NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

Collaborating Center for Questionnaire Design and Evaluation Research

August 2026

Results of Cognitive Testing of Inclusive Education Questions

By: Meredith Massey and Kristen Cibelli Hibben

INTRODUCTION

Suggested citation:
Massey, M., Cibelli-Hibben, K. Results of Cognitive Testing of Inclusive Education Questions. National Center for Health Statistics - CCQDER. Q-Bank. 2026. Available from: https://wwwn.cdc.gov/qbank/report.aspx?1266

This report presents the findings of a cognitive interview study designed to evaluate questions from the Inclusive Education Module (IEM), developed by UNICEF and the Washington Group on Disability Statistics (WG)[1]. The study was conducted by the Collaborating Center for Questionnaire Design and Evaluation Research (CCQDER) at the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), using interpretive cognitive interview methodology. It was carried out in collaboration with UNICEF and the Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics (IBGE) and received approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the NCHS/CDC Ethics Review Board.

The IEM was developed as a companion to UNICEF's earlier Child Functioning Module and is intended to assess factors that influence school participation among children both with and without disabilities. It reflects the biopsychosocial model of disability, which considers both individual functioning and environmental conditions in shaping participation (1). Although developed to capture the educational experiences of children with disabilities, the IEM is intended for use with all children, allowing for disaggregation by disability status when used alongside the Child Functioning Module. The instrument is intended for children currently attending school, as well as children not currently enrolled (1).

This evaluation represents a third and final round of testing of the IEM and is based on 80 cognitive interviews conducted in August 2023 in three favela neighborhoods of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Preliminary testing results were presented by NCHS staff to UNICEF and the Washington Group on Disability Statistics on October 18, 2023. These findings directly informed the final modifications to the IEM.

This report outlines the methods used in the evaluation and provides a synthesis of the major findings. A detailed question-by-question analysis appears as Appendix 1, the tested instrument is included in Appendix 2, a summary table of revisions based on the findings is included as Appendix 3 and the final version of the instrument, based on multiple rounds of testing, appears as Appendix 4

[1] Washington Group on Disability Statistics. WG/UNICEF Inclusive Education Module (IEM) [Internet]. London: Washington Group on Disability Statistics; Available from: https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/question-sets/wg-unicef-inclusive-education-module-iem

METHODS

This evaluation of survey questions on the IEM used one-on-one cognitive interviewing methodology. This approach allows researchers to explore the mental processes of survey response in the context of respondents' experiences (2, 3). This approach helps identify potential sources of measurement error and assess how well the questions capture intended constructs. Findings from the study informed revisions to the final version of the instrument.

Instrument: The Inclusive Education Module (IEM) was developed by UNICEF and the Washington Group on Disability Statistics to assess environmental factors affecting school participation among children with and without disabilities. Designed as a companion to the UNICEF/WG Child Functioning Module, the IEM focuses on identifying facilitators and barriers to inclusive education using a biopsychosocial model of disability (1, 4, 5).

A first phase of evaluation, conducted in 2016, included 140 respondents from the metropolitan areas of Washington, DC, Mumbai, India, and Kingston, Jamaica. Findings from this first round are detailed in Scanlon and Miller, 2017 (6). A second round of testing was carried out in Cambodia and Kazakhstan, with 69 and 57 interviews conducted respectively (7). The present study represents a third round of cognitive testing and was intended to evaluate revised items and provide final input into the refinement of the IEM. The portion of the module tested in the current round consisted of four sections covering school type, school environment, out-of-school children, attendance determinants, and attitudes to inclusive education. To provide context, additional questions were posed to respondents during testing; however, these contextual questions were not part of the testing (Appendix 2).

Sample: Eighty caregivers from Rio de Janeiro were purposively selected for cognitive interviews. The recruitment aimed to recruit respondents based on a broad range of characteristics, focusing on factors relevant to the module such as school enrollment status and the disability status of the focal child. The UNICEF Program Office in Rio de Janeiro directly managed the recruitment process, including screening participants for specific criteria like disability and out-of-school status. Despite targeted efforts and initial interest screenings suggesting a sufficient number of respondents with out-of-school children, the final sample included fewer of these respondents than anticipated. Table 1 below provides a detailed breakdown of the sample's characteristics.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

	n=80
Age of Respondent (in years)	
18-28	7
29-39	36
40-49	23
50 and older	14
Relationship to Child	
Mother	67
Grandmother	9
Aunt	2
Sibling	2
Age of Child	
<5	10

6-10	24
11-14	28
15-18	17
>18	1
Sex of Child	
Female	26
Male	54
Disability Status of Child*	3
Disabled	54
Non-Disabled	26
School Status of Child*	
In School	73
Out of School	7

*Caregiver reported
SOURCE: National Center for Health Statistics, Collaborating Center for Questionnaire Design and Evaluation Research, 2023.

Data Collection: Data collection took place in August 2023. Interviews were conducted in Portuguese by staff from the Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, IBGE) as well as two Brazilian PhD candidates. Interviewers were trained in cognitive interviewing by CCQDER researchers. Interviews were conducted in-person at IBGE Headquarters and at partner organizations within the Mara, Cidade de Deus, and Alemão favela communities of Rio de Janeiro. Conducting interviews at local partner organizations within the favelas facilitated participation from caregivers with lower education and income levels by reducing logistical challenges associated with traveling to central locations.

CCQDER researchers observed the interviews with real-time translation and provided ongoing feedback to interviewers. Interviews lasted no more than 60 minutes, and respondents received R$100 (Brazilian Reais) for their participation.

Interview Procedures: Each interview followed a structured cognitive interviewing protocol using interpretive methodology (8). In the first part of the interview, respondents answered the survey questions as they would in an actual survey, allowing researchers to assess whether and how they could respond without assistance or with minimal interviewer guidance. In the second part, interviewers used verbal probing to explore comprehension and response processes. Special attention was given to identifying cases of nonresponse and following up to explore barriers to response. Audio recordings and written summaries of the interviews were collected for data analysis.

Data Analysis: Interview notes from the audio recordings were entered into Q-Notes (9) translated into English, to be analyzed by CCQDER researchers using the grounded theory approach (10). Each interview was summarized by question, capturing respondents' interpretations, reasoning, and any difficulties they encountered. Summaries were then reviewed to identify patterns of interpretation, response error, and potential measurement issues. The analysis emphasized identifying sources of nonresponse and response error and assessing how well question constructs and response categories aligned with respondent understanding and experience (11)

RESULTS

The following summary presents key findings from Round 3 cognitive testing, organized by section (School Participation, Out of School, School Attendance Determinants, and Attitudes toward Inclusive Education), along with the revisions made to the final instrument based on these findings. Broader patterns and themes that emerged across multiple questions are highlighted, reflecting key response tendencies and overall question performance. Appendix 2 offers a detailed, question-by-question review of the findings, expanding on this summary. A table summarizing revisions made to the final instrument is provided in Appendix 3. The table includes only items that were revised or removed following testing.

Across most sections of the instrument, respondents were generally able to answer questions grounded in direct experience. Some variation in interpretation and response error was observed, typically related to unfamiliar terminology or differences between the intended meaning of concepts and how they are understood in the local context. For example, terms such as “academic skills,” “teaching methods,” and “special school” were not always interpreted consistently, and some respondents mapped their experiences onto response options in ways that did not fully align with the intended categories.

Difficulties were more pronounced for questions that required more abstract reasoning or interpretation of less familiar constructs. In these cases, respondents often relied on partial understandings of terms or provided responses based on differing interpretations of the question. These patterns indicate that while most respondents were able to provide answers, question wording and conceptual clarity played a critical role in shaping response quality.

Overall Findings and Revisions

School Participation Section: The School Participation section was retained in the final version of the instrument but required substantial revision due to ambiguous concepts and inconsistent interpretation of response categories. A key issue was misclassification driven by unclear or overlapping categories, particularly in SP7 (“Does (name) go to a school, or is (he/she) taught at home, or both?”), where many respondents interpreted “both” to include informal learning at home rather than formal schooling. This led to inconsistent classification of school participation. In the final instrument (ST3), response options were revised to be mutually exclusive, and the “both” category was removed.

Several items also revealed limited familiarity with concepts or terms, leading respondents to reinterpret questions based on their own experiences. For example, in SP8 (“Is (***name***)’s school a boarding school where (he/she) lives for most of the week?”) “boarding school” was unfamiliar to many respondents and was often misunderstood. This was addressed by replacing the term with a concrete description of living and sleeping at school (ST5).

Other issues stemmed from vague or underspecified concepts, particularly in SP9 (“What type of school does (name) attend?”) and SP10 (“What type of classroom is (name) in?”), where terms like “special school” or “special class” were interpreted inconsistently. These were revised to explicitly reference settings for children with disabilities, improving alignment between question intent and respondent understanding.

Finally, some items did not function as intended due to systematic misinterpretation of the construct itself. For example, SP11 (“Is (name) taught at home instead of going to school?”) and SP12 (“Has (name) taken online classes during the current school year?”) were interpreted in ways that differed from the intended meaning and were therefore removed from the final instrument.

Out of School Section: The Out of School section was retained in the final version of the instrument with moderate revision to address ambiguity in how respondents attributed reasons for non-attendance. A central issue was that respondents often interpreted questions as referring to multiple or context-dependent reasons rather than evaluating each item independently. In many cases, respondents described general conditions or aspects of their situation rather than assessing whether those conditions explained why the child was not attending school. This pattern was particularly evident for items such as OS3 ("Is (name) not attending that school because of conditions at the school?") and OS6 ("Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe getting there?"), where respondents sometimes shifted between reasons depending on the situation. As a result, responses did not consistently reflect a single, clearly defined reason for non-attendance.

In response, items such as OS3 and OS6 were restructured in the final instrument to allow respondents to report multiple reasons in a standardized format reducing the need to interpret question intent or prioritize responses.

Additional issues arose from broad or unclear concepts, such as OS4 ("Are conditions at the school a reason (name) is not attending?"), which respondents interpreted in different ways (e.g., infrastructure, safety, accessibility). These were revised into more specific and concrete categories, improving comparability across responses.

Question wording and structure were also simplified to reduce reliance on respondent interpretation and improve consistency.

School Attendance Determinants Section: The School Attendance Determinants section performed relatively well and required only minor revisions. Observed issues primarily involved variation in how respondents interpreted the scope of questions. For SA2 ("Does (name) need to work, earn money or help out at home?"), respondents differed in whether they considered current income-generating work or broader household responsibilities, and one respondent interpreted the question in terms of potential future work. In the final instrument, the question was revised to emphasize current work or earning money, while household caregiving responsibilities were addressed separately.

Minor revisions were also made to the health condition questions. For SA6 and SA7, most respondents distinguished between having a health condition and having a condition that actually prevented school attendance, although some respondents interpreted the questions more broadly to include temporary illnesses. The word "serious" was added in the final instrument to clarify the intended scope of these questions.

Finally, SA11 ("Is it important for (name) to go to school?") was removed from the final instrument. Overall, revisions to the School Attendance Determinants section focused on clarifying temporal and conceptual scope and simplifying the section while retaining questions that performed well.

Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education Section: The Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education (Attitudes) section underwent multiple rounds of revision prior to this study, including Round 1 in India, the United States, and Jamaica, and Round 2 in Cambodia and Kazakhstan. A third iteration of the section was tested in the current study (Round 3). Despite these prior revisions, the Attitudes questions continued to perform poorly. Based on these findings, the section was not retained in the final instrument and was eliminated rather than further revised.

Across items (IE1–IE10), responses exhibited consistent patterns of nonresponse, response error, and difficulty using the response scale, which often co-occurred within the same response. Nonresponse occurred when respondents were unable to provide an initial answer without prompting, typically due to difficulty

understanding key terms such as “academic skills” (IE5), “social skills” (IE6), and “teaching methods” (IE3), or uncertainty about the intent of the question. Response error was observed when respondents selected answers that did not align with their explanations, often reflecting partial, shifting, or incorrect interpretations. Difficulties with the response scale were also common, with many respondents treating the options as binary or interchangeable rather than as ordered categories.

A dominant pattern across items was conditional (“it depends”) reasoning. Rather than interpreting the questions as generalizable statements, respondents frequently evaluated them in relation to specific circumstances, such as the child’s needs, type or severity of disability, teacher capacity, classroom environment, or available supports. About one-third to one-half of respondents, depending on the item, qualified their answers in this way. This was evident, for example, in responses to IE8 (“Children with disabilities will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a general classroom”), where one respondent explained that the answer depends on whether the child “needs special support” or can function in a regular classroom, while another noted that one must “look at all angles.”

This conditional framing fundamentally shaped how respondents engaged with the items. Instead of forming a single, stable judgment, respondents weighed multiple competing considerations and, in some cases, revised or qualified their answers during probing. For example, in response to IE10 (“Children with disabilities should be in special classrooms so that they do not face rejection from children without disabilities”), one respondent explained that the answer “depends on the level and capacity of the child,” indicating that placement decisions vary based on individual circumstances rather than a general rule. As a result, responses were not anchored to a shared interpretation of the question but reflected individualized, context-specific reasoning. This made it difficult for respondents to map their views onto fixed response categories such as “agree” or “disagree,” contributing directly to response error and scale-use difficulties.

Importantly, these issues were observed consistently across all items (IE1–IE10), regardless of specific wording or topic (e.g., classroom placement, teacher ability, learning outcomes, or peer interactions). Even after multiple rounds of revision, the questions continued to elicit variable interpretations, conditional reasoning, and inconsistent response patterns and were therefore, not retained in the final version of the instrument.

CONCLUSION

This cognitive interview study presents findings from the third and final round of testing of the Inclusive Education Module (IEM), conducted to evaluate revised items and provide final input into the refinement of the IEM questions. The study offers detailed insight into how low-income caregivers in Brazil interpreted and responded to the module.

Cognitive testing identified consistent interpretive patterns across questions, as well as key sources of response error and nonresponse. Respondents were generally able to answer questions grounded in direct experience, particularly when concepts were familiar and clearly defined. However, difficulties arose when questions relied on abstract reasoning, unfamiliar terminology, or response categories that did not align with how respondents naturally described their experiences. These challenges were most evident in the Attitudes section, where respondents often expressed uncertainty, provided conditional (“it depends”) answers, or selected response options that did not reflect their stated views.

Findings from this study informed targeted revisions to the final version of the instrument. Revisions focused on simplifying question wording, clarifying key concepts, and improving the alignment between question intent and respondent interpretation. Response categories were refined to be more concrete and mutually exclusive, and question structures were adjusted to reduce ambiguity and support more consistent responses.

In some cases, items that did not function as intended were removed entirely, most notably the Attitudes section, which was eliminated due to persistent measurement challenges across rounds of testing.

Overall, the study highlights the importance of designing survey questions that reflect respondents' lived experiences and cognitive processes, particularly in diverse and low-literacy contexts. These findings can inform both instrument development and data interpretation, helping data users better understand how variation in comprehension may influence response patterns and measurement quality.

Works Cited

1. UNICEF. Module on Inclusive Education [Internet] New York. 2023 [Available from: https://data.unicef.org/resources/module-on-inclusive-education/.

2. Madans JH, ProQuest. Question evaluation methods : contributing to the science of data quality. Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley & Sons; 2011.

3. Miller K, Willis G. Cognitive models of answering processes. The Sage handbook of survey methodology. 2016:210-7.

4. UNICEF. Module on Child Functioning New York. 2021 [Available from: https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-disability/data-collection-tools/module-on-child-functioning/.

5. Massey M. The development and testing of a module on child functioning for identifying children with disabilities on surveys. II: Question development and pretesting. Disability and health journal. 2018;11(4):502-9.

6. Scanlon P, & Miller, K. Cognitive Evaluation of the UNICEF Early Child Development Index (ECDI) and Inclusive Education Modules in the United States, India, and Jamaica. 2017 [Available from: https://wwwn.cdc.gov/qbank/report.aspx?1179].

7. Miller K. Results of a Second Round of Cognitive Testing of Questions on Inclusive Education [unpublished report]. National Center for Health Statistics. 2025.

8. Miller K, Willson S, Chepp V, Padilla J-L, editors. Cognitive interviewing methodology. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2014.

9. National Center for Health Statistics.. Q-Notes. 2023 [Available from: wwwn.cdc.gov/qnotes].

10. Glaser B, Strauss A. Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research: New York, NY: Routledge. 2017.

11. Strauss A, Corbin J. Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. 1998.

Appendix 1: Question-by-question results

The following presents detailed findings for each question that was tested in Round 3 of testing. Unless otherwise noted, questions were asked of all respondents.

School participation

SP7. Does (name) go to a school, or is (he/she) taught at home, or both? (School, Home, Both)

	Responses
School	53
Both	20
Home	0

All respondents were asked this question except for the seven who skipped to the Out of School section. Respondents based their answers on whether their child was taught at a school, at home, or both. However, limited familiarity with the concept of "homeschooling," which is rare in Brazil, affected how some respondents understood the response categories.

Respondents generally interpreted being taught at "school" as physically attending a formal educational institution, such as a public or private school. For example, one respondent answered "school" explaining that his child "…goes to school every day."

Twenty respondents answered "both" indicating that their children were taught both at school and at home. However, these responses were shaped by how respondents interpreted a key term that was unfamiliar in the local context, in this case "homeschooled," which is not commonly used in Brazil.

Respondents interpreted "homeschooled" in several ways. In the first and largest group, more than half of respondents understood homeschooling as informal educational support at home rather than as a formal alternative to school. These respondents described activities such as helping with homework or reinforcing school content. For example, one respondent answered "both" and explained it as "the help and attention she gives her son at home regarding school activities," while another who also answered "both" said the child "does his homework at the home of a person who helps him with study activities."

A smaller group, fewer than ten respondents, interpreted homeschooling as more formal instructional support outside of school. In these cases, respondents referred to structured instruction at home or external supports such as tutoring or therapy. For instance, one respondent noted that the child receives "assistance outside of school, such as therapy and pedagogical assistance at an institute."

Another group of respondents (approximately one-quarter) did not have a concept of "homeschool" and instead answered by describing the child's schooling situation. For example, one respondent stated that the child "studies only at school" but later said she didn't know what was meant by "homeschool." No evidence of response error was seen in these responses, but this pattern further indicates that the term "homeschool" was not well understood and could lead to misclassification.

SP8. Is (name)'s school a boarding school where (he/she) lives for most of the week? (Yes, No)

	Responses
No	68
Yes	5

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. Most respondents interpreted boarding school as a place where a child lives or sleeps away from home during the week. In this group, respondents offered a variety of descriptions that were all compatible with this idea. For example, one who answered "no" said, "Boarding school is being away from home all week ... Boarding school is not sleeping at home." Another respondent explained that she herself studied in this way at a "nun's school, in which she entered on Monday and left on Friday." Another thought of a boarding school as an orphanage, saying, "where children who often have no parents and go there to grow and learn..." A few thought that boarding school is a place where a child with behavioral problems might have to go. Nearly all respondents in this group answered "no" because the situation did not apply to their child.

Some respondents (approximately one-quarter) conceived of boarding school as having to do with the amount of time the child spends at school, resulting in several instances of response error. For example, one respondent answered "yes" because, "[HE] goes every day." Another respondent who answered "yes," when asked what boarding school means, said that it means spending a lot of time at school. Others appeared to think of boarding school as referring to the extended schedule that some children in Brazil follow. One of these respondents explained that she understands that her child does attend boarding school because he spends a lot of time at school, saying that the child is there from 7:30 a.m. to 14:20 p.m. and he then takes a course from 15 p.m. to 18 p.m. The interviewer noted that the respondent confused the concept of boarding school with integral school. Another respondent similarly confused boarding school with an extended schedule explaining that the child stays there all day.

A smaller number of respondents (fewer than ten) said that they had never heard of boarding school or were unsure what it was. While these respondents ultimately answered "no," there was evidence that uncertainty and unfamiliarity contributed to hesitation in responding. For example, the interviewer notes that in one case the respondent made a long pause before answering and eventually said "no," explaining that the child only studied in the afternoon.

SP9. What type of school does (name) currently attend? (Regular school, Special school)

	Responses
Regular school	70
Special school	3

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. More than three-quarters of respondents understood "special schools" as schools dedicated to children with some form of disability. In this group, respondents offered a range of descriptions that were consistent with this idea. For example, one respondent said, "It's a school only for specials, special children," while another

explained that a special school is "…where only special students with disabilities study." Many respondents also described special schools as adapted in particular ways, such as with equipment or trained personnel, for example, a "school with apparatus for special children and with trained professionals as well"; "…had specific professionals to treat and deal with PWD (People with Disabilities)."

A smaller group of respondents, roughly one-fifth, associated special schools primarily with physical disabilities, often referring to children who are blind or use a wheelchair. A similar proportion mentioned other types of disability, such as one respondent who said, "I imagine it's for a type of child who has some mental disability."

Nearly all respondents answered "Regular school," with only a very small number identifying their child's school as a special school, including one respondent who explained, "It is a special school for the visually impaired."

A small number of respondents, fewer than five, said that they did not know or had never heard of a special school. However, these respondents were still able to determine and correctly answer "Regular school."

There were a few isolated instances of potential response error. For example, one respondent reported that, formally, the child's school is not a special school for children with disabilities, but that most of the children who study there have some kind of disability and, on this basis, answered "Special school." Another respondent also answered "Special school," potentially in error, with the interviewer noting a contradiction in that the respondent's child does not have a disability.

SP10. What type of classroom does (name) currently attend? (Regular classroom, Special classroom, Both regular and special classrooms)

	Responses
Regular classroom	52
Special classroom	2
Both regular classroom and special classrooms	19

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. More than three-quarters of respondents understood a "special classroom" as a classroom intended for children with disabilities. In this group, many described it as a space specifically designed for children with different types of disabilities and supported by trained professionals. For example, one respondent explained that it is "a room only for children with disabilities," while another described it as a space with "a suitable teacher to deal with children with disabilities." Others noted that these classrooms include adaptations such as specialized materials, fewer students, or additional support staff.

A smaller group of respondents, roughly one-fifth, referred to special classrooms using different terminology, such as "resource room," "support room," or similar concepts. In these cases, respondents often described settings where children receive individualized attention or participate in specific activities separate from the regular classroom. For example, one respondent explained that in the resource room, "there is less noise and fewer children and the teacher reads the test and gives it to him," while another described activities such as games, puzzles, or music used to support the child's learning.

Among respondents whose children attended both settings, many described a combination of general classroom instruction and periodic use of a resource or support room. However, there was variability in how respondents interpreted and applied the "both" category. Some respondents selected "both" based on actual

participation in both settings, while others based their answer on the availability of a special classroom or the possibility that their child could use it, even if they had not done so.

A small number of respondents, fewer than five, expressed uncertainty about whether their child attended a special classroom or how frequently it was used. For example, one respondent indicated that they did not know if the child still attended the special classroom, while another was unsure how much time the child spent in each setting.

There were several instances of potential response error involving a small number of cases. In some cases, respondents answered based on access to a special classroom rather than actual use. For example, one respondent selected "both" even though the child had not yet used the special classroom but could if needed. In another case, a respondent answered "regular classroom" even though it later emerged that the child attended a support or resource room periodically. Additionally, some respondents did not distinguish clearly between different types of specialized support, such as resource rooms versus special classrooms, leading to inconsistencies in classification.

SP11. Who is teaching (name) at home? (Teachers or private tutor, Parent(s) or other family members(s), Both)

	Responses
Teachers or private tutor	0
Parent(s) or other family member(s)	18
Both	1

Respondents who were asked this question had answered "Both" to the previous question on whether their child is taught at school, at home, or both (SP 7). However, as seen in earlier probing, many of these children were not actually receiving formal instruction at home and should have been skipped out of this question.

When asked about their response to this question, a majority of respondents indicated that they understood being "taught at home" as receiving informal academic support rather than formal instruction. Most described helping the child with homework, reviewing school content, or reinforcing lessons provided at school. For example, one respondent explained that the father and mother help "in carrying out the homework sent by the school," while another described the support as assistance with "reading, writing, and math."

Nearly all respondents identified parents or other family members as those providing this support. Commonly mentioned individuals included mothers, fathers, grandparents, siblings, and other relatives. In a few cases, respondents mentioned someone outside the immediate household, such as a paid helper or "explainer," who assists the child with schoolwork.

SP12. During the current school year did (name) attend any online classes at home? (Yes, No)

	Responses
Yes	10
No	63

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section.

Respondents interpreted this question in two main ways. In the first group, respondents understood and answered the question as intended, referring to the current school year. These respondents described their child's experience with online classes during the current school year. For example, one respondent reported that the child had online classes due to construction work at the school, while another explained that the child had online classes at the beginning of the year because the class was without a teacher and that the "director herself gave classes online and sent the tasks to the cell phone." Another respondent answered "yes" because the child received exercises when classes were suspended due to police operations. Many respondents in this group referenced the Covid-19 pandemic as a comparison point but correctly answered "no" because the child had not taken online classes during the current school year.

A minority of respondents, about one-third, answered the question as if it referred to the Covid-19 pandemic period rather than the current school year, resulting in several instances of response error. In these cases, respondents either did not hear or did not understand the reference to the "current school year." For example, one respondent initially answered "yes" but clarified that the child only had online classes during the pandemic and answered "no" when asked specifically about the current school year. A small number of respondents explicitly indicated that they did not understand the term "current," or were unable to define it.

In addition to these two patterns, respondents varied in how they understood "online classes." Many described online classes in reference to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as watching lessons on a computer or following materials provided by teachers at home. Others described online classes as involving access to teaching, either live or recorded, through computers, mobile phones, or online platforms. In some cases, respondents referred to synchronous instruction, for example, "the teacher was live teaching with all the children connected," while others described more general activities such as watching videos.

Some respondents understood online classes as receiving assignments or materials to complete at home without access to teaching, either live or recorded. Among these respondents, there was inconsistency in whether such activities were considered online classes. For example, one respondent considered receiving exercises by phone to be online classes, while another did not, explaining that without a computer there were no "online" classes, only homework.

SP14. Do you expect (name) to complete the current school year? (Yes, No)

	Responses
Yes	62
No	7
Don't know	4

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. While "the current school year" was not consistently understood in SP12, in the context of this question more than three-quarters of respondents understood it as referring to the grade or class level the child was in at the time. In this context, respondents generally had no difficulty interpreting the reference to the current school year, and there is no evidence of response error related to this aspect of the question.

Most respondents interpreted completing the current school year as performance-based, that is, related to learning, grades, or attendance. For example, one respondent explained that completing the school year means that the child has sufficient grades to pass, while another described it as "finishing the year and understanding everything that was taught during the school year." Respondents who held this interpretation

typically answered “yes” when they expected the child to perform or learn as required and advance to the next grade.

Some respondents answered “no” or “don’t know” when they had concerns about the child’s ability to meet these expectations. For example, one respondent answered “no” due to the child’s difficulty with learning and following classes, while another cited late enrollment in the school year. Another explained, “It’s going to be half done,” because the child frequently misses school due to seizures and behavioral issues. A small number of respondents answered “don’t know,” often citing low grades or health-related challenges that interfere with learning.

A smaller group of respondents, roughly one-fifth, interpreted completing the school year as not necessarily tied to performance, but instead as automatic progression. In this group, respondents indicated that children advance regardless of learning. Several respondents answered “yes” on this basis, even when they did not expect the child to learn the material. For example, one respondent said, “He'll finish, but he's not going to learn,” while another explained that in early grades “they always approve.” One respondent noted that for children with disabilities, “because of the automatic approval, [the child] will [pass].”

A few respondents expressed mixed interpretations, answering “no” despite expecting the child to advance, because they defined completion in terms of learning rather than promotion. For example, one respondent said the child would not complete the year because he is not learning the current content, even though other children are advanced without learning. Another similarly answered “no,” explaining that although the child may pass, he will not have learned what is required.

School environment

SE1. Does (name) need help from another person to get to and from her/his school? (Yes, No)

	Responses
Yes	49
No	24
Don’t know	0

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School Questionnaire. Nearly all respondents understood “help from another person” as referring to accompaniment to and from school rather than physical assistance with walking. In this group, respondents consistently interpreted help as someone accompanying or supervising the child during the journey. A few respondents explicitly addressed this distinction. For example, one respondent asked whether help referred to walking assistance and concluded that it instead meant accompaniment, explaining that the child needs to be accompanied and cannot go alone. Another respondent noted that the child has no difficulty walking but still requires accompaniment for safety, while another described it as needing someone to guide the child to school.

Most respondents answered in a way that aligned with this interpretation, describing accompaniment by a parent, sibling, or other person, or traveling with others for safety. These responses reflect a consistent understanding that “help” involves supervision or accompaniment rather than physical mobility support.

A small number of respondents, fewer than five, provided answers that appeared inconsistent with their descriptions. In these cases, respondents answered "no" even though probing indicated that the child does receive help from another person. For example, one respondent described the child receiving help from a brother and friends when traveling to and from school. Another reported that transportation is provided by the city, including pickup and drop-off, and that she would otherwise accompany the child by bus.

These cases suggest a secondary interpretation pattern, where a small group of respondents interpreted the question as asking whether the child needs help beyond what is already provided, rather than whether help is received.

SE2. Why does (name) need help to get to and from her/his school? Is it because: (No transportation, Too young, Too far, Not safe, Other reason)

	No transportation	Too young	Too far	Not safe	Other reason
Yes	17	36	26	34	30
No	32	13	23	15	19

Respondents were asked this question if they answered "yes" to the previous question about whether the child needs help from another person to get to and from school (SE1).

Overall, most respondents, well over three-quarters, interpreted this question consistently with the previous item, understanding help as accompaniment rather than physical assistance with walking. There was no evidence of difficulty understanding the response options. However, many respondents noted that multiple factors could apply at the same time and often overlap.

Some respondents, roughly one-third to one-half, selected multiple response options and described how these factors are interconnected. For example, respondents explained that if a child is young or has a disability, it is often also unsafe or too far for them to travel alone. One respondent with a child with a disability selected "Too young," "Not safe," and "Other reason," explaining that although the school is close, the child has crises on the way and the route can be dangerous given the child's condition. Another respondent with a child without a disability selected nearly all response options, explaining that the child is "still small," the school is far, and the area is unsafe, adding that the child is at risk of being shot or robbed.

A smaller group of respondents, about one-quarter, referenced "No transportation" specifically in terms of the availability of school-provided transportation. In these cases, respondents focused on whether transportation was offered by the school or government. For example, one respondent noted the absence of school transportation and lack of access to a public transit pass, while a couple of respondents with children with disabilities referred to the lack of adapted or "special" transportation.

Among those selecting "Not safe," a substantial group of respondents described safety concerns, most commonly related to violence and police operations, and to a lesser extent traffic and crime. For example, one respondent explained that during police operations it is not possible to leave the house, while another said, "If I send her alone… there could be an operation, a shooting." Others mentioned traffic dangers, such as cars and motorcycles or non-functioning traffic lights. Several respondents with children with disabilities emphasized that their child's condition increases their vulnerability, for example noting that the child "does not see the evil in people."

Most respondents who selected "Other reason," roughly one-third of those selecting multiple responses, were those with children with disabilities who referenced the child's condition or related limitations. These included lack of maturity, difficulty navigating independently, or increased vulnerability. For example, one respondent said, "He doesn't know much here. He'll end up getting lost." A small number of respondents without a disability also selected "Other reason," including one who cited harassment and abuse the child experienced on the way to school. A few additional respondents used this category to describe broader safety concerns such as police operations or gang violence.

SE 4. During the school day, does (*name*) receive any of the following types of support from school staff to prevent him/her from falling behind? Does (*name*) receive: (Academic support, Support in moving around, Communication support, Psychosocial counseling support, Other type of support)

	Academic support	Support in moving around	Communication support	Psychosocial counseling support	Other type of support
Yes	43	22	17	12	11
No	9	30	35	40	41

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. Most respondents, well over three-quarters, understood "to prevent him/her from falling behind" to mean helping the child keep up with classroom learning and academic expectations. Conversely, falling behind was commonly interpreted as not receiving sufficient support from teachers or the school, particularly in terms of instruction, adapted materials, or individualized attention.

Some respondents, roughly one-third, particularly those with a child with a disability, emphasized the role of appropriate supports such as adapted materials, resource rooms, and individualized plans in enabling the child to keep pace with peers. Some respondents in this group described falling behind as a consequence of lacking these supports rather than the child's ability.

Within this group, a small subset of respondents interpreted "preventing from falling behind" more broadly in terms of inclusion rather than academic performance. These respondents focused on the child's presence and participation in the classroom as an indicator of keeping up. For example, one respondent stated, "He's not behind. He's in his rhythm," explaining that although the child was not completing the same academic work, being in the classroom meant he was keeping up.

A smaller group of respondents, about one-quarter, considered support outside the school when answering this question, including assistance from non-governmental organizations, rehabilitation centers, therapists, or family members. Respondents varied in how they conceptualized specific supports such as resource rooms and mediators, with some viewing them as distinct types of support and others grouping them together or not considering them at all.

Academic support: Most respondents understood academic support as assistance provided by teachers, school staff, or the school more broadly. Respondents identified a wide range of personnel, including mediators, assistant teachers, interns, educational psychologists, and coordinators. Additional forms of support included adapted materials, resource rooms, and individualized education plans. Respondents with a child with a disability widely reported receiving this type of support. In contrast, respondents with a child without a disability showed more variation, with some associating academic support only with children who have learning or behavioral problems, while others described it as general reinforcement or tutoring.

Support in moving around: Most respondents understood this as support for children with physical disabilities, such as assistance with mobility or wheelchair use. A small number interpreted it more broadly

as accompaniment related to age or emotional needs. In a few cases, respondents described other forms of support, such as supervision by school staff, assistance from classmates, or routine movement within school.

Communication support: Most respondents interpreted communication support as assistance for children with speech or communication difficulties, including non-verbal children. Examples included mediators facilitating communication or teachers adapting to the child's communication style. A small number of respondents without a child with a disability interpreted this more broadly as general interaction or social engagement.

Psychosocial counseling support: Many respondents, about half, expressed uncertainty about what "Psychosocial counseling support" means. Those who provided interpretations described a wide range of concepts, including psychological support, help with mental health, social work, family assistance, or social inclusion.

Other type of support: A relatively small number of respondents selected "Other support," most of whom had a child with a disability. These respondents often referred to support from specific individuals, such as assistant teachers or interns, or to additional tutoring. A few respondents without a child with a disability provided broader or less specific interpretations, including general satisfaction with the support provided by the school.

SE 5. Does (name) use books or other learning materials provided by the school? (Yes, No)

	Responses
Yes	56
No	16
Don't know	1

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. Respondents interpreted this question in two main ways. In the first and larger group, roughly three-quarters of respondents understood the question as asking whether the child uses books or other learning materials provided by the school. These respondents interpreted "books" primarily as textbooks used for school subjects. For example, one respondent explained that the child receives books annually, one for each subject. Respondents in this group also referred to a range of other learning materials, including notebooks, stationery items, handouts, and other didactic materials.

In a second group, about one-quarter of respondents, the question was interpreted as asking whether the school provides books or other learning materials, regardless of whether the child actually uses them. These respondents focused on receipt rather than use. This distinction was particularly evident among respondents with a child with a disability and resulted in inconsistent responses. For example, some respondents answered "no" when materials were provided but not usable by the child, explaining that although the school supplied them, the child could not use them due to not being literate or not understanding the content. In contrast, others answered "yes" in similar situations, noting that the child receives books or materials even if they are not used or are not adapted to the child's needs.

SE 19. Does the school have a program that meets (*name*)'s learning needs? (Yes, No)

	Responses
Yes	31
No	39
Don't know	3

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. Respondents interpreted "learning needs" in two main ways. In the first and larger group, well over three-quarters of respondents interpreted the question in relation to the needs of an individual child. In this group, respondents focused on whether the school was able to meet specific learning needs, often referencing supports such as adapted materials, teaching strategies, or additional attention. In the second group, about one-third of respondents, primarily those whose children did not have a disability, interpreted "learning needs" more broadly in terms of general schooling. These respondents referred to what children should learn, the amount of work assigned, how welcoming the school is, or whether the school helps children think about their future.

Within the group that focused on individual needs, interpretations differed by disability status. Most respondents with a child with a disability emphasized the school's ability to adapt to their child's specific needs, including the use of specialized materials, tailored instruction, and the level of support and inclusion provided in the classroom. In contrast, the smaller group of respondents with a child without a disability who took an individual perspective tended to focus on reinforcement or extra help in specific subjects such as reading, writing, Portuguese, or mathematics.

Some inconsistency was observed among a small number of respondents, fewer than five, primarily those with a child without a disability, who perceived that their child had no particular learning needs or rather that "learning needs" referred to extra support needed by children with disabilities. These respondents provided varied answers, including "yes," "no," and "don't know," and in a few cases had difficulty articulating what "learning needs" meant altogether.

There was also substantial variation in how respondents understood the term "program." A notable minority of respondents, roughly one-third, described a wide range of interpretations, including specific supports such as resource rooms, mediators, tutoring, or therapy, as well as broader concepts such as teacher training, adapted instruction, individualized plans, or general flexibility. At the same time, many respondents, about half, expressed uncertainty or were unable to clearly define what constitutes a "program." This variation contributed to inconsistent responses. Some respondents answered "yes" based on the presence of informal or general support, while others answered "no" because they did not perceive a formal or structured program. For example, one respondent who answered "yes" described teacher effort and inclusion rather than a formal program, whereas another who answered "no" acknowledged targeted support but did not consider it to be a program.

SE 20. Do teachers know how to meet (*name*)'s specific learning needs? (Yes, No)

	Responses
Yes	48
No	21
Don't know	4

All respondents were asked this question except for those who skipped to the Out of School section. Respondents interpreted this question in two main ways. In the first and larger group, well over three-quarters of respondents interpreted the question in relation to whether teachers can meet the specific learning needs of an individual child. These respondents focused on the teacher's ability to adapt instruction, provide additional attention, or offer targeted support. For example, one respondent answered "yes," explaining that the teacher helps the child with reading because he is not yet literate despite being in a higher grade. In the second group, about one-half of respondents, the question was interpreted more broadly in terms of teacher effort, attentiveness, or general teaching quality rather than specific learning needs. For example, one respondent explained that teachers "talk to and guide the students," reflecting a general assessment of teaching behavior.

Within the group that focused on individual learning needs, interpretations differed by disability status. Respondents with a child with a disability were more likely to emphasize the teacher's ability to adapt to their child's specific needs. In contrast, the smaller group of respondents with a child without a disability who took an individual perspective, roughly one-third of that group, focused on more limited forms of support such as reinforcement or help with specific subjects. For example, one respondent described a teacher as very supportive when the child experienced panic attacks.

Some inconsistency was observed among a small number of respondents, fewer than five, primarily those with a child without a disability who perceived that their child had no specific learning needs. These respondents answered inconsistently, with some selecting "yes," others "no," and some "don't know." In a few cases, respondents also expressed uncertainty due to limited knowledge of the teacher or noted that the answer depends on the subject or the specific teacher.

Out of School

OS1. Is there a school that other children who live in this area and are of the same age as (*name*) attend? (Yes, No)

Yes	7
No	0

This question was asked of the 7 respondents who reported that their children are not currently in school. A few respondents had difficulty answering initially. In these cases, respondents asked for the question to be repeated, and one required additional explanation before providing a response.

Respondents understood the question as asking about the presence of a school in their local area and answered based on their knowledge of nearby schools. Respondents drew on both personal experience and information from friends and family when identifying whether such a school exists. For example, one respondent described attempting to enroll her child in a local school, explaining that "it's a school that accepts children up to 6 years old, so I could enroll him there except I was not able to enroll him because they didn't have a place for him."

OS2. Was *(name*) ever denied enrolment in that school? (Yes, No)

Yes	2
No	5

This question was asked of the 7 respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents generally interpreted the question as asking whether their child had been denied enrollment at the local school. Those who answered "yes" described situations in which they were explicitly told their child could not attend, typically due to lack of available space. For example, one respondent explained that her son had previously attended the local school but could not enroll for the current school year because "there was no vacancy for him."

Respondents who answered "no" had either not attempted to enroll their child in the local school or had chosen to pursue enrollment elsewhere. In one case, a respondent answered "no" because she had missed the enrollment deadline, interpreting this as her own responsibility rather than as being denied enrollment.

OS3. *The next questions ask why (name) is not going to that school.* Is (*name*) not attending that school because of conditions at the school? (Yes, No)

Yes	3
No	4

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Several respondents initially did not understand the phrase "conditions at the school" and were unable to provide a meaningful response without additional explanation.

The remaining respondents answered the question focusing on the physical conditions of the local school as a reason for non-attendance. For example, one respondent who answered "yes" explained that her child was not enrolled because the school did not have a wheelchair ramp, making it difficult for the child to access the classroom.

A couple of respondents were not familiar with the conditions at the local school and instead referenced other reasons for not enrolling their children, answering "no."

OS4. Is (*name*) not attending that school because there is no adequate transportation to get to school? (Yes, No)

Yes	0
No	7

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents interpreted the question as asking whether transportation difficulties were the primary reason their child was not enrolled in the local school. All respondents answered "no," indicating that while transportation could be challenging, it was not the main reason for non-attendance. For example, one respondent explained that "there is school transportation, but it is not adapted to the needs of the child. If that were the only restriction, it wouldn't prevent the child from attending school."

OS5. Is (*name*) not attending that school because there is no one available to take (him/her)? (Yes, No)

Yes	1
No	6

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents interpreted the question as asking whether someone was available to escort the child to school in general, rather than specifically to the local school.

Respondents answered in two ways. In the first group, a small number of respondents answered "yes," indicating that lack of accompaniment was a barrier. For example, one respondent explained that although her child had been offered a place in a more distant school, she was not available to take him there, which prevented enrollment.

In the second and larger group, most respondents answered "no," explaining that someone was available to accompany the child or that the child did not require accompaniment. For instance, one respondent noted that she herself was available to take the child to school, stating, "Everything is the mother who always does, isn't it?"

OS6. Is (*name*) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe getting there? (Yes, No)

Yes	2
No	5

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. A few respondents asked for the question to be repeated, but all were ultimately able to provide a response.

Respondents interpreted the question in two main ways. In the first and larger group, respondents understood the question as asking whether danger in getting to the local school was the primary reason their child was not enrolled there. These respondents often acknowledged safety concerns but answered "no" if those concerns were not the main reason for non-enrollment. For example, one respondent noted that the route could be dangerous, "especially when there are police actions," but still answered "no" because this was not the primary reason.

In the second group, a couple of respondents interpreted the question as asking more generally whether the route to school is dangerous, regardless of whether it influenced enrollment decisions. These respondents answered "yes" based on general safety concerns. For example, one respondent explained, "In the community it's complicated because there's always operations. That is the problem." However, this respondent indicated that her child was not enrolled in the local school for other reasons.

OS7. Is (*name*) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe in school with other students? (Yes, No)

Yes	2
No	5

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents interpreted the question in several ways. In one group, a few respondents understood the question as asking whether safety concerns were the primary reason their child was not enrolled at the local school. These respondents described serious safety issues but answered "no" when those issues were not the main reason for non-enrollment. For example, one respondent noted that "safety conditions are terrible," with violent student behavior and frequent police presence, but still answered "no."

Another respondent interpreted the question in terms of hypothetical safety risks at the school. Although the child was not enrolled due to lack of wheelchair access, the respondent answered "yes" based on concerns about potential harm, explaining that a child "could come and push her down the stairs."

A different interpretation focused on the child as a source of danger to others. One respondent answered "yes" based on the child's aggressive behavior toward other children, explaining that the child "hurts himself and he assaults others… when he is upset."

OS8. Is (*name*) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be able to use the toilet? (Yes, No)

Yes	1
No	6

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents interpreted the question as asking whether lack of access to a toilet would be a problem if their child attended the school, rather than whether this was the primary reason the child was not enrolled.

Respondents applied this interpretation in different ways. Some respondents considered their child's specific needs when answering. For example, one respondent whose child wears diapers answered "no," explaining that the child would not need to use the toilet. Another respondent answered "yes" based on anticipated accessibility challenges, explaining that her child, who uses a wheelchair, would have difficulty accessing the toilet.

Several respondents were uncertain in their responses, indicating that they were not familiar with the toilet facilities at the local school and therefore could not answer with confidence.

OS9. Is (*name*) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be able to move around the school or classroom with ease? (Yes, No)

Yes	2
No	5

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents interpreted the question in two main ways. In the first group, some respondents understood the question as asking whether their child would have difficulty moving around the school without assistance. These respondents focused on the child's ability to navigate the school environment independently. For example, one respondent answered "yes" because her child could not move around the school unescorted due to behavioral issues.

In the second group, respondents interpreted the question in relation to their child's broader mobility limitations and how these related to school attendance. These respondents did not focus specifically on the school environment but instead on the child's general level of autonomy. For example, one respondent explained that the child "does not have the autonomy to move around on his own" and always requires assistance. This respondent answered "no" on that basis.

OS10. To attend that school, would (*name*) need any type of assistive devices or technology such as a braille textbook, hearing aid, or wheelchair? (Yes, No)

Yes	3
No	4

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Several respondents asked for the question to be repeated and required explanation of the term "assistive devices."

Respondents interpreted the question as asking whether the school would need to provide devices or supports that the child does not already have in order for the child to attend. In this interpretation, respondents excluded devices already owned by the child and focused instead on additional supports that would need to be provided by the school. For example, one respondent whose child is non-verbal answered "yes" and explained that the child would need alternative communication support in the classroom, stating that "there are communication boards, but to be used in the school it would need to be with a trained professional."

In one case, a respondent initially answered "no" but later changed to "yes" after considering that the child would need new glasses to attend school, indicating that she interpreted glasses as an assistive device.

OS11. To attend that school, would (*name*) need extra help or services such as a speech therapist, a support worker or aide, or a sign language interpreter? (Yes, No)

Yes	4
No	3

This question was asked of the respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Respondents interpreted the question as asking whether their child would require additional help from another person in order to attend school.

Respondents applied this interpretation in different ways. In one group, respondents focused on the need for individualized support in the classroom. For example, one respondent whose child has severe behavioral difficulties explained that the child would need an aide, joking that the person "did not need to be an expert in anything, only to be the most patient person in the world."

In another group, respondents interpreted the question in relation to whether their child required any additional support beyond typical schooling. These respondents answered "no" when they viewed their child as not needing special assistance. For example, one respondent explained that her child does not have a disability and simply needs to attend school, stating that "he needs education, learning to read and write."

OS12. Do you believe that teachers at that school would know how to meet (*name*)'s specific learning needs? (Yes, No)

Yes	0
No	4
Don't know	3

This question was asked of the seven respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. Three respondents were unable to answer because they were not familiar with the teachers at the local school and therefore did not feel able to evaluate them.

Among those who did respond, respondents interpreted the question as asking whether the teachers at the local school would be able to meet their child's needs. Some respondents focused on teachers' ability to

adapt to their child's specific needs. For example, one respondent answered "no," explaining that teachers "want to treat all children the same," but her child "needs more attention and patience."

Other respondents focused on whether teachers could manage specific care needs within the classroom. For example, one respondent considered whether teachers could handle the child's medical needs and answered "no" on that basis.

A small number of responses suggested potential response error. In one case, a respondent answered "no" but then indicated that she believed the teachers at the local school were good and would meet her child's needs, suggesting a mismatch between the response and the explanation.

OS13. Do you believe that teachers at that school would treat (*name*) fairly? (Yes, No)

Yes	3
No	2
Don't know	2

This question was asked of the respondents who reported that their children are not in school and who reported that there is a school in their neighborhood. A couple of respondents were unable to answer because they were not familiar with the teachers at the local school. One of these respondents speculated negatively about the school environment, describing it as "the worst school in the area" and saying her child would not receive fair treatment, but still did not provide a definitive response.

Most of the remaining respondents interpreted the question as asking whether teachers would provide an equitable learning environment. For some respondents, this meant treating all children fairly and equally. For others, particularly those with children with disabilities, fair treatment was understood as providing additional support tailored to the child's needs. For example, one respondent explained that fair treatment would involve "understand[ing] the needs of the child," including assistance with care tasks such as feeding and diapering.

A small number of responses suggested potential response error. In one case, a respondent answered "yes" but then indicated that she did not understand the question or the meaning of "fair treatment."

School Attendance

SA1. Is there enough money to pay the costs of (*name)*'s schooling? (Yes, No)

Yes	8
No	12
Don't know	1

This question was asked of respondents whose children were in school (SP7), who reported missing a substantial portion of the school year (SP13), and who were not expected to complete the current school year (SP14). Several respondents asked for the question to be repeated or required additional explanation before answering. A few respondents provided answers despite indicating that they did not fully understand the question, and one respondent was unable to answer even after explanation.

Respondents interpreted the question in several ways. More than half of respondents understood the question as asking about the costs of schooling but varied in what they included as "costs." While some considered only direct school expenses, many included additional expenses such as transportation, clothing, materials, food, and extracurricular activities. For example, one respondent explained, "It is usually all free at school but sometimes there is not money for the snack. Sometimes the mother has to pay for parties and tournaments at school. Sometimes the boy does not go for lack of money."

About one-third of respondents interpreted the question in relation to their own financial situation, focusing on whether they could afford schooling using their own income. For example, one respondent said, "For him there is no lack. If the school asks, I must." Another respondent contrasted this by explaining that school and supply costs had to be covered through external support due to lack of income.

A smaller group of respondents, fewer than five, incorporated government assistance into their interpretation of available resources. These respondents treated benefits such as Bolsa Família as part of their income when considering whether they could afford schooling. For example, one respondent stated, "The school fees come out of the Bolsa familia."

Another small group of respondents, fewer than five, interpreted the question as asking whether schooling itself required payment. These respondents focused on the fact that public schooling is free. For example, one respondent said, "As it is public, free, I do not pay anything and so I have no difficulties, but if it were private…."

SA2. Does (*name*) need to work, earn money or help out at home? (Yes, No)

Yes	1
No	20
Don't know	0

This question was asked of respondents whose children were in school (SP7), who reported missing a substantial portion of the school year (SP13), and who were not expected to complete the current school year (SP14). Respondents interpreted the question in two main ways. In the first and largest group, more than three-quarters of respondents understood the question as asking whether their child needed to work to contribute to the household. These respondents consistently interpreted "work" as economic or income-generating activity and answered "no," often explaining that their child's priority was schooling or that the child was too young or unable to work. For example, one respondent said, "She doesn't have to because she's still in her early teens and her priority is to study. First she studies, then she thinks about a job."

In a second, smaller group, about one-quarter of respondents interpreted the question more broadly to include helping with household tasks or informal activities. These respondents described children assisting with chores or engaging in small activities to earn money, but still distinguished this from required work. For example, one respondent explained, "Nope, but he likes it. He likes to pick up cans to buy a popsicle."

A single respondent interpreted the question in terms of future work rather than current expectations. This respondent answered "yes" while describing the child's potential to work later in life, explaining that her granddaughter could become "an eyebrow and makeup artist."

SA6. Does (*name*) have a health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to a school outside of the home? (Yes, No)

Yes	0
No	7
Don't know	1

This question was asked of respondents whose children were reported as homeschooled (SP7), who reported missing a substantial portion of the school year (SP13), and who were not expected to complete the current school year (SP14). However, due to an error in the skip pattern and inclusion criteria, no respondents had children who were exclusively homeschooled. Instead, respondents whose children were reported as both attending school and being educated at home were asked this question. Respondents often interpreted "home school" as doing homework or receiving tutoring at home, resulting in a sample that did not align with the intended population. One respondent answered "don't know" because she was awaiting a diagnosis for her child's condition.

More than three-quarters of respondents understood the question as asking whether their child had a medical condition that prevented them from attending school outside the home. These respondents answered based on the presence and severity of health conditions, typically distinguishing between having a condition and that condition limiting school attendance. For example, one respondent explained, "He has autism and epilepsy, but this does not prevent him from going to school."

A smaller group of respondents, fewer than five, also focused on health conditions but emphasized that their child did not have any condition that would prevent attendance. These respondents answered "no" based on the absence of a relevant medical issue.

SA7. Does (*name*) have a health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to school? (Yes, No)

Yes	6
No	15
Don't know	0

This question was asked of respondents whose children attended school outside the home (SP7), who reported missing a substantial portion of the school year (SP13), and who were not expected to complete the current school year (SP14). All respondents were able to provide a response. Respondents interpreted the question in two main ways. In the first and largest group, more than three-quarters of respondents understood the question as asking whether their child had a chronic medical condition that interfered with school attendance. These respondents distinguished between having a health condition and that condition preventing

school attendance. For example, one respondent explained that her child "has no health problems," clarifying that "It's just motor and cognitive limitations but it is not an impediment to going to school." Another respondent described a condition but emphasized that it did not interfere with attendance.

Within this group, respondents with children who had disabilities generally did not interpret these as "medical conditions" unless they directly prevented school attendance.

A smaller group of respondents, fewer than five, interpreted the question more broadly to include acute or temporary illnesses. These respondents answered "yes" based on occasional sickness. For example, one respondent said, "It's not a frequent problem. [The child] does not go to class when he has the flu or a cold."

SA11. Is it important for (*name*) to go to school? (Yes, No)

Yes	21
No	0
Don't know	0

This question was asked of respondents whose children were in school (SP7), who reported missing a substantial portion of the school year (SP13), and who were not expected to complete the current school year (SP14). All respondents were able to provide a response. Respondents interpreted the question in two main ways. In the first and larger group, more than half of respondents understood the question as asking about the long-term benefits of schooling, particularly in relation to future success. These respondents emphasized education as a pathway to employment, independence, and a better future. For example, one respondent said, "Every mother wants a bright future for her child. I want him to be a dental surgeon or a lawyer, but only God knows with his vision problem what the future will look like." Another respondent stated, "I think it's key to something better."

In a second group, about one-third of respondents focused on the social and developmental benefits of attending school. These respondents described school as important for interaction, communication, and socialization with other children. For example, one respondent explained, "It's important for him to interact. Interacting is important for the child—to talk to other people, to have friendship, not be isolated in a corner at home."

A smaller group of respondents, fewer than five, described school in terms of general learning and foundational skills, such as learning to read, write, and communicate, or described education more broadly as "everything" needed for life.

SA12. Will going to school help (*name*) make a living? (Yes, No)

Yes	16
No	5
Don't know	0

This question was asked of respondents whose children attended school outside the home (SP7), who reported missing a substantial portion of the school year (SP13), and who were not expected to complete the current school year (SP14). All respondents were able to provide a response. Respondents interpreted the question primarily as asking whether schooling would help their child obtain a job in the future. More than three-quarters of respondents understood the question in this way and focused on education as a pathway to employment and financial independence. For example, one respondent said, "Study is fundamental. Nowadays, children have the opportunity to study, to be a doctor. Just follow the opportunity." Another respondent explained that schooling would help the child "enter the job market" in the future.

A smaller group of respondents, fewer than five, interpreted the question as asking whether schooling would meaningfully improve employment prospects for their specific child and expressed skepticism. For example, one respondent answered "no," stating, "School can't give him the teaching he needs."

Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education

IE1. Children with disabilities should only go to special classrooms for those with disabilities. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	13
Agree	19
Disagree	26
Strongly Disagree	22

Initial nonresponse was observed in a small number of cases (fewer than ten). In these cases, respondents were unable to answer without repetition or rephrasing. For example, one respondent required the question to be repeated multiple times and could not respond until it was simplified, with interview notes stating, "I could not get her to respond with understanding and she asked for repetition of the question repeatedly."

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their answers based on factors such as the child's needs, type of disability, or school context. A dominant pattern, observed among about half of respondents, was for respondents to provide a response and then say, "It depends." For example, one respondent explained, "The special school has its role in the education of children with disabilities. One cannot generalize and think that all children with disabilities should be in a regular school; you have to understand the child's need," while another noted, "I agree, but only to a certain extent… It depends on the school as well."

While respondents generally understood a "regular classroom" as one with children without disabilities and a "special classroom" as a separate setting for children with disabilities, they interpreted the overall question in two main ways. In one group, more than one-third of respondents evaluated the question as a trade-off between inclusion and specialized support. These respondents weighed concerns such as whether children would receive adequate attention or be safe in a regular classroom. For example, one respondent said that in a regular classroom children with disabilities "don't get the necessary attention from the teacher and don't learn right," while another said, "The other kids can hurt the special ones."

In a second group, about one-third of respondents interpreted the question in terms of inclusion as a principle. These respondents emphasized that children with disabilities should be educated alongside other

children. For example, one respondent explained that children "deserve to be included like anyone… it's a child like any other."

Response error was observed in multiple cases, roughly one-quarter of respondents. In these cases, selected responses did not align with respondents' explanations. For example, some respondents selected "disagree" but then described situations in which special classrooms were necessary, saying, "My children really need special classrooms," or selected "agree" while emphasizing inclusion, stating, "Students need to live with inclusion. They need to learn to live with different people together in the same classroom."

Difficulties with the response scale were also common. About one-third or more of respondents did not use the scale as intended and instead treated it as binary or interchangeable. For example, some respondents initially answered "yes" or "no," while others indicated no meaningful distinction between "agree" and "strongly agree."

IE2. Having children with disabilities in regular school requires extensive adaptation of the school. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	32
Agree	36
Disagree	6
Strongly Disagree	3
Refused	3

Initial nonresponse was observed in a small but meaningful number of cases (fewer than ten). In these cases, respondents were unable to answer without repetition or clarification, and a few selected "Don't know" due to difficulty understanding the question. For example, one respondent stated that she "does not know what teaching methods mean" and could not answer, while another respondent asked for the question to be repeated and then admitted, "No. I don't understand that question."

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the child, type of disability, teacher, or classroom context. A dominant pattern, observed among about one-third to one-half of respondents, was conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent stated, "It depends on the teacher," while another explained that "some children don't need adaptation and others may need major adaptations." In these cases, respondents were not evaluating a single level of change but instead shifting their interpretation depending on the situation, making it difficult to provide a general answer.

While most respondents understood the question as asking whether teaching needs to change to accommodate children with disabilities, interpretations of "teaching methods" varied widely. Some respondents understood the concept in pedagogical terms, such as individualized instruction or differentiated teaching. For example, one respondent described adaptation as "a different method for children with disabilities… a special test… someone to read to the child," while another stated, "It requires teachers to be adapted to know how to deal with children with disabilities." Other respondents interpreted "teaching methods" more broadly or incorrectly, often as effort, attention, or general care. For example, one respondent described it as simply "teaching more," while another associated it with unrelated activities, explaining that it meant "to give dough for the child to learn to play," indicating a mismatch with the intended construct.

Similarly, respondents had differing notions of what changes to teaching would entail. More than half of respondents understood "teaching methods" as requiring substantive changes to instruction, including differentiated teaching, individualized supports, or specialized approaches. In contrast, about one-quarter of respondents interpreted the concept more generally, emphasizing increased effort, patience, or attention rather than specific pedagogical strategies. Some respondents also generalized beyond disability, suggesting that all children require adaptation. For example, one respondent stated that "not only the disabled child needs adaptation… everyone needs it." Additional interpretations focused on physical or structural changes, with one respondent explaining, "If there is no ramp for the child to climb, for example, a child in a wheelchair would have to have a ramp," while another emphasized both instructional and structural changes, stating, "The school and teachers have to adapt the task and the facilities." Other respondents based their answers on personal experience, with one stating, "By law, these schools should already be adapted, but this one is not."

Response error was observed in about one-quarter of respondents. In these cases, respondents selected an answer but demonstrated a different or unclear interpretation. For example, one respondent who answered "strongly agree" later admitted, "I don't really know. That question got kind of wrapped up in my head," while another answered "strongly agree" but confessed, "I don't really know what 'extensive adaptation' is." These responses indicate that answers were sometimes provided without a clear understanding of the key concept.

Difficulties with the response scale were also evident. About one-quarter to one-third of respondents did not use the response options as an ordered scale. Some initially answered in non-scale terms, asked for the options to be repeated, or did not distinguish between categories such as "agree" and "strongly agree." For example, one respondent requested the response options be repeated, saying, "Repeat again. I don't understand," indicating difficulty using the response scale.

IE3. Having children with disabilities in regular classrooms requires extensive adaptation of the teaching methods. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	25
Agree	44
Disagree	6
Strongly Disagree	1
Refused	4

Initial nonresponse was observed in a notable number of cases, approximately 10–15 respondents. In these cases, respondents were unable to provide an initial answer without clarification or repetition. Some explicitly indicated that they did not understand the question or the phrase "teaching methods." For example, one respondent stated that she "does not know what teaching methods mean" and could not answer.

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the child, type of disability, teacher, or classroom context. A substantial share of respondents, about one-third to one-half, engaged in conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent stated, "It depends on the teacher," while another explained that "some children don't need adaptation and others may need major adaptations." In these cases, respondents were not evaluating a single, general level of change but instead shifting their interpretation depending on the situation.

Respondents interpreted "teaching methods" in multiple ways. Some respondents understood the concept in pedagogical terms, such as individualized instruction or differentiated teaching. For example, one respondent described adaptation as "a different method for children with disabilities… a special test… someone to read to the child." Other respondents interpreted "teaching methods" more broadly or incorrectly, often as effort, attention, or general care. For example, one respondent described it as simply "teaching more," while another associated it with unrelated activities, explaining that it meant "to give dough for the child to learn to play," indicating a mismatch with the intended construct.

These differences in interpretation led to two main patterns of response. In the first and larger group, more than half of respondents understood "teaching methods" as requiring substantive changes to instruction, including differentiated teaching, individualized supports, or specialized approaches. In a second group, about one-quarter of respondents interpreted the concept more generally, focusing on increased effort, patience, or attention rather than specific pedagogical strategies. Some respondents also generalized beyond disability, reframing the question as applying to all children. For example, one respondent stated that "not only the disabled child needs adaptation… everyone needs it."

Response error was common, observed in approximately 15–20 cases. In some instances, respondents selected an answer despite not understanding the key concept. For example, one respondent answered "agree" but then stated, "I don't know what 'teaching methods' is," indicating that the response was not based on a clear interpretation. In other cases, respondents answered based on related but different concepts, such as general effort, classroom conditions, or overall teaching quality rather than teaching methods specifically. Additional response error occurred when respondents' explanations did not align with their selected answers, reflecting difficulty mapping their interpretation onto the response options.

Difficulties with the response scale were also observed among about one-quarter to one-third of respondents. Respondents frequently asked for response options to be repeated, initially answered in non-scale terms, or did not distinguish between categories. For example, some indicated that "agree" and "totally agree" made no difference, while others required prompting to select a response category.

IE4. Regular classroom teachers are not able to effectively teach children with disabilities. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	14
Agree	25
Disagree	31
Strongly Disagree	5
Refused	5

Initial nonresponse was observed in a small but meaningful number of cases, fewer than ten respondents. In these cases, respondents expressed uncertainty about how to evaluate all teachers or stated that they could not generalize. For example, one respondent explained that she did not know because "in some schools [teachers] are prepared… in others, she does not know."

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the individual teacher. A large share of respondents, about one-third to one-half, expressed conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent stated, "It depends… it depends on the teacher," while

another explained that some teachers are capable and others are not. In these cases, respondents were not evaluating teachers as a group but instead considering variation across individuals, making it difficult to provide a single, generalizable answer.

Respondents interpreted the question in multiple ways, particularly in how they evaluated teacher ability. In one pattern, more than half of respondents focused on teacher preparation and training, emphasizing lack of qualifications, specialization, or formal knowledge. For example, one respondent stated that "many teachers do not have the study… they are not adapted," while another explained that teachers "do not receive training on how to adapt teaching methods." In another pattern, about one-quarter of respondents focused on teacher effort, patience, or personal characteristics rather than formal training. For example, one respondent said teachers could teach if "they have patience," while another emphasized "interest… to better understand and serve all children." Some respondents also reframed the statement normatively, focusing on what teachers should be able to do rather than what they are able to do. For example, one respondent stated, "If they are able to teach a child without a disability, why can't they teach a child with a disability?" while another said that "every teacher should be able to teach anyone."

The negative construction of the item further complicated interpretation. Some respondents appeared to misinterpret or reverse the meaning of the statement. For example, one respondent initially agreed but, after the statement was re-read with emphasis on "not," changed their interpretation and response.

Response error was common, observed in approximately 15–20 cases. In some instances, respondents selected an answer that reflected a reversal of the item's meaning. For example, one respondent answered "agree" but then explained that teachers are capable, indicating confusion with the negative phrasing. In other cases, respondents explicitly contradicted their selected response or shifted interpretation after clarification. Additional response error occurred when respondents answered based on a different construct, such as classroom size, resources, or broader inclusion issues, rather than teacher ability itself.

Difficulties with the response scale were also observed among about one-quarter to one-third of respondents. Respondents often struggled to align their opinions with the scale, particularly due to the negative wording. For example, some changed their answers after the statement was repeated, while others selected responses that did not match their explanations.

IE5. Children with disabilities often lack the academic skills necessary to be in regular classrooms. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	8
Agree	35
Disagree	21
Strongly Disagree	9
Refused	7

Initial nonresponse was observed in a notable number of cases, approximately 12–18 respondents. In these cases, respondents were unable to provide an initial response without clarification or repetition and often explicitly stated that they did not understand the term. For example, one respondent asked, "What kind of skill?" and said, "this one I'll leave unanswered," while another said she "does not understand the term academic ability."

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the child, type of disability, or context. A large share of respondents, about one-third to one-half, expressed conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent stated, "It depends on the child… some may have [skills], others may not," while another explained that "some children have the ability to stay in the classroom; others don't." In these cases, respondents were not evaluating a single, general level of ability but instead shifting their interpretation depending on the situation.

Respondents did not share a common understanding of the term "academic skills," resulting in multiple patterns of interpretation. In one pattern, more than one-third of respondents understood "academic skills" as school-related abilities, such as literacy, learning capacity, or cognitive skills. For example, one respondent defined it as "knowing how to read and write," while another described it as "the ability to learn." In another pattern, more than one-third of respondents interpreted the term differently, often shifting to other constructs. Some understood it as teacher skills or school quality. For example, one respondent stated that academic skills "are those of teachers." Others interpreted it as resources or infrastructure, asking whether academic skills meant "having more resources." Additional interpretations included physical or functional abilities, behavioral traits, or social experiences. For example, one respondent described academic skills as "the ability to get around," while another associated the concept with social treatment or prejudice rather than learning.

Response error was widespread, observed in approximately 20–30 cases. In many instances, respondents selected an answer based on a different interpretation of the concept. For example, one respondent answered "agree" but defined academic skills as "having more resources," indicating a mismatch with the intended meaning. In other cases, respondents showed confusion or contradiction during probing, or shifted their interpretation after initially responding. Additional response error occurred when respondents substituted a different construct entirely, such as discrimination, access to resources, or general support, rather than academic ability.

Difficulties with the response scale were also observed among about one-quarter to one-third of respondents. Respondents frequently asked for response options to be repeated, struggled to select among them, or did not distinguish between levels of agreement. For example, some indicated no difference between "agree" and "strongly agree," while others selected a response without being able to justify it.

IE6. Children with disabilities often lack the social skills necessary to be in regular classrooms. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	10
Agree	38
Disagree	24
Strongly Disagree	7
Refused	1

Initial nonresponse was observed in a notable number of cases, approximately 15–20 respondents. In these cases, respondents were unable to provide an initial response without clarification or repetition and often explicitly stated that they did not understand the term. For example, one respondent said she "gave a blank" when asked what social skills meant, while another required multiple explanations before answering.

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the child, type or severity of disability, or context. A substantial share of respondents, about one-third, expressed conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent stated, "It depends on the

disability," while another explained that "some children can [interact], others cannot." These responses reflect attempts to evaluate specific situations rather than provide a general judgment.

Respondents did not share a consistent understanding of "social skills." While some interpreted the term in line with the intended construct—relating to interaction, communication, or making friends—many others mapped it onto different or unrelated concepts. One common interpretation, observed among more than one-third of respondents, focused on interaction and communication. For example, one respondent defined it as "the student knowing how to interact with other people," while another described it as "the ability to relate to other people and make friends."

A second interpretation, also observed among more than one-third of respondents, focused on behavior and discipline. These respondents described social skills in terms of aggression, emotional regulation, or appropriate conduct. For example, one respondent explained that children with disabilities "are very aggressive… they don't know how to interact," while another described social skills as not hitting or controlling behavior.

Additional interpretations extended beyond the intended construct. Some respondents defined social skills in terms of cognitive ability or intelligence, while others associated them with physical functioning, family upbringing, or broader life conditions. For example, one respondent linked social skills to "the way the child is raised," while another associated the concept with social treatment or prejudice.

A smaller but meaningful group interpreted the question as referring to the effects of inclusion rather than the child's skills. These respondents focused on peer reactions or classroom dynamics. For example, one respondent said that disabled children "are embarrassed… they are alone and despised," while another stated that "children with disabilities will hinder the development of children without disabilities." A third explicitly shifted the focus, explaining, "I actually agree not so much on the special kids part, but on the kids who aren't… I think it gets in the way of the kids who aren't."

Response error was common, observed in approximately 20–30 cases. In many instances, respondents selected an answer but then gave an explanation that conflicted with their response. One respondent answered "disagree" but explained, "I thought it best to be separated. There are children who don't have patience. There are children who are abused. They're going to want to hit. They don't know how to be with other children." Another initially disagreed but described situations in which separation would be beneficial. In other cases, respondents changed their reasoning during probing, indicating difficulty mapping their interpretation onto the response categories.

Difficulties with the response scale were also observed among about one-quarter of respondents. Respondents frequently asked for the response options to be repeated, hesitated between categories, or treated the scale as binary. For example, some initially answered "yes" or "no," while others indicated no meaningful distinction between levels of agreement or changed their answers after the question was repeated.

IE7. Having children with and without disabilities attending the same classes has a negative effect on the social development of children with disabilities. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	6
Agree	22
Disagree	19

Strongly Disagree	30
Refused	3

Initial nonresponse was observed in a small number of cases, fewer than ten respondents. In these cases, respondents required repetition or clarification before answering or expressed difficulty understanding the question.

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the child, type of disability, or classroom context. A notable share of respondents, about one-quarter, expressed conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent answered "disagree" but said, "It really just depends," and noted she would prefer to answer "neither agrees nor disagrees." These responses reflect difficulty providing a single, general judgment.

Respondents interpreted the question in multiple ways. In one pattern, respondents interpreted the question as asking about the negative effects of inclusive classrooms on children with disabilities. Those who answered "agree" often cited bullying or isolation. For example, one respondent said, "No one likes to play with their wheelchair-bound colleague," while another explained that disabled children "are embarrassed. They do not know how to deal and so they are alone and despised."

In a second pattern, respondents who answered "disagree" or "strongly disagree" emphasized the benefits of inclusion. These respondents described improvements in confidence, development, or academic outcomes. For example, one respondent stated, "The coexistence of children with disabilities with children without disabilities shows them that it is possible to be more, that they can do differently, achieve greater goals," while another described how his hearing-impaired son's performance improved due to "increased socializing with other children."

A third group of respondents interpreted the question as referring to the effects of inclusion on children without disabilities rather than on children with disabilities. For example, one respondent stated, "Children with disabilities will hinder the development of children without disabilities. They should be separated," while another explained, "I thought they would get in the way—the disabled child is screaming in the room and the normal child is trying to study." A third respondent explicitly shifted focus, stating, "I actually agree not so much on the special kids part, but on the kids who aren't… I think it gets in the way of the kids who aren't."

Response error was observed in several cases, approximately one-quarter of respondents. In these cases, respondents selected a response but then expressed a different or contradictory view during probing. For example, one respondent answered "strongly disagree" but explained, "What helps is separating children with and without disabilities. There is no possibility of being together successfully within the same classroom." Another respondent answered "disagree" but stated, "My son was bullied at school, so he felt more comfortable in the special classroom."

Difficulties with the response scale were also observed among a notable minority of respondents. Respondents frequently asked for the response options to be repeated, struggled to select among them, and did not consistently interpret the scale as ordered categories.

IE8. Children with disabilities will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a general classroom. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	16
Agree	23
Disagree	22
Strongly Disagree	12
Refused	6

Initial nonresponse was observed in a moderate number of cases, approximately 10–15 respondents. In these cases, respondents required clarification or indicated uncertainty before answering. For example, one respondent stated she "does not know" because she was unfamiliar with special classrooms, while others could not respond without additional explanation.

More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their responses based on factors such as the child, type or severity of disability, availability of support, or classroom context. A substantial share of respondents, about one-third to one-half, expressed conditional ("it depends") reasoning. For example, one respondent explained that outcomes depend on whether the child "needs special support" or can function in a regular classroom, while another stated that one must "look at all angles." In these cases, respondents were not evaluating a single comparison of learning speed but instead weighing multiple factors.

Respondents interpreted the question in two main ways. In the first and larger group, more than half of respondents focused on specialized support and resources in special classrooms. These respondents emphasized adapted instruction, trained staff, or individualized attention. For example, one respondent explained that special classrooms have "specific professionals" and "adaptations," while another said that in these settings "they will be able to see the specific needs of each one with a differentiated planning."

In a second group, about one-third of respondents emphasized inclusion and exposure in general classrooms. These respondents described learning as occurring through interaction and participation with other children. For example, one respondent stated that children "will learn everything" in regular classrooms, while another explained that development comes from "living with everyone in the ordinary classroom."

Some respondents reframed the question away from speed of learning and instead focused on appropriate placement or support. For example, one respondent described that the key issue is whether the child is "better supported" in a given setting rather than whether learning is faster.

Response error was observed in at least one-quarter of respondents. In these cases, respondents selected a response category but then provided explanations that contradicted or did not align with their answer. For example, one respondent answered "disagree," but the interviewer's notes state, "The respondent said disagree, but actually meant agree. She said that children should be separated because of special needs, so they would do better and so they would not hinder children without disabilities." Another respondent answered "agree," but explained that inclusion with non-disabled children "helps a lot when there is an activity that [the disabled child] cannot do," indicating a shift away from the intended meaning of disadvantage.

Additional response error occurred when respondents misunderstood the focus of the question. For example, one respondent answered "disagree" and said, "It's not a disadvantage. Special children need that attention, so it's good if they get it," suggesting that she interpreted the question as referring to whether children with disabilities are disadvantaged, rather than whether other students are affected.

Difficulties with the response scale were also observed among about one-quarter to one-third of respondents. Respondents frequently asked for the response options to be repeated, had difficulty selecting among them,

or did not distinguish between response categories. These patterns indicate that the response options were not consistently used as an ordered scale.

IE9. The extra attention that children with disabilities require is to the disadvantage of the other students. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	3
Agree	20
Disagree	33
Strongly Disagree	23
Refused	1

Initial nonresponse was observed in a notable number of cases. Eighteen respondents were unable to provide a response, and required the interviewer to explain the question before they could respond. In these cases, respondents were unfamiliar with the term "disadvantage" and required paraphrasing before answering. For example, one respondent answered "Don't know" and said, "How is that a disadvantage? Why is it not an advantage?"

While respondents generally understood the question as asking whether having children with disabilities in the classroom detracts from the experience of children without disabilities, they interpreted the question in two main ways. In one group, more than half of respondents evaluated the question as a trade-off in teacher attention and resources. These respondents emphasized that attention given to one child reduces attention available to others. For example, one respondent explained, "Paying attention to my granddaughter can harm other children who do not have disabilities. Someone will provide something, because the time that the teacher will dedicate to my granddaughter, another child will be without attention, will be left with nothing to do, and may lose the subject."

In a second group, about one-third of respondents rejected the idea that additional attention constitutes a disadvantage. These respondents emphasized that children with disabilities require support and that this does not negatively affect others. For example, one respondent said, "It is a need that he has and will not hinder the learning of others."

Response error was observed in multiple cases. In these cases, selected responses did not align with respondents' explanations or reflected misunderstanding of the question. For example, one respondent answered "disagree" but said, "It's not a disadvantage. Special children need that attention, so it's good if they get it," indicating that she interpreted the question as referring to whether children with disabilities are disadvantaged rather than whether other students are affected. In other cases, respondents appeared to answer without fully engaging with the question.

Difficulties with the response scale were also common. Respondents frequently asked for the response options to be repeated, had difficulty selecting among them, and did not interpret the response options as an ordered scale.

IE10. Children with disabilities should be in special classrooms so that they do not face rejection from children without disabilities. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

Strongly Agree	11
Agree	20
Disagree	22
Strongly Disagree	27
Refused	0

Initial nonresponse was observed in a small number of cases, fewer than ten. In these cases, respondents were unable to answer without repetition or rephrasing. More commonly, respondents were able to answer but then qualified their answers based on factors such as the child's disability, school environment, or peer behavior. A dominant pattern, observed among about one-third of respondents, was for respondents to provide a response and then indicate that the answer "depends."

While respondents generally understood the question as asking whether placing children with disabilities in special classrooms protects them from rejection by other children, they interpreted the overall question in two main ways. In one group, more than one-third of respondents understood rejection as bullying, exclusion, or mistreatment by peers and viewed special classrooms as protective. For example, one respondent explained, "Normal kids are going to look at the things that disabled people do and they're going to laugh at them," while another said, "It's horrible. Not even normal people like to be rejected."

In a second group, about one-third of respondents evaluated the question in terms of inclusion versus separation. These respondents rejected the idea that special classrooms prevent rejection and instead emphasized inclusion. For example, one respondent said, "Children can experience rejection for any characteristic regardless of whether or not they have a disability. That would be no reason to separate the children." Another respondent explained, "I don't agree. The special classroom is discrimination. We have to teach respect for all people."

Response error was observed in multiple cases. In these cases, selected responses did not align with respondents' explanations or reflected lack of engagement with the question. For example, some respondents repeated their answers during probing without providing an explanation, and the notes from one interview read, "She was tired and gave any response so I would stop asking."

Difficulties with the response scale were also common. Respondents frequently asked for the response options to be repeated, had difficulty selecting among them, and did not interpret the scale as ordered categories. For example, notes from one interview read, "She still did not understand the use of the scale, but answered 'agree' already because she knew I would ask her."

Appendix 2: Instrument as tested in Round 3

Note: Questions in gray-shaded boxes were asked to provide context and were not tested in this round of testing. Questions in white boxes were asked to provide skip patterns and were not tested in this round of testing. All other questions were tested.

Child Information Panel and Child Background

The following questions are about your child and your relationship to him/her.

CI1. What is the child's name?

CI2. What is the child's sex?

Male
Female

CI3. What is your name?

CI4. What is your sex?

CI5. What is your relationship to this child?

Mother
Father
Grandfather
Grandmother
Uncle/Aunt
Sibling (Brother/Sister)
Cousin
Other

CI6. What is your age?

CI7. What is your highest level of education?

No education
Primary
Secondary
Higher

CB1. In what month and year was (*name*) born?

School CB2. How old is (*name*)?

School Participation and School Type
The following questions are about your child's educational background and has questions about the level of education they have completed and are attending, as well as the types of schools (he/she) has attended.

SP1. Has (*name*) ever attended school or any early childhood education programme?

1=YES
2=NO *(If no, skip to Out of School Questionnaire)*

SP2. What is the highest level and grade or year of school (***name***) has ever attended?

000=EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
1=PRIMARY
2=LOWER-SECONDARY
3=UPPER-SECONDARY
4=HIGHER

SP3. Did (***name***) ever complete that grade/year?

1=YES
2=NO

SP4. At any time during the current school year did (***name***) attend school?

1=YES
2=NO (*If no, skip to Out of School Questionnaire)*

SP5. During the current school year, which level/grade is (***name***) attending?

000=EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (*If early childhood education, end questionnaire)*
1=PRIMARY
2=LOWER-SECONDARY
3=UPPER-SECONDARY
4=HIGHER (*If higher, end questionnaire)*

SP6. Is (***name***) now repeating this grade?

1=YES
2=NO

SP7. Does (***name***) go to a school, or is (he/she) taught at home, or both?

1=SCHOOL
2=HOME (*If home, skip to SP11)*
3=BOTH

SP8. Is (***name***)'s school a boarding school where (he/she) lives for most of the week?

1=YES

2=NO

SP9. What type of school does (***name***) currently attend?

1=A REGULAR SCHOOL
2=A SPECIAL SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (*If a special school for children with disabilities, skip to SP11)*

SP10. What type of classroom does (***name***) currently attend?

1=A REGULAR CLASSROOM
2=A SPECIAL CLASSROOM FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES
3=BOTH REGULAR AND SPECIAL CLASSROOMS

SP11. (*If SP7=2 or 3. If SP7=1 proceed to SP12)* Who is teaching (***name***) at home?

1=TEACHERS OR PRIVATE TUTOR
2=PARENT(S) OR OTHER FAMILY MEMBER(S)
3=BOTH

SP12. During the current school year did (***name***) attend any online classes at home?

1=YES
2=NO

SP13. During the current school year has (***name***) missed half or more days of school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SP14. Do you expect (***name)*** to complete the current school year?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

School Environment
(If SP7=1 or 3, and SP8=2 please proceed with SE1. If SP7=1 or 3, and SP8=1 please proceed with SE4. If SP7=2, skip to next section (OS1).)

The following questions refer to the school that (***name***) is currently attending.

SE1. Does (***name***) need help from another person to get to/from his/her school?

1=YES
2=NO (*If no, skip to SE3)*
8=DON'T KNOW (*If don't know, skip to SE3)*

SE2. Why does (***name***) need help to get to school? Is it because:

A=THERE'S NO TRANSPORTATION TO GET TO SCHOOL (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
B=(HE/SHE) IS TOO YOUNG TO GO ALONE (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
C=THE DISTANCE IS TOO FAR FOR (HIM/HER) TO TRAVEL ALONE (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
D=IT IS NOT SAFE FOR (HIM/HER) TO GO ALONE (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
X=FOR SOME OTHER REASON (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)

SE3. How long does it usually take (***name***) to get to school?

1=LESS THAN 30 MINUTES
2=30-60 MINUTES
3=MORE THAN 1 HOUR
8=DON'T KNOW

SE4. During the school day, does (***name***) receive any of the following types of support from school staff to prevent them from falling behind? Does (***name***) receive:

A=ACADEMIC SUPPORT (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
B=SUPPORT IN MOVING AROUND (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
C=COMMUNICATION SUPPORT (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
D=PSYCHOSOCIAL COUNSELING SUPPORT (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)
X=OTHER TYPE OF SUPPORT (YES/NO/DON'T KNOW)

SE5. Does (***name***) use books or other learning materials provided by the school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE6. Are there desks or tables for every student in (***name***)'s classroom?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE7. Does (***name***)´s classroom have enough light for students to do their work?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE8. Is (***name***)'s classroom cool or warm enough for students to do their work?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE9. Is (***name***)´s classroom well ventilated?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE10. Is there too much noise in (***name***)´s classroom for students to do their work?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE11. Is there too much noise coming from outside (***name***)´s classroom for students to do their work?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE12. Does (***name***) move around in the school easily?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE13. Does (***name***) use the drinking water facilities at school?

1=YES
2=NO
7=NO SUCH FACILITIES IN THE SCHOOL
8=DON'T KNOW

SE14. Does (***name***) use a toilet at school?

1=YES
2=NO
7=NO SUCH FACILITIES IN THE SCHOOL
8=DON'T KNOW

SE15. Does (***name***) use areas at the school where children play and socialize, such as a playground or sports field?

1=YES
2=NO
7=NO SUCH FACILITIES IN THE SCHOOL
8=DON'T KNOW

SE16. Does (***name***) feel accepted by (his/her) classmates?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE17. Is (***name***) safe at school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE18. Is the school responsive if you have concerns about (***name***)'s education?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE19. Does the school have a program that meets (***name***)'s learning needs?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SE20. Do teachers know how to meet (***name***)'s specific learning needs?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

Out of School Children
(If SP7=2 please proceed with OS1. If SP7=1 or 3 skip to next section (OS1).)

These next questions ask some questions about other schools that children who live in your area attend and whether they would be suitable for (*name*).

OS1. Is there a school that other children who live in this area attend?

1=YES
2=NO (*If no, skip to School Attendants Determinants questionnaire)*
8=DON'T KNOW (*If don't know, skip to School Attendants Determinants questionnaire)*

OS2. Was *(**name***) ever denied enrolment in that school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS3. Is (***name***) not attending that school because of conditions at the school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS4. Is (***name***) not attending that school because there is no adequate transportation to get to school?
1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS5. Is (***name***) not attending that school because there is no one available to take (him/her)?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS6. Is (***name***) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe getting there?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS7. Is (***name***) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe in school with other students?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS8. Is (***name***) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be able to use the toilet?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS9. Is (***name***) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be able to move around the school or classroom with ease?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS10. To attend that school, would (***name***) need any type of assistive devices/technology such as a braille textbook, hearing aid, or wheelchair?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS11. To attend that school, would (***name***) need extra help or services such as speech therapist, support worker, or sign language interpretation?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS12. Do you believe that teachers at that school would know how to meet (***name***)'s specific learning needs?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

OS13. Do you believe that teachers at that school would treat (***name***) fairly?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

School Attendance Determinants
If SP7=1 or 3 and SP13=2 and SP14=1, please skip to next section (IE1). Otherwise, please proceed with SA1.

These next questions are going to ask you about different aspects of your child's life which may impact their school attendance.

SA1. Is there enough money to pay the costs of (***name)***'s schooling?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA2. Does (***name***) need to work, earn money or help out at home?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA3. Is (***name***) married or about to get married?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA4. Does (***name***) have children or is (he/she) about to have children?

1=YES

2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA5. Does (***name***) care for other children in the household, or for other members who are old, sick or have a disability?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA6. (*If SP7=2)* Does (***name***) have a health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to a school outside of the home?

1=YES (*If yes, skip to Attitudes on Inclusive Education)*
2=NO (*If no, skip to Attitudes on Inclusive Education)*
8=DON'T KNOW (*If don't know, skip to Attitudes on Inclusive Education)*

SA7. (*If SP7=1 or 3)* Does (***name***) have a health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA8. Do you consider (***name***) to be too old or too young to attend school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA9. Has (***name***) completed enough schooling?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA10. Is (***name***) interested in going to school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA11. Is it important for (***name***) to go to school?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

SA12. Will going to school help (***name***) make a living?

1=YES
2=NO
8=DON'T KNOW

Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education

I am now going to read a few statements. For each statement, please tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or don't know.

IE1. Children with disabilities should only go to special classrooms for those with disabilities.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE2. Having children with disabilities in regular school requires extensive adaptation of the school.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE3. Having children with disabilities in regular classrooms requires extensive adaptation of the teaching methods.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE4. Regular classroom teachers are not able to effectively teach children with disabilities.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE5. Children with disabilities often lack the academic skills necessary to be in regular classrooms.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE

8=DON'T KNOW

IE6. Children with disabilities often lack the social skills necessary to be in regular classrooms.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE7. Having children with and without disabilities attending the same classes has a negative effect on the social development of children with disabilities.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE8. Children with disabilities will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a general classroom.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE9. The extra attention that children with disabilities require is to the disadvantage of the other students.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

IE10. Children with disabilities should be in special classrooms so that they do not face rejection from children without disabilities.

1=STRONGLY AGREE
2=AGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=STRONGLY DISAGREE
8=DON'T KNOW

Appendix 3: Summary of Revisions to Items Tested in Round 3

Only questions tested in Round 3 that were revised or removed from the final instrument are included. Items that were not tested in Round 3, or that were retained without substantive change, are excluded.

Tested Item	Question Tested in Round 3	Final Item	Final Question / Disposition	Change	Reason
SP7	Does (name) go to a school, or is (he/she) taught at home, or both?	ST3	Does (name) attend school outside of the home or is (he/she) taught only at home?	Revised	Removed 'both' to eliminate misclassification of informal help at home as homeschooling.
SP8	Is (name)'s school a boarding school where (he/she) lives for most of the week?	ST5	Is (name)'s school a place where (he/she) lives and sleeps for most of the week?	Revised	Replaced unfamiliar 'boarding school' terminology with a concrete description.
SP9	What type of school does (name) currently attend?	ST6	Does (name) attend a regular school or a special school for children with disabilities?	Revised	Clarified the meaning of special school.
SP10	What type of classroom does (name) currently attend?	ST7	Does (name) attend a regular classroom or a special classroom for children with disabilities or both?	Revised	Clarified the meaning of classroom types.
SP11	Who is teaching (name) at home?	--	Removed	Removed	Responses reflected misunderstanding of being taught at home, largely because informal homework help was interpreted as home instruction.
SP12	During the current school year did (name) attend any online classes at home?	--	Removed	Removed	Respondents inconsistently interpreted the reference period and what constituted an online class.
SE4	During the school day, does (name) receive any of the following types of support from school staff to prevent him/her from falling behind?	SE9	During the school day, does (name) receive any of the following types of support from school staff to prevent (him/her) from falling behind?	Revised	Refined support categories, including 'extra academic support' and 'psychosocial or counseling support.'
SE5	Does (name) use books or other learning materials provided by the school?	SE10-SE11	Does (name)'s school provide books or other learning materials? / Does (name) use the books or other learning materials provided by the school?	Revised	Separated availability of materials from their actual use.
SE19	Does the school have a program that meets (name)'s learning needs?	SE28	Does the school meet (name)'s learning needs?	Revised	Removed the ambiguous concept of a 'program' and focused directly on whether learning needs are met.
SE20	Do teachers know how to meet (name)'s specific learning needs?	SE29	Do teachers know how to meet (name)'s learning needs?	Revised	Simplified wording.
OS3	Is (name) not attending that school because of conditions at the school?	OS9[X]	Is it because: Of other conditions at that school?	Revised	Incorporated the broad concept into a standardized multiple-reason format.
OS4	Is (name) not attending that school because there is no adequate transportation to get to school?	OS6[A]	There is no adequate transportation to get to the school?	Revised	Incorporated into a standardized multiple-reason format.
OS5	Is (name) not attending that school because there is no one available to take (him/her)?	OS6[B]	No one is available to take (him/her)?	Revised	Incorporated into a standardized multiple-reason format.
OS6	Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe getting there?	OS6[C]	(He/She) would not be safe getting there?	Revised	Incorporated into a standardized multiple-reason format.
OS7	Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be safe in school with other students?	OS6[D]	(He/She) would not be safe in school with other students?	Revised	Incorporated into a standardized multiple-reason format.
OS8	Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be able to use the toilet?	OS6[E]	(He/She) would not be able to use the toilet?	Revised	Incorporated into a standardized multiple-reason format.

OS9	Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) would not be able to move around the school or classroom with ease?	OS6[F]	(He/She) would not be able to move around the school or classroom with ease?	Revised	Incorporated into a standardized multiple-reason format.
OS10	To attend that school, would (name) need any type of assistive devices or technology such as a braille textbook, hearing aid, or wheelchair?	OS7	Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) needs assistive devices or technology that are not available at that school?	Revised	Reframed the item to measure whether unavailable assistive technology is a reason for non-attendance.
OS11	To attend that school, would (name) need extra help or services such as a speech therapist, a support worker or aide, or a sign language interpreter?	OS8	Is (name) not attending that school because (he/she) needs extra help or services that are not available at that school?	Revised	Reframed need for services as a reason for non-attendance.
OS12	Do you believe that teachers at that school would know how to meet (name)'s specific learning needs?	OS9[A]	The teachers do not know how to meet (his/her) learning needs?	Revised	Reframed as a potential reason for non-attendance and incorporated into the multiple-reason format.
OS13	Do you believe that teachers at that school would treat (name) fairly?	OS9[B]	The teachers would not treat (him/her) fairly?	Revised	Reframed as a potential reason for non-attendance and incorporated into the multiple-reason format.
SA2	Does (name) need to work, earn money or help out at home?	SA7	Does (name) currently need to work or earn money?	Revised	Clarified the current reference period and separated work from household caregiving responsibilities.
SA6	Does (name) have a health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to a school outside of the home?	SA13	Does (name) have a serious health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to a school outside of the home?	Revised	Added 'serious' to clarify the intended scope.
SA7	Does (name) have a health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to school?	SA14	Does (name) have a serious health condition that prevents (him/her) from going to school?	Revised	Added 'serious' to clarify the intended scope.
SA11	Is it important for (name) to go to school?	--	Removed	Removed	Not retained in the final instrument.
IE1-IE10	Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education statements	--	Entire section removed	Removed	Persistent conceptual problems, conditional reasoning, inconsistent interpretation, response error, and difficulty using the response scale across items.

Appendix 4: Final Version Module on Inclusive Education

CHILD'S BACKGROUND		CB
CB1. On what day, month and year was (***name***) born? *Probe:* What is (***his/her***) birthday? *If the mother/caregiver knows the exact date of birth, also record the day; otherwise, record '98' for day.* *Month and year must be recorded.*	DATE OF BIRTH DAY ..... __ __ DK DAY ..... 98 MONTH ..... __ __ YEAR ..... 2 0 __ __	
CB2. How old is (***name***)? *Probe*: How old was (***name***) at (***his/her***) last birthday? *Record age in completed years.* *If responses to CB1 and CB2 are inconsistent, probe further and correct.*	AGE (IN COMPLETED YEARS) __ __	
CB3. Has (***name***) ever attended school or any early childhood education programme?	YES ..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*End*
CB4. What is the highest level of school (***name***) has ever attended?	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION. 0 PRIMARY ..... 1 LOWER SECONDARY ..... 2 UPPER SECONDARY ..... 3 HIGHER 4	0 ⇨*End interview* 4 ⇨*End interview*
CB5. Did (***name***) ever complete that level?	YES ..... 1 NO 2	
CB6. *Check CB4 and CB5: Did (**name**) attend upper secondary education (CB4=3) and complete that level (CB5=1)?*	COMPLETED UPPER SECONDARY EDUCATION (CB4 = 3 AND CB5=1) ..... 1 NO 2	1 ⇨*End interview*

CB7. At any time during the current school year did (***name***) attend school?	YES ..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*End*
CB8. During the current school year, which level is (***name***) attending?	PRIMARY ..... 1 LOWER SECONDARY ..... 2 UPPER SECONDARY 3	

SCHOOL TYPE		ST
ST1. *Check CB3: Has (**name**) ever attended school or any early childhood education programme?*	YES..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*End*
ST2. *Check CB7: At any time during the current school year did (**name**) attend school?*	YES..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*End*
ST3. Does (***name***) attend school outside of the home or is (***he/she***) taught only at home?	OUTSIDE (PARTIALLY OR FULLY) THE HOME .....1 ONLY AT HOME 2	1 ⇨*ST5*
ST4. Is (***name***) taught by a teacher or private tutor?	YES.....1 NO 2	1 ⇨*ST8* 2 ⇨*ST8*
ST5. Is (***name***)'s school a place where (***he/she***) lives and sleeps for most of the week?	YES.....1 NO 2	
ST6. Does (***name***) attend a regular school or a special school for children with disabilities?	A REGULAR SCHOOL .....1 A SPECIAL SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES 2	2 ⇨*ST8*
ST7. Does (***name***) attend a regular classroom or a special classroom for children with disabilities or both?	A REGULAR CLASSROOM .....1 A SPECIAL CLASSROOM FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES .....2 BOTH REGULAR AND SPECIAL CLASSROOMS.....3 DON'T KNOW 8	
ST8. During the current school year has (***name***) missed school more than half of the days?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
ST9. Do you expect (***name***) to complete the current school year?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT		SE
SE1. *Check CB3: Has (**name**) ever attended school or any early childhood education programme?*	YES .....1 NO.....2	2 ⇨*End*
SE2. *Check CB7: At any time during the current school year did (**name**) attend school?*	YES .....1 NO.....2	2 ⇨*End*
SE3. *Check ST3: Does (**name**) attend school outside of the home or is (**he/she**) taught only at home?*	OUTSIDE (PARTIALLY OR FULLY) THE HOME.....1 ONLY AT HOME.....2	2 ⇨*End*
SE4. The following questions ask about the school that (***name***) is currently attending.		

SE5. *Check ST5: Is (**name**)'s school a place where (**he/she**) lives and sleeps for most of the week*?	YES .....1 NO 2	1 ⇨*SE9*
SE6. Does (***name***) need help to get to that school?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	 2 ⇨*SE8* 8 ⇨*SE8*
SE7. Why does (***name***) need help to get to school? Is it because: [A] There is no transportation to get to school? [B] (***He/She***) is too young to go alone? [C] The distance is too far for (***him/her***) to travel alone? [D] It is not safe for (***him/her***) to go alone? [X] Is it because of any other reason?	Y N DK NO TRANSPORTATION .....1 2 8 TOO YOUNG TO GO ALONE .....1 2 8 DISTANCE IS TOO FAR .....1 2 8 NOT SAFE TO GO ALONE .....1 2 8 OTHER REASON.....1 2 8 *SPECIFY*: _____	
SE8. How long does it usually take (***name***) to get to school?	LESS THAN 30 MINUTES .....1 30-60 MINUTES.....2 MORE THAN 1 HOUR .....3 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE9. During the school day, does (***name***) receive any of the following types of support from school staff to prevent (***him/her***) from falling behind? Does (***name***) receive: [A] Extra academic support? [B] Support in moving around? [C] Communication support? [D] Psychosocial or counseling support? [X] Any other type of support?	Y N DK EXTRA ACADEMIC SUPPORT .....1 2 8 SUPPORT IN MOVING AROUND ..1 2 8 COMMUNICATION SUPPORT .....1 2 8 PSYCHOSOCIAL/COUNSELING SUPPORT .....1 2 8 OTHER TYPE OF SUPPORT.....1 2 8 *SPECIFY*: _____	
SE10. Does (***name***)'s school provide books or other learning materials?	YES .....1 NO 2	2 ⇨*SE12*

	DON'T KNOW 8	8 ⇨*SE12*
SE11. Does (***name***) use the books or other learning materials provided by the school?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE12. Are there desks or tables for every student in (***name***)'s classroom?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE13. Does (***name***)'s classroom have enough light for (***him/her***) to do (***his/her***) work?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE14. Is (***name***)'s classroom cool or warm enough for (***him/her***) to do (***his/her***) work?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE15. Is (***name***)'s classroom well ventilated?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE16. Is there too much noise in (***name***)'s classroom for (***him/her***) to do (***his/her***) work?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE17. Does (***name***) move around in school easily?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE18. Does (***name***)'s school have drinking water facilities?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	2 ⇨*SE20* 8 ⇨*SE20*
SE19. Does (***name***) use the drinking water facilities at school?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE20. Does (***name***)'s school have toilets?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	2 ⇨*SE22* 8 ⇨*SE22*
SE21. Does (***name***) use the toilets at school?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE22. Does (***name***)'s school have areas such as a playground or sports field where children play and socialize?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	2 ⇨*SE24* 8 ⇨*SE24*
SE23. Does (***name***) use these areas at school?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE24. Does (***name***) feel accepted by (***his/her***) classmates?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE25. Is (***name***) safe at school?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	

SE26. Has the school been responsive when you had concerns about (***name***)'s education?	YES .....1 NO 2	1 ⇨*SE28*
SE27. Did you answer 'no' because you have never had concerns with the school about (***name***)'s education or because the school has not been responsive to your concerns?	NO CONCERNS .....1 NOT RESPONSIVE 2	
SE28. Does the school meet (***name***)'s learning needs?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	
SE29. Do teachers know how to meet (***name***)'s learning needs?	YES .....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW 8	

REASONS FOR NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL		OS
OS1. *Check CB3: Has (**name**) ever attended school or any early childhood education programme?*	YES ..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*OS4*
OS2. *Check CB7: At any time during the current school year did (**name**) attend school?*	YES ..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*OS4*
OS3. *Check ST3: Does (**name**) attend school outside of the home or is (**he/she**) taught only at home?*	OUTSIDE (PARTIALLY OR FULLY) THE HOME ..... 1 ONLY AT HOME 2	1 ⇨*End*
OS4. Is there a school that other children of (***name***)'s same age who live in this area attend?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW 8	2 ⇨*End* 8 ⇨*End*
OS5. The next questions ask why (***name***) is not going to that school.		
OS6. Is (***name***) not attending that school because: [A] There is no adequate transportation to get to the school? [B] No one is available to take (***him/her***)? [C] (***He/She***) would not be safe getting there? [D] (***He/She***) would not be safe in school with other students? [E] (***He/She***) would not be able to use the toilet? [F] (***He/She***) would not be able to move around the school or classroom with ease?	Y N DK NO ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION ..... 1 2 8 NO ONE IS AVAILABLE ..... 1 2 8 UNSAFE GETTING THERE ..... 1 2 8 UNSAFE IN SCHOOL ..... 1 2 8 UNABLE TO USE TOILET ..... 1 2 8 UNABLE TO MOVE AROUND 1 2 8	
OS7. Is (***name***) not attending that school because (***he/she***) needs assistive devices or technology that are not available at that school? By assistive devices or technology, we mean things such as braille textbooks, a hearing aid, or a wheelchair.	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW 8	
OS8. Is (***name***) not attending that school because (***he/she***) needs extra help or services that are not available at that school? By extra help or services, we mean assistance provided by people such as a speech therapist, a support worker, or a sign language interpreter.	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW 8	
OS9. I have a few more questions about why (***name***) is not attending that school. Is it because:	Y N DK	

[A] The teachers do not know how to meet (***his/her***) learning needs? [B] The teachers would not treat (***him/her***) fairly? [X] Of other conditions at that school?	TEACHERS DO NOT KNOW HOW TO MEET NEEDS ..... 1 2 8 TEACHERS WOULD NOT TREAT FAIRLY ..... 1 2 8 OTHER CONDITIONS..... 1 2 8 *SPECIFY*: _____	
OS10. Was *(**name**)* ever denied enrollment in that school?	YES ..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW 8	

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE DETERMINANTS		**SA**
SA1. *Check CB3: Has (**name**) ever attended school or any early childhood education programme?*	YES..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*SA6*
SA2. *Check CB7: At any time during the current school year did (**name**) attend school?*	YES..... 1 NO 2	2 ⇨*SA6*
SA3. *Check ST3: Does (**name**) attend school outside of the home or is (**he/she**) taught only at home?*	OUTSIDE (PARTIALLY OR FULLY) THE HOME ..... 1 ONLY AT HOME..... 2	2 ⇨*SA6*
SA4. *Check ST8: During the current school year has (**name**) missed school more than half of the days?*	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	1 ⇨*SA6*
SA5. *Check ST9: Do you expect (**name**) to complete the current school year?*	YES..... 1 NO 2	1 ⇨*End interview*
SA6. Is there enough money to pay the costs of (***name)***'s schooling?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA7. Does (***name***) currently need to work or earn money?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA8. Does (***name***) currently care for other children in the household, or for other household members who are old, sick or have a disability?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA9. *Check CB2: (**Name**)'s age?*	LESS THAN 10 YEARS..... 1 10 YEARS OR ABOVE 2	1 ⇨*SA12*
SA10. Is (***name***) married or about to get married?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	

SA11. Does (***name***) have children or is (***he/she***) about to have children?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA12. *Check ST3: Does (**name**) attend school outside of the home or is (**he/she**) taught only at home?*	OUTSIDE (PARTIALLY OR FULLY) THE HOME OR BLANK..... 1 ONLY AT HOME..... 2	1 ⇨*SA14*
SA13. Does (***name***) have a serious health condition that prevents (***him/her***) from going to a school outside of the home?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	1 ⇨*End interview* 2 ⇨*End interview* 8 ⇨*End interview*
SA14. Does (***name***) have a serious health condition that prevents (***him/her***) from going to school?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA15. Do you consider (***name***) to be too old or too young to attend school?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA16. Has (***name***) completed enough schooling?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA17. Is (***name***) interested in going to school?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	
SA18. Will going to school help (***name***) make a living?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... 8	1 ⇨*End interview* 2 ⇨*End interview* 8 ⇨*End interview*