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INTRODUCTION

What is MICS and SISS?

UNICEF launched the MICS-EAGLE (Education Analysis for Global Learning and Equity) initiative in 2018 with the objective of improving both learning outcomes and equity issues in education by addressing two critical education data problems: data gaps and lack of data utilization. The initiative is designed to:

- Support education sector situation analysis and sector plan development by building national capacity, and leveraging the vast wealth of education data collected by MICS6; and
- Build on the global data foundation provided by MICS6 to yield insights at the national, regional, and global level about ways to ensure each child can reach his or her full potential by reducing barriers to opportunity.

This fact sheet presents the education related findings from the 2018 SISS undertaken in 2018. It combines such education analysis with policy and practice recommendations from a workshop organized in June 2020 and Jan 2021 and multiple consultations with the Ministry of Education and Science, the Education Institution and relevant government agencies and development partners. Education related data from the survey are analyzed in terms of a series of key research questions concerning the following topics.

- Early childhood education and development
- Access to each level of education
- Skills (learning outcomes, ICT skills and literacy rate)
- Repetition and drop out (internal efficiency)
- Completion
- Out of school children
- Education and child protection (child labour and child marriage)
- Inclusive education (with a focus on functional difficulties)
- Parental involvement in children’s learning
- Summary of recommendations
- Definition of indicators (Definition of base populations and indicators of interest)
- Annexes (references, detailed tables of descriptive statistics with hypothesis test results and regression tables)

How is this fact sheet structured?

UNICEF launched Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) program in 1995 to monitor the status of children around the world, and it has become the largest source of statistically sound and internationally comparable data on women and children worldwide.

Over the past 20 years, more than 300 MICS surveys have been carried out in more than 100 countries. MICS is a major source of data used to measure Sustainable Development Goals indicators in support of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.

MICS has been updated several times with new and improved questions. The current version, MICS6 includes new modules that track SDG4 indicators on learning (SDG4.1.1), information and communication technology (ICT) skills (SDG4.4.1), parental involvement in education and child functioning (child disability—SDG4.5.1), early learning (SDG4.2.1. and SDG4.2.2).

The Social Indicators Sample Survey (SISS) was carried out in 2018 by the National Statistics Office (NSO) of Mongolia as part of the global MICS program. Technical support was provided by the Global MICS Team of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). UNICEF and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) provided financial support to aid the Government of Mongolia.

It also produces data necessary for monitoring national policies and programs Sustainable Development Vision of Mongolia 2030 and others.

Further information on the SISS can be found at www.1212.mn or www.mics.unicef.org/surveys.
Methodology

The MICS education indicators, but not limited with, used in the study are defined and constructed according to standardised MICS6 computerised tabulation programs for data analysis, which have been customised according to SISS2018 country questionnaires. See http://mics.unicef.org/tools#analysis.

The analysis is performed on subsets of the SISS 2018 data (i.e. pooled data of the children under 5 and 5-17 year-old children datasets) at the child level. Geographically, a selection of household and child-level indicators relating to education characteristics are tabulated for national, regional, district (available) and intra-urban areas, splitting the capital into apartment and ger areas. In indicator definition section, we describe the identification of intra-urban areas in the data. Graphs are presented in the main body of the factsheets for readability, and the full tabulations are presented in the annexes.

The analysis is of descriptive mostly and inferential natures where relevant. Statistically significant differences are reported and marked with asterisks (*). The more asterisks are shown, the more likely it is that observed differences are due to real differences between the groups rather than being due to chance. Where asterisks are not displayed, this does not necessarily mean that there is no difference between the groups, but rather that there are insufficient data to discern that there is a difference. In addition, we also present the unweighted sample size ‘N’ on which the estimates are based. The test for significant differences is conducted in the indicator estimates between the indicator of interest and background characteristics.

We use a method of multivariate analysis called logistic (multiple) regression modelling. Logistic regression estimates the degree to which attendance to early childhood education, for example, is correlated with wealth, while excluding (or controlling for) any association with the other indicators, such as mother’s education, ethnicity and region. This model is appropriate for this study as all indicators of interest are dichotomous (i.e. the answer can only be one of two choices, here usually ‘yes’ or ‘no’).

We use the variable ‘wealth index quintiles’ throughout the study provided in the SISS2018 data. The wealth index is a composite measure of a household’s cumulative living standard and is calculated using data on housing characteristics, household and personal assets, and on water and sanitation. Once the wealth index has been calculated (via principal components analysis), the total sample of household members in the survey data are equally distributed into five groups known as quintiles, with the poorest 20% in quintile 1 and the wealthiest 20% in quintile 5. See http://mics.unicef.org/tools#analysis.
EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Guiding questions

1. Who attends early childhood education? What factors determine ECE attendance?
2. Do children of ECE school age attend ECE schools?
3. How do students transition to primary education?
4. Which children are developmentally on track (measured by ECDI)? How do ECE and support for learning connect to child development?

Figure 1.1.1
ECE attendance rate for children aged 2-4 years, by socio-economic characteristics

Figure 1.1.2
ECE attendance rate, by geographic areas
**Figure 1.1.3**  ECE attendance rate, by child’s characteristics and environment at home

- **Stunting (moderate and severe)**
  - Not stunted: 70%
  - Stunted: 57%

- **Early stimulation and responsive care**
  - 4 or more activities: 73%
  - 0–3 activities: 62%

- **Availability of children’s books**
  - 3 or more children’s books: 83%
  - 0–2 children’s books: 58%

- **Availability of playthings**
  - 2 or more playthings: 69%
  - 0–1 plaything: 66%

- **Violent discipline**
  - Not experienced: 65%
  - Experienced: 71%

- **Children’s living arrangement**
  - Living with biological parent: 69%
  - Living with neither biological parent: 60%

**Figure 1.1.4**  Likelihood of attending ECE, by socio-economic factors (%)

- **National average**: 68%
- **Age**
  - Below primary: 53%
  - Upper secondary or vocational: 71%
  - Lower secondary (basic): 67%
- **Mother’s education**
  - College, university: 79%
  - Second: 77%
  - Fourth: 87%
- **Wealth index quintile**
  - Richest: 87%
  - Second: 77%
  - Fourth: 87%
- **Region**
  - Central: 78%
  - Western: 80%
  - Ulaanbaatar: 61%
  - Khangai: 83%
  - Eastern: 83%
  - Lower secondary (basic): 67%
  - College, university: 79%
  - Second: 77%
  - Fourth: 87%
  - Richest: 87%

**Note:** This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age, sex, nutritional status (stunting), living arrangement (living with biological parents), mother’s education, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.1 for detailed results).
Guiding questions

1. Who attends early childhood education? What factors determine ECE attendance?
2. Do children of ECE school age attend ECE schools?
3. How do students transition to primary education?
4. Which children are developmentally on track (measured by ECDI)? How do ECE and support for learning connect to child development?

Figure 1.2.1
Level of education attended by children aged 5 at beginning of school year, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Basic (lower secondary)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Attending ECE program
- Attending primary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-orphan</th>
<th>Orphan</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orphanhood status</th>
<th>Non-orphan</th>
<th>Orphan</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-orphan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2.2
Participation rate in organized learning, by geographic areas
Figure 1.2.3 shows that 84 percent of children aged 5 years old attend some form of organized learning, of which 61 percent attend ECE, the education specifically designed for their age, and the rest of 23 percent attend in primary school. Moreover, Figure 1.2.4 demonstrates the age distribution of Grade 1 students and the data reveals that 4 percent of students are late comers and 23 percent attend younger than their age.

ECE attendance is 1.5-2.2 times lower among 2-4 years-old rural and rural bagh children compared to those of city and aimag centres. Moreover, it is 19-26 percentage points lower among 5 year-olds (Figure 1.1.2; 1.2.2). ECE attendance among Kazakh children aged 2-4 years is 47 percent, and 56 percent among 5 year olds. ECE attendance is 18-42 percentage points lower among poorest quantile compared to the middle quantile (Figure 1.1.1; 1.2.1).

Several factors impact on the ECE attendance such as parents’ attitude, their education level, geographical location, child physical development, family support and household environment. Also whether they have books at home and whether child lives with biological parent affect on child’s ECE attendance. (Figure 1.1.3).
Figure 1.3.1  
Children attending first grade of primary school who attended ECE in the previous year, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Basic (lower secondary)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Mother's functional difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-orphan</th>
<th>Orphan</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orphanhood status</th>
<th>Non-orphan</th>
<th>Orphan</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-orphan</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding questions

1. Who attends early childhood education? What factors determine ECE attendance?
2. Do children of ECE school age attend ECE schools?
3. How do students transition to primary education?
4. Which children are developmentally on track (measured by ECDI)? How do ECE and support for learning connect to child development?

Figure 1.3.2  
School readiness, by geographic areas
Children aged 3 to 4 developmentally on track according to UNICEF definition of ECDI

- 76% children are developmentally on track
  - Literacy - Numeracy: 99%
  - Physical: 77%
  - Social-Emotional: 97%
  - Learning: 9%

Can pick up a small object with two fingers, like a stick or a rock from the ground
Is not sometimes too sick to play
Can identify/name at least ten letters of the alphabet
Can read at least four simple, popular words
Knows the name and recognizes the symbol of all numbers from 1 to 10
Follows simple directions on how to do something correctly
When given something to do, is able to do it independently

Children aged 3 to 4 developmentally on track according to country-specific definition of ECDI

- 87% children are developmentally on track
  - Literacy - Numeracy: 98%
  - Physical: 77%
  - Social-Emotional: 97%
  - Learning: 67%

Can pick up a small object with two fingers, like a stick or a rock from the ground
Is not sometimes too sick to play
Can hold a spoon, a fork or a pencil with the thumb, index finger and middle finger
Can identify some colours
Can identify simple shapes such as triangle, square, circle, etc.
Knows the name and recognizes the symbol of all numbers from 1 to 10
Follows simple directions on how to do something correctly
When given something to do, is able to do it independently

Note: Country-specific ECDI components are highlighted in red
**Figure 1.4.2** Children age 3-4 years developmentally on track in literacy-numeracy, by socio-economic characteristics according to UNICEF and COUNTRY-SPECIFIC definitions of ECDI

- **Sex**
  - Male: 65, Female: 7
  - Pre-primary or none: 69, Primary: 4
  - Lower secondary (basic): 55, Upper secondary: 4
  - Vocational: 3, College, university: 1
  - Since birth: 61, Within 5 years: 69
  - Before 6 or more years: 65

- **Age**
  - 3: 55, 4: 4

- **Mother’s education**
  - Male: 46, Female: 5
  - Pre-primary or none: 49, Primary: 13
  - Lower secondary (basic): 46, Upper secondary: 5
  - Vocational: 5, College, university: 6
  - Since birth: 61, Within 5 years: 69
  - Before 6 or more years: 65

- **Mother’s migration status**
  - Male: 59, Female: 6
  - Pre-primary or none: 61, Primary: 3
  - Lower secondary (basic): 46, Upper secondary: 5
  - Vocational: 6, College, university: 6
  - Since birth: 7, Within 5 years: 65
  - Before 6 or more years: 67

- **Ethnicity of household head**
  - Khalkh: 69, Kazakh: 5, Other: 4
  - Has functional difficulty: 36, Has no functional difficulty: 6
  - Poorest: 51, Second: 6
  - Middle: 65, Fourth: 7
  - Richest: 7, Wealth index quintile: 7

- **National average**
  - Male: 85, Female: 90
  - Pre-primary or none: 86, Primary: 85
  - Basic (lower secondary): 91, Upper secondary: 88
  - Vocational: 89, College, university: 87
  - Since birth: 87, Within 5 years: 92
  - Before 6 or more years: 86

- **Ethnicity of household head**
  - Khalkh: 87, Kazakh: 90, Other: 88
  - Has functional difficulty: 57, Has no functional difficulty: 88
  - Poorest: 86, Second: 88
  - Middle: 88, Fourth: 89
  - Richest: 87

- **Wealth index quintile**
  - National average: 87
**Figure 1.4.4**  
ECDI (country-specific), by geographic areas

**Figure 1.4.5**  
ECDI (country-specific), by child’s characteristics and environment at home

- Stunted (moderate and severe)
  - Not stunted 88
  - Stunted 82

- Availability of children’s books
  - 3 or more children’s books 92
  - 0–2 children’s books 84

- ECE attendance
  - Attends 88
  - Does not attend 85

- Violent discipline
  - Not experienced 90
  - Experienced 85

- Inadequate supervision
  - Adequate 88
  - Inadequate 83

- Early stimulation and responsive care
  - 4 or more activities 88
  - 0–3 activities 87

- Physical inactivity
  - Does not play with digital technology 80
  - Plays with digital technology 71

- Physical inactivity (ECDI by country-specific definition)
  - Does not play with digital technology 88
  - Plays with digital technology 87

- Availability of playthings
  - 2 or more playthings 88
  - 0–1 plaything 86

- Children’s living arrangement
  - Non-orphan 88
  - Orphan 86
Figure 1.4.6  
Likelihood of being developmentally on track of ECDI (according to UNICEF definition), by socio-economic factors (%) 

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age, sex, nutritional status (stunting), ECE attendance, functional difficulties, availability of children’s book at home, digital activity, experience of any violent discipline method, mother’s education, migration status and region (refer to annex B.1 for detailed results).
Figure 1.4.7

Likelihood of being developmentally on track of ECDI (according to country-specific definition), by socio-economic factors (%)

- Male: 87, Female: 92
- Western: 93, Khangai: 93, Central: 91, Eastern: 91, Ulaanbaatar: 87
- Below primary: 90, Lower secondary: 94, College, university: 88
- 0–2 children’s books: 94, 3 or more children’s books: 85
- Does not attend ECE# 0–3 activities: 86, Does not attend ECE# 4 or more activities: 92
- Attends ECE# 0–3 activities: 91, Attends ECE# 4 or more activities: 89
- Within 5 years: 89, Since birth: 89
- No functional difficulty: 90, Functional difficulty: 59
- National average: 87

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age, sex, ECE attendance, functional difficulties, stimulating support for learning at home, availability of children’s book at home, inadequate care, mother’s education, migration status and region (refer to annex B.1 for detailed results).
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Early Childhood Development Index (ECDI) was assessed against UNICEF and national definition. The country definition in numeracy and literacy domain was 58 percentage points lower than that of UNICEF (Figure 1.4.1). Though this domain was worst by most of children, the other 3 domains were almost same.

Early childhood development is affected hugely by child’s functional difficulties, and as shown in the Figure 1.4.2 and Figure 1.4.3 there are many other factors as mother’s education level, wealth and family migration contribute to the child development. In addition to all these factors, ECE attendance and caregivers’ supervision impact on the ECDI. (Figure 1.4.5)

RECOMMENDATIONS

To ensure equal access for ECE to every child and provide opportunities for age appropriate learning there is still a room for improvement in access and quality of education. Notably, the low attendance among children with functional difficulties and children from poor quantile and Kazakh families (28-59 percent for 2 to 4 years-old and 43-56 percent for 5 year-olds) shows that we have to work more to ensure the equity in education. Moreover, proportion of children attending to ECE who are developmentally on track is still only 67-69 percent for 2 to 4 year-olds and 61-62 percent for 5 year-olds at national level. On one hand, low rate of ECE attendance may be linked with availability, insecurity and quality issues about ECE. On the other hand, parents may be undervaluing the role of ECE to equip children with the necessary skills to start primary school.

The following actions and policy interventions are recommended:

Policy intervention
• Create the data sharing mechanism on early childhood education, development and care
• Increase state budget for ECE
• Ensure equal and quality ECE services to all children no matter of geographical location, training approaches and family environment
• Build more kindergartens in outskirt districts of Ulaanbaatar, expand the alternative learning in rural areas, and provide training for teachers and assistant teachers through pre-service and in-service training

Improving implementation strategies
• Increase ECE attendance in Bayan-Ulgii province through kindergarten and alternative learning, reflecting their cultural identities, provide bilingual education in collaboration with parents and train the teachers
• Strengthen parents’ awareness on the importance of the age-appropriate education programme, so that the children be prepared adequately to progress up the primary education as well as the number of children per teacher at Grade 1 decreases which contribute also to the quality of education.
• Strengthen the collaboration between ECE and primary school teachers for ensuring smooth transition from ECE to primary
• Accelerate information sharing and collaboration between national and local agencies working in education, social welfare and health

Further research
• Child development is measured using different variables as social and learning skills. Learning skills equip children with necessary reading and numeracy competencies to start primary school. Though Mongolian national curricula is updated in 2019, it has not included the reading comprehension. In order to make comparable the foundational skills of Mongolian students at International level and to ensure the implementation of Mongolian language policy at all levels of education, it is necessary to investigate the possibility of including the reading of simple words and identifying the alphabet letters as well as recognition of numbers from 1 to 10 in the new curriculum. Develop a comprehensive assessment tool for child development and school readiness
• Assess the usage of digital tools by young children and their impacts on child development, and report the results to the parents, education and other relevant agencies as ICT companies, mass media etc.
### ACCESS TO EACH LEVEL OF EDUCATION

| Guiding questions | 1. Who attends primary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine primary school attendance? | 2. Who attends lower secondary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine lower secondary attendance? | 3. Who attends upper secondary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine upper secondary attendance? |

#### Figure 2.1.1
Children of primary school entry age entering grade one, by socio-economic characteristics

![Chart showing children of primary school entry age entering grade one, by socio-economic characteristics.](chart_1)

- **Sex**: Male (92), Female (93)
- **Mother’s education**: Pre-primary or none (97), Primary (93)
- **Lower secondary (basic)**: 88
- **Upper secondary**: 93
- **Vocational**: 91
- **College, university**: 93
- **Has functional difficulty**: 84
- **Has no functional difficulty**: 94

#### Figure 2.1.2
Primary school entry, by geographic areas

![Map showing primary school entry by geographic areas.](map_1)

- **Ethnicity of household head**: Khalkh (92), Kazakh (73), Other (97)
- **Children’s living arrangement**: Living with biological parent (93), Living with neither biological parent (88)
- **Functional difficulties**: Has functional difficulty (79), Has no functional difficulty (93)
- **Wealth index quintile**: Poorest (90), Second (87), Middle (95), Fourth (94), Richest (96)
Figure 2.1.3
Adjusted net attendance rate (ANAR), by level of education

- Adjusted net attendance ratio
- Attending a lower level of education
- Out of school

Figure 2.1.4
Primary school adjusted net attendance ratio, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother's education</th>
<th>Mother's functional difficulties</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>Richest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- National average 97
- Khalkh
- Kazakh
- Other
- Living with biological parent
- Living with neither biological parent
- Has functional difficulty
- Has no functional difficulty
- Poorest
- Second
- Middle
- Fourth
- Richest
- Functional difficulties
- Wealth index quintile
Figure 2.1.5  Primary ANAR, by geographic areas

Figure 2.1.6  Age distribution in primary school, by socio-economic characteristics
Share of 6 year-old children in Grade 1 is 7.9 percentage points lower among Ulaanbaatar and rural bagh children than those of soum and aimag centres. Attendance rate is lower among children whose mother has functional difficulties (10 percentage points), children with functional difficulties (14 percentage points) and among Kazakh children (19-24 percentage points) (Figure 2.1.1; 2.1.2).

Adjusted net attendance rate of primary school students is 97 percent, while the rate is 93 percent for lower secondary and 86 percent for upper secondary education. What’s more, 3 percent of primary school-aged children, 5 percent of lower secondary school-aged children and 9 percent of upper secondary school-aged children are not in school (Figure 2.1.3; 2.1.4).

Primary school adjusted net attendance is lowest among 6 year-olds, which is 93 percent. Children with functional difficulties or those whose mother has difficulties have 4-6 percentage points lower attendance than those without difficulties, while Kazakh children’s attendance is 4-5 percentage points lower compared to other ethnicity groups (Figure 2.1.3; 2.1.4).

Children in primary school exhibit significant age variation: 6 percent are younger their sanctioned age of 6, and 1 percent is older than their cohorts (Figure 2.1.6).
Guiding questions
1. Who attends primary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine primary school attendance?

2. Who attends lower secondary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine lower secondary attendance?

3. Who attends upper secondary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine upper secondary attendance?

Figure 2.2.1
Lower secondary school adjusted net attendance ratio, by socio-economic characteristics

Figure 2.2.2
Lower secondary ANAR, by geographic areas
### Figure 2.2.3

#### Age distribution in lower secondary school, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity of household head</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional difficulties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wealth index quintile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khangai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulaanbaatar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age at the beginning of the school year, sex, living arrangement (biological parents dead), functional difficulties, mother’s education, ethnicity of household head and region (refer to annex B.2 for detailed results).

### Figure 2.2.4

#### Likelihood of attending lower secondary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below primary</th>
<th>Upper secondary or vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Khangai</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Ulaanbaatar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s education</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional difficulties</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age at the beginning of the school year, sex, living arrangement (biological parents dead), functional difficulties, mother’s education, ethnicity of household head and region (refer to annex B.2 for detailed results).
### Guiding questions

1. Who attends primary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine primary school attendance?

2. Who attends lower secondary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine lower secondary attendance?

3. Who attends upper secondary education? Who is left behind? Who should be targeted to improve access to education? What factors determine upper secondary attendance?

### Figure 2.3.1

Upper secondary school adjusted net attendance ratio, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Living with biological parent</th>
<th>Living with neither biological parent</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2.3.2

Upper secondary ANAR, by geographic areas
**Figure 2.3.3** Likelihood of attending upper secondary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at beginning of school year</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15 86 17 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84 91 95 96 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poorest 67 | National average 97

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age at the beginning of the school year, sex, living arrangement (living with biological parents), functional difficulties, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.2 for detailed results).

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Lower secondary education adjusted net attendance is lowest among 11 year-olds, which is 3 percentage points lower than national average and it is 2 percentage points lower among boys compared to girls. Compared to children without any functional difficulties, children with difficulties have 13 percentage points lower attendance rate (Figure 2.2.1).

9-10 percent of lower secondary students attend school earlier than the official sanctioned age and 3 percent of students are over-aged. Under-age attendance is 18 percent in the richest quintile, 11 percent in Ulaanbaatar and Central region and 15 percent among students whose mother has college or university education. However, over-age attendance is highest in the Western region (9 percent) and among Kazakh children (14 percent) and slightly high among children with functional difficulties (Figure 2.2.3).

Upper secondary education adjusted net attendance is lowest among 15 year-olds (83 percent) and boys have 7 percentage points lower attendance than girls. Compared to children without any functional difficulties, children with difficulties have 7 percentage points lower attendance rate. What's more, mother’s functional difficulties make the rate 10 percentage points lower compared to those without. In rural and rural bagh the attendance is 13-15 percentage points lower than in Ulaanbaatar and aimag centre (Figure 2.3.1; 2.3.2).

Compared to girls, boys have 8 percentage points lower likelihood of attending upper secondary education, and students in the poorest quintile have only a 67 percent chance attending this level of education compared to students belonging to the richest quintile (Figure 2.3.3).

Low attendance among children aged 11 and 15 at primary and lower secondary levels may have some relations with education quality and curricula, though at primary education it could be affected by a high number of nonattendance among 6 year-olds.
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

*Policy intervention*
- The share of under-age and over-age students is quite high both at primary and lower secondary levels. This increases the likelihood of further under-performance and further grade repetition and dropouts. Therefore, it is essential that students attend the education that is appropriate to their age and on the other hand there is a need to improve the boarding facility, its infrastructure and safety.
- Ensure that all students, including children from herder families start schooling at the age of 6.
- Develop an Intervention support programme for those who enter school over their age, aimed at ensuring that they catch up. This programme would be in addition to the learners’ existing school lessons and require additional training and hours for the teachers delivering them. It would also require a balance between after-school, out-of-lesson time and other learning methods such as distance learning.

*Improving implementation strategies*
- Pay special attention to the most disadvantaged groups as children with functional difficulties or children whose mother or caregiver has functional difficulties, children living in outskirt area of Ulaanbaatar, remote rural areas and Western region, children from the poorest quintiles, and Kazakh children whose attendance is the lowest. With respect to their diversity and cultural differences, ensure that these children get equal access to education and developmental services regardless who they are, where they live or how much the family earns.
- The boys’ school attendance is low across lower and upper secondary levels. So maximize the collaboration of parents and teachers to increase the parents’ involvement in children’s education, especially their intervention in boys’ education attainment.

*Further research*
- Conduct careful investigation on the issues and needs of the people who are in foremost need of support. Pay attention to low attendance of children with difficulties and children belonging to the poorest quintile at lower secondary level.
- Investigate the needs and possibilities to develop a pre-school curriculum framework for children who could not enter school at official age. The framework would deliver the same standard of learning, but learning from an earlier age, over a longer time-period, in less formal settings.
### Guiding questions

1. What is the share of children of 7 to 14 year-olds who have foundational skills? What are the factors that determine the acquisition of foundational skills?

2. Are adolescents and youth equipped with enough ICT skills? What factors determine ICT skills?

3. What is the relationship between education background and literacy? What factors determine literacy rate?

---

**Figure 3.1.1** Foundational learning skills for children aged 7 to 14 years, by sex, according to indicated domains

#### Foundational numeracy skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern recognition and completion</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number discrimination</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Foundational reading skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 inferential comprehension question</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 literal comprehension question</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 90% of words in a story</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Foundational numeracy skills, by socio-economic characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Primary education grades</th>
<th>Lower secondary education grades</th>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foundational numeracy skills, by geographic areas**

**Foundational numeracy skills by parental involvement, attendance status and child labour status**

- **School attendance**
  - Attends: 52
  - Does not attend: 48

- **Support with homework**
  - Helps: 47
  - Does not help: 60

- **Information on school performance**
  - Receives: 52
  - Does not receive: 48

- **Child labor**
  - Not in child labor: 52
  - In child labor: 50

- **Violent discipline**
  - Not experienced: 52
  - Experienced: 51

- **Children’s living arrangement**
  - Living with biological mother: 52
  - Not living with biological mother: 48
Likelihood of demonstrating foundational numeracy skills, by socio-economic factors (%)

Figure 3.1.5

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s sex, grade, support for homework at home, availability of children’s school performance card, living arrangement (living with biological parents), child labour status, mother’s education, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.2 for detailed results).
Figure 3.1.6  Foundational reading skills, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary/secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Lower secondary/secondary (basic)</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>College, university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1.7  Foundational reading skills, by geographic areas

Figure 3.1.8  Foundational reading skills, by parental involvement, attendance status and child labour status
Figure 3.1.9

Likelihood of demonstrating foundational reading skills, by socio-economic factors (%)

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s sex, grade, availability of children’s book at home, support for homework at home, availability of children's school performance card, living arrangement (living with biological parents), child labour status, mother’s education, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.2 for detailed results).
The proportion of children with foundational numeracy skills is higher among girls aged 7 to 14 in each of skill domains (Figure 3.1.1). Numeracy skills acquisition are lowest in Western provinces and Ulaanbaatar city compared to other regions. Moreover, the proportion of children with foundational numeracy skills declines at Grade 6 and increases gradually in more advanced grades. Recognizing patterns and calculating addition questions is 10-30 percentage points lower than recognizing numbers and discriminating numbers questions. The share of those with foundational numeracy skills is lower among Ulaanbaatar and city students than aimag, soum and rural students (Figure 3.1.2; 3.1.5).

The proportion of children with foundational reading skills is higher among girls aged 7 to 14 in each of skill domains except for literal comprehension questions (Figure 3.1.1). Reading skills acquisition is low in Western provinces but high in Khangai regions. Pattern recognition question is 13 percentage points and reading skills 2-5 percentage points lower among public school students compared to private school students. However, share of reading skills is lowest among rural students (Figure 3.1.3; 3.1.9).

Foundational reading skills is 14-17 percentage points lower among Kazakh students compared to other ethnic groups, though the reading comprehension was assessed in both Mongolian and Kazakh languages (Figure 3.1.3; 3.1.8).

Likelihood of demonstrating foundational reading skills is lower than national average in Western provinces and in Ulaanbaatar, by 24 percentage points and 4 percentage points respectively. Moreover, the likelihood of demonstrating foundational reading skills among children from poorest households who have books is 7 percentage points higher than the richest households who have no books at home (Figure 3.1.11).
Guiding questions

1. Are children of primary and lower secondary education equipped with enough foundational learning skills? What factors determine basic learning skills?

2. Do adolescents and youth have ICT skills? What factors determine ICT skills?

3. What is the relationship between education background and literacy? What factors determine literacy rate?

Figure 3.2.1
ICT skills for adolescents and youth age 15-24 years, by sex, according to indicated domains

- Sent e-mail with attached file: 33% (men), 25% (women)
- Used a basic arithmetic formula in a spreadsheet: 21% (men), 23% (women)
- Copied or moved a file or folder: 32% (men), 33% (women)
- Used a copy and paste tool within a document: 36% (men), 36% (women)
- Connected and installed a new device: 14% (men), 16% (women)
- Found, downloaded, installed and configured software: 27% (men), 20% (women)
- Created an electronic presentation with presentation software: 19% (men), 23% (women)
- Wrote a computer program in any programming language: 6% (men), 4% (women)

Figure 3.2.2
ICT skills for adolescents and youth age 15-24 years, by socio-economic characteristics

- National average 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Since birth</th>
<th>Within 5 years</th>
<th>Before 6 or more years</th>
<th>National average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since birth</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 6 or more years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Migration status
- Ethnicity of household head

- Has functional difficulty: 31
- Has no functional difficulty: 44
- Poorest: 17
- Second: 32
- Middle: 42
- Fourth: 61
- Richest: 61

- Wealth index quintile
The lowest rate of ICT skill acquisition among 15 to 24 year-olds is exhibited by youth who have primary and vocational education levels and Kazakh people. Moreover, functional difficulties and poverty have a significant impact on ICT skill acquisition (Figure 3.2.2). ICT skill acquisition is demonstrated 2.1-2.7 times higher among youth from urban than those of rural and rural bagh which argues the urban-rural divide in ICT (Figure 3.2.3).

It is observed that ICT skill acquisition is hugely influenced by wealth quintile and education level, in order words the higher the education level the chance of acquiring ICT skill increases (Figure 3.2.4).

Likelihood of literacy acquisition is high among youth 20 to 29 year-olds no matter of sex, early marriage and functional difficulties, however, poverty has a clear effect on it (Figure 3.3.3).
Guiding questions

1. Are children of primary and lower secondary education equipped with enough foundational learning skills? What factors determine basic learning skills?

2. Are adolescents and youth equipped with enough ICT skills? What factors determine ICT skills?

3. What is the relationship between education background and literacy? What factors determine literacy rate?

Figure 3.1: Adult literacy among aged 15-29 years by primary education attendance status

- **Male**
  - Total: 3 literate, 97 illiterate
  - Attended primary: 49 literate, 51 illiterate
  - Did not attend primary: 51 literate, 49 illiterate

- **Female**
  - Total: 1 literate, 99 illiterate
  - Attended primary: 25 literate, 75 illiterate
  - Did not attend primary: 59 literate, 41 illiterate

Figure 3.2: Illiteracy rate among aged 15-49 years, by age and sex

- **Male**
  - 15-17: 0 literate, 1 illiterate
  - 18-19: 2 literate, 0 illiterate
  - 20-24: 4 literate, 2 illiterate
  - 25-29: 1 literate, 1 illiterate
  - 30-34: 6 literate, 4 illiterate
  - 35-39: 13 literate, 8 illiterate
  - 40-44: 8 literate, 4 illiterate
  - 45-49: 4 literate, 1 illiterate

- **Female**
  - 15-17: 0 literate, 1 illiterate
  - 18-19: 0 literate, 2 illiterate
  - 20-24: 2 literate, 4 illiterate
  - 25-29: 1 literate, 1 illiterate
  - 30-34: 6 literate, 8 illiterate
  - 35-39: 13 literate, 4 illiterate
  - 40-44: 8 literate, 4 illiterate
  - 45-49: 4 literate, 1 illiterate

Figure 3.2: Literacy and education of adults age 15-29 years, by wealth quintile

- **Poorest**
  - Not educated: 96
  - Primary illiterate: 3
  - Primary literate: 5
  - Higher than primary: 9

- **Second**
  - Not educated: 99
  - Primary illiterate: 1
  - Primary literate: 1
  - Higher than primary: 1

- **Middle**
  - Not educated: 99
  - Primary illiterate: 1
  - Primary literate: 1
  - Higher than primary: 1

- **Fourth**
  - Not educated: 99
  - Primary illiterate: 1
  - Primary literate: 1
  - Higher than primary: 1

- **Richest**
  - Not educated: 99
  - Primary illiterate: 1
  - Primary literate: 1
  - Higher than primary: 1

- **Poorest**
  - 15-17: 83
  - 18-19: 9
  - 20-24: 3
  - 25-29: 5
  - 30-34: 6
  - 35-39: 13
  - 40-44: 8
  - 45-49: 4
51 percent of males and 59 percent of females who have not attended primary school are illiterate, moreover, 49 percent of males, 25 percent of females are not literate, even though they have completed primary education (Figure 3.3.1).

Illiteracy is highest among 30 to 39 year-olds and especially among males. 99 percent of young people aged 15 to 29 from middle, fourth and richest quintile and 96 and 83 percent of youth from the bottom two quintiles, respectively, have attended primary school. Out of 83 percent from bottom quintile 5 percent have acquired literacy and 3 percent could not possess adequate literacy skills (Figure 3.3.2).
RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy intervention
• The study has shown that children are not acquiring grade 2/3 level reading and numeracy skills by the first grade of the lower secondary education. The importance of developing more robust, comprehensive assessment systems to assess learning outcomes of foundational reading, writing and numeracy skills at critical points of early primary and lower secondary education is being advocated by international development agencies. In Mongolia the quality assurance assessment has been carried out since 2014 to investigate the education impact factors and their correlations. So it is recommended to include more primary schools in the assessment and share the reports with all assessment covered schools, teachers and parents so that the schools and teachers could reflect their teaching as well as parents understand the weak and strong points of their children’s learning.
• As revealed with this survey, 25-49 percent of young people have not acquired literacy skills though attended primary school which alarms us on the quality of primary education and urgency of creating the literate environment at all settings as home, school, cultural and all educational institutions. Learning environment is important to literacy retaining and improving the quality of life and opportunity for employment. So it is vitally important to build and ensure learning supportive environment through availability of books, reading materials as well as ICT devices.
• Lower levels of attainment by 7 to 14 year-old students in higher order thinking skills as recognizing patterns and answering inferential questions and the difference in skill acquisition among public school students compared to private school students, as well as urban and rural gaps demonstrate that concentrating on education access is not enough and we also have to pay more attention to the quality of education, skill acquisitions earned at educational institutions. So we have to equip our children with most important skills as reasoning, problem solving and critical thinking skills which needed for individuals and for socioeconomic development of country, and train the teachers who will be teaching these skills.

Improving implementation strategies
• Provide literacy and continuing education programmes for 30 to 39 old people who make the majority of the illiterate population so that they could retain literacy skills and acquire relevant vocational skills that are linked with economic opportunities
• Promote ICT utilization in teaching and learning, provide ICT literacy skills training to the most disadvantaged groups as poor, disabled and less educated people through schools, vocational training centres and Lifelong learning centres; Improve digital literacy skills of children and the youth.

Further research
• Develop comprehensive tools to assess the literacy skills and use the tools to reveal the proportion of adults with no literacy skills and proficiency levels of the population
REPETITION AND DROP OUT

**Guiding questions**
1. At which grades do children fail to progress?
2. Which students repeat grades and drop out?
3. What determines drop out in Mongolia?

**Figure 4.1.1** Repetition and drop out rate for children of secondary school age at the beginning of the school year, by education level attended the last year

**Figure 4.1.2** Repetition and drop out rate, by grade
### Guiding questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. At which grades do children fail to progress?</th>
<th>2. Which students repeat grades and drop out?</th>
<th>3. What determines drop out in Mongolia?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Figure 4.2.1

**Repetition rate for children of secondary school age at the beginning of the school year, by socio-economic characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Since birth</th>
<th>Within 5 years</th>
<th>Before 6 or more years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mother's education</th>
<th>Mother's functional disabilities</th>
<th>Mother's migration status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 4.2.2

**Repetition rate for children of secondary school age at the beginning of the school year, by geographic areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Children's living arrangement</th>
<th>Functional difficulties</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>Living with biological mother</td>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>Poorest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Living with neither biological mother</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Children's living arrangement</td>
<td>Functional difficulties</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Capital city</th>
<th>Aimag center</th>
<th>Soum center</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Rural bagh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2.3
Drop out rate for children of secondary school age at the beginning of the school year, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since birth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 6 or more years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
<th>National average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Orphan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Orphanhood status</th>
<th>Functional difficulties</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Non-Orphan</td>
<td>Orphan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Non-Orphan</td>
<td>Orphan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Orphan</td>
<td>Non-Orphan</td>
<td>Orphan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2.4
Drop out rate for children of secondary school age at the beginning of the school year, by geographic areas

[Map of Mongolia with regions indicated]
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Repetition rate is significantly higher in grade 6 that is the first grade of the next education level. This tendency is observed also in transition from lower secondary to upper secondary, as it decreases in Grades 7-9 and again shoot up to 2.9 percent in Grade 10. Moreover, the share of students who drop out from school increases 2 times in each education level, reaching the highest rate in Grade 9 and Grade 12, which are the last Grade of lower and upper secondary levels (Figure 4.1.1).

There are more boys (0.3 percentage points higher) who repeat than girls. Repetition rate is 2-5 times higher in urban areas compared to rural area and soum centre. While poverty and migration status impact on students’ repetition greatly, the disability does not contribute to the repetition of the students (Figure 4.2.1; 4.2.2).
RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy intervention

- There are highest repetition rates in Grade 6 and Grade 10, which are the first years of lower and upper secondary levels, and also highest dropouts in the last years of these levels in Grade 9 and Grade 12. High rates of repetition and dropouts in these Grades could be related to the students’ transition within education institutions and the social and economic reasons. However, this may have some relationships with school and curricula. Starting the first year of each level of schooling may be difficult change for many students, which explains less preparedness of students and on the other hand, the curricula may not assure the smooth transition in each education level. Therefore, if the revised curricula implemented from 2019/2020 academic year do not reflect this issue then there is a need to evaluate the curriculum coherence of primary, lower and upper secondary education and revise them.
- Implement the transition programme for the students entering to next level of education where necessary

Improving implementation strategies

- Advise schools on how to effectively organize teaching and learning activities in various circumstances in consideration of sufficiency of classrooms, number of students and supply of qualified teachers.
- Support the out-of-school children with functional difficulties and children whose mother or caregiver has functional difficulties to get involved in learning through Equivalency programme and through Individualized curriculum.
- Build capacity of teachers and school leaders on cooperating with parents and community to reduce repetition and drop outs.
- See for specific recommendations on preventing children in the poorest quintile from dropping out of school (Topic 7), supporting of migrant children and boys’ education (Topic 5)

Further research

- Further study is needed to provide better opportunity to students studying at upper secondary level to specialize and prepare for their next steps, decrease number of subjects and strengthen Grade 9 year-end assessment so that it provides accurate information in all schools for students to choose their pathway and subjects for Grade 10.
**Guiding questions**

1. How many students complete each level of education? Why can't students complete lower and upper secondary school?

2. Why are students absent from school?

---

**Figure 5.1.1**
Completion rate for children age 3-5 years above the intended age for the last grade of primary, lower and upper secondary school, by sex and according to education level

- **Male**
  - Primary: 96%
  - Lower secondary: 89%
  - Upper secondary: 67%

- **Female**
  - Primary: 100%
  - Lower secondary: 96%
  - Upper secondary: 75%

**Figure 5.1.2**
Primary completion rate for children age 13-15 years, by socio-economic characteristics

- **National average 98**

- Pre-primary or none: 97, 92
- Primary: 96, 99
- Lower secondary (basic): 99, 100
- Upper secondary: 100, 99
- Vocational: 99, 97
- College, university: 99
- Has functional difficulty: 96, 95
- Has no functional difficulty: 99, 100
- Khalkh: 98
- Kazakh: 99
- Other: 92

- Living with biological parent: 98, 99
- Living with neither biological parent: 90
- Has functional difficulty: 98
- Has no functional difficulty: 98
- Poorest: 100
- Second: 100
- Middle: 100
- Fourth: 100
- Richest: 100

**Ethnicity of household head**

**Children's living arrangement**

**Functional difficulties**

**Wealth index quintile**
Figure 5.1.3: Primary completion rate, by geographic areas

Figure 5.1.4: Lower secondary completion rate for young adults age 17-19 years, by background characteristics

Figure 5.1.5: Lower secondary completion rate, by geographic areas
Figure 5.1.6  Likelihood of completing lower secondary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mother’s functional difficulties</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty 98</td>
<td>Has functional difficulty 92</td>
<td>Poorest 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Second 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Middle 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Fourth 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Richest 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khangai</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Central 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulaanbaatar</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National average 92

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s sex, living arrangement (living with biological parents), mother’s functional difficulties, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.5 for detailed results).

Figure 5.1.7  Upper secondary completion rate for youth age 20-22 years, by background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early marriage</th>
<th>Youth migration status</th>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Functional difficulties</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married after 18</td>
<td>Married before 18</td>
<td>Since birth</td>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>Before 6 or more years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital city</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural city</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural bagh</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural soum center</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural aimag center</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National average 73

Figure 5.1.8  Upper secondary completion rate, by geographic areas
Figure 5.1.9  Likelihood of completing upper secondary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are person’s sex, functional difficulties, migration status, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.5 for detailed results).
1. How many students complete each level of education? Why can’t students complete lower and upper secondary school?

2. Why are students absent from school?

**Figure 5.2.1**
Children age 7-14 years unable to attend class in the last year due to teacher’s absence or school closure, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National average 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Sex**: Male 51, Female 50
- **School level**: Primary 49, Lower secondary (basic) 52, Upper secondary or Higher 45
- **School management**: Public 51, Non-public 19
- **Pre-primary or none**: Primary 33, Lower secondary (basic) 39, Upper secondary 41, Vocational 53, College, university 54

**Figure 5.2.2**
School-related reasons for inability to attend class, by geographic areas

- **Mother’s migration status**: Non-Orphan 52, Orphan 16
- **Orphanhood status**: Before 6 or more years 50, Within 5 years 53, Since birth 52
- **Ethnicity of household head**: Khalkh 45, Kazakh 50, Other 53
- **Has functional difficulty**: Has no functional difficulties 52, Has functional difficulty 45
- **Wealth index quintile**: Poorest 27, Second 47, Middle 56, Fourth 60, Richest 61

**Geographic Areas**
- Ulaanbaatar 68
- Khangai 43
- Eastern 38
- Central 40
- Western 21
- Capital city 68
- Rural 29
- Urban 61
- Soum center 33
- Aimag center 49
- Rural bagh 29
- Ger area 69
- Apartment area 66
Compared to the girls, boys' completion rate is low at each education level as 4 percentage points in primary, 7 percentage points in lower secondary and 8 percentage points in upper secondary level (Figure 5.1.1).

As shown in Figure 5.1.2 and Figure 5.1.4 regional and socio-economic disparities impact the share of children aged 13 to 15 years completing primary education. Completion rate declines at lower secondary level among Kazakh children, and greater divergence is seen according to wealth quintiles and region (75-88 percent of the poorest and second quintiles and 79 percent in rural areas which is 17 percentage points lower than that of city).

Likelihood of completing lower secondary education fall below the national average by 2-18 percentage points and 12-22 percentage points at upper secondary education among children belonging to the poorest and second quintiles. This is also same for children living in Eastern region and those who migrated last 5 and more years (Figure 5.1.6; 5.1.9).

The impact of disparities in wealth and region becomes quite prominent among 20 to 22 year-olds. The proportion of youth from the poorest and second quintiles completing upper secondary level is 2 times smaller than that of middle and above level quintiles (41-47 percent), while it is 26-39 percentage points lower in rural and rural bagh compared to soum centre and Ulaanbaatar (Figure 5.1.7; 5.1.8; 5.1.9).

School absence by 7 to 14 year-old is 2 times greater among Ulaanbaatar and city schools compared to those of soum centre and rural schools. It is also 2 times greater in public schools compared to private schools. The main reason for school absence is either the school is closed or teacher doesn’t appear at school. 73 percent of school absence is caused by teacher’s absence (79 percent is due to teacher’ strike and 23 percent due to teacher's absenteeism) (Figure 5.2.1; 5.2.2; 5.2.3).
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

*Policy intervention*
- Teachers are the most significant inputs into students’ learning and education quality, thus need more careful attention on teachers’ working condition, and investment in teachers and their continuous professional development along with the improvement of infrastructure
- Monitor whether school assessment to evaluate the students’ learning achievement is carried out effectively, and whenever necessary conduct additional training so that the students who are left can catch up.
  */This could be implemented through Intervention support program/
- Develop an Intervention support programme for those who enter school over their age, aimed at making sure that they catch up. This programme would be in addition to the learners’ existing school lessons and require additional training and hours for the teachers delivering them. It would also require a balance between after-school, out-of-lesson time and other learning methods such as distance learning.
- Repetition, completion and dropout rates at all levels of education are worst among boys. This may be related to the boy’s labor due to family’s poverty. On the other hand, there might be some hidden factors related to education as school environment and school curriculum. So it is recommended to evaluate whether education and curricula is relevant to the boys’ needs, interests and lives.

*Improving implementation strategies*
- Increase the school and teachers’ intervention to influence on parent’s negative attitude to undervalue boys’ education. Give more opportunities to boys to take responsibilities inside and outside of the classroom, to participate in fun activities including sports clubs, school events etc.
- Completion rate among Kazakh children across all levels of education is quite low. So there is a need to take necessary actions as upgrading the teachers’ bilingual knowledge and instruction skills, improving access and quality of bilingual learning materials and increasing learning outcomes.
- The students’ school completion is affected by the wealth of their parents and by the migration status. Children experience stress of navigating unfamiliar surroundings and challenge of making friends in new school. Therefore, school and teachers’ support and their cooperation with parents is very essential to ease the move. It is recommended that school to think of introducing school programme or initiative to support students and help settle into new school and adopt in new environment.
### Out of School Children

#### Guiding questions
1. How many children are out of primary education? Why are children out of primary school?
2. How many children are out of lower secondary education? Why are children out of lower secondary school?
3. How many children are out of upper secondary education? Why are children out of upper secondary school?

#### Figure 6.1.1
Out of school rate for children of secondary school (primary, lower and upper secondary) age at the beginning of the school year, by some socio-economic characteristics

- **Primary**
  - Has functional difficulties: 9%
  - Has no functional difficulties: 3%
  - Poorest: 20%
  - Richest: 9%
  - Urban: 6%
  - Rural: 14%

- **Upper secondary**
  - Has functional difficulties: 19%
  - Has no functional difficulties: 8%
  - Poorest: 9%
  - Richest: 5%
  - Urban: 4%
  - Rural: 6%

- **Lower secondary**
  - Has functional difficulties: 12%
  - Has no functional difficulties: 4%
  - Poorest: 9%
  - Richest: 5%
  - Urban: 3%
  - Rural: 3%

#### Figure 6.1.2
Estimated number of out-of-school children in each level of education

- Primary: 10,205
- Upper secondary: 11,604
- Lower secondary: 9,114

---

MICS – Education Analysis for Global Learning and Equity
Figure 6.1.3  Primary out of school children, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at the beginning of school year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's functional difficulties</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of household head</td>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's living arrangement</td>
<td>Living with biological parent</td>
<td>Living without biological parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth index quintile</td>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1.4  Primary out of school children, by geographic areas
Figure 6.1.5  Likelihood of being out of primary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age at the beginning of the school year, sex, functional difficulties, living arrangement (living with biological parents), household wealth quintile, area and region (refer to annex B.6 for detailed results).
### Guiding questions

1. How many children are out of primary education? Why are children out of primary school?

2. How many children are out of lower secondary education? Why are children out of lower secondary school?

3. How many children are out of upper secondary education? Why are children out of upper secondary school?

---

**Figure 6.2.1**

Lower secondary out of school children, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at the beginning of school year</td>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>College, university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Living with biological parent</th>
<th>Living with neither biological parent</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Living with biological parent</td>
<td>Living with neither biological parent</td>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Richest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Living with biological parent</td>
<td>Living with neither biological parent</td>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Richest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 6.2.2**

Lower secondary out of school children, by geographic areas

- **Western**: 9
- **Central**: 4
- **Eastern**: 4
- **Khangai**: 2
- **Khuvsgul**: 2
- **Bayan-Ölgii**: 2
- **Govi-Altai**: 2
- **Bayan-Ulgii**: 2
- **Ulaanbaatar**: 5
- **Ger area**: 5
- **Apartment area**: 6

- **Rural bagh**: 8
- **Soum center**: 3
- **Aimag center**: 2
- **Capital city**: 5
- **Urban**: 4
Likelihood of being out of lower secondary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

Figure 6.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional difficulties</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>National average 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khangai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulaanbaatar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age at the beginning of the school year, sex, functional difficulties, living arrangement (living with biological parents), household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.6 for detailed results).
Guiding questions

1. How many children are out of primary education? Why are children out of primary school?
2. How many children are out of lower secondary education? Why are children out of lower secondary school?
3. How many children are out of upper secondary education? Why are children out of upper secondary school?

Figure 6.3.1
Upper secondary out of school children, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at the beginning of school year</th>
<th>Mother's education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary or none</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wealth index quintile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's functional difficulties</th>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Children's living arrangement</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>Living with biological parent</td>
<td>Poorest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalkh</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Living with neither biological parent</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children's living arrangement</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with biological parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with neither biological parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with biological parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.3.2
Upper secondary out of school children, by geographic areas
Figure 6.3.3  Likelihood of being out of upper secondary school, by socio-economic factors (%)

- **National average:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty quintile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional difficulty since birth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever entered primary</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed primary</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioned to lower secondary</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed lower secondary</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioned to upper secondary</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This is the logistic regression model and controlling variables are child’s age at the beginning of the school year, sex, functional difficulties, living arrangement (living with biological parents), mother’s migration status, household wealth quintile and region (refer to annex B.6 for detailed results).

Figure 6.3.4  Overall education picture – Pathway analysis

Pathway analysis, by wealth index quintile

- **Poorest:**
  - Ever entered primary: 17.2%
  - Completed primary: 8.2%
  - Transitioned to lower secondary: 7.1%
  - Completed lower secondary: 3.6%
  - Transitioned to upper secondary: 6.0%

- **Richest:**
  - Ever entered primary: 88.0%
  - Completed primary: 97.0%
  - Transitioned to lower secondary: 9.2%
  - Completed lower secondary: 1.6%
  - Transitioned to upper secondary: 0.6%
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The functional difficulty is reported to be the main reason of withholding the children from school. Also at primary and upper secondary levels children whose mother or caregiver has functional difficulties attend school twice less than those without difficulties (Figure 6.1.1; 6.1.3; 6.3.1).

At lower and upper secondary levels, children in the poorest quintile and in less educated families drop out school 2-3 times more than those in middle quintile and in families whose education level is higher than upper secondary (Figure 6.2.1; 6.3.1).

The school entrance rates for children from the poorest quintile are at primary level 1.4 percentage points, at lower secondary level 3.3 percentage points and at upper secondary level 24.4 percentage points lower compared to the richest. Moreover, 17.2 percent of these children drop out from lower secondary school and 8.2 percent repeat, while their completion rate is 26.4 percentage points lower than the richest quintile children (Figure 6.3.4).

Out of school rates are high across all levels of education in rural area. Ulaanbaatar has relatively high rates at primary level, while at primary and upper secondary level the rate is high among Kazakh children. (Figure 6.1.3; 6.1.4; 6.2.2; 6.3.2).

Factors affecting the children to be out of school are shown by each level of education as below:
1. At primary level, 4 percent of 6 year-olds and children in Ulaanbaatar are out of school. Also out of school rate is high among children living in the city without their biological parent and children who live in rural area with their biological parent (Figure 6.1.5).
2. At lower secondary level, children’s functional difficulties and the poverty are the main reasons for children to be out of school and one in ten children remain excluded from education for these reasons (Figure 6.2.3).
3. At upper secondary level, gender, poverty and migration are the factors negatively impacting on school attendance. School dropout rates remain 4-7 times high among the poorest quintile compared to middle and richer quintiles. What’s more, migrant children with functional difficulties tend to dropout from school 5-6 times more than those of migrant but without difficulties or non-migrant with and without difficulties. Boys’ dropout rate is highest at upper secondary level and it is 6 percentage points higher compared to girls (Figure 6.3.3).

99.5 percent of the children attended in primary school, while this percentage is 98.6 in lower secondary and 82.6 in upper secondary. At lower secondary level, 4.1 percent repeat and 5.1 percent drop out from school (Figure 6.3.4).
**Policy intervention**

- Support teachers of ethnic minority groups with training and improve quality of learning materials as well as infrastructure. Make sure that the quality of education delivered both in Mongolian and Kazakh languages has same quality and to national standard.

**Improving implementation strategies**

- Drop outs are highest among children from the poorest quintile, children with functional difficulties, or those whose mother has functional difficulties. The rate remains high in rural areas and among migrants and Kazakh children. Ensuring better collaboration and linkages between education, social welfare and health agencies are necessary so that these children get access to education, on track to complete their education and get equipped with necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes.
- Coordinate the activities of governmental and NGOs, projects and programmes to empower parents and family members of out of school children and to organize life skills and livelihood training so that these children’s rights to an education be fulfilled.
- Build capacities of local actors as health, education and social welfare committees, school support units and teachers, and facilitate their services to support children with functional difficulties as early detection and intervention, providing appropriate educational services and ensuring school’s physical accessibility.
- Strengthen the activities of school, khoroo (community) and social development unit to support out-of-school children and youth with Equivalency programme and life skills training and provide with necessary information.
EDUCATION AND CHILD PROTECTION

Guiding questions

1. Which groups of children are more frequently involved in child labor? How does child labor affect children’s learning skills?

2. Who are the children marrying early? How does child marriage affect youth literacy and ICT skills?

Figure 7.1.1
Child labor for children age 5-17 years, by sex, according to indicated domains

Figure 7.1.2
Children’s engagement in economic activities and household chores, by socio-economic characteristics
Figure 7.1.3  Child labor for children age 5-17 years, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>5-11</th>
<th>12-14</th>
<th>15-17</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Does not attend</th>
<th>Attends</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Non-public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's education</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Functional difficulties</th>
<th>Orphanhood status</th>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1.4  Child labor, by geographic areas
**Figure 7.1.5**  Children attending school by child labor status among those 5-17 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Not in child labor</th>
<th>In child labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.1.6**  Foundational numeracy skills by child labor status among children 7-14 years

**Foundational numeracy skills**

- **50%**  In child labor
- **52%**  Not in child labor
Guiding questions

1. Which groups of children are more frequently involved in child labor? How does child labor affect children’s learning skills?

2. Who are the children marrying early? How does child marriage affect youth literacy and ICT skills?

Figure 7.2.1  Youth age 20-24 years married before their 18th birthday, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary or below</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since birth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 6 or more years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary or below</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary (basic)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since birth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 6 or more years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since birth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 6 or more years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of household head</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has functional difficulty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no functional difficulty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional difficulties</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth index quintile</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.2.2  Early marriage, by geographic areas

Figure 7.2.3  Impact of early marriage on youth ICT skills and literacy

ICT skills

- Married early: 34%
- Not married early: 41%

Literacy rate

- Married early: 100%
- Not married early: 98%
A total of 20 percent of boys aged 5 to 17 years are engaged in some forms of child labour which is 7 percentage points greater than girls. Children are mostly involved in hazardous work and income-generating activities, and child labour is highest among out of school children. (Figure 7.1.1; 7.1.2; 7.1.3). Hazardous work is most common among 15 to 17-year-old upper secondary school-age adolescents reaching 18 percent. 10-14 percent of primary school children from Grade 2 to Grade 6 are involved in Income generating activities (Figure 7.1.2).

Children may be driven into work for various reasons. Most common factors that impacted seem lower educational level of caregiver, poverty and location. In particular, child labour occurs highest in Western and Khangai regions. In Western region child labour in hazardous work and income-generation is 2-2.2 times greater than Central and Eastern regions. Children from the poorest quintile are engaged in work 4-5 times greater than the middle quintile (Figure 7.1.2).

Women’s marriage before the age of 18 is 6 times greater than men, and it is more prevalent among women whose highest level of education is primary and secondary school. Early marriage is 5 percentage points higher among young people with functional difficulties compared to those without and slightly higher in rural areas (Figure 7.2.1; 7.2.2).
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Improving implementation strategies**

- Dropout rate for working children is 13-19 percentage points higher than that of non-working children which shows that child labour can make it more difficult for students to remain in school (Figure 7.1.5). So it is crucially important to raise parent’s awareness on harmfulness of child labour for their children’s education, physical development and future; and to strengthen the social service workforce to prevent the school-age children from engaging in child labour, especially in hazardous work. Moreover, it is also important to make aware the parents and caregivers that excessive household chores heighten the child risk of falling behind.

- Child labour is linked to poorer social-economic condition, so there is an urgent need to ensure wider cooperation with Ministry of Labour and Social Protection and other projects and programmes to empower the parents and family members and to engage the adults in employment.

- Draw back the work-engaged drop-out students into learning through Equivalency programme and vocational training and improve the school, community and Social development unit partnership.

- Improve the awareness of the entrepreneurs and employers on the laws and legislation about child labour.

- Monitor the enforcement of Child labour laws and regulations about prohibitions on child labour, minimum age of employment, safety and health protection for children.

- Those who are less educated and having functional difficulties seem to get married early and as the survey reveals education and functional difficulty are more correlated with early marriage than socio-economic background. As education influences early marriage, the school and parent involvement in the prevention of adolescents, especially girls from dropping out school is crucial. Moreover, increasing the awareness of youth on the educational outcomes as personal development, long term social and economic benefits is important.

- Improve the quality of reproductive education for adolescents.
**Guiding questions**

1. For what groups of children are disability rates higher? What are the most common functional difficulty domains among children?
2. How does functional difficulty vary by children’s socio-economic characteristics?
3. How is functional difficulty linked to education indicators?

**Figure 8.1.1**

A concept of child functioning and disability

- **UNACCOMODATING ENVIRONMENT**
  - Glasses are not available to the child who has difficulty seeing distant objects. Learning material is not made available in braille to the child who is blind.

- **DISABILITY**
  - These children are likely to experience limited participation and their right to education may be compromised as a result of unaccommodating environments.

**Figure 8.1.2**

Prevalence functional difficulties among children age 5-17 years, by domains

- **Self-care** 0.4%
- **Concentrating** 0.5%
- **Making friends** 0.8%
- **Depression** 1.1%
- **Anxiety** 2.2%
- **Controlling behavior** 0.9%
- **Accepting change** 0.8%
- **Learning** 0.7%
- **Communication** 0.6%
- **Walking** 1.0%
- **Remembe-ring** 0.7%
- **Hearing** 0.5%
- **Seeing** 1.0%

6.1% Functional difficulties in at least one domain
Guiding questions

1. For what groups of children are disability rates higher? What are the most common functional difficulty domains among children?
2. How does functional difficulty vary by children’s socio-economic characteristics?
3. How is functional difficulty linked to education indicators?

Figure 8.2.1  Functional difficulties among children age 5-17 years, by socio-economic characteristics

National average 6

Figure 8.2.2  Functional difficulties, by geographic areas
Guiding questions

1. For what groups of children are disability rates higher? What are the most common functional difficulty domains among children?
2. How does functional difficulty vary by children’s socio-economic characteristics?
3. How is functional difficulty linked to education indicators?

Figure 8.3.1
Foundational learning skills, by functional difficulties among children age 7-14 years

Foundational reading skills

- 59% Has functional difficulties
- 61% Has no functional difficulties

Foundational numeracy skills

- 55% Has functional difficulties
- 51% Has no functional difficulties

Figure 8.3.2
Attendance to ECE and adjusted net attendance ratio, by functional difficulties among children age 2-17 years

- 59% ECE 2-4 years Has functional difficulties
- 68% Has no functional difficulties
- 91% Primary 6-10 years Has functional difficulties
- 97% Has no functional difficulties
- 81% Lower secondary 11-14 years Has functional difficulties
- 94% Has no functional difficulties
- 80% Upper secondary 15-17 years Has functional difficulties
- 87% Has no functional difficulties

Figure 8.3.3
Repetition and drop out rate, by education level among children 6-17 years

Repetition rate

- 1.0 Primary Has functional difficulties
- 1.1 Lower secondary Has functional difficulties
- 1.7 Upper secondary Has functional difficulties
- 0.2 Has no functional difficulties
- 0.0 Has no functional difficulties

Drop out rate

- 2 Primary Has functional difficulties
- 4 Lower secondary Has functional difficulties
- 1 Upper secondary Has functional difficulties
- 5 Has no functional difficulties
- 8 Has no functional difficulties
The prevalence of different types of child functional difficulties varies widely. Difficulties related to behavioural characteristics as anxiety (2.2 percent), depression (1.1 percent) are highest while seeing (1 percent) and walking (1 percent) are most common among other difficulties (Figure 8.1; 8.1.2).

Schools seem much less accommodating to 5 to 17 year-old children with functional difficulties demonstrating 14 percent of out of school rate. The mother's functional difficulties and migration also contribute negatively on school attendance (Figure 8.2.1).

Children with disabilities are likely to be left behind at all levels of education. ECE and school attendance for 2 to 17 year-old children with functional difficulties is 6-13 percentage points lower compared to the cohorts without difficulties. Dropout rates among children with difficulties raise to 15 percent at upper secondary level which is 7 percentage points higher than those without difficulties (Figure 8.3.2; 8.3.3).

Literacy and numeracy skills are 2-4 percentage points lower among children with functional difficulties compared to their cohort students (Figure 8.3.1).

Likelihood of school attendance with high outcomes is very doubtful for children with disabilities. Compared to their cohorts without difficulties, children with difficulties demonstrate 31 percentage points lower performances in ECDI. Moreover, children with difficulties have only a 88 percent chance of being in lower secondary school, while children without any functional difficulties have a 95 percent likelihood. They also have 10 percent chance to be out of school, while their cohorts without difficulties have 3 percent likelihood, which is significantly different (Figure 8.3.4).
Improving implementation strategies
Since survey conducting period significant progress has been made in creating legislative environment to enable the inclusion of children with disabilities in education. Notably, to support children’s attendance to ECE and school in their place of residence, to triple per child cost, to increase teacher’s salary by 10 percent, to provide learning materials and equipment to all educational institutions and to approve exemplary curricula. Moreover, in order to ensure successful implementation of the policy the followings should be taken into consideration. They are:

• It is important to know which functional difficulties schools are more prepared and which ones are less prepared to accommodate children with difficulties. Monitor school infrastructure standards and requirements to accommodate them, remove barriers and make public transportation and school buses accessible for disabled children and youth
• Train teachers on implementing Individualized curriculum for children with functional difficulties
• Understanding the child functional domain of cognitive and behavioural characteristics is important for ensuring education equity and promoting inclusive education. So increase parents’ understanding and knowledge for getting early diagnosis and preventing developmental delay for their children and providing opportunities to study and develop together with their peers
• People get handicapped largely because of limited and unaccommodating environments in the society rather than physical difficulties. So it is vitally important to train the school social workers and teachers to work with children with various special needs on how to address challenges of students and efficiently educate them
• Encourage school psychologists, who assist students in mental health, learning and behavior, also to provide training and expertise to school leaders, teachers and parents on how to support children with special needs so that these children could succeed academically, socially and emotionally.
• Increase public awareness on children with functional difficulties and their special characteristics through mass media so that inclusive child friendly settings are established at school and in society
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN CHILDREN’S LEARNING

Guiding questions

1. How do parents participate in children’s education?
2. How does the learning environment differ from child to child?

Figure 9.1.1
Involvement by adult in school management for children age 7-14 years attending school, by background characteristics

- Attended meeting called by governing body
  - School has a governing body open to parents
- A meeting discussed key education/financial issues

Figure 9.1.2
Involvement by adult in children’s learning, by mother’s education

- School has a governing body open to parents
- Attended meeting called by school governing body
- A meeting discussed key education/financial issues
- Attended school celebration or a sport event
- Met with teachers to discuss child’s progress
- Received a report card for the child
### Figure 9.1.3
Involvement by adult in school activities and in child’s learning age 7-14 years attending school, by background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary or Higher</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Non-public</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity of household head</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Attended school celebration or a sport event
- Met with teachers to discuss child’s progress
- Received a report card for the child

### Figure 9.1.4
Involvement by adult in children’s learning, by wealth quintile
Guiding questions

1. How do parents participate in children’s education?
2. How does the learning environment differ from child to child?

### Figure 9.2.1
Learning environment for children age 7-14 years, by background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary or Higher</th>
<th>Out of school</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Non-public</th>
<th>School management</th>
<th>Has functional difficulty</th>
<th>Has no functional difficulty</th>
<th>Mother’s functional difficulties</th>
<th>Khalkh</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Have 3 or more books to read at home**
- **Read books or are read to at home**

| Region | Western | Khangai | Central | Eastern | Ulaanbaatar | Urban | Rural | Capital city | Aimag center | Soum center | Rural bagh | Apartment area | Ger area |
|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|----------|--------|
| Sex    | Male    | Female  | Male    | Female  | Male        | Female| Male  | Female      | Male         | Female      | Male       | Female      | Male     | Female |
| Male   | 81      | 78      | 33      | 49       | 44          | 38    | 59    | 57          | 37           | 59          | 52         | 40          | 35       | 78     |
| Female | 78      | 75      | 44      | 38       | 38          | 59    | 57    | 37          | 59           | 52          | 40         | 35          | 78       | 52     |

### Figure 9.2.2
Learning environment for children age 7-14 years, by mother’s education and wealth quintile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read books or are read to at home</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have 3 or more books to read at home</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Pre-primary or none</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read books or are read to at home</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have 3 or more books to read at home</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9.2.3  Help with homework for children age 7-14 years attending school and having homework, by socio-economic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower secondary (basic)</th>
<th>Upper secondary or Higher</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National average 65

Figure 9.2.4  Help with homework, by geographic areas

- Western: 63
- Khangai: 62
- Eastern: 59
- Central: 67
- Ulaanbaatar: 68
- Capital city: 64
- Soum center: 67
- Aimag center: 67
- Rural: 61
- Urban: 67
- Apartment area: 68
- Ger area: 68

Has functional difficulty
Has no functional difficulty
Khalkh
Kazakh
Other
Non-Orphan
Orphan
Poorest
Second
Middle
Fourth
Richest
Mother's functional difficulties
Ethnicity of household head
Orphanhood status
Wealth index quintile
Though more than 50 percent of parents report that school council activities are open, their participation in parent meeting and decision-making activities is not sufficient, which is only 20 percent. However, their involvement in the activities organized at school and in the children’s learning is quite high, especially in primary education, indicating about 80 percent. This is influenced by geographical location, caregiver’s functional difficulties, school type, housing conditions and household head’s ethnicity (3ypar 9.1.1; 9.1.3).

Parent’s engagement in ger districts of Ulaanbaatar is 10 percentage points lower than those of living in apartments. The low rate of engagement is also common in rural area and especially in Western region (Figure 9.1.2; 9.1.3; 9.1.4).

31 percent of out of school and 28 percent of Kazakh children aged 7-14 report that they have more than 3 books at home which is the worst compared to other groups, however 78 percent responded that they read books or someone at home reads books for them. Having books available at home is insufficient among families in rural area, especially in Western region (33 percent), in ger district of Ulaanbaatar (52 percent) (Figure 9.2.1).

Reading books at home has no relationship with mother’s education and wealth of the family, but having books available at home has some relationships (Figure 9.2.2).

Parent’s help with their child’s homework is 80 percent in primary school, 47 percent in lower secondary school and it drops to 13 percent in upper secondary and above levels. Helping child in their homework is high among parents who have higher education level and those who have not migrated within last 5 years as well as among parents in public schools. Also it is affected by whether parent or caregiver has functional difficulties, whether child is orphaned and by wealth (Figure 9.2.3).
Improving implementation strategies

Parental engagement has a large and positive impact on children’s learning and behaviour. Parents can be involved in their children’s education through helping with their homework and engaging in school activities.

As the survey reveals parents’ engagement in children’s learning is not sufficient, especially at higher grades though their involvement in school activities and children’s learning is quite good at primary education level. Policies developed by the Ministry of Education and Science to increase and stimulate public and community participation in school activities and to make contract with parent and caregiver would accelerate parental engagement in their children’s education. Further the following activities and strategies should be put in place to initiate and enhance interventions to support parental engagement:

- Train teachers to work with different socioeconomic background parents on supporting their children’s learning and development, and managing their behaviour
- Empower parents on parenting skills and supporting their children’s learning at home environment. Also as future parents educate adolescents and youth on parenting education
- Family constitutes the child’s foremost important social environment. Positive attitude of parents influence greatly on child’s reading habit. The survey result shows that most children are being read books by the parent though the family has no books at home, which is very good attitude from the parents. So the parents can think of creating a small home library or even reading corner of printed materials and materials composed by parent together with their child so that child is motivated and encouraged to read, to value the books and to build reading culture which would impact on their lifelong habits.
Summary of Recommendations

The survey results indicate that poverty remains one of the key factors negatively impacting on the education acquisition by children and youth. Disparities in education still exist between different regional and ethnic groups. On the other hand, migrant children and children with functional difficulties are also left behind. Educational attainment for Kazakh children are considerably low, indicating low attendance and completion rates, high dropout, and lowest level of foundational reading skills. Also high rates of boys’ repetition and school dropout demonstrate that gender disparity in education have become an issue to be solved immediately.

Regardless of their socio-economic background, ethnicity, disabilities and places of living, all children have the right to education and learn. The below shows the summary of recommendations in abovementioned 9 topics to provide equity of education and improve education quality for every child.

• Ensure good partnership between all levels of education, that includes cooperation among ECE, primary, lower secondary and upper secondary teachers, as well as curricula coherence
• Extend quality assurance assessment to include more primary schools so that learning outcomes of foundational skills could be diagnosed and assessed at early stages of primary.
• Give attention to the high teacher absenteeism in public schools. Invest more in teachers and their continuous professional development along with the improvement of infrastructure
• Create literate environments at home, in the classroom, in the community, in educational and cultural institutions to promote literacy and build literate behavior. Promote ICT utilization in teaching and learning and improve digital literacy skills of children and the youth.
• Implement an Intervention support programme for those students who enter school over-aged and for those who are left behind in learning
• For supporting inclusive education at all levels of education it is important to ensure the supply of teachers, human resource, infrastructure and learning materials. But vitally important is that a quality of suitable curricula and assessment system are in place along with increased understanding of parents on early detection and diagnosis of child disability or difficulties. It is also necessary to promote participation and social inclusion of children with disabilities through public awareness, change of other students’ and teachers’ attitudes towards disability and to increase financing and investment.
• Make sure that the quality of education delivered both in Mongolian and Kazakh languages has same quality and to national standard. Support teachers of ethnic minority groups with training and improve quality of learning and teaching materials as well as infrastructure
• Secure that the school-age children are not engaged in child labour, especially in hazardous work. Monitor the enforcement of Child labour laws and regulations
• Ensure whether school curricula meet the needs and interests of boys, whether there is a quality issue. There is also a strong need to change the parents’ attitude towards boy’s education
• Encourage schools to introduce school programme or initiative to support migrant students and help them adopt in new school environment.
• Empower parents and family members of out-of-school children and provide them life skills and livelihood training
• Accelerate the partnership and coordination of local actors working in health, education, child development and child protection. Provide comprehensive education, health and social care services to the children who are out of school, migrant and children living apart from their parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early child development index (UNICEF definition)</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 36-59 months who are developmentally on track in at least three of the following four domains: literacy-numeracy, physical, social-emotional, and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy-numeracy: Children are identified as being developmentally on track based on whether they can identify/name at least ten letters of the alphabet, whether they can read at least four simple, popular words, and whether they know the name and recognize the symbols of all numbers from 1 to 10. If at least two of these are true, then the child is considered developmentally on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical: If the child can pick up a small object with two fingers, like a stick or a rock from the ground and/or the mother/caretaker does not indicate that the child is sometimes too sick to play, then the child is regarded as being developmentally on track in the physical domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social-emotional: Children are considered to be developmentally on track if two of the following are true: if the child gets along well with other children, if the child does not kick, bite, or hit other children and if the child does not get distracted easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning: If the child follows simple directions on how to do something correctly and/or when given something to do, is able to do it independently, then the child is considered to be developmentally on track in this domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early child development index (Country specific definition)</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 36-59 months who are developmentally on track in at least three of the following four domains: literacy-numeracy, physical, social-emotional, and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The definitions about the social-emotional and learning domains are same as in the standard MICS calculation (UNICEF definition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy-numeracy: Children are identified as being developmentally on track based on whether they can recognize/differentiate colors, recognize simple forms like, triangle, square or round, and whether they know the name and recognize the symbols of all numbers from 1 to 10. If at least two of these are true, then the child is considered developmentally on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical: In addition to the two standard MICS items, i.e., the child can pick up a small object with two fingers, like a stick or a rock from the ground and/or the mother/caretaker does not indicate that the child is sometimes too sick to play, if the child can hold objects with his/her thumb, index finger or middle finger, like a spoon, fork or pen then the child is regarded as being developmentally on track in the physical domain providing that at least two of these are true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attendance to early childhood education</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 24-59 months who are attending an early childhood education programme. ECE programmes include programmes for children that have organised learning components as opposed to baby-sitting and day-care which do not typically have organised education and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participation rate in organised learning (adjusted)</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 5 years who are attending an early childhood education programme or primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School readiness</td>
<td>Percentage of children attending the first grade of primary school who attended early childhood education programme during the previous school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS TO EACH CYCLE OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary school entry (Net intake rate in primary education)</td>
<td>Percentage of children of primary school-entry age who enter the first grade of primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Net attendance ratio (adjusted)</td>
<td>Percentage of children of primary school age currently attending primary or secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of children of lower secondary school age currently attending lower secondary school or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of children of upper secondary school age currently attending upper secondary school or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Age distribution in primary and lower secondary school (Over-age for grade)</td>
<td>Percentage of students attending in each grade who are 2 or more years older than the official school age for grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of students attending in primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of students attending in lower secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Literacy rate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of a population who are able to read a short simple statement about everyday life or who attended secondary or higher education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>ICT skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;Activities are: 1) copied or moved a file or folder; 2) used a copy and paste tool to duplicate or move information within a document; 3) sent e-mail with attached file, such as a document, picture or video; 4) used a basic arithmetic formula in a spreadsheet; 5) connected and installed a new device, such as a modem, camera or printer; 6) found, downloaded, installed and configured software; 7) created an electronic presentation with presentation software, including text, images, sound, video or charts; 8) transferred a file between a computer and another device; and 9) wrote a computer program in any programming language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Children with foundational reading skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children aged 7-14 years who successfully completed three foundational reading tasks. Tasks are: 1) correctly read 90% of words in a story, correctly answered comprehension questions, consisting of 2) three literal and 3) two inferential questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Children with foundational numeracy skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children aged 7-14 years who successfully completed four foundational number tasks. Tasks are: successfully completed 1) number reading, 2) number discrimination, 3) addition and 4) pattern recognition and completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPETITION AND DROP OUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Repetition rate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children attended a grade the previous year who repeated that grade in the current school year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Drop out rate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of all children attended secondary education (except grade 12 of upper secondary school) the previous year who no longer enrolled in the current school year. Children who repeat are not included in the calculation for the dropout rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Non-transitioners</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children who attended the last grade of an education level but did not continue to the next level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Completion rate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children age 3-5 years above the intended age for the last grade who have completed that grade&lt;br&gt;(a) primary school&lt;br&gt;(b) lower secondary school&lt;br&gt;(c) upper secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>School-related reasons for inability to attend class</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children age 7-14 years who were unable to attend class in the last year due to a school-related following reasons: 1) natural disasters; 2) man-made disasters; 3) teacher strike; 4) teacher absence and 5) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Out-of-school rate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Percentage of children of&lt;br&gt;(a) primary school age who are not attending early childhood education, primary or lower secondary school&lt;br&gt;(b) lower secondary school age who are not attending primary school, lower or upper secondary school or higher&lt;br&gt;(c) upper secondary school age who are not attending primary school, lower or upper secondary school or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19     | **Pathway analysis**<br>Percentage of children of upper secondary school age who<br>(a) ever entered primary school<br>(b) never entered primary school<br>(c) completed primary school<br>(d) dropped out of primary school<br>(e) transitions to lower secondary school<br>(f) still attending lower secondary school<br>(g) completed lower secondary school<br>(h) dropped out of lower secondary school<br>(i) transitioned to upper secondary school<br>(j) did not transition to lower secondary school
**EDUCATION AND CHILD PROTECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>Child labour</th>
<th>Percentage of children age 5-17 years who are involved in child labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A child that performed economic activities (paid or unpaid work for someone who is not a member of the household, work for a family farm or business) during the last week for more than the age-specific number of hours is classified as in child labour:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. age 5-11: 1 hour or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. age 12-14: 14 hours or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. age 15-17: 43 hours or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A child that performed household chores (household chores such as cooking, cleaning or caring for children, as well as collecting firewood or fetching water) during the last week for more than the age-specific number of hours is classified as in child labour:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. age 5-11 and age 12-14: 28 hours or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. age 15-17: 43 hours or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous work is defined as that requires 1) carrying heavy loads; 2) working with dangerous tools such as knives and similar or operating heavy machinery; 3) working at heights; 4) working with chemicals, such as pesticides, glues and similar, or explosives; 5) a working environment that exposed to dust, fumes or gas; 6) to extreme cold, heat or humidity; 7) to loud noise or vibration; 8) to processes or conditions bad for child's health or safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION AND CHILD FUNCTIONING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>Early marriage</th>
<th>Percentage of women and men age 20-24 years who were first married or in union before age 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN CHILDREN’S LEARNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>Availability of information on children’s school performance</th>
<th>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending schools whose student report cards provided to parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Opportunity to participate in school management</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending schools whose school governing body is open to parental participation, as reported by respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Participation in school management</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending school for whom an adult household member participated in school governing body meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Effective participation in school management</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending school for whom an adult household member attended a school governing body meeting in which key education/financial issues were discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Discussion with teachers regarding children’s progress</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending school for whom an adult household member discussed child’s progress with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Contact with school concerning teacher strike or absence</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending school who could not attend class due to teacher strike or absence and for whom an adult household member contacted school representatives when child could not attend class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Availability of books at home</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years who have three or more books to read at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Reading at home</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years who read books or are read to at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Support with homework</td>
<td>Percentage of children age 7-14 years attending school who have homework and received help with homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Children’s living arrangement</td>
<td>Children age 0-17 years living with neither biological parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Orphanhood status</td>
<td>Children age 0-17 years with one or both biological parents dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Early stimulation and responsive care</td>
<td>Children age 24-59 months engaged in four or more of the following activities to provide early stimulation and responsive care in the last 3 days with any adult household member. Activities are: 1) read books; 2) telling stories; 3) sing songs; 4) be taken outside; 5) play with; 6) name/count or draw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Availability of children’s books</td>
<td>Children under age 5 who have three or more children’s books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Availability of playthings</td>
<td>Children under age 5 who play with two or more types of playthings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play with smart phone, tablet and computer</td>
<td>Children under age 5 who play with smart phone, tablet and computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Inadequate supervision</td>
<td>Children under age 5 left alone or under the supervision of another child younger than 10 years of age for more than one hour at least once in the last week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Violent discipline</td>
<td>Children age 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past one month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Stunting prevalence</td>
<td>Children under age 5 who fall below minus two standard deviations (moderate and severe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Apartment area</td>
<td>Capital city’s (Ulaanbaatar) built-up core where the majority of residential buildings are apartments, having better access to water, heating, roads, and waste collection services than elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ger area</td>
<td>Surrounding and peripheral area of the capital city’s core that is farther from primary infrastructure and services, highly dependent on water from tankers and simple pit latrines for sanitation, having expanding and meandering streets that can be difficult to access, and locating on hazardous sites in some parts due to a lack of subdivision guidance or layouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Capital city and aimag centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Soum centers and rural baghs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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