

## CHAPTER VII

### RESULTS

One hundred forty AHW were included in this study who has been working in both hill and terai health post in the central development region of Nepal. The selected district in hill areas were Kathmandu, Patan, Bhaktapur, Dhading, Kabre, Nuwakot, Makawanpur, and selected district in terai were Rautahat, Dhanusa, Chitawan, Mahotari, and Sarlahi. The total number of AHW were 106 but 70 were accessible. In terai total number of AHW were 104 but 70 were selected for research purpose.

Table 7.1

Title: Duration of work

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA about duration of work.

Duration of work in years	Hill		TERAI		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
below 1 year	16	22.9	9	12.9	25
1 - 5	16	22.9	16	22.9	32
6 - 10	10	14.2	17	24.3	27
11 - 15	18	25.7	20	28.6	38
16 above	10	14.3	8	11.4	18
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

Table 7.2

Title: Percentage of CMA graduation

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA about percentage of CMA graduation.

Percentage of CMA graduation	Hill		Terai		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	
Below = 50%	18	22.7	12	17.1	30
51 - 60 %	7	10.0	13	18.0	20
61 - 70 %	26	37.1	34	48.6	60
71 - 80 %	14	20.0	11	15.7	25
81 - above	5	7.1	0	0	5
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

Table 7.3

Title: Graduation from different program

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA graduation from different program.

AHW graduation from different program	Hill		Terai		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	
1) CMA One year	53	75.7	62	88.6	115
2) AHW two year	17	24.3	8	11.4	25
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

**Table 7.4****Title: Average number of cases in a day**

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA about average number of cases in a day last year.

Average number of cases in a day	Hill		Terai		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	Number
< - 20	31	44.3	15	21.4	46
21 - 40	23	32.9	20	28.6	43
41 - 60	15	21.4	10	14.3	25
61 - above	1	1.4	25	35.7	26
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

**Table 7.5****Title: Average number of patient examination by CMA**

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA about average number of patient examination by CMA.

Average number of patient examination	Hill		Terai		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	
< -- 10	24	34.3	10	14.3	34
11 -- 20	23	32.9	17	24.3	40
21 -- 30	13	18.6	19	27.1	32
31 above	10	14.3	24	34.3	34
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

Table 7.6

## Title: Supervision by health post in-charge

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA about supervision by health post in-charge.

Supervision by health post in-charge	HILL		TERAI		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
None	42	60.0	32	45.7	74
1 - 3	18	25.7	19	27.1	37
4 - 6	5	7.1	7	10.0	12
7 - 8	5	7.1	12	17.1	17
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

Table 7.7

## Title: Supervision by district

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA about supervision by district.

Supervision by district	HILL		TERAI		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
None	26	37.1	15	21.4	41
1 - 3	32	45.7	40	57.1	72
4 - 6	11	15.7	10	14.3	21
7 - above	1	1.4	5	7.1	6
total	70	100.	70	100.	140

**Table 7.8**  
**Title: Supervision by region**

Number and percentage of hill and terai CMA about supervision by region.

Supervision by region	HILL		TERAI		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
None	39	55.7	53	75.7	92
1 - 3	29	41.4	15	21.4	44
4 - 6	2	2.9	2	2.9	4
total	70	100.	70	100.	140

**Table 7.9**  
**Title: Supervision by center**

Number and percentage of hill and terai CMA about supervision by center.

Supervision by center	HILL		TERAI		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
None	62	88.6	53	75.7	115
1 - 3	8	11.4	13	18.6	21
4 - 6			4	5.7	4
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

**Table 7.10**  
**Title: Refresher training**

Number and percentage of hill and terai CMA about refresher training

Refresher training received	HILL		TERAI		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
None	23	32.9	10	14.3	33
1 - 3	23	32.9	10	14.3	42
4 - 6	10	14.3	12	17.1	22
7 - above	14	20.0	29	41.4	43
Total	70	100.	70	100.	140

The data of CMA working in hill and terai health post were analyzed in percentage. Table No 1 shows that the duration of work in hill areas were below one year (22.9%) where as terai had (12.9%). It shows that the newly trained CMA was appointed in the hili areas. After getting more experience they wanted to work in terai region because of more convenient than hill.

Table Number 2 shows that the percentage of CMA graduation below 50% in hill (22.7%) where as terai has (17.1%) among the 30 CMA In margin 61-70 % of CMA graduation (37.1%) in hill whereas terai has (48.6%) among 60 CMA. It shows that higher percentage were staying in terai. But average percentage of CMA graduation the hill has (20.0) and the terai has (15.7) respectively.

Table Number 3 shows that one year course program in CMA in hill has (75.7%) whereas terai has (88.6%). Two year

program in AHW (auxiliary health worker) in hill has (24.3%) whereas terai has (11.4%) among 25 AHW.

Table number 4 shows that the average no of cases in a day last year, less than 20(44.3%) in hill whereas 21.4% in terai among 46. It means that the hill has low patient load. The table shows that the more patient load in the terai health post.

Table Number 5 shows that the average number of patient examination by CMA less than 10 has more in hill where as terai has (14.3%) among the 34 CMA. Above 31 patient examination by CMA has (14.3%) in hill whereas (34.3%) in terai. It shows that terai has more work load than the hill.

The data of table number 6 shows that the supervision by health post in-charge of CMA in hill was 60.0% and in terai was (45.7%) respectively.

The data of table number 7 shows that the supervision by district of CMA in hill was 37.1% and in terai was (21.4%) respectively.

The data of table number 8 shows that the supervision by region of CMA in hill was 55.7% and in terai was (75.7%) respectively.

The data of table number 9 shows that the supervision by center of CMA in hill was 88.6% and in terai was (75.7%) 163 respectively.

The data on table No 10 show that the health workers in terai got more refresher training courses than those in hill the course offered for 7 times and more was evident on the survey ; 41.4% of health workers in the terai participated while only 20% from the hill were able to attend the refresher training courses.

Regarding supervision the data shows that there were less supervision from top to bottom. If supervision is less there may be less work performance out come. Lack of intersectional supervision there may not be intersectional co-operation and coordination. The supervision plan should be formulated from the central and implemented up to the grassroots level.



**Table 7.11**  
**Title: Chi square**

Significance result from chi square statistics in each performance between terai and hill CMA.

Performance area	% of performance		X <sup>2</sup>	p.value
	Hill N=70	Terai N= 70		
<u>HISTORY TAKING</u>				
- Location	81.42	95.71	7.01	.008
-Taking medicine	51.42	91.42	27.24	.000
- How long have you been taking them	51.14	91.42	21.38	.00
-Allergic	34.28	65.71	13.73	.000
- Hypertension	24.28	45.71	7.01	.000
- Tuberculosis	42.85	61.42	4.80	.028
-Head ache	64.28	87.14	9.87	.001
-Nose	35.71	54.28	4.84	.027
-Mouth	60.00	91.40	18.67	.000
-Lungs	57.14	81.42	9.63	.001
-Heart	41.42	62.85	6.39	.011
-Ulcer	35.71	71.42	17.82	.000
-Travel out side the country	32.85	51.42	4.92	.026
-Alcohol	54.28	74.28	6.05	.013
<u>PHYSICAL EXAMINATION</u>				
-Inspection of lower eye lid for paleness, yellowness of eye or any inflammation or discharge	78.57	100.	16.68	.000
Inspect of mouth for tonsil, pharynx, nasal, dental carries, and tongue for anaemia	65.71	94.28	17.72	.000
-Inspect the chest for deformity	44.28	70.	9.38	.002
-Inspection of ear by otoscope	28.57	45.71	4.37	.036

**Table 7.12**  
**Title: Chi square**

Significance result from Chi square statistics in each performance between terai and hill CMA.

Performance area	% of performance		X <sup>2</sup>	p-value
	Hill N=70	Terai N=70		
<u>PALPATION</u>				
- Palpation to check enlarge lymph nodes	57.14	78.57	7.31	.006
Palpation of the chest wall (for changes in the (lungs)	35.71	52.85	4.13	.041
-Palpation of liver	52.85	77.14	9.00	.002
<u>AUSCULTATION</u>				
-Auscultation of infront lungs	80.00	94.28	6.32	.011
-Auscultation of back of the chest	57.14	72.85	3.77	.052
-Auscultation of heart	47.14	82.85	19.48	.000
-Auscultation of abdomen	52.28	84.28	14.69	.000
<u>MEASUREMENT OF BLOOD PRESSURE</u>				
-Ask the patient's have you ever had your blood pressure taken	35.71	80.00	27.95	.000
-Rolls up sleeve of patie- nt's garment so no materi- al will be under the cuff	74.28	92.85	8.72	.003
-Applies the cuff placing the balloon over the area of the artery	88.57	97.14	3.84	.049
Inflates the cuff 140mm above pre-estimated systo- lic fossa	84.28	95.71	5.04	.024
-Deflates the cuff slowly	80.00	92.85	4.89	.026

Table 7.13

Title: Chi square

Significance result from chi square statistics in each performance between terai and hill CMA.

Performance area	% performance		X <sup>2</sup>	P-value
	Hill N=70	Terai N= 70		
-Records ausculator blood pressure	82.85	94.28	4.48	.034
-Establish rapport with patient	71.42	91.42	9.19	.002
-Clarity of language (speak with audible clear voice)	64.28	80.00	4.2	.038
-Systemic (logical sequence of ideas)	47.14	77.14	13.2	.000
<u>INTRAMUSCULAR INJECTION</u>				
-Check kardex	85.71	97.14	5.7	.016
-Insert sterile needle at an angle of 90.degree for intramuscular injection	60.00	92.85	20.8	.000
Stapes the procedure appropriately to tolerance of patient	54.28	82.85	13.16	.000
-Response to the patient's reaction	71.42	85.71	4.21	.040
<u>EVALUATION OF JOB DESCRIPTION OF CMA</u>				
-On an average how many patient you have dealt with in a month	24.28	47.14	7.90	.004
-Do you give Malaria health service from this health post a Malaria?	54.28	72.86	5.18	.022
-Do you conduct tuberculosis clinic?	41.43	57.57	4.08	.043
-Do you conduct leprosy clinic?	27.14	54.29	10.61	.001
-Do you have the list of drop out cases of them?	35.71	60.00	8.21	.004
-Do you provide supervision to the village health worker regarding their work in diarrhoea	52.86	72.86	5.95	.014
Supervision by district officer	62.9	78.6	4.14	.04
,, regional ,,	45.7	25.71	6.04	.01
Radio listening	42.9	60.00	4.09	.04

**Table 7.14**  
**Multiple logistic regression:**

Logistic regression analysis is helpful in ascertaining the probable form of the relationship between variables, usually is to predict the value of one variable corresponding to a given value of another variable. The logistic model for the probable of outcome yields value that one always zero and one.

Total population = 140

variables	coefficient	sem	z	P-value
1) supervision by a) health post incharge 1=0, >2=1	.3882	.6584	.3477	.5554
b) district 1=0, >2=1	2.1428	.9536	5.0490	.0246
c) region 1=0, >2=1	-1.2625	.8984	1.9748	.1599
d) center 1=0, >2=1	-1.2849	.8648	2.2077	.1373
2) refresher training received 0=n, 1=y	.4120	.6831	.3638	.5464
3) Duration of work <48=0, >49=1	.7409	.5673	1.7058	.1915
4) Percentage of CMA graduation <50=0, >51=1	.3974	.8147	.2379	.6257

Dependent variable : % of performance

Total population =140 (table 7.14 continue)

variables	Z	odd ratio	95 % C-I
1) supervision by a) health post incharge 1=0, >2=1	.3477	1.4744	0.406 - 5.0357
b) district 1=0, >2=1	5.0490	8.5229	1.3148-55.2263
c) region 1=0, >2=1	1.9748	.2829	0.0487-1.6459
d) center 1=0, >2=1	2.2077	.2767	0.0508-1.5069
2) refresher training received 0=n, 1=y	.3638	1.5099	0.3958-5.7586
3) Duration of work <48=0, >49=1	1.7058	2.0979	0.690 -6.376
4) % Of CMA graduation <50=0, >51=1	.2379	.6721	0.136-3.31
Constant	5.8676		

#### Analysis :-

Logistic regression analysis to predict the strength of association between the dependent and independent variables. The best method for to analyze this relationship was the logistic regression. The dependent variable and independent variable both were dichotomous and continuous data. Five predictor variables were included to see the probable form of relationship.

**Table 7.15**  
**Title: T. test**

The following items are the mean score of both hill and terai CMA.

Variable	Number	mean	sem	p-value
duration of work	hill 70	8.4417	.673	.319
	terai 70	9.4184	.708	
percentage of CMA graduation	hill 70	52.4960	3.420	.717
	terai 70	54.1284	2.919	
Refresher training	hill 70	2.2143	.133	.001
	terai 70	2.9000	.146	

Test of significance from T. test.

**Table 7.16**  
**Title: History taking**

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA who received 60% cut off point regarding history taking in 22 items.

GROUP	EQUAL AND ABOVE 60%	BELOW 60%	TOTAL	P-VALUE
HILL	23 (32.9%)	47 (67.1%)	70 (100)%	0.010
TERAI	38 (54.3%)	32 (45.7%)	70 (100)%	

**Table 7.17****Title: Physical examination**

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA who received 60% cut off point regarding physical examination in 15 items.

GROUP	EQUAL and ABOVE 60%	BELOW 60%	TOTAL %	P-VALUE
HILL	25 (35.7%)	45 (64.3%)	70(100)%	0.7227
TERAI	38 (54.3%)	32 (45.7%)	70(100)%	

**Table 7.18****Title: Blood pressure**

Number percentage of both hill and terai AHW who received 60% cut off point regarding blood pressure examination in 10 items.

GROUP	EQUAL and ABOVE 60%	BELOW 60%	TOTAL	P-VALUE
HILL	48 (68.57%)	22 (31.43%)	70 100%	0.0002
TERAI	65 (95.86%)	5 (7.14%)	70 100%	

**Table 7.19****Title: Intramuscular injection**

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA who received 60% cut off point regarding intra muscular injection in 11 items.

GROUP	EQUAL and ABOVE 60%	BELOW 60%	TOTAL	P-VALUE
HILL	65 (92.90%)	5 (7.1 %)	70 (100)%	0.4680
TERAI	67 (96.3 %)	3 (5.7%)	70 (100)%	

Table 7.20

Title: Job description of CMA

Number and percentage of both hill and terai AHW who received 60% cut off point regarding job of CMA in 30 items.

GROUP	EQUAL AND ABOVE 60%	BELOW 60%	TOTAL	P-VALUE
HILL	17 (24.30%)	53 (75.7 %)	70(100)%	0.0009
TERAI	36 (51.4 %)	34 (48.6 %)	70(100)%	

Table 7.21

Title: Test of correlation

Test of correlation of the following items

correlations:	D1	P7	p7fr	p8	p10G
1.District(D1)	1.0000	-.1471	.1666	-.1973	-.1405
2.Read litera(p7)	-.1471	1.0000	.2286*	.2394*	.0448
3.Read freq (p7fr)	.1666	.2286*	1.0000	.0000	.1228
4.Radio listen (p8)	-.1973*	.2394*	.0000	1.0000	-.0537
5.Lack time (P10g)	-.1405	.0448	.1228	-.0537	1.0000

Correlation of the following items.

Correlation	D1	p8fr	p10A	p10B	P10C
1.District (D1)	1.0000	.1689	-.0684	.1133	.0556
2.Read freq(p8fr)	.1689	1.0000	.0925	-.0702	-.0903
3.Equipment(P10A)	-.0684	.0925	1.0000	.2307*	.2131*
4.Building(P10B)	.1133	-.0702	.2307*	1.0000	.3253**
5.Transport(P10c)	.0556	-.0903	.2131*	.3253**	1.0000
6.Many Pt(P10D)	-.0855	.0750	.1639	.0452	-.0214
7.Poor - communication(P10E)	-.0985	.0648	.1321	.0625	.0471
8.Inadequate drugs(P10F)	.0000	-.0485	.4174**	.1022	.1254



Correlations	P10D	P10E	P10F
1. District (D1)	-.0855	-.0985	.0000
2. Read freq(p8fr)	.0750	.0648	.0485
3. Equipment(P10A)	.1639	.1321	.4179**
4. Building(P10E)	.0452	.0625	.1022
5. Transport(P10c)	-.0214	.0471	.1631
6. Many Pt(P10D)	1.0000	.1835	.1254
7. Poor communication(P10E)	.1835	1.0000	.1187
8. Inadequate drugs(P10F)	.1254	.1187	1.0000

Correlation measure the strength of the relationship between the two variables, It is desired to use the equation describing the relationship between the two variables for the purposes to estimate means.

P. may assume any value between -1 and +1. If  $P=1$  There is a perfect direct liner co-relation between the two variables, while  $p= -1$  indicates perfect inverse liner correlation If  $p=0$  The two variables are not correlated.

Course curriculum of CMA

Number and percentage of both hill and terai CMA gave their attitude on relevant and adequate of the present curriculum to work in the health post situation.

\* Note for abbreviations

Relevant:- v = very relevant , M = moderately relevant  
Ir = irrelevant , 0 = no answer

Adequate:- V = very adequate , M = moderately adequate  
In = inadequate , 0 = no answer

**Table 7.21**

**Title: Health and health services in Nepal**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Irr	
A) Health and health services in Nepal	hill %	16 22.9	30 42.9	16 22.9	8 11.4	70 50.0
	terai %	9 12.9	44 62.9	17 24.3		70 50.0
Total		25	74	33	8	140
%		17.9	52.9	23.6	5.7	100.

**Table 7.22**

**Title: Health and health services in Nepal**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	in	
a. Health and health services in Nepal	hill %	15 21.4	23 32.9	20 26.6	12 17.1	70 50.0
	terai %	9 12.9	34 48.6	22 31.4	5 7.1	70 50.0
Total		24	57	42	17	140
%		17.1	40.7	30.0	12.1	100.0

Table 7.23

Title: Health and health services in Nepal

Unit within Subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
a) health & health services in Nepal	hill %	16 22.9	54 77.1	70 50.0
	terai %	9 12.9	61 48.6	70 50.0
Total		25	115	140
%		17.9	82.1	100.

The health and health service in Nepal course title shows that 17.9%(25) has not studied. 52.9%(74) said that the course was very relevant; 23.6%(33) said that the course was moderate relevant; 5.7%(8) said that the course was irrelevant. 40.7%(57) said that the course was very adequate; 30.0% (42)said that the course was moderate adequate; 12.1%(17) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.24**  
**Title: Socio culture aspect of health and disease**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Relevant			Ir	Row Total
		o	v	M		
b) Socio culture aspect of health and disease	hill %	15 21.4	33 41.1	19 27.1	3 4.3	70 50.0
	terai %	7 10.0	46 65.7	16 22.9	1 1.4	70.0 50.0
	Total %	22 15.7	79 56.4	35 25.0	4 2.9	140 100.

**Table 7.25**  
**Title: Socio culture aspect of health and disease**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		o	v	M	In	
b. Socio culture aspect of health and disease	hill %	15 21.4	24 34.3	16 22.9	15 21.4	70 50.0
	terai %	8 11.4	33 47.1	24 34.3	5 7.1	70 50.0
	Total %	23 16.4	57 40.7	40 28.6	20 14.3	140 100.

**Table 7.26**  
**Title: Socio culture aspect of health and disease**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
a. Socio culture aspect of health and disease	hill %	14 20.0	56 80.0	70 50.0
	terai %	7 10.0	63 90.0	70 50.0
	Total %	21 15.0	119 85.0	140 100.0

The socio culture aspect of health and disease course title shows that 15% (21) has not studied. 56.4%(79) said that the course is very relevant; 25.4%(35) said that the course was moderate relevant; 2.9%(4) said that the course was irrelevant. 40.7%(57) said that the course was very adequate; 28.6(40) said that the course was moderate adequate; 14.3%(20) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.27**  
**Title: Health post administration**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
c. Health post administration	hill %	5 7.1	56 80.0	8 11.4	1 1.4	70 50.0
	terai %	7 10.4	50 71.4	13 18.6		70 50.0
Total		12	106	21	1	140
%		8.6	75.7	15.0	.7	100.0

**Table 7.28**  
**Title: Health post administration**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
c. Health post administration	hill %	5 7.1	37 52.9	19 27.1	9 12.9	70 50.0
	terai %	7 10.0	41 58.6	18 25.7	4 5.7	70 50.0
Total		12	78	37	13	140
%		8.6	55.7	26.4	9.3	100.0

**Table 7.29**  
**Title: Health post administration**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
c. Health post administration	hill %	6 8.6	64 91.4	70 50.0
	terai %	7 10.0	63 90.0	70 50.0
Total		13	127	140
%		9.3	90.7	100.0

The health post administration course title shows that 9.3 % (13) has not studied. 75.7% (106) said that the course was very relevant; 15.0% (21) said that the course was moderate relevant; 7% (1) said that the course was irrelevant. 55.7%(78) said that the course was very adequate; 26.4(37) said that the course was moderate adequate; 9.3% (13) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.30**  
**Title: Community Health diagnosis**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Relevant				row total
		0	V	M	In	
d. Community health diagnostic	hill %	14 20.0	40 57.1	14 20.0	2 2.9	70 50.0
	terai %	2 2.9	47 67.1	21 30.0		70 50.0
Total		16	87	35	2	140
%		11.4	62.1	25.0	1.4	100.0

**Table 7.31**  
**Title: Community Health diagnosis**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Adequate				row total
		0	V	M	In	
d. Community health diagnostic	hill %	14 2.0	31 44.3	7 10.0	18 25.7	70 50.0
	terai %	2 2.9	41 58.6	26 37.1	1 1.4	70 50.0
Total		16	72	33	19	140
%		11.4	51.4	23.6	13.6	100.0

**Table 7.32**  
**Title: Community Health diagnosis**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
d. Community health diagnosis	hill %	14 8.6	56 91.4	70 50.0
	terai %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
Total		16	124	140
%		11.4	88.6	100.0

The community health diagnosis course title shows that 11.4% (16) has not studied. 62.1% (87) said that the course was very relevant; 25.0% (35) said that the course was moderate relevant; 1.4% (2) said that the course was irrelevant. 51.4% (72) said that the course was very adequate; 23.6% (33) said that the course was moderate adequate; 13.6% (19) said that the course was adequate.

**Table 7.33**  
**Title: Anatomy and physiology**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
a. Anatomy and physiology	hill	1 1.4	68 97.1	1 1.4		70 50.0
	terai		55 78.6	15 21.4		70 50.0
Total		1	123	16		140
%		.7	87.9	11.4		100.

**Table 7.34**  
**Title: Anatomy and physiology**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
a. Anatomy and physiology	hill	1	21	17	31	70
	%	1.4	30.0	24.3	44.3	50.0
	terai	13	41	16		70
	%	18.6	58.6	22.9		50.0
Total		1	34	58	47	140
%		.7	24.3	41.4	33.6	100.

**Table 7.35**  
**Title: Anatomy and physiology**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
a. Anatomy and physiology	hill		70	70
			100.0	50.0
	terai		70	70
			100.0	50.0
total			140	140
%			99.3	100.0

The anatomy and physiology course title shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 87.9%(123) said that the course was very relevant; 11.4 % (16) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 24.3 % (34) said that the course was very adequate; 41.4 (58) said that the course was moderate adequate; 33.6% (47) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.36**  
**Title: Pharmacology**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
b. Pharmacology	hill %		68 97.1	2 2.9		70 50.0
	terai %		55 78.6	15 21.4		70 50
Total %			123 87.9	17 12.1		140 100.0

**Table 7.37**  
**Title: Pharmacology**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Adequate			Row Total	
		0	V	M		In
b. Pharmacology	hill %		15 21.4	20 28.6	35 50.0	70 50.0
	terai %		11 15.7	40 57.1	19 27.1	70 50.0
Total %			26 18.6	60 42.9	54 38.6	140 100.0

**Table 7.38**  
**Title: Pharmacology**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
b) Pharmacology	hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total %			140 100.0	140 100.0

The pharmacology course title shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 87.9%(123) said that the course was very relevant; 12.1%(17) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 18.6%(26) said that the course was very adequate; 42.9(60) said that the course was moderate adequate; 38.6%(54) said that the course was inadequate.



**Table 7.39**  
**Title: Pharmacy**

Unit within sub subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
b)Pharmacy	hill %	1 1.4	61 87.1	6 8.6	2 2.9	70 50.0
	terai %		56 80.0	14 20.0		70 50.0
Total		1	127	20	2	140
%		.7	83.6	14.3	1.4	100.0

**Table 7.40**  
**Title: Pharmacy**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
b)Pharmacy	hill %	1 1.4	18 25.7	10 14.3	41 58.	70 50.0
	Terai %	12 17.1	39 55.7	19 27.1		70 50
total		1	30	49	60	140
%		.7	21.4	35.0	42.9	100.0

**Table 7.41**  
**Title: Pharmacy**

Unit within subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
b) Pharmacy	hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total			140	140
%			100.	100.0

The pharmacy course title shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 83.6%(127) said that the course was very relevant; 14.3%(20) said that the course was moderate relevant; 1.4(2) said that the course was irrelevant. 21.4%(30) said that the course was very adequate; 35.0(49) said that the course was moderate adequate; 42.9%(60) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.42**  
**Title: Health education**

Unit within 3 (1) sub subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
Health education	hill %		56 80.0	13 18.6	1 1.4	70 50.0
	terai %		51 72.9	19 27.0		70 50
Total			107	32	1	140
%			76.4	22.9	.7	100.0

**Table 7.43**  
**Title: Health education**

Unit within 3(1) sub subtitle	Region -	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
a)Health education	hill %		45 64.3	16 22.9	9 12.9	70 50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	39 55.7	26 37.1	4 5.7	70 50.0
Total		1	84	42	13	140
%		.7	60.7	30.0	9.3	100.0

**Table 7.44**  
**Title: Health education**

Unit within 3(1) sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
a) Health education	hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total			140	140
%			100.0	100.0

The health education title shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 76.4%(107) said that the course was very relevant; 22.9%(32) said that the course was moderate relevant; .7(1) said that the course was irrelevant; 60.0%(84) said that the course was adequate. 30.0(42) said that the course was moderate; 9.3%(13) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.45**  
**Title: School health**

Unit within 3(1) sub subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total	
		0	V	M	Ir		
b) School health	hill %	12 17.1	40 57.1	13 18.6	5 7.1	70 50.0	
	terai %	4 5.7	43 61.4	23 32.9		70 50	
Total		16	83	36	5	140	
		%	11.4	59.3	25.7	3.6	100.0

**Table 7.46**  
**Title: School health**

Unit within 3 (1) sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total	
		0	V	M	In		
b) School health	hill %	12 17.1	30 42.9	15 21.4	13 18.6	70 50.0	
	terai %	4 5.7	41 58.6	23 32.9	2 2.9	70 50.0	
Total		16	71	38	15	140	
		%	11.4	50.7	27.1	10.7	100.0

**Table 7.47**  
**Title: School health**

Unit within 3(1) sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total	
		0	1		
b) School health	hill %	13 18.6	57 81.4	70 50.0	
	terai %	4 5.7	66 94.3	70 50.0	
Total		17	123	140	
		%	12.1	87.9	100.0

The school health title shows that 12.1% (17) has not studied. 76.4%(107) said that the course was very relevant; 22.9%(32) said that the course was moderate relevant; .7(1) said that the course was irrelevant. 50.7%(71) said that the course was very adequate; 27.1(38) said that the course was moderate adequate; 10.7%(15) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.48**  
**Title: Epidemiology**

Unit within 4 (11 sub subtitle)	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
a)Epidemiology	hill %	5 7.1	57 81.4	6 8.6	2 2.9	70 50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	55 78.6	13 18.6	1 1.4	70 50.0
Total		6	112	19	3	140
%		4.3	80.0	13.6	2.1	100.0

**Table 7.49**  
**Title: Epidemiology**

Unit within 4(11) sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Tota
		0	V	M	In	
a) Epidemiology	hill %	5 7.1	25 35.7	25 35.7	15 21.4	70 50.0
	terai %	2 2.9	30 42.9	34 48.6	4 5.7	70 50.5
Total		7	55	59	19	140
%		5.0	39.3	42.1	13.6	100.0

**Table 7.50**  
**Title: Epidemiology**

Unit within 4(11)	Region	Studied		Row total
		o	1	
a)Epidemiology	hill %	5 7.1	65 92.9	70 50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	69 98.6	70 5
Total		6	134	140
%		4.3	95.7	100.0

The epidemiology title shows that 4.3% (6) has not studied. 80.0%(112) said that the course was very relevant; 13.6%(19) said that the course was moderate relevant; 2.1(3) said that the course was irrelevant. 39.3%(55) said that the course was very adequate; 42.1(59) said that the course was moderate; 13.6%(19) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.51**  
**Title: Communicable disease**

Unit within 4(11) subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
b) Communicable disease	hill %		66 94.3	4 5.7		70 50.0
	terai %		48 68.6	22 31.4		70 50.0
Table			114	26		140
%			81.4	18.6		100.0

**Table 7.52**  
**Title: Communicable disease**

Unit within 4(11) subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
b) Communicable disease	hill %	1 1.4	26 37.1	19 27.1	24 34.3	70 50.0
	terai %		19 27.1	38 54.3	13 18.6	70 50.0
Table		1	45	57	37	140
%		.7	32.1	40.7	26.4	100.0

**Table 7.53**  
**Title: Communicable disease**

Unit within 4(11) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
Communicable disease	hill %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
	terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total		2	138	140
%		1.4	98.6	100.0

The communicable disease title shows that 1.4% (2) has not studied. 81.4%(114) said that the course was very relevant; 18.6%(26) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 32.1%(45) said that the course was very adequate; 40.7(57) said that the course was moderate adequate; 26.4%(37) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.54**  
**Title: Health post laboratory technique**

Unit within 4 (11) subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row
		0	V	M	Ir	
c)Health post laboratory technique	hill %	5 7.1	40 57.1	11 15.7	14 20.0	50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	56 80.0	13 18.6		70 50.0

Table	6	96	24	14	140
%	4.3	68.6	17.1	10.0	100.0

**Table 7.55**  
**Title: Health post laboratory technique**

Unit within 4(11) sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
c) Health post laboratory technique	hill %	6 8.6	27 38.6	12 17.1	25 35.7	7 50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	11 15.7	39 55.7	19 27.1	70 50.0

Total	7	38	51	44	140
%	5.0	27.1	36.4	31.4	100.0

**Table 7.56**  
**Title: Health post laboratory technique**

Unit within 4(11) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
c) Health post laboratory technique	hill %	5 7.1	65 92.9	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	69 98.6	70 50.0

Table	6	134	140
%	4.3	95.7	100.0

The health post laboratory technique title shows that 4.3% (6) has not studied. 68.6%(96) said that the course was very relevant; 17.1%(24) said that the course was moderate relevant; 10.0(14) said that the course was irrelevant. 27.1%(38) said that the course was very adequate; 36.4(51) said that the course was moderate adequate; 31.4%(44) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.57**  
**Title: Microbiology**

Unit within 4(11) sub subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
d) Microbiology	hill %	1 1.4	47 67.1	11 15.7	11 15.7	70 50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	44 62.9	25 35.7		70 50
Table		2	91	36	11	140
%		1.4	65.0	25.7	7.9	100.0

**Table 7.58**  
**Title: Microbiology**

Unit within 4 (11) sub subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
d)Microbiology	hill %	2 2.9	25 35.7	18 25.7	25 35.7	70 50.0
	terai 5	1 1.4	18 25.7	37 52.9	14 20.0	70 50
Table		3	43	55	39	140
%		2.1	30.7	39.3	27.9	100.0

**Table 7.59**  
**Title: Microbiology**

Unit within 4(11) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
d) Microbiology	hill %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
	terai %	1 1.4	69 98.6	70 50.0
Table		3	137	140
%		2.1	97.9	100.0

The microbiology title shows that 2.1% (3) has not studied. 65.0%(91) said that the course was very relevant; 25.7%(36) said that the course was moderate relevant; 7.9(11) said that the course was irrelevant. 30.7%(43) said that the course was very adequate; 39.3(55) said that the course was moderate adequate; 27.9%(39) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.60**  
**Title: Family planning**

Unit within 5(111) subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
a) Family planning	hill %	2 2.9	65 92.9	3 4.3		70 50.0
	terai %		52 74.3	18 25.7		70 50.0
Table		2	117	21		140
%		1.4	83.6	15.0		100.0

**Table 7.61**  
**Title: Family planning**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
d) Family planning	hill %	2 2.9	45 64.3	10 14.3	13 18.6	70 50.0
	terai %		37 52.9	24 34.3	9 12.9	70 50.0
Total		2	82	34	22	140
%		1.4	58.6	24.3	15.7	100.0

**Table 7.62**  
**Title: Family planning**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
d) Family planning	hill %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
	terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total		2	138	140
%		1.4	98.6	100.0

The family planing title shows that 1.4% (2) has not studied. 83.6%(117) said that the course was very relevant; 15.0%(21) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 58.6%(82) said that the course was very adequate; 24.3(34) said that the course was moderate adequate; 15.7% (22) said that the course was inadequate .





**Table 7.63**  
**Title: Maternal and child health**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	0	Relevant			Row Total
			V	M	Ir	
b)Maternal And child health	hill %	5 7.1	62 88.6	3 4.3		70 50.0
	terai %		48 68.6	22 31.4		70 50.0
Total		5 3.6	110 78.6	25 17.9		140 100.0

**Table 7.64**  
**Title: Maternal and child health**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	0	Adequate			Row Total
			V	M	In	
b) Maternal and child health	hill %	5 7.1	32 45.7	17 24.3	16 22.9	70 50.0
	terai %		32 45.7	27 38.6	11 15.	70 50.0
Table		5 3.6	64 45.7	44 31.4	27 19.3	140 100.0

**Table 7.65**  
**Title: Maternal and child health**

Unit within 5 (111) sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		0	1	
b)Maternal and child health	hill %	5 7.1	65 92.9	70 50.0
	terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total		5 3.6	135 96.4	140 100.0

The Maternal and child health shows that 3.6% (5) has not studied. 78.6%(110) said that the course was very relevant; 17.9%(25) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 45.7%(64) said that the course was very adequate; 31.1(44) said that the course was moderate adequate; 19.3%(27) said that the course was inadequate .

**Table 7.66**  
**Title: Nutrition**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
c) Nutrition	Hill %	2 2.9	58 82.9	9 12.9	1 1.4	70 50.0
	Terai %		46 65.7	24 34.3		70 50.0
Total		2	104	33	1	140
%		1.4	74.3	23.6	.7	100.0

**Table 7.67**  
**Title: Nutrition**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row total
		0	V	M	In	
c) Nutrition	Hill %	2 2.9	36 51.4	18 25.7	14 20.0	70 50.0
	Terai %		35 50.0	24 34.3	11 15.7	70 50
Table		2	71	42	25	140
%		1.4	50.7	30.0	17.9	100.0

**Table 7.68**  
**Title: Nutrition**

Unit within 5 (111) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
c) Nutrition	Hill %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
	Terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Table		2	138	140
%		1.4	98.6	100.0

The Nutrition course shows that 1.4% (2) has not studied. 74.3%(104) said that the course was very relevant; 23.6%(33) said that the course was moderate relevant; .7%(1) said that the course was irrelevant. 50.7%(71) said that the course was very adequate; 30.0(42) said that the course was moderate adequate; 17.9%(25) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.69**  
**Title: Environmental sanitation**

Unit within 6(1v) subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row total
		0	V	M	Ir	
a) Environmental sanitation	Hill %	3 4.3	54 77.1	11 15.7	2 2.9	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	50 71.4	19 27.1		70 50.0
Total		4	104	30	2	140
%		2.9	74.3	21.4	1.4	100.0

**Table 7.70**  
**Title: Environmental sanitation**

Unit within 6 (1v ) subtitle	Region	Adequate			Row Total	
		0	V	M		In
a)Environmental sanitation	Hill %	2 2.9	29 41.4	18 25.7	21 30.0	70 50.0
	Terai %	2 2.9	40 57.1	21 30.0	7 10.	70 50.0
Total		4	69	39	28	140
%		2.9	49.3	27.9	20.0	100.0

**Table 7.71**  
**Title: Environmental sanitation**

Unit within 6 (1v ) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
a) Environmental sanitation	Hill %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 5
	Terai %	1 1.4	69 98.6	70 50.0
Total		3	137	140
%		2.1	97.9	100.0

The Environmental sanitation course shows that 2.1% (3) has not studied. 74.3%(104) said that the course was very relevant; 21.4%(30) said that the course was moderate relevant; 1.4%(2) said that the course was irrelevant. 49.3%(69) said that the course was very adequate; 27.9(39) said that the course was moderate adequate; 20.0%(28) said that the course was inadequate .

**Table 7.72**  
**Title: Community health development**

Unit within 6 (1v) subtitle	Region	Relevant				row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
b)Community health development	Hill %	14 20.	39 55.7	14 20.0	3 4.3	70 50.0
	Terai %	2 2.9	45 64.3	23 32.9		70 50.0
Table		16	84	37	3	140
%		11.4	60.0	26.4	2.1	100.0

**Table 7.73**  
**Title: Community health development**

Unit within 6 (1v ) subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row total
		0	V	M	In	
b) Community health development	Hill %	13 18.6	23 32.9	15 21.4	19 21.1	70 50.0
	Terai %	3 4.3	40 57.1	22 31.4	5 7.1	70 50.0
Total		16	63	37	24	140
%		11.4	45.0	26.4	17.1	100.0

**Table 7.74**  
**Title: Community health development**

Unit within 6 (1v ) subtitle	Region	Studied		Row total
		No	yes	
b) Community health development	Hill %	14 20.0	56 80.0	70 50.0
	Terai %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
Table		16	124	140
%		11.4	88.6	100.

The community health development course shows that 11.4% (16) has not studied. 60.0%(84) said that the course was very relevant; 26.4%(37) said that the course was moderate relevant; 2.1%(3) said that the course was irrelevant. 45.0%(63) said that the course was very adequate; 26.4(37) moderate adequate; 17.1%(24) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.75**  
**Title: History taking**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
a) History taking	Hill %		69 98.6	1 1.4		70 50.0
	Terai %		55 78.6	15 21.4		70 50.0
Total %			124 88.6	16 11.4		140 100.0

**Table 7.76**  
**Title: History taking**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Adequate			Row Total	
		0	V	M		In
a) History taking	Hill %		32 45.7	15 21.4	23 32.9	70 50.0
	Terai %		17 24.3	34 48.6	19 27.1	70 50.0
Total %			49 35.0	49 35.0	42 30.0	140 100.0

**Table 7.77**  
**Title: History taking**

Unit within 6 (1v ) sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
b) History taking	Hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	Terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total %			140 100.0	140 100.0

The history taking course shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 88.6%(124) said that the course was very relevant; 11.4%(16) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant; 35.0%(49) said that the course was very adequate; 35.0(49) said that the course was moderate adequate; 30.0%(42) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.78**  
**Title: Physical examination**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	IR	
b) Physical examination	Hill %		67 95.7	3 4.3		70 50.0
	Terai %		55 78.6	15 21.4		70 50.0
Table %			122 87.1	18 12.9		140 100.0

**Table 7.79**  
**Title: Physical examination**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Adequate			Row Total	
		0	V	M In		
b) Physical examination	Hill %		34 48.6	8 11.4	28 40.	70 50.0
	Terai %		11 15.7	38 54.3	21 30.0	70 50
Total %			45 32.1	46 32.9	49 35.0	140 100.0

**Table 7.80**  
**Title: Physical examination**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
b) Physical examination	Hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	Terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total %			140 100.0	140 100.0

The physical examination course shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 87.1%(122) said that the course was very relevant; 12.9%(18) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 32.1%(45) said that the course was very adequate; 32.9(46) said that the course was moderate adequate; 35.0%(49) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.81**  
**Title: Systemic disease**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
c) Systemic disease	Hill %		66 94.3	4 5.7		70 50.0
	Terai %		55 78.6	15 21.4		70 50.0
Table			121	19		140
%			86.4	13.6		100.0

**Table 7.82**  
**Title: Systemic disease**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
c) Systemic disease	Hill %	2 2.9	31 44.3	4 5.7	33 47.1	70 50.0
	Terai %		9 12.9	38 54.3	23 32.9	70 50.0
Total		2	40	42	56	140
%		1.4	28.6	30.0	40.0	100.0

**Table 7.83**  
**Title: Systemic disease**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
c) Systemic disease	Hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	Terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total			140	140
%			100.0	100.0

The systemic disease course shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 86.4%(121) said that the course was very relevant; 13.6%(19) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 28.6%(40) said that the course was very adequate; 30.0(42) said that the course was moderate adequate; 40.0%(56) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.84**  
**Title: First aid**

Unit within 8 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	v	M	Ir	
a) First aid	Hill %		66 94.3	4 5.7		70 50.0
	Terai %		55 78.6	15 21.4		70 50
Total %			121 86.4	19 13.6		140 100.0

**Table 7.85**  
**Title: First aid**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
a) First aid	Hill %		33 47.1	12 17.1	25 35.7	70 50.0
	Terai %		13 18.6	33 47.1	24 34.3	70 50.0
Total %			46 32.9	45 32.1	49 35.0	140 100.0

**Table 7.86**

**Title: First aid**

Unit within 7 sub subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
a) First aid	Hill %		70 100.0	70 50.0
	Terai %		70 100.0	70 50.0
Total %			140 100.0	140 100.0

The First aid course shows that 100.0% (140) has studied. 86.4%(121) said that the course was very relevant; 13.6%(19) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 32.9%(46) said that the course was very adequate; 32.1(45) said that the course was moderate adequate; 35.0%(49) said that the course was inadequate .



Table 7.87  
Title: Emergency care

Unit within 8 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
b) Emergency care	Hill %	3 4.3	56 80.0	11 15.7		70 50.0
	Terai %	4 5.7	54 77.1	12 17.1		70 50.0
Total		7	110	23		140
%		5.0	78.6	16.4		100.0

Table 7.88  
Title: Emergency care

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
b) Emergency care	Hill %	3 4.3	25 35.7	14 20.0	28 40.0	70 50.0
	Terai %	4 5.7	9 12.9	36 51.4	21 30.0	70 50.0
Total		7	34	50	49	140
%		5.0	24.3	35.7	35.0	100.0

Table 7.89  
Title: Emergency care

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
b) Emergency care	Hill %	4 5.7	66 94.3	70 50.0
	Terai %	4 5.7	66 94.3	70 50.0
Total		8	132	140
%		5.7	92.3	100.0

The Emergency care course shows that 5.7% (8) has not studied. 78.6%(110) said that the course was very relevant; 16.4%(23) said that the course was moderate relevant; Nobody said irrelevant. 24.3%(34) said that the course was very adequate; 35.7(50) said that the course was moderate adequate; 35.0%(49) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.90**  
**Title: Health post activities**

Unit within 9 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
a) Health post activities	Hill %	1 1.4	62 88.6	5 7.1	2 2.9	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	60 85.7	9 12.9		70 50.0
Total		2	122	14	2	140
%		1.4	87.1	12.9	1.4	100.0

**Table 7.91**  
**Title: Health post activities**

Unit within 9 subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
a) Health post activities	Hill %	1 1.4	30 42.9	14 20.0	25 35.7	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	43 61.4	23 32.9	3 4.3	70 50.0
Total		2	73	37	28	140
%		1.4	52.1	26.4	20.0	100.0

**Table 7.92**  
**Title: Health post activities**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
a) Health post activities	Hill %	2 2.9	68 97.1	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	69 98.6	70 50.0
Total		3	137	140
%		2.1	97.9	100.0

The Health post activities course shows that 2.1% (3) has not studied. 87.1%(122) said that the course was very relevant; 12.9%(14) said that the course was moderate relevant; 1.4 (2) said that the course was irrelevant. 52.1%(73) said that the course was very adequate; 26.4(37) said that the course was moderate adequate; 20.0%(28) said that the course was inadequate.

**Table 7.93**  
**Title: community activities**

Unit within 9 subtitle	Region	Relevant				Row Total
		0	V	M	Ir	
b) Communities activities	Hill %	3 4.3	53 75.7	10 14.3	4 5.7	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	54 77.1	15 21.4		70 50
Total		4	107	25	4	140
%		2.9	76.4	17.9	2.9	100.0

**Table 7.94**  
**Title: community activities**

Unit within 9 subtitle	Region	Adequate				Row Total
		0	V	M	In	
b) Communities activities	Hill %	4 5.7	29 41.4	15 21.4	22 31.4	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	45 64.3	21 30.0	3 4.3	70 50.0
Total		5	74	36	25	140
%		3.6	52.9	25.7	17.8	100.0

**Table 7.95**  
**Title: community activities**

Unit within 7 subtitle	Region	Studied		Row Total
		no	yes	
b) Communities activities	Hill %	4 5.7	66 94.3	70 50.0
	Terai %	1 1.4	69 98.6	70 50.0
Total		5	135	140
%		3.6	96.4	100.0

The Communities activities course shows that 3.6% (5) has not studied. 76.4%(107) said that the course was very relevant; 17.9%(25) said that the course was moderate relevant; 2.9 (4) said that the course was irrelevant. 52.9%(74) said that the course was very adequate; 25.7(36) said that the course was moderate adequate; 17.8%(25) said that the course was inadequate.

### SUMMARY OF CMA COURSE CURRICULUM

The result of the CMA course curriculum data indicated that the subjects which were not related to curative performance such as (a) Health and health services in Nepal (25), (b) Socio culture aspects of health and disease(21), (c) Health post administration(13), (d) community health diagnosis(16), (e) School health(47), might not be taught to AHW during their training period. The inclosed number indicates that the number of AHW had not studied. The above mentioned subjects were related to preventive side. In the beginning, the AHW training was given more emphasis on curative side. All the above mentioned subjects were newly introduced only after CMA program. All the subjects were relevant. Regarding adequate some subjects were not enough such as a) Anatomy and physiology(34%), b) Pharmacy(42%), c)Pharmacology(39%) d) Health post laboratory techniquc(31%), e)Microbiology(28%), f) History taking(30%) g) Physical examination(35%), h) Systemic disease(40%), i) First aid(35%), j) Emergency care(35%) were not adequate. So it seems that the course curriculum need to be detailed study for needful modification.