien de fois avez-vous eu l'impression d'avoir des idées ou des opinions différentes de celles de vos proches parents [bandiraab'e ; mbok] sur des questions importantes?	0	1	2	3	4
B. Combien de fois vos idées et opinions diffèrent-elles de celles de vos amis?	0	1	2	3	4
C. Combien de fois vos idées et opinions diffèrent de celles des autres habitants de votre village?	0	1	2	3	4
D. De celles de la plupart des gens dans le pays?	0	1	2	3	4

59. Revenons à présent aux déclarations par paires. Dites-moi s'il vous plaît, sur laquelle des déclarations vous êtes le plus d'accord? Choisissez la déclaration A ou la déclaration B.

[L'enquêteur: indiquez la valeur de l'opinion: "Etes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: J'aurais souhaité que les gens soient plus honnêtes.	2	1
B: Je trouve que la plupart des gens vont droit au but.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord sur aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

60. *[L'enquêteur: indiquez la valeur de l'opinion: "Etes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]*

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Les gens sont plutôt satisfaits avec eux-même et n'acceptent jamais leurs défauts.	2	1
B: Tout le monde fait son possible pour faire de son mieux.	3	4
C: Je ne suis d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

61.

[L'enquêteur: indiquez la valeur de l'opinion: "Etes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Je me sens rejeté tout comme si les gens ne voulaient pas de moi.	2	1

B: Les gens semblent m'apprécier.	3	4
C. Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

62. [L'enquêteur: indiquez la valeur de l'opinion: "Etes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]		
	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: La plupart des gens semblent d'être accord avec moi et ma façon de faire.	2	1
B: Les gens sont assez critiques avec moi.	3	4
C. Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

63. [L'enquêteur: indiquez la valeur de l'opinion: "Etes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]		
	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: J'ai l'impression que les gens respectent mon opinion en général.	2	1
B: Souvent, les gens ne donnent pas à mes idées la considération qu'elles méritent.	3	4
C. Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

64.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A. Pour une large part ma vie dépend d'événements accidentels.	2	1
B: Pour la plupart, je suis responsable de ce qui m'arrive.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

65.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A. Souvent, je suis presque incapable de protéger mes intérêts personnels de la malchance.	2	1
B: Lorsque je fais des plans, je suis presque toujours certain que je vais les faire marcher.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]		

	9	
66.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: On n'obtient ce qu'on veut qu'en faisant plaisir à ceux qui sont au dessus de soi.	2	1
B: On n'obtient ce qu'on veut que par le travail et la persévérance.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

67.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Les gens devraient s'occuper d'eux-mêmes et être responsable de leur propre succès dans la vie.	2	1
B: Le gouvernement devrait avoir la responsabilité principale dans l'assurance du bien être des gens.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

68. Diriez-vous que la plupart des hommes sont mieux fait, émotionnellement parlant, pour la politique que la plupart des femmes, ou que les hommes égalent les femmes ou alors que les femmes sont mieux faites que les hommes dans ce domaine?	
Hommes mieux faits	1
Hommes égalent femmes	2
Femmes mieux faites	3
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

69. S'il vous plaît, choisissez à nouveau A ou B. <i>[Enquêteur: indique la valeur de l'opinion: "Êtes-vous tout à fait d'accord ou quelque peu d'accord."]</i>	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A: Tous les membres d'une famille doivent avoir les mêmes opinions politiques.	2	1
B: Chaque membre d'une famille devrait être libre de son opinion sur les questions politiques.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	5	
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9	

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
70.		
A. Chacun devrait décider pour qui il ou elle doit voter.	2	1
B. Une épouse ferait de voter pour le candidat de son mari car celui-ci connaît probablement mieux ces choses qu'elle.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	5	
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	9	

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
71.		
A: La place de la femme est à la maison; les femmes ne devraient pas essayer de parler tout haut de politique.	2	1
B: Une femme devrait exercer son droit de parler tout haut de politique, même si son mari n'est pas d'accord.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	5	
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	9	

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
72.		
A. Notre héritage ethnique et nos coutumes sont des choses qui ont fait de nous un grand peuple et certaines personnes devraient être amenés à leur montrer un plus grand respect.	2	1
B. Nous devrions peut-être abandonner certaines de nos traditions qui ont bloqué notre développement.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	5	
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	9	

	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
73.		
A. Le respect et l'obéissance à l'autorité sont les vertus les plus importantes que les enfants devraient apprendre.	2	1
B. Dans cette époque de changements rapides, les vertus les plus importantes pour les enfants sont la curiosité et l'ouverture d'esprit.	3	4
C: Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	5	
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>		

	9
--	---

74.	Quelque peu d'accord	Tout à fait d'accord
A. Le système de caste est aujourd'hui une réalité dépassé grâce à la modernisation.	2	1
B. Le système de caste devrait être maintenu afin de préserver la paix sociale.	3	4
C. Vous n'êtes d'accord avec aucune de ces déclarations. <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	5	
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	9	

75. Il y a listée, ci-après, une série de déclarations que les gens pourraient faire à propos des autres Sénégalais. Il n'y a pas de réponse juste ou fausse. Nous voulons simplement recueillir votre opinion. Dites-moi s'il vous plaît si vous êtes d'accord ou pas.
[L'enquêteur: indique la valeur de l'opinion]

	Pas du tout d'accord	Pas d'accord	Ni pour, ni contre	D'accord	Tout à fait d'accord	NSP <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>
A. Vous êtes fiers d'être _____.	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. Vous souhaiteriez que vos enfants se considèrent comme _____.	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. De tous les groupes du pays, les _____ sont les meilleurs.	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. Vous vous sentez plus proche des _____ que des autres Sénégalais.	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. Vous êtes fiers d'être qualifié de sénégalais.	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. Vous souhaitez que vos enfants se considèrent comme Sénégalais.	1	2	3	4	5	9

76. Si on devait vous classer dans une de ces deux indentités, <i>[le groupe identitaire du répondant]</i> ou sénégalais, lequel choisiriez-vous ?	
<i>[le groupe identitaire du répondant]</i>	1
Sénégalais	2
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>	9

77. Est-ce que les conditions économiques des _____ <i>[groupe auquel la répondant dit appartenir]</i> sont pires, pareilles, ou meilleures que les autres groupes dans ce pays? <i>[Indique la valeur de l'opinion]</i>
--

Absolument pires conditions économiques	1
Pires conditions	2
Pareilles	3
Meilleures	4
Absolument meilleures conditions	5
NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

78. A votre avis, arrive-t-il au gouvernement de traiter inéquitablement les _____	
Toujours	1
Pour une large part	2
Un peu	3
A peine	4
Jamais	5
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

79. A. Estimez-vous que le gouvernement gère les intérêts de tous les Sénégalais ou alors seulement ceux d'un seul groupe social?	
Tous les sénégalais [Aller à Q.80]	1
Un seul groupe	2

79. B. [Si un seul groupe] Lequel _____	PC
---	----

80. Durant ces dernières années, combien de fois vous est-il arrivé d'être sans:					
	Jamais	Occasionnell ement	Fréquemm ent	Toujou rs	Non concerné
A. Nourriture pour votre famille?	0	1	2	3	9
B. Eau pour usage domestique?	0	1	2	3	9
C. Moyens pour l'éducation de nos enfants?	0	1	2	3	9
D. Soins de santé pour votre famille?	0	1	2	3	9

81. A qui vous adressez vous en général lorsque vous êtes incapable d'obtenir:							
	A pers onne	Pare nts et allié s	Au groupe communaut aire	A un organisme privé	Au gouverne ment	Origine illicite	Non concerné
A. De la nourriture pour votre famille?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. De l'eau pour usage domestique?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. De moyens pour scolariser vos enfants?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. De moyens pour assurer la santé de votre famille?	0	1	2	3	4	5	9

82. A quel point êtes-vous satisfait:				
[L'enquêteur: indiquer la valeur de l'opinion]	Pas du tout satisfait	Pas très satisfait	Quelque peu satisfait	Très satisfait
A. de l'état général de l'économie Sénégalaise?	1	2	3	4

B. de vos conditions de vie actuelles?	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

83. Estimez-vous que vos conditions de vie sont pires, pareilles, ou meilleures que celles des autres Sénégalais? <i>[L'enquêteur: indiquer la valeur de l'opinion]</i>				
Absolument pires				1
Pires				2
A peu près les mêmes				3
Meilleures				4
Absolument meilleures				5
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>				9

84. Quelle appréciation faites-vous de vos conditions de vie actuelles comparées à celles cinq ans auparavant ? Êtes-vous :				
Beaucoup moins satisfait				1
Sensiblement moins satisfait				2
A peu près les mêmes conditions				3
Sensiblement plus satisfait				4
Beaucoup plus satisfait				5
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>				9

85. Lorsque vous considérez l'avenir et vos potentialités dans la vie, quel degré de satisfaction pensez-vous obtenir dans un an?				
Beaucoup moins satisfait				1
Sensiblement moins satisfait				2
A peu près les mêmes conditions				3
Sensiblement plus satisfait				4
Beaucoup plus satisfait				5
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>				9

86. A votre avis, qui est responsable des conditions actuelles de l'économie sénégalaise?				
Le gouvernement précédent				1
L'actuel gouvernement				2
Le FMI/Banque Mondiale				3
Le peuple sénégalais				4
Le programme d'ajustement structurel				5
Les forces internes d'opposition				6
Les forces économiques internationales				7
Autre <i>[à préciser]</i>				8
Ne sais pas <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>				9

87. Comment, à votre avis, le gouvernement traite-t-il les questions suivantes?					
	Très mal	Assez mal	Assez bien	Très bien	NSP <i>[Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]</i>
A. La création d'emploi	1	2	3	4	9
B. Le maintien de prix bas	1	2	3	4	9
C. La diminution des différences de revenus entre les différents groupes.	1	2	3	4	9
D. La réduction de la criminalité	1	2	3	4	9
E. La traitement des besoins éducatifs des sénégalais	1	2	3	4	9
F. L'amélioration des services de santé primaires	1	2	3	4	9

G. La lutte contre la corruption dans l'Administration publique	1	2	3	4	9
H. La gestion de l'économie	1	2	3	4	9

88. Quelle appréciation globale faites-vous des performances du gouvernement actuel?	
Très mauvaise	1
Mauvaise	2
Ni mauvaise, ni bonne	3
Bonne	4
Très bonne	5
Il est trop tôt pour se prononcer. [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	6
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	9

89. A votre avis, combien de temps faudra-t-il:						
	Dans les deux ans	Dans les quatre ans	Dans les huit ans	Plus de huit ans	Jamais	NSP [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]
A. avant que le gouvernement ne tienne les promesses faites lors de la campagne électorale?	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. avant que vos conditions de vie changent conformément à vos attentes?	1	2	3	4	5	9

90. Quel est votre revenu mensuel?	
Pas de revenu	0
Moins de 10,000	1
Entre 10,000 et 30,000	2
Entre 31,000 et 50,000	3
Entre 51,000 et 100,000	4
Entre 101,000 et 150,000	5
Entre 151,000 et 200,000	6
Entre 201,000 et 300,000	7
Entre 301,000 et 400,000	8
Entre 401,000 et 500,000	9
Entre 501,000 et 700,000	10
Entre 701,000 et 900,000	11
Entre 901,000 et 1,100,000	12
Plus de 1,100,000	13
Préfère de ne pas dire [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	14
Ne sais pas [Item à ne pas communiquer au répondant]	-8

Merci beaucoup. Vos réponses m'ont été d'une grande utilité. Soyez assurés que leur confidentialité sera préservée.

Moment de la fin de l'interview: [L'enquêteur: indiquez l'heure et la minute en utilisant le système de 24 heures.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Fin de l'Interview

Appendix D: Project Description

STUDY ON EDUCATION, CIVIL SOCIETY AND DEMOCRACY IN SENEGAL

Introduction

The objective of the study was to assess the effects of nonformal education on civic participation and orientation in rural Senegal. A probability sample of 1484 Senegalese citizens was drawn in the regions of Thies, St. Louis, Diourbel, Louga and Kaolack.

SAMPLING

Target Population

Senegalese citizens who were at least 18 years old and who lived in rural areas in the five regions of study constituted the target population.

Sample Design

As in the Afrobarometer surveys, a multi-stage, stratified, area cluster probability sample design was employed. The design was intended to generate a sample that would allow one to assess the effects of four different nonformal education programs in the rural areas of the five regions mentioned above. The four programs are Tostan, PIP, PAPA, and PAPP. These five regions were selected because they have a fairly high concentration of literacy programs and also contain largely the same ethnolinguistic groups.

Selection of primary sampling units. The village constituted the primary sampling unit (PSU). Selection of PSUs was stratified by region and NFE program. Villages were selected with probability proportionate to size (PPS). In other words, the probability of selection associated with any particular village was exactly proportional to its share of the total population.

Following sampling protocol of the Afrobarometer studies, selection of control sampling units was administered at four levels:

1. PSU: village
2. starting points
3. households
4. individuals

One thousand four hundred and eighty-four questionnaires administered

One thousand four hundred and eighty four questionnaires were administered in 94 villages randomly selected with probability proportionate to size in St. Louis, Thies, Louga, Diourbel and Kaolack between the end of October 2000 and the beginning of April 2001. These villages included “treatment” villages (i.e., nonformal education (NFE) villages) and control villages. PIP guides accompanied us to the PIP villages and a Tostan guide accompanied us to the Tostan villages. In the NFE villages, a list of all those who had participated in the relevant NFE program was taken with the aid of the person/people in charge of the class in that village or someone else knowledgeable about the program. Twelve of those who had participated in the program were randomly drawn from that list. In each NFE village, four “control” households were randomly selected through a walking pattern (*pas de sondage*). That is, a particular part of the village was selected randomly: north, south, east, west or center. Following the sampling protocol used by the Afrobarometer studies, in this part of the village, the supervisor or primary researcher identified a mosque, water spigot, school or other landmark that could be used as a starting point. At the starting point, the first interviewer walked in the direction of the sun, the second interviewer walked in the opposite direction, the third proceeded at a right angle from the first and the fourth interviewer walked in the direction opposite of the third. The interviewers selected every third household on their right. The respondent was then randomly selected at the household level.

In the control villages, sixteen households were randomly selected in one of two ways. Households were either selected via the walking pattern or, when the village did not contain a large number of households, a list of households was created with the help of a knowledgeable villager, usually the chief of the village. Sixteen households were then randomly selected from the list.

Sampling Frame: Databases for NFE Villages by Region

Numerous sub databases were created in excel. Databases containing the PAPA villages were created for the regions of Thies, St. Louis, and Kaolack. Databases containing Tostan villages were created for St. Louis, Thies, and Diourbel. Databases containing PAPF villages were created for Louga and Diourbel. Finally, a database of PIP villages was created for the Region of St. Louis. From these databases, which included basic demographic information on each village, a sampling list was generated and villages were selected with probability proportionate to size in excel. “Control” databases were also created for the five regions covered in the study.

A plethora of materials had to be gathered and generated so that a representative sample could be drawn. Numerous visits were made to DAEB, PAPF, PAPA and Tostan. Lists of all of the villages that have completed literacy programs with PIP, TOSTAN, PAPF, and PAPA were eventually obtained or constructed. Unfortunately, PAPA does not have a comprehensive list of the villages that have had the PAPA program. All of the IDEN Departmental representatives in the regions of interest were contacted and asked for this information. A short trip week was required to collect this information. We were

required to return to the majority of the offices at least once or use other follow-up measures. Moreover, we rarely simply received a list of villages, but instead were given numerous papers, letters, memos, etc. with short lists of villages that had to be organized and aggregated. Most of the lists associated with the other organizations required some organization, aggregation and follow-up. In short, creating the sampling frame involved many steps, and, in a few cases, we could not be sure that our lists were completely exhaustive.

The tables below show the distribution of the selected villages and respondents by region and NFE program.

Number of Villages by Region and Program

	PAPA	PAPF	Tostan	PIP	Control	TOTALS
SL	4		10	15	6	35
Louga		6			5	11
Kaolack	5				5	10
Diourbel		4	2		5	11
Thies	6		12		9	27
	15	10	23	15	30	94

Number of Respondents by Region and Program

	PAPA	PAPF	Tostan	PIP	Control in NFE Villages	Control in Control Villages	Totals
SL	48		120	180	116	96	560
Louga		72			24	61	157
Kaolack	60				20	79	159
Diourbel		48	24		24	80	176
Thies	72		144		72	144	432
Totals	180	120	288	180	256	460	1484

Substitutions

Seven substitutions were made:

Kaolack

Ida Mmbayene was selected as a control village in the region of Kaolack. Although it did not appear on any of the PAPA lists, upon arriving at Ida Mmbayene, the research team found that at least one member of nearly every household had participated in the PAPA literacy program. Dara Niassene was randomly selected as the substitution village.

Thies

Although Ndiouffene was on the list for PAPA Thies, the research team found that no PAPA class had been established in this village. Diass (Ndiass) was randomly selected with (PPS) as the substitution village.

St. Louis

Aere Lao was selected as a Tostan village. However, three days prior to that on which the research team was supposed to conduct work in Aere Lao, Tostan and the Senegalese government attempted to organize a discussion on excision in that village. The discussion was not able to take place because several marabouts and their followers came to the discussion with weapons waiting to attack should anyone have dared to raise the issue of excision. Our Tostan guide and members of the research team feared a hostile and potentially violent reception from the inhabitants of this village, so Aere Lao was substituted by Aram.

Senobowal had not had a PIP class and was therefore substituted by Thianaff.

Diourbel Control

Tene was substituted by Mbadiane SAD Thiade and Kholkhorane was substituted by Sessene. While these villages were chosen as control villages, they both had actually been recipients of the PAF program, and nearly every household contained a participant in the program. This situation arose because, despite all the work dedicated to assembling the sampling frame, the sampling lists were not exhaustive.

Louga

Because the marabout refused the research team access to this village, Merina Ndiaye was substituted by Coki Dakhar.

Minimizing Interviewer Error

A supervisor accompanied each team of interviewers. Interviews were observed and questionnaires were examined.

CREATING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Development of a Draft of the Questionnaire

One of the first steps in this project was to develop a draft of the questionnaire that would be used to assess the relationship between education and civic and political participation.

This step in the research project involved intensive work in constructing questions and scales. Some of the questions were formulated based on my past experience with and knowledge of Senegal, while others were borrowed from questionnaires such as the Afrobarometer and World Values Survey. A few of the scales dealing with attitudes and dispositions were taken from *Measures of Social-Psychological Attitudes*. In all cases, I spent significant amounts of time modifying the questions so that they would be appropriate for the Senegalese context. I asked several survey experts to read the questionnaire and give me their feedback, and also solicited the advice of experts on Senegal. I then used mock interviews to see how the questionnaire flowed and modified it accordingly. Prior to the pretest, the questionnaire had 220 variables.

Translation of the Questionnaire into Pulaar, Wolof, and French

The questionnaire was translated into Pulaar, Wolof, and French. Many steps were taken to ensure the integrity, consistency and validity of the research instrument. The questionnaire was first translated into French from English. Because this is a critical translation (all of the national language questionnaires were translated from this translation), the French translation was given to an editor who used the English version to edit and correct this translation. The French translation was then backtranslated into English. The English backtranslation and the original English questionnaire were then compared. Inconsistencies between these versions were identified, and the French translation was then corrected and modified once again. The questionnaire was then translated into Pulaar and Wolof. The Wolof and Pulaar questionnaires were then given to two other translators so that they could be backtranslated into French.

Pretest

The pretest was successfully conducted in the suburbs of Dakar and villages of Thies during September 2000. The 39 pretest questionnaires were carefully scrutinized and then entered into a database. Based on the results of the pretest, the questionnaire was modified.

The testing of these materials revealed that much of the language was overly sophisticated and inaccessible. Also, some of the vocabulary employed was region-specific. Numerous additional work sessions were scheduled with members of the research team so that the practical viability of these translations could be assessed and ameliorated. The translations of the questionnaires were edited and corrected with painstaking care. The research team received additional days of training after the pretest so that the lessons of the pretest could be disseminated among and assimilated by the members of the research team.

The data generated by the pretest was analyzed. Variances were checked, and most of the questions with low variances were excluded on the final questionnaire. The validity of the questions was assessed. Factor analysis was employed to check dimensionality and Cronbachs alphas were checked so that the internal reliability of the scales could be assessed. Certain questions were reformulated (i.e., categories were collapsed, question

working was changed, etc.), as well as some of the scales. The pretest also allowed us to close a couple open-ended questions.

Development of the Research Team and Research Protocol

Eight interviewers were hired to administer the questionnaire. Altogether, the interviewers received seven days of training. Materials that would introduce the interviewers to the project and principles of survey research and instruct the interviewers on their role in the research process were developed and presented. Interviewers were trained on the use of acceptable probes and clarifications, and the list of standardized probes was translated into French, Wolof, and Pulaar for their use. The supervisor and interviewers learned how to draw a random sample of households at the village level and how to randomly select a respondent at the household level. (The supervisor and data entry person also learned how to select primary sampling units with probability proportionate to size (PPS)).

APPENDIX E : EFFECTS OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS ON COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Table E.1 : Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Tostan Training and General Control Variables on Community Participation

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of Tostan	.5166301	.0471032	10.968	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.059499	.01978	3.008	0.003
Income	.0736728	.0420506	1.752	0.080
Age	.0291201	.0046187	6.305	0.000
Gender	-.0210018	.1363296	-0.154	0.878
Pular	-.0861053	.1658665	-0.519	0.604
Wolof	-.1527565	.1619334	-0.943	0.346

Number of observations = 854
 chi2(7) = 180.88
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -1511.2808
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0565

Table E.2: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of PAPA Training and General Control Variables on Community Participation

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of PAPA	.4985042	.0865756	5.758	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.0554096	.0208232	2.661	0.008
Income	.1017272	.0434966	2.339	0.019
Age	.0243165	.0047907	5.076	0.000
Gender	-.0725058	.1481212	-0.490	0.624
Pular	.0828158	.1637054	0.506	0.613
Wolof	-.2988067	.1623576	-1.840	0.066

Number of observations = 780
 chi2(7) = 79.62
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -1394.9702
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0277

Table E.3: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Years of PAPF Training and General Control Variables on Community Participation

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of PAPF	.6029411	.0722537	8.345	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.0451542	.0209392	2.156	0.031
Income	.1283716	.0446771	2.873	0.004
Age	.025762	.004944	5.211	0.000
Gender	-.1081496	.1492336	-0.725	0.469
Pular	.065596	.184923	0.355	0.723
Wolof	-.1621782	.1753782	-0.925	0.355

Number of observations = 726
 chi2(7) = 107.49
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -1289.3985
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0400

Table E.4: Ordinal Logit-Estimated Effects of Years of PIP Training and General Control Variables on Community Participation

Finally, the effect of the PIP program is examined. Since PIP operates almost exclusively in St. Louis among Pulaar-speakers, only Pulaar-speakers were included in the analysis.

Explanatory Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Z score	P> z
Years of PIP	.4972177	.0717594	6.929	0.000
Years of Formal Schooling	.0659841	.032445	2.034	0.042
Income	.0643003	.0697424	0.922	0.357
Age	.0217597	.0082584	2.635	0.008
Gender	-.5530441	.2437145	-2.269	0.023

Number of observations = 290
 chi2(5) = 77.37
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Log Likelihood = -497.36661
 Pseudo R2 = 0.0722

Appendix F: Probability Tables for Community Participation for Subgroups of the Sample

Table F.1: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Community Participation for Pulaar Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.10	.08 to .12	.15	.12 to .19
1	.15	.12 to .18	.16	.13 to .20
1.27	.17	.13 to .20	.16	.13 to .20
1.7	.20	.16 to .24	.17	.13 to .20
2	.22	.18 to .26	.17	.13 to .21
2.4	.25	.21 to .30	.17	.14 to .21
3	.31	.26 to .37	.17	.14 to .21
4	.42	.35 to .50	.18	.14 to .22
6	.65	.56 to .74	.20	.15 to .24
6.6	.71	.62 to .79	.20	.16 to .25
7	.75	.66 to .83	.20	.16 to .25
10	.92	.88 to .96	.23	.17 to .29
12	*	*	.24	.17 to .32
20	*	*	.32	.20 to .46

Table F.2: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Community Participation for Wolof Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.06	.05 to .08	.10	.08 to .12
1	.10	.08 to .12	F	F
1.27	.11	.09 to .13	.11	.09 to .13
1.7	.13	.11 to .16	.11	.09 to .13
2	.15	.12 to .18	.11	.09 to .13
2.4	.18	.15 to .21	.11	.09 to .14
3	.22	.18 to .26	.12	.10 to .14
4	.31	.26 to .37	.12	.10 to .15
6	.54	.45 to .63	.13	.10 to .16

6.6	.61	.52 to .70	.14	.11 to .17
7	.66	.56 to .74	.14	.11 to .17
10	.89	.82 to .94	.16	.12 to .20
12	*	*	.17	.12 to .22
20	*	*	.23	.14 to .35

Table F.3: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Community Participation for Wolof Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.07	.05 to .09	.11	.09 to .14
1	.11	.08 to .14	.12	.09 to .15
1.27	.12	.10 to .15	.12	.09 to .15
1.7	.15	.12 to .18	.12	.10 to .15
2	.16	.13 to .21	.12	.10 to .16
2.4	.19	.15 to .24	.13	.10 to .16
3	.24	.19 to .30	.13	.10 to .16
4	.34	.27 to .41	.13	.11 to .17
6	.57	.47 to .67	.15	.11 to .19
6.6	.64	.53 to .73	.15	.11 to .19
7	.68	.57 to .77	.15	.12 to .20
10	.90	.82 to .94	.17	.13 to .23
12	*	*	.18	.13 to .25
20	*	*	.25	.15 to .38

Table F.4: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Community Participation for Serer Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of High Community Participation level for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.07	.06 to .10		
1	.11	.09 to .14		
1.27	.13	.10 to .16		
1.7	.15	.12 to .19		
2	.17	.14 to .21		
2.4	.20	.16 to .25		

3	.25	.20 to .30
4	.35	.28 to .42
6	.58	.49 to .67
6.6	.65	.55 to .74
7	.69	.59 to .78
10	.90	.83 to .95
12	*	*
20	*	*

Appendix G: Probability Tables for Interest/Engagement in Politics for Subgroups of the Sample

Table G.1: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Engaged in Politics for Pulaar Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.45	.39 to .50	.46	.41 to .51
1	.48	.43 to .53	.48	.43 to .52
1.27	.49	.44 to .54	.48	.44 to .53
1.7	.50	.46 to .55	.49	.44 to .54
2	.51	.46 to .56	.49	.45 to .54
2.4	.52	.48 to .58	.50	.45 to .55
3	.54	.49 to .60	.51	.46 to .56
4	.58	.52 to .64	.53	.47 to .58
6	.64	.56 to .72	.56	.49 to .62
6.6	.66	.57 to .74	.56	.50 to .63
7	.67	.58 to .75	.57	.50 to .64
10	.75	.63 to .84	.62	.53 to .70
12	*	*	.64	.55 to .73
20	*	*	.74	.61 to .85

Table G.2: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Engaged in Politics for Pulaar Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.48	.42 to .54	.50	.43 to .55
1	.51	.45 to .57	.51	.45 to .57
1.27	.52	.46 to .58	.52	.46 to .58
1.7	.54	.48 to .60	.52	.47 to .58
2	.55	.48 to .60	.53	.46 to .58
2.4	.56	.49 to .61	.54	.48 to .59
3	.58	.51 to .64	.54	.48 to .60
4	.61	.54 to .68	.56	.49 to .62
6	.67	.58 to .75	.59	.52 to .65
6.6	.69	.59 to .77	.60	.53 to .67
7	.70	.60 to .78	.60	.53 to .67

10	.77	.65 to .86	.65	.56 to .72
12	*	*	.67	.57 to .76
20	*	*	.77	.64 to .87

Table G.3: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Engaged in Politics for Wolof Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.50	.45 to .55	.52	.47 to .57
1	.53	.48 to .58	.53	.48 to .58
1.27	.54	.49 to .59	.54	.48 to .59
1.7	.56	.51 to .61	.54	.49 to .59
2	.57	.52 to .61	.55	.50 to .60
2.4	.58	.53 to .63	.55	.51 to .60
3	.60	.55 to .65	.56	.51 to .61
4	.63	.56 to .69	.58	.52 to .63
6	.69	.61 to .76	.61	.54 to .67
6.6	.70	.62 to .78	.62	.56 to .69
7	.71	.62 to .80	.62	.55 to .69
10	.79	.67 to .87	.66	.58 to .74
12	*	*	.69	.60 to .77
20	*	*	.78	.65 to .88

Table G.4: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Engaged in Politics for Wolof Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.53	.46 to .60	.55	.48 to .61
1	.57	.50 to .63	.57	.50 to .63
1.27	.58	.51 to .64	.57	.51 to .63
1.7	.59	.52 to .65	.58	.51 to .64
2	.60	.53 to .66	.58	.51 to .64
2.4	.61	.55 to .68	.59	.52 to .65
3	.63	.56 to .70	.60	.53 to .66
4	.66	.58 to .73	.61	.54 to .67
6	.72	.62 to .80	.64	.56 to .71
6.6	.73	.63 to .81	.65	.57 to .72

7	.74	.64 to .82	.65	.57 to .72
10	.81	.69 to .89	.69	.60 to .77
12	*	*	.72	.62 to .80
20	*	*	.80	.68 to .89

Table G.5: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Engaged in Politics for Serer Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Interest/Engagement in Politics for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.47	.41 to .54	.49	.43 to .55
1	.51	.44 to .56	.50	.44 to .57
1.27	.51	.45 to .57	.51	.45 to .56
1.7	.53	.47 to .58	.51	.45 to .57
2	.54	.48 to .60	.52	.46 to .58
2.4	.55	.49 to .61	.52	.47 to .58
3	.57	.50 to .64	.53	.47 to .59
4	.60	.52 to .67	.55	.49 to .61
6	.66	.56 to .74	.58	.51 to .65
6.6	.68	.57 to .76	.59	.52 to .65
7	.69	.58 to .78	.60	.52 to .66
10	.77	.64 to .87	.70	.56 to .84
12	*	*	.66	.56 to .75
20	*	*	.76	.63 to .86

Appendix H: Probability Tables for Having Progressive Values for Subgroups of the Sample

Table H.1: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for Pulaar Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.25	.21 to .30	.27	.23 to .32
1	.29	.25 to .35	.29	.25 to .35
1.27	.31	.26 to .36	.30	.25 to .35
1.7	.33	.28 to .38	.31	.26 to .36
2	.34	.29 to .40	.31	.26 to .37
2.4	.36	.31 to .42	.32	.27 to .38
3	.40	.33 to .46	.34	.28 to .39
4	.45	.38 to .53	.36	.30 to .42
6	.57	.47 to .67	.41	.34 to .48
6.6	.60	.49 to .71	.42	.36 to .50
7	.62	.51 to .74	.43	.36 to .51
10	.76	.57 to .94	.51	.41 to .61
12	*	*	*	
20	*	*	.73	.55 to .92

Table H.2: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for Wolof Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Having Progressive Orientation for Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.17	.14 to .20	.19	.15 to .23
1	.20	.17 to .24	.20	.17 to .24
1.27	.21	.18 to .25	.21	.17 to .24
1.7	.23	.19 to .27	.21	.18 to .25
2	.24	.20 to .29	.22	.18 to .26
2.4	.26	.21 to .31	.23	.19 to .26
3	.29	.24 to .34	.24	.20 to .28
4	.33	.27 to .41	.26	.21 to .30
6	.44	.35 to .54	.30	.24 to .35
6.6	.47	.37 to .59	.31	.25 to .37
7	.50	.38 to .62	.32	.26 to .38

10	.66	.51 to .84	.39	.30 to .47
12	*	*	.43	.34 to .53
20	*	*	.63	.47 to .79

Appendix I: Probability Tables for Support for Democratic Values for Subgroups of the Sample

Table I.1: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Supportive of Democratic Values for Pulaar Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.09	.07 to .11	.08	.06 to .10
1	.10	.08 to .12	.10	.08 to .12
1.27	.11	.09 to .13	.10	.08 to .12
1.7	.11	.09 to .13	.11	.09 to .13
2	.11	.09 to .14	.11	.09 to .13
2.4	.12	.10 to .14	.12	.10 to .14
3	.13	.10 to .15	.13	.11 to .15
4	.14	.11 to .18	.15	.12 to .18
6	.18	.13 to .23	.20	.16 to .24
6.6	.19	.14 to .25	.21	.17 to .26
7	.20	.14 to .27	.22	.18 to .27
10	.26	.16 to .38	.33	.26 to .40
12	*	*	.40	.32 to .49
20	*	*	.72	.58 to .83

Table I.2: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Supportive of Democratic Values for Pulaar Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.14	.10 to .17	.12	.10 to .15
1	.15	.12 to .19	.14	.11 to .18
1.27	.16	.13 to .19	.15	.12 to .18
1.7	.16	.13 to .20	.16	.13 to .19
2	.17	.14 to .21	.16	.13 to .20
2.4	.18	.14 to .22	.17	.14 to .21
3	.19	.15 to .23	.19	.15 to .23
4	.21	.16 to .26	.22	.18 to .26
6	.25	.18 to .33	.28	.23 to .34
6.6	.27	.19 to .35	.30	.24 to .36
7	.28	.20 to .37	.31	.25 to .38
10	.35	.23 to .51	.43	.35 to .52

12	.52	.42 to .62
20	.80	.69 to .89

Table I.3: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Supportive of Democratic Values for Wolof Men

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.10	.07 to .12	.08	.06 to .11
1	.11	.08 to .13	.10	.08 to .13
1.27	.11	.08 to .14	.10	.08 to .13
1.7	.11	.09 to .15	.11	.08 to .14
2	.12	.09 to .15	.11	.09 to .14
2.4	.12	.09 to .16	.12	.09 to .15
3	.13	.10 to .17	.13	.10 to .17
4	.15	.11 to .19	.15	.12 to .19
6	.18	.13 to .25	.20	.15 to .26
6.6	.19	.13 to .27	.22	.17 to .28
7	.20	.14 to .28	.23	.18 to .29
10	.27	.16 to .40	.33	.25 to .42
12	*	*	.41	.31 to .52
20	*	*	.73	.58 to .84

Table I.4: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Being Highly Supportive of Democratic Values for Serer Women

Number of Years of Education	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For NFE	95% Confidence Interval for NFE	Likelihood of Supporting Democratic Values For Formal Education	95% Confidence Interval for Formal Education
0	.08	.06 to .10	.07	.05 to .09
1	.09	.07 to .11	.08	.06 to .10
1.27	.09	.07 to .11	.08	.06 to .10
1.7	.09	.07 to .12	.09	.07 to .11
2	.10	.07 to .12	.09	.07 to .12
2.4	.10	.08 to .13	.10	.08 to .12
3	.11	.08 to .14	.11	.08 to .13
4	.12	.09 to .15	.12	.10 to .15
6	.15	.10 to .20	.17	.13 to .20
6.6	.16	.10 to .22	.18	.14 to .22
7	.17	.11 to .23	.19	.15 to .24
10	.22	.13 to .35	.28	.21 to .35

12	*	*	.36	.27 to .44
20	*	*	.68	.53 to .80

Appendix J: Probability Tables for Electoral Participation for Subgroups of the Sample

Table J.1: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Electoral Participation for Pulaar Women

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Highest Level of Electoral Participation	95% Confidence Interval
0	.41	.35 to .47
1	.43	.38 to .49
1.27	.44	.39 to .50
2	.46	.40 to .52
2.4	.47	.41 to .53
3	.48	.42 to .55
4	.51	.43 to .58
6	.56	.46 to .65
10	.65	.50 to .79

Table J.2: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Electoral Participation for Pulaar Men

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Highest Level of Electoral Participation	95% Confidence Interval
0	.32	.26 to .39
1	.34	.28 to .42
1.27	.35	.28 to .43
2	.37	.30 to .44
2.4	.38	.30 to .46
3	.39	.31 to .47
4	.41	.33 to .51
6	.46	.36 to .58
10	.56	.39 to .72

Table J.3: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Electoral Participation for Wolof Women

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Highest Level of Electoral Participation	95% Confidence Interval
0	.45	.39 to .51
1	.47	.42 to .53

1.27	.48	.43 to .54
2	.50	.44 to .56
2.4	.51	.45 to .57
3	.53	.46 to .59
4	.55	.48 to .62
6	.60	.50 to .69
10	.69	.53 to .81

Table J.4: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of High Level of Electoral Participation for Wolof Men

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Highest Level of Electoral Participation	95% Confidence Interval
0	.36	.29 to .43
1	.38	.31 to .46
1.27	.39	.32 to .47
2	.41	.33 to .48
2.4	.42	.34 to .50
3	.43	.35 to .51
4	.46	.36 to .55
6	.51	.39 to .63
10	.60	.43 to .76

Appendix K: Probability Tables for Registering to Vote for Subgroups of the Sample

Table K.1: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Registering to Vote for Pulaar Men

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Registering to Vote	95% Confidence Interval
0	.66	.58 to .73
1	.71	.64 to .77
1.27	.72	.65 to .78
1.7	.74	.67 to .80
2	.75	.69 to .81
2.4	.77	.70 to .82
3	.79	.72 to .84
4	.82	.75 to .88
6	.88	.81 to .93
6.6	.89	.82 to .94
7	.90	.83 to .95
10	.94	.88 to .98

Table K.2: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Registering to Vote for Wolof Women

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Registering to Vote	95% Confidence Interval
0	.67	.61 to .72
1	.71	.66 to .76
1.27	.73	.67 to .77
1.7	.74	.70 to .79
2	.76	.71 to .80
2.4	.77	.72 to .82
3	.79	.74 to .84
4	.83	.77 to .87
6	.88	.82 to .92
6.6	.89	.83 to .94
7	.90	.84 to .94
10	.94	.89 to .98

Table K.3: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Registering to Vote for Wolof Men

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Registering to Vote	95% Confidence Interval
------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

0	.63	.55 to .70
1	.68	.61 to .75
1.27	.69	.62 to .76
1.7	.71	.64 to .78
2	.72	.65 to .79
2.4	.74	.67 to .81
3	.77	.69 to .83
4	.80	.72 to .87
6	.86	.78 to .92
6.6	.88	.79 to .93
7	.88	.80 to .94
10	.93	.86 to .97

Table K.4: The Effects of NFE on the Likelihood of Registering to Vote for Serer Women

Number of Years of NFE	Likelihood of Registering to Vote	95% Confidence Interval
0	.66	.59 to .73
1	.71	.65 to .77
1.27	.72	.66 to .78
1.7	.74	.69 to .79
2	.75	.70 to .81
2.4	.77	.71 to .82
3	.79	.73 to .84
4	.82	.76 to .88
6	.88	.82 to .93
6.6	.89	.83 to .94
7	.90	.83 to .95
10	.94	.88 to .98

Appendix L: Villages Selected in Study on Nonformal Education, Civil Society and Democracy

VILLAGES SELECTED

SUBSTITUTIONS

Diourbel Control

Tene

Mbadiane S A D

Thiade

Ndiakalak Ngueye Ngueye

Ngoudiodj

Kholkhotrane

Dendey Peul

Sessene

Diourbel PAPP

Madina

Ndoulo

Thiaytou

Dalla Peulh I

Tostan Diourbel

Keur Samba Kane Ii

Gram Fall

Control Kaolack

Birkelane

Ida Mmbayene

Keur Taiba Ouolof

Moula Mamour

Santhie Medina (Keur Omar)

Dara Niassene

Kaolack PAPA

Keur Djiby

Maleme Hodar

Ndoffane

Thiamene Maka

Baitite

Louga Control

Darou Marnane

Kanene Khar

Merina Ndiaye

Nguith

Touba Belel

Coki Dakhar

Louga PAPA

Diokoul
Keur Pathe Peulh
Ndamé Gotte
Sakal
Touba Merina
Barkedji

St. Louis Control

Boinadji Roumde
Doumga Ouro Alpha
Lahbar Ii
Ndiebene Gandiole
Ourourbe Medina I
Taba Darou Salam Ii

PAPA St. Louis

Mbarigot
Pathe Gallo
Abdallah
Doumga Ouro
Thierno

PIP St. Louis

Ballel
Banadji
Thilogne
Ogo
Mbiddi
Gaoude Boffe
Foumihara Demboube
Walalde
Madina Ndiatbe
Kanel
Ngouye
Awqaly Thiewel
Senobowal
Thialaga
Gamadji Sare

Thianaff

Tostan St. Louis

Boberel (Tioka)
Gaol
Woudourou

Bokidiawe
Toucouleur
Ndendory
Bondji Ndiobo
Agnam Thiodaye
Fanaye Diery
Dimat Diery
Aere Lao

Aram

Thies Control

Bangadji
Fass (Fass Diack Sao)
Keur Demba
Khaye Goundiang
Mboro Kondio
Ndiao Ndiao(Ndawene)
Ngandiouf
Pout
Teugue Gatteigne

Tostan Thies

Ngaparou
Nguekhokh
Thor Diender
Mbidiem
Therox
Ndindy Hann
Malicounda Serere
Taiba Mbaye
Meouane
Taiba Senthie
Keur Madiagne
Darou Khoudoss

Thies PAPA

Godaguene
Mbalakhate
Ndiouffene
Niomar
Sinthiane
Tocomack

References

- Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. 1965. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond Ses: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *The American Political Science Review* 89(2): 271-294.
- Bratton, Michael and Philip Alderfer. 1999. "The Effects of Civic Education on Political Culture: Evidence from Zambia." *World Development* 27(5):807-824.
- Finifter, Ada W. and Ellen Mickiewicz. 1992. "Redefining the Political System of the USSR: Mass Support for Political Change." *The American Political Science Review* 86(4):857-874.
- Gibson, James L., Raymond M. Duch and Kent L. Tedin. 1992. "Democratic Values and the Transformation of the Soviet Union." *The Journal of Politics* 54(2):329-371
- Goody, Jack and Ian Watt. 1968. "The Consequences of Literacy" in ed. Jack Goody, *Literacy in Traditional Society* pp. 27-68. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadenius, Axel. 1992. *Democracy and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inkeles, Alex. 1983. *Exploring Individual Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lawrence, David G. 1976. "Procedural Norms and Tolerance: A Reassessment," *American Political Science Review* 70(1):80-100.
- Lerner, Daniel. 1958. *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Lipset, Seymour. 1959. *Political Man*. Garden City, New York: Double Day and Company, Inc.
- McClosky, Herbert. 1964. "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," *American Political Science Review* 58:361-82.
- Oxenham, John. 1980. *Literacy: Writing, Reading and Social Organization*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.: London.
- Prothro, James and Charles Grigg. 1960. "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement," *Journal of Politics*. 22:76-94.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Scribner, Sylvia and Michael Cole. 1981. *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Street, Brian V. 1995. *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography and Education*. London and New York.
- Sylla, Abdou. 1993. "Reform Options for the Educational System." In *Senegal: Essays in Statecraft*, ed. Momar Coumba Diop. Dakar, Senegal: CODESRIA. Pp. 370-419.
- Villalon, Leonardo. 1994. "Democratizing a (Quasi) Democracy: The Senegalese Elections of 1993." *African Affairs* 92:163-193.