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This 2018 summary report looks at Nal’ibali’s activities, reach, network profile and reading club trends as of December 2018. While the main focus is our work in 2018, we place this in historical context where possible and relevant. The report also examines strategic implications of the data, in relation to our long-term objectives.

Background
The Nal’ibali reading for enjoyment campaign was launched in April 2012, nearly seven years ago.

In 2018, we’ve been hard at work - growing our footprint on the ground thanks to new funders and special projects, honing our strategies based on new research and experience, and strengthening the back-end systems that enable us to spread a culture of reading far and wide.

Over the last year and a half, we also updated our Theory of Change, key impact metrics, and data collection tools and processes; strengthened data capturing, verification, cleaning and management; and grew our capacity for analysis and data-driven decision making.

We still have a lot to learn - but we are in a better position to describe, understand and learn from the work Nal’ibali is doing across South Africa.

Emerging trends are examined below, aligned with our theory of change and key impact metrics.

Data analysis
Data analysis is organised according to the four key outcome domains in Nal’ibali’s theory of change:

- **KNOWLEDGE & AWARENESS**: Adults and children understand and value reading for enjoyment, and know how to nurture it.

- **ROLE MODELS**: Adults share books and stories with children, and encourage others to do the same.

- **OPPORTUNITIES**: Reading opportunities exist in a variety of accessible spaces.

- **ACCESS**: Adults and children have access to a wide variety of relevant engaging reading material, in all South African languages.

1. Knowledge and awareness
   a. Flagship events
Nal’ibali achieved unprecedented reach during this year’s World Read Aloud Day (WRAD) campaign. The exponential growth we have achieved year-on-year is evident in the graph below.

**World Read Aloud Day participation reached approximately 1 in 43 South Africans and approximately 1 in 15 SA children** in 2018.

*Story Bosso indicator changed from # of entries to people reached in 2018.

Our target was to secure pledges from South Africans to read aloud to 1 million children. We exceeded this by 30%, and increased 80% on last year’s reach.

With nearly 1.3 million people participating, ~1 in 43 South Africans and ~1 in 15 South African children were read to on 1 February 2018.¹

To maintain this growth and momentum going forward, we intend to:

- Ensure we continue communicating with people we mobilised for the first time this year. For 2019, we are phoning all our past partners to re-secure pledges.
- Harness the momentum and hype we successfully generated around WRAD, and find ways to sustain the call-to-action regularly, year-round. We are building calls to action into FUNda Sonke, our FUNda Leader incentive scheme to launch in 2019.
- Though we could not achieve this for 2019, continue to engage with DBE towards the goal of all primary schools participating in 2020.

b. **Other events**

¹ The estimate of 1 in 15 South African children assumes that 95% of those participating in World Read Aloud day were children ages 0 to 17. The calculation is based on South African population size of ~56 million (Stats SA), and a child population (ages 0 to 17) of ~18.576 million [Children Count 2015 data].
In addition to flagship events, Nal’ibali’s field staff run regular Story Power Activations in their communities, and the Communications team runs campaign drives throughout the year linked to the literacy calendar. Staff members from different departments also present at conferences and workshops.

Through these face-to-face engagements in 2018, Nal’ibali reached almost 100 000 people - an estimated 98 972 people2, up 55% from last year.

![Graph showing people reached through events over years](image)

The graph below shows how this activity broke down, by project and province. The Free State reached the most people, followed by the Eastern Cape.

---

2 Where they are available, Nal’ibalians report actual event attendance; where not available, estimated numbers are used.
2. Role models: training

a. Number of people trained - over time

Nal’ibali trained 7 027 people (unique individuals)\(^3\) in 2018. This is the largest number in any one year, and an increase of 18% as compared to 2017. In the first six months of the year, it trained 5 097 people, an all-time high for a six-month period.

Since the campaign launched, it has trained ~22 456 people.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) In 2018, we can say with confidence that these are unique individuals, due to improvements in our data management system. Prior to 2018, we are not confident that every person trained was a unique individual, though the vast majority would be.

\(^4\) A small amount of duplication exists across years - for example, a person trained in 2015 and 2017 may be counted twice.
We strove in 2018 not only for quantity, but for quality and depth, by moving away from once-off training to a modular training programme within our core campaign. As such, the numbers above partially obscure the amount of work done by our team: 23% of people attended more than one training event (but are only counted once in the total above).

b. Number of people trained - by profile, vs. 2017

Training participants indicate a “profile type”, and are allowed to choose more than one option (for example, they may be both a teacher and a parent). This year, we saw the following profile breakdown (shown in comparison to 2017):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>% change, 2018</th>
<th>% of people, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members/volunteers</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/caregivers</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD practitioners</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>272%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nal’ibali trained 7 027 people in 2018. 36% were community members or volunteers, and 24% were teachers. The greatest growth was among ECD practitioners (which nearly quadrupled), and NGO practitioners (which increased by 156%).

Cumulative # of people trained
We observed the following trends:

- 36% of those trained identify as community members/volunteers, the largest group. This is driven largely by community trainings at 221 schools in the Story Powered Schools project.
- The greatest growth this year was seen in ECD practitioners and NGO practitioners.
  - ECDs: 1 017 people were trained, up from 274 in 2017 - nearly 4 times as many (+271%).
  - NGOs: 580 people were trained, up from 227 in 2017 - a 156% increase.
- Teachers remained a large percentage of those trained, at 22%. We trained 25% more teachers than we did in 2017.
- The number of CWP participants, tertiary students, library practitioners and DBE officials declined, as shown above. This reflects difficulty working with libraries, challenges within DCoG, and a shift in our core campaign schools strategy from train-the-trainer to working more directly with schools (which is a positive development).
- Only 15% of people indicated they are parents or caregivers. We suspect this is under-reported, as many people did not tick more than one profile on their attendance register.

c. Number of people trained - by project and province

In 2018, of the 7 027 people we trained:
- 3 431 (49%) attended the core campaign training modules.
- 845 people (12%) attended “Big 5” teacher training at Story Powered Schools.
- 2 360 people (33%) attended community training at Story Powered Schools.
- 312 people (4.4%) attended training via the Diaconia partnership.
- 100 people (1.4%) attended training via the Lesedi and Letsatsi projects.\(^5\)

\(^5\) These numbers do not sum to 6 899; they sum to 6 905. This is because six people attended training run by more than one project.
**SPS community training** - where twelve community members are invited to a one-day training at their school - accounts for **one-third of our overall training reach**.

The provinces that trained the most people in the **core campaign** were:
- Eastern Cape (966 people, 14% of the annual total and 28% of core campaign activity);
- KwaZulu-Natal (615 people, 9% of the annual total and 18% of core campaign activity);
- Western Cape (418 people, 6% of the annual total and 12% of core campaign activity).

In the core campaign, our strategy focused on four **priority provinces**: Eastern Cape, Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo. 2 230 of 3 431 people trained (65%) were in these four provinces.

A further breakdown by province and project is shown in the graphs below.

Adults volunteering with reading clubs are also a key outcome metric in the “role models” domain. They are discussed in the following section, together with other indicators related to reading club quality (such as number of children per club and child-to-adult ratio).

### 3. Opportunities to read

The key metric Nal’ibali uses to track the degree to which it is creating opportunities for children to read, write, and engage with books and stories is the **number of reading clubs registered**.

We also use key characteristics of these reading clubs (like child enrolment, frequency of meeting, adult-to-child ratio and longevity) to help us begin to understand key outcome metrics, including frequency, quality and sustainability.
Reading clubs are considered “active” in a given year if they are newly registered that year (using either a paper or online form), or they have re-registered and confirmed that they are still active (via a phone call). Enrolment, frequency of meeting and other data is self-reported by the reading club leaders.

**d. Reading club growth over time - by level of support**

By the end of 2018, we had 4,839 reading clubs that registered or re-registered this year. This is nearly double the number of reading clubs in December 2017 (a 99% increase), and up 24% from 3,905 registered at mid-year.

Nal’ibali classifies reading clubs as receiving 1 of 3 levels of support:⁶

- **Directly supported clubs** are run by Nal’ibali Literacy Mentors and Story Sparkers, or receive weekly visits from Nal’ibali staff via the Story Powered Schools and Lesedi-Letsatsi projects.
- **Limited support clubs** are established and run by partner organisations that participate in structured training and mentoring programmes.
- **Unsupported clubs** started independently, or used to receive face-to-face support and have “graduated” to running independently.

Growth over time is shown in the graph and table below:

---

⁶ These definitions have fluctuated slightly over the years, as our implementation strategies have evolved over time. However, the basic principle of the degree to which we have interacted with reading clubs can be used to understand broad trends.
As shown above, in 2018 we saw the greatest growth in our limited support reading clubs (a 258% increase). This indicates that the new partnership strategy, with two intakes per year, has achieved its goal of further saturating communities with reading-for-joy, by providing a structured journey that supports partners to register reading clubs. The Diaconia partnership’s 311 clubs also contributed to this growth. We have achieved width with this strategy; the return rate in 2019 will show the degree to which we are starting to move towards depth as well.

Our supported clubs grew by nearly 40%. This was driven by the Story Powered Schools programme, where Story Sparkers continued to visit 40 of our 2017 schools for six months through the Reduced Support Programme, in addition to the 240 new schools; and the launch of the Lesedi and Letsatsi projects (though reading club registration in these projects has been lower than anticipated).

We also saw growth in unsupported clubs. In part, this reflects a stronger approach to keeping in touch with reading clubs via our call centre. Last year, we suspected that there were many active reading clubs that we had fallen out of touch with, and our re-registration phone drive this year confirmed this. We also included a link to register your reading club on our company email signatures for much of the year - which may have also made it easier for people to do so. FUNda Leader welcome calls for all who sign up online also signed up 40 new clubs between August and December. This shows that many FUNda Leaders are running clubs or want to, if only we would ask!

We are proud of our team’s hard work to train and recruit new partners. And we are excited that - as we suspected - our network of previously-registered reading clubs is indeed bigger than we thought!

e. **Reading clubs active by province and project**

The number of reading clubs active in 2018, by province and project, is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supported clubs</th>
<th>102</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>289</th>
<th>117</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>826</th>
<th>1 131</th>
<th>37%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited support clubs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1 081</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>2 617</td>
<td>258%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported clubs</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1 091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1 271</td>
<td>2 434</td>
<td>4 839</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. Children in reading clubs: number and demographics

This year, the number of children in registered and active reading clubs more than doubled - from 63 004 to 140 998 (a 124% increase). By June, we had already topped 100 000 for the first time, with 115 833 children in reading clubs. This growth over time is illustrated in the graph below.

At a population level, we can estimate that approximately 1 in 160 children in South Africa, and approximately 1 in 127 children ages 0-11, are in a reading club.\(^7\) Our goal is to increase this fourfold over the next five years, until approximately 1 in 32 children under age 11\(^8\) are in a reading club.

---

\(^7\) This estimate is based on Child Gauge “Children Count” statistics for 2015, the most recent year available, when there were 18 576 000 children ages 0 to 17 and 12 574 000 children ages 0 to 11 in South Africa. With 140 998 children in reading clubs, an estimated 99 219 of whom are ages 0-11 (extrapolating the “age unknown” children proportionately according to known age data), this means approximately 0.76% of all children and 0.79% of children ages 0-11 are in reading clubs.

\(^8\) Nal’ibali primarily targets children ages 3 and older; however, for purposes of this exercise, we do not have population available per age cohort. If we reduced the population to children ages 3-11 only (excluding 0-2s), this would be more like 1 in 24 children.
**Age group** is known for 84% of children:

- 44 017 children (31%) are ages 0-6 (up 187% from 15 345 in Dec 2017)
- 51 323 children (36%) are ages 7-11 (up 10% since Dec 2017)
- 23 597 children (17%) are ages 12 and up (a 23-fold increase since Dec 2017)
- Age group is unknown for 22 061 children (16%).

In 2018, we re-strategised to focus on partnering with organised ECD forums, instead of ECD community sites. As evidenced by the nearly tripled number of children ages 0-6, this approach is bearing fruit.

The number of children ages 12 and older showed surprising growth (23 597, up from only 976 in December 2017). The apparent growth is largely due to increased granularity in our data collection. We would need to undertake further research to understand whether children are “growing with Nal’ibali”, staying in reading clubs as they age. Nevertheless, this trend indicates that although teenagers are not our primary audience, FUNda Leaders are able to apply Nal’ibali approaches to other age groups and settings. Nal’ibali’s clear appeal to children ages 12 and older also suggests that we may need to consider developing more content for this age group, and further strengthen our partnership with FunDza.

---

9 Prior to 2018, Nal’ibali calculated # of children per age group figures based on the predominant age group of the reading club - for example, all children in a “teen reading club” were counted as teenagers. From 2018, we are counting the age of each individual child, as reported by reading club leaders - even where different age groups are present in the same reading club. This may be why a greater number of teenagers appear to be participating in 2018 - for example, there may be many 12- and 13- year olds in reading clubs that are predominantly focused on primary school children.

10 The data shows that of the 23 597 children ages 12+ in 2018 reading clubs, 12 449 (53%) are in reading clubs that registered this year, 4 982 (21%) are in reading clubs that registered last year, and 4 384 (19%) are in reading clubs that registered in 2016. This suggests that “getting older with reading clubs” may be taking place to some degree, but growth in the 12+ age group was also significant in 2018.
Sex\textsuperscript{11} of children in reading clubs is relatively evenly split, though we see a slightly higher participation rate for girls in 2018. While there is often concern in education that boys are being left behind, our enrolment data suggests that reading club spaces and activities appeal to children irrespective of sex. Given the gap in learning outcomes between boys and girls - about a year’s worth of learning, according to the most recent PIRLS 2016 assessments - Nal’ibali should continue ensuring it appeals to boys.

Sex of children in reading clubs: 2016-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

949 children (0.67%) have a disability, as reported by reading club leaders. (This percentage is lower than the population-at-large rate, estimated to be 5-10\%\textsuperscript{12} The actual number of children with a disability is likely higher, as not all disabilities are visible to/known by reading club leaders). This suggests that while Nal’ibali reading clubs do include children with disabilities, we can do more to be inclusive.

g. Frequency of meeting
The vast majority of clubs (81\% of active reading clubs, which have 86\% of all children) meet once a week or more. The breakdown is shown in the table below.

17\% of clubs, with 21\% of children, meet five times a week or more.

---

\textsuperscript{11} Nal’ibali changed this indicator from gender to sex in 2018 to be in line with USAID’s standard indicators, and best practice from a gender perspective.

\textsuperscript{12} National estimates of the number of children with disabilities seem to range from approximately 5\% (Uhambo Foundation 2013) to 10\% (Stats SA 2014, UNICEF 2011).
h. Size of reading clubs

In 2018, the average reading club size was 29.1 children per reading club. The average reading club size is down slightly since mid-2018, from 29.6 to 29.1 children per club.

The majority of reading clubs (52% of clubs) have between 11 and 30 children, as shown in the histogram below.
We have found that in a school environment, sometimes “reading clubs” are full classes; this may be the case for many of the 1 067 clubs (22%) with 31 to 60 children.

A total of 33 clubs (<1% of clubs) report that they have more than 150 children; 9 of these report more than 300 children. It is possible for a reading club to have more than 150 children; however, we suspect that some of these reading clubs are either (a) entire schools or educare centres, or (b) school libraries or other spaces that work with multiple groups or children at different times, but have registered as only one reading club. We will seek to better understand what is happening in these spaces with our 2019 reading club re-registration drive.

When we look at the average number of children per club in different types of spaces, we see that club size varies by where reading clubs take place: clubs in “other” spaces, preschools and churches are largest; school clubs have 31 children on average; and clubs in homes and libraries are smallest, as shown in the table below:
i. Number of adults

Taking all clubs into account, there are an average of 2.0 adults per reading club. This is lowest at reading clubs in homes and libraries (1.6 adults per club on average), and highest at reading clubs in ‘other’ spaces (2.4 adults per club on average), followed by schools (2.1 adults per club on average).

However, the number of volunteers is only known for 57% of clubs (2 781 clubs). Of these:
- 1 172 (24% of all clubs) do not have any volunteers - i.e. only one adult (the reading club leader).
- 538 (11% of all clubs) have 1 volunteer (2 adults).
- 391 (8% of all clubs) have 2 volunteers (3 adults), and 12% have 3-4 volunteers (4-5 adults).
- 213 clubs have between 6 and 10 adults, 30 clubs have 11-15 adults, and 14 report that more than 15 adults are involved with the reading club.\(^\text{13}\)

2058 clubs (43%) have not specified the number of volunteers.

This trend is shown in the graph below.

\(^{13}\) We suspect these may be schools who did not understand the question and reported the total number of teachers.
j. Child-to-adult ratio

Although reading club size and number of volunteers are important indicators of quality, a more important indicator is the child-to-adult ratio. Small clubs can be wonderful spaces from a pedagogical perspective, especially for very young children, where a 1 to 10 ratio or lower is ideal. However, there are also benefits to the social and cultural sense of belonging that comes from being part of a larger reading club, and large reading clubs can also be well-run - even those with 60 children or more - if there are enough adults.

While ratios of children-per-adult are not a perfect proxy for quality care, they are a useful indicator. In training, Nal’ibali promotes that reading clubs should not exceed a 15-to-1 child-to-adult ratio.

Of our 2018 active clubs:
- 48% of reading clubs (2 301 clubs) meet the Nal’ibali ‘gold standard’, with 15 or fewer children per adult. 32% of children are in these clubs.
- Another 19% of reading clubs (927 clubs) have between 15 and 25 children per adult. 17% of children are in these clubs. This means 67% of clubs and 51% of children (just over half) have a child-to-adult ratio of 25 or fewer.
- 11% of reading clubs (514 clubs) have a ratio of more than 40 children to one adult. 30% of children (42 234 children) are in these clubs. We suspect that these do not look like what we would consider ‘typical’ or ‘ideal’ reading clubs, and may be taking place in places such as crowded school classrooms.
When we break this down by the type of site where the reading clubs take place, and look at the averages (rather than the distribution), the data looks more promising: the child-to-adult ratio ranges from 12 children (at home reading clubs) to 20 children (at preschools).

![Average reading club size and child-adult ratio, by type of site](image)

We see above that while the child-to-adult ratio is within our “okay” range for clubs in homes, community centres, libraries and schools, the ratios particularly in ECD centres are worryingly high. This suggests that in 2019, Nal’ibali may want to focus on recruiting more adults to participate in existing reading clubs, in line with its strategy of prioritising quality over quantity in order to strengthen the model.

**k. Reading club sustainability: re-registrations vs. new clubs in 2018**

The 4 839 Nal’ibali reading clubs active in 2018 included:

- **3 112 new reading clubs (registered for the first time in 2018).** These included:
  - 1 768\textsuperscript{14} clubs registered by our core campaign;
  - 825 reading clubs at Story Powered Schools;
  - 311 reading clubs from the Diaconia partnership;
  - 78 clubs from the Lesedi-Letsatsi project;
  - 130 clubs that registered online.

- **1 727 re-registered reading clubs (registered prior to 2018, and still running).** These included:
  - 1 276 clubs re-registered from our core campaign;
  - 254 reading clubs from 2017 Story Powered Schools;

\textsuperscript{14} Includes 2x CWP clubs.
197 reading clubs that registered online.

The ‘rate of return’ is illustrated below.

Notably:
- 1,727 reading clubs re-registered in 2018 after registering in a previous year. This is more than two-thirds the number of clubs that were active in 2017, and more than double the ‘return rate’ last year.
- The number of newly-registered clubs this year (3,112) exceeded the number of ALL active clubs in 2017, by 28%.

When we look at a breakdown of new vs. returning clubs per project, we can see how much of each project’s footprint was based on new growth vs. sustainable reading clubs from previous years:
76% of SPS clubs and 58% of core campaign clubs were new in 2018. Online-registered clubs had the highest rate of return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Returning clubs</th>
<th>% returning (per project)</th>
<th>New clubs</th>
<th>% new (per project)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of all clubs (per project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core campaign</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Schools</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaconia</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesedi Letsatsi</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4839</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably:
- For clubs that registered online (327 in total), a higher proportion were returning (60%) than new (40%). This is partly because our online registration form was down for a few months earlier this year. However, the trend is still noticeable, as these clubs typically receive the
least/lightest-touch support from Nal’ibali - and as such, promising with regards to sustaining a volunteer network over time.

I. Reading club longevity and turnover - a brief look

Using re-registration data, we are able to look at how long each of our 2018 active clubs have been running. While only a quarter have been running since 2016 (~3 years), this sample still includes nearly 800 reading clubs. 382 have been since 2015 (~4 years).

How long have active clubs been running?
(n = 4 839 reading clubs active in 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year (reg. 2018)</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years (reg. 2017)</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years (reg. 2016)</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years (reg. 2015)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years (reg. 2014)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years (reg. 2013)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years (reg. 2012)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Longevity of reading clubs does not vary enormously by province, but we can see that Gauteng seems to have a higher proportion of returning clubs than other provinces, and KZN has the most returning clubs in absolute terms, as shown below:
When we place this data in the “bigger picture” of all clubs ever registered, whether or not we managed to reach them during a re-registration drive, we see that for 4 657 clubs registered between 2013 and 2017, we managed to reach 65% during our re-registration drive. Of these:
- 36% (1 719) were still active.
- 29% (1 354) were no longer active.

This analysis excludes clubs registered in 2012 because we were not using our data management system at that time, and they are not captured in a consistent manner on our system.
- 34% (1,584) were not contactable, though we tried to reach each club three times.

This is illustrated in the graphs below:

The above graph shows how many reading clubs are confirmed active (green), confirmed inactive (yellow), or unknown because we did not reach them in the reading club re-registration drive (grey).

The below graph shows (unsurprisingly) that the percentage of reading clubs that we can reach, and the percentage who are still active, increases as registration year becomes more recent. We managed to reach 91% of our clubs that registered in 2017, 50% of those that registered in 2015, and 30% of those registered in 2013.

We shared some more extensive analysis of reading club longevity and turnover in our mid-year data analysis report, available [here](#).

We seek to better understand the dynamics that contribute to reading club sustainability via an external evaluation that would include visits to a sample of clubs. We are planning to commission this in the second half of 2019.
4. Access to reading materials

a. Reading clubs’ access to reading material

As reported mid-year, we have started to paint a better picture of how well-resourced (or not) our reading clubs are. In our reading club re-registration drive, we asked clubs about whether they have supplements, whether they have their own books (and how many they have), and whether they use library books.

As shown in the graph below, we learned that while 74% of re-registering clubs report that they have their own books, only 41% have Nal’ibali supplements. 57% use library books.16

More than 2/3 of re-registered clubs have their own books, while only 2 in 5 clubs receive Nal’ibali supplements.

(n = 1,665 clubs that completed phone-based reading club re-registration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does reading club have...</th>
<th>74% (1172)</th>
<th>29% (456)</th>
<th>2% (37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Books?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books?</td>
<td>57% (897)</td>
<td>46% (730)</td>
<td>2% (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplements?</td>
<td>41% (651)</td>
<td>46% (727)</td>
<td>18% (278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those 1,172 (74%) of re-registered reading clubs that have their own books, 43% have 20 books or fewer - which is arguably insufficient to run a reading club over a sustained period of time. Just over a quarter are reasonably well-resourced, with more than 50 books for their club, as shown below.

16 These figures have changed marginally since our mid-year report, as the reading club re-registration drive was not quite complete at the time of data analysis.
As shown in the graph below\textsuperscript{17}, we also learned that:

- **14\% of clubs have access to all 3 types of reading material** asked about (supplements, own books and library books). 42\% have two of these three, 38\% have just one of these options, and 5\% have none.
- **16\% of reading clubs do not own their own materials** - 11\% rely on library books and 5\% do not report using any of the above.

\textsuperscript{17} NB - we did not re-run this analysis since mid-2018. For other analyses, overall trends have not changed with the addition of a few new reading clubs to the dataset. We will update these figures soon.
b. Access to reading material - characteristics of long-running reading clubs

In August, we compared access to reading material in long-running reading clubs (543 clubs that have been running for 4 years or more) to the full group of 1 574 re-registered clubs in the dataset at the time, to see whether any significant differences were evident.18

We suspected that long-running reading clubs would be more likely to receive supplements, but in fact, we found the opposite. Long-running reading clubs are less likely to report having supplements (26% have supplements, vs 39% of all re-registered clubs). However, they are more likely to use library books (64%, as opposed to 55% of all re-registered clubs), as shown in the graph below. This suggests that libraries may be a key to sustainability - something that merits further exploration.

---

18 NB - we did not re-run this analysis since August 2018. For other analyses, overall trends have not changed with the addition of a few new reading clubs to the dataset. We will update these figures soon.
We did not ask about the language of reading material, nor whether the books are children’s picture books / story books, in this survey. We collected more data about this in our late 2018 FUNda Leader survey, which we have yet to analyse.

c. Supplement targeting over time

In 2018, Nal’ibali distributed 4 183 964 supplements.

Over time, the Nal’ibali supplement has become increasingly targeted to reading clubs, schools, libraries and educares, as shown in the graph below. In the second half of 2018, for the first time, we distributed more supplements directly to reading clubs and partners (56% of supplements in this period) than in Tiso Blackstar newspapers. Given the findings of the supplement external evaluation - that only 18% of newspaper ad hoc purchasers and 19% of newspaper subscribers use the supplement, in contrast with 95% of organisational recipients interviewed - this implies an increase in the percentage of supplements that are being used.

This trend over time is shown in the graph below.
b. Reading material distributed in 2018: by language

Thus far in 2018, 84% of reading materials distributed have been in either isiXhosa or isiZulu, as shown below. While the Story Powered Schools project is a major driver of this (33% of all reading materials were delivered to Story Powered Schools), this is also rooted in our Tiso Blackstar partnership and a long history of face-to-face work in Xhosa- and Zulu-speaking areas.

Encouragingly, in line with our values, only 0.4% of reading materials distributed so far in 2018 are English-only, though 96% of the materials (all supplements) are bilingual.

When we exclude supplements distributed to Story Powered Schools (97% of which are isiXhosa or isiZulu) or via Tiso Blackstar publications, and look at supplements delivered directly to reading clubs, we see a slightly more balanced picture, as shown via the contrasting charts below.

---

19 This includes bilingual reading materials. The majority of these are the Nal’ibali supplement, which includes English.
20 Including the Lesedi and Letsatsi special projects.
Though isiXhosa and isiZulu are still most strongly represented, our distribution to reading clubs is not terribly far off from our demographics regarding what percentage of South Africans speak each language as a mother tongue, as shown below on the right (in comparison). Setswana may be one area where the greatest growth could be achieved to bring our distribution in line with population figures.

Given that the investment in translation and editing is the same for every language produced, going forward Nal’ibali may want to try to print and distribute larger quantities of reading material in Sesotho, Sepedi, Afrikaans, Setswana and Xitsonga. This is well aligned to the content team’s intention of repackaging more existing reading material from 2019, and will help Nal’ibali better serve the more under-served languages.
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