Sustainable and Child Friendly Initiative

Children Consultation

February - March 2015

Focus Group Discussions with Children: gender perspectives

This exercise aimed to explore the level of gender perception and stereotyping and was undertaken by forming in each municipality two groups of each 10 persons; one all-female and one all-male.

Each member of the group was asked to indicate for each of the provided 13 general activities whether it was to be undertaken more by men or by women.

Scores were obtained from a total of 12 groups. To enable further analysis, the scores with relation to the gender roles were converted to quotients, by dividing the male score by the female score. The following quotient categories were created to determine whether the scores depicted a bias toward a male or a female stereotyped role or gender neural (score 1):

> 3	Strongly biased toward traditional male role
1.68 - 2.99	Biased toward traditional male role
0.61 - 1.67	Towards gender equality
0.33 - 0.60	Biased toward traditional female role
< 0.33	Strongly biased toward traditional female role

The averaging of all scores for all thirteen given activities/ chores provided the following result:

Table 11: Scores for Gender Role Perceptions and Bias

Role of	Girls Group Quotient Male/ Female	Boys Group Quotient Male/ Female
Feeding the animals	1.74	1.61
Cleaning	0.60	0.49
Caring for children	0.92	0.85
Carrying water	6.93	5.56
Getting university degree	1.00	1.00
Financial management	0.96	1.07
Road repairing	8.70	8.33
Teaching	0.94	0.84
Working outside the city	1.50	1.87
Let children go to school	0.90	0.99
Sewing	0.49	0.34
Playing sports	1.20	1.59
Fishing	2.50	3.04
Average	2.18	2.12

Focus Group Discussion with Children with disabilities: findings

The focus group discussion with children with disabilities attempted as much as possible to follow a pattern and format, similar to the group work in the nine municipalities. However due to the limited time available for the group work, the group only completed the first segment (importance and needs unmet of the 6 domains) and some parts of identifying issues. The results are the following:

Table 12: Scores for Issues: Children with Disabilities

Children w Disabilities		
Group size: 10 children		
	Importance	Needs
Education	30	20
Nutrition	30	0
WASH	20	0
HIV/AIDS	10	0
Protection	10	30
Social Inclusion	0	50
	100	100

The children provided the following specific issues, without assigning a specific weight to each issue:

Education
Doctor needed at school
Financial Assistance
Teachers are boring; and there not enough teachers
More science at school; better explain Math, Language Arts, Social Studies & HFLE so we can better understand
Inclusion in Music Group, P.E. and after-school clubs
Nutrition
Food is available but unaffordable
Protection
Protection from bullying
From being kidnapped or killed on street
Need for more police on street
From teasing
Social Inclusion
Not invited to play
To be allowed to participate in PE and Music activities
To be able to participate in community activities, e.g. Xmas Parade, Parties, Dances

Most interestingly, the group did not find social inclusion an important issue in their life, but gave the highest ranking to the social inclusion needs being unmet and was descriptive in the social exclusion issues they experience daily. The latter is in line with the main thrust of the information of the Situation Analysis of Children with Disabilities, which speaks to the social exclusion of children with disabilities from services and social activities. The apparent discrepancy may point at the likelihood that the tasks were not properly explained and/or fully understood.

Focus Group Discussions: general indications

a. Apart from specific issues related to the difference in their physical abilities, there appear to be only minor differences between the group of children with disabilities and the groups in the nine municipalities in respect of ranking the importance and unmet needs of key aspects in their life. The children with disabilities assign a similar level of importance to education, but also believe that eating healthy food is important.

b. Except for Nutrition (which is predominantly determined by bottlenecks in the group of social and cultural practices and beliefs), most of the bottleneck issues are in the supply side and, within that, mostly in the access to adequately staffed services, facilities and information. In addition, in all groups, children are aware of the negative characteristics and impact of income-based poverty.

c. Using the social ecology framework, the conclusion can be drawn that the children who participated believe that in general, there is a shared responsibility between the family (children & parents) and government (local and central) in addressing key bottlenecks in areas of concern to them. The teachers, representing the school as institution, are assigned a lower level of responsibility.

Table 13: Scores for level of responsibility for problem solving

Level of responsibility for removal of bottlenecks	Me & Parents	School	Government
Education	28	24	48
Nutrition	59	6	35
WASH	32	6	62
HIV/AIDS	48	10	42
Protection	23	7	70
Social Inlcusion	49	17	34
Average	39.8	11.7	48.5

Note: the level of responsibility is expressed in percentages. E.g. in relation to removing bottlenecks in education, in 48% of the issues the responsibility for actin lies with the government; etc.

d. Below are specific bottlenecks, which were mentioned by children in the groups, and which provide additional illustrations of children's perceptions and concerns:

"

"Protection from being kidnapped or killed on the street"

"Parents don't feed children" properly"

"Parents spend more on drugs/drinks than on food"

"Protection from some police forces"