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Every day, girls and boys around the world face many forms of physical, sexual and psychological violence in and around schools: a boy gets beaten by older boys as a ‘rite of passage’ to adulthood; a male teacher seeks to exchange sex-for-grades with a female student; or a community member abuses an adolescent girl on their way to school. On too many occasions, such violence is tolerated by societies and institutions, including schools, and it is these forms of violence that contribute to the alarming numbers of girls and boys being excluded from schools with their learning chances under threat.

In response, UNICEF and the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), have joined forces to launch the End Gender Violence in Schools Initiative combining research, capacity building and knowledge exchange to contribute to one of the most critical education objectives today: increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, as reflected in the GPE Strategic Plan and the Incheon Declaration. School-related gender-based violence (SRGBV) represents one of the worst forms of gender-based discrimination and requires coordinated, cross-sectoral approaches and responses with a variety of partners across sectors and institutions, at national, regional and global levels. To this end, we are particularly pleased to be partnering with UCL Institute of Education, the UN Girl’s Education Initiative and governments and partners in Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Togo, and Zambia. With significant data and evidence gaps related to SRGBV, the End Gender Violence in Schools Initiative seeks to generate such an evidence base and foster effective actions to prevent and respond to SRGBV.

A major product of this partnership, this Global Review of Literature examined the latest research evidence on approaches to addressing SRGBV. The review found that research efforts around SRGBV tend to focus on short-term, local level interventions with limited attention to policies and policy implementation processes. The most promising interventions are multi-layered and address the links between violence, identities, social and cultural norms and intersecting structural inequalities. However, how to sustain and institutionalize work on gender and violence in schools and communities is less known. Most importantly, the review finds that a focus on resources and efforts are needed to build a robust evidence base that supports policy, practice, monitoring and evaluation at all levels.

This global review provides a rigorous analysis, perceptive insights and compelling recommendations, making it important reading for those dedicated to ending gender violence in and around schools.

Josephine Bourne
Associate Director Education, UNICEF

Karen Mundy
Chief Technical Officer, Global Partnership for Education
Aims and rationale

This rigorous literature review was commissioned by UNICEF, with the aim of examining research evidence on approaches to addressing school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV). While the scope of the review was global, an emphasis was placed on research in low- and middle-income countries. The review addressed the following questions:

1. What does research evidence tell us about the kinds of policies and practices being used to address SRGBV, and in what contexts, around the world? What concepts and ideas underpin these interventions, and what are the implications for addressing SRGBV?

2. What is the evidence on how interventions on SRGBV engage with education policy processes at and across national, district and local levels, and with contextual features, including political, economic and social conditions?

3. How can research evidence and data-gathering tools be used effectively to inform policy and practice on SRGBV across a range of settings?

The conceptual approach taken viewed SRGBV as multi-dimensional, including physical, sexual and psychological acts of violence that are underpinned by norms, stereotypes and inequalities and shaped by institutions.

Methods

Three bibliographic databases were searched for relevant publications, along with websites of key governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and complementary databases. Citations referenced in individual papers and known about by team members were also followed up, eliciting a total of 2,525 publications.

Findings

The review was conducted in two main stages. Stage 1 (‘light review’) consisted of a systematic mapping exercise of 171 publications that met the inclusion criteria through coding, giving a broad picture of the research and interventions on SRGBV globally. At the conclusion of this first stage, 49 studies that met additional inclusion criteria – of assessing the effectiveness of a sustained intervention with relevance to low- and middle-income countries, and/or engaging with policy processes – were selected for Stage 2 (‘detailed review’). The detailed review included examination of the research (theoretical underpinning, quality of contextualization, and methodological trustworthiness) and of the interventions (focus, design, sustainability, ecological validity), with a view to generating the analysis of approaches with potential for addressing SRGBV in a range of settings.

Mapping the global evidence on SRGBV interventions

A key finding of the review was that the majority of studies were of short-term programmes of less than a year, and the evidence was drawn from evaluations at a moment of practice, commonly at the end of the programme. Few studies engaged with policy, with most focusing on local programmes working directly with groups of girls and/or boys, usually at secondary school level, on sexual violence or young people’s aggressive behaviour. Quantitative studies dominated the global evidence base, with far fewer qualitative, mixed methods or longitudinal studies. Most of the evidence came from North America or sub-Saharan Africa, with very few studies from Asia or the Middle East. Studies in the United States tended often to operate as packaged, off-the-shelf interventions with experimental
designs of narrow focus, and gender was often one of many variables. The studies in sub-Saharan Africa employed a range of study designs including qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods. These were of variable quality in terms of rigour and reliability. Some had strengths in the quality of their contextualization, their participatory and flexible designs, or their attention to gender, sexual violence and inequalities.

Evidence on promising approaches

The detailed review identified promising evidence in a number of areas.

Work with groups of young people on gender, sex and violence:
Evidence suggests that the most promising approaches involve reflection and consciousness-raising on gender identities, norms and inequalities that shape the risk and experience of sexual violence. Single sex groups (e.g., girls’ and boys’ clubs), sometimes combined with mixed group sessions, can provide ‘safe spaces’ for building awareness about gender equality, violence prevention and redress. However, more work is needed on the sustainability of clubs or groups that are often separate from the mainstream school curriculum. Skilled facilitation is important, and needs to be sustained by well-trained and supported teachers and peer mentors. The onus of change can be placed too heavily on girls if not integrated with other forms of intervention.

Work with groups of young people on peer violence, gangs, violent crime, war and conflict:
Evidence suggests that youth gang involvement can be deterred through ‘holistic’ community-based programmes to develop critical reflection and interpersonal skills, alongside socio-economic support/training. Promising group-work approaches to bullying, including homophobic and cyber-bullying, involve reflection on beliefs and stereotypes, recognizing and regulating emotions, and communication and conflict resolution. These are more effective when combined with preventive whole-school approaches. Psychosocial interventions in war zones need to be carefully tailored to local conditions, as they can have unforeseen negative effects on some groups of children. However, much more evidence is needed in these areas from lower- and middle-income countries, and very few studies use a gender lens.

Work with teachers and schools:
Evidence suggests that teachers’ confidence in addressing SRGBV can be strengthened by supporting reflection on their own values, beliefs and personal histories; curriculum materials and training in strategies to address discrimination and violence; and training in interactive, inclusive pedagogies. Engagement of whole school communities, including leadership, in developing and sustaining policies, protocols and practices, can reduce violence and promote non-violent, equitable norms. Though evidence is weak on whether interventions targeting school infrastructure (e.g., toilets) reduce violence, well-resourced and managed schools may be better able to sustain SRGBV work – and more research is needed to establish these pathways.

Work with communities:
Evidence suggests that collaborative engagement on tackling SRGBV with parents, and community and religious gatekeepers can be effective in addressing social norms that underpin violence. Approaches that recognize positive, dynamic features of cultural identities and practices can be effective ways of engaging communities in tackling GBV. Interventions with men and boys involving reflection on norms about masculinity, relationship dynamics and livelihoods have reduced intimate partner violence – more work is needed on the impact on children. Interventions
combining focus on gender relations and economic empowerment have reduced intimate partner violence, and improved earnings and equitable relationships. More evidence is needed on integrating community- and school-based approaches.

**Legislative and policy frameworks:** Evidence suggests that there has been a large expansion of international and national policy activity relating to SRGBV, especially on bullying and corporal punishment, but there are few studies that provide evidence evaluating these processes, or the effectiveness of their outputs. The limited evidence base suggests that comprehensive, intersectoral planning across government departments needs to combine with action plans and guidelines supported by resources and training at all levels of policy enactment. Strengthened dialogues between national and local policy actors are needed to identify how to address potential barriers to implementation on sensitive and controversial issues linked to gender and violence. Media campaigns can be effective ways to address social norms around gender and violence at a large scale, with some multi-level interventions combining this work effectively with community programmes. Partnerships between Ministries of Education, researchers and civil society organizations may have potential to strengthen evidence building and use.

**District-level policy enactments:** Evidence suggests that district education officials; medical, welfare and judicial services; policymakers; teaching unions; and teacher training institutions are key actors in policy enactment, yet are mostly missing from research evidence on SRGBV. Better integration of services (e.g., one stop centres, specialist police stations), with resources and well-trained staff, and strengthened links between formal and informal child protection structures, have potential, but more evidence is needed. Critical reflection on values, norms, professional cultures and institutions has the potential to strengthen policy enactment at the level of the ‘missing middle’.

**Conclusions**

- Research has been skewed towards evaluations of short-term interventions at a moment of practice, with little long-term follow-up.
- While there is a good evidence base on violence prevention interventions with groups of children, work that is not specifically focused on sexual violence tends to be gender-blind.
- Some of the most promising interventions are multi-layered and address the links between violence, identities, norms and intersecting structural inequalities.
- Much more work is needed on how to sustain and institutionalize work on gender and violence in schools and communities.
- There is very little reflection on policy enactment processes to ensure that change is sustained at all levels.
- More attention is needed to research and evidence building (qualitative and quantitative) that supports policy development and enactment.

These key findings have been used to develop a framework of cross-cutting approaches with potential for strengthening policy enactment on SRGBV.

The framework (shown in figure 1), which is discussed in depth below in section 4.2, depicts in the upper boxes policy and practice approaches identified by the review as having promise for addressing SRGBV. The approaches are cross-cutting in the sense that they each have relevance for all the actors and institutions in the policy arc, they can be combined to address the many dimensions of SRGBV and to generate longer-term outcomes in which girls and boys have the capability to have lives free from violence.
Cross-cutting approaches to policy and practice on SRGBV

Figure 1

- Knowledge-building on strategies to prevent and take action on SRGBV through specialist training & sustained support
  - Reflection & critical consciousness on identities, norms and inequalities shaping violence
  - Climate of change on SRGBV at global, national and local levels

- Inequitable structures & institutions
  - Norms & identities
    - Acts of violence
  - Multi-dimensional framing of violence
  - Promising approaches
    - Connections across sectors, services & institutions to ensure coordinated approach with comprehensive action plans, budgets and monitoring

- Actors and institutions
  - Parents & communities
  - Government departments & political leaders
  - District officials, TTI, teacher unions, NGOs, media etc.

- Learning environment that promotes inclusive, participatory engagement in developing, implementing, monitoring & reviewing policy and action plans on SRGBV
  - Policies, laws and action plans in place and enacted to support prevention and elimination of SRGBV
  - Generations of teachers, parents & other policy actors valuing openness, diversity and confident to challenge violence
  - Generations of girls & boys with capability to have lives free from violence

- Capacity to draw on robust, contextually sensitive research evidence
  - Learning environment that promotes inclusive, participatory engagement in developing, implementing, monitoring & reviewing policy and action plans on SRGBV
As reports have proliferated on widespread violence experienced by girls and boys in and around schools across the globe, school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV) has become a major concern for policymakers, education practitioners and researchers. At an international level, addressing violence against children and gender violence have gained momentum through conventions and resolutions arising from the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) (1981) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC 1989). In 2000, the Education for All goals and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) heralded an emphasis on increasing girls’ access to education, and since then concerns have expanded to include a greater interest in gender equality and broader conceptual thinking around SRGBV to include boys as well. From 2015, these concerns about gender, violence and education have been reiterated in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In the course of the twenty-first century, there has also been a considerable expansion of laws
and policies at national levels, as well as local interventions in schools and communities, and a growing body of research documenting children’s experiences of violence. But recent reviews have lamented the lack of evidence that these interventions are having any effect in reducing levels of violence (Covell and Becker, 2011; Leach et al., 2012). One review concluded that the efforts to address SRGBV around the globe were ‘patchy and largely ineffective’ (Leach et al., 2014, p.2), and criticized the authoritarian and gendered school cultures that continue to foster violence; the lack of coordinated efforts in design, implementation and monitoring of policies and programmes; and the limited research evidence to inform policy and practice decisions.

This report addresses these concerns through presenting the findings of a rigorous review of research evidence on approaches to addressing SRGBV. Our analysis spans research from across the globe, paying particular attention to evidence from low- and middle-income countries, in order to consider which policy and practice approaches hold most promise in combating SRGBV in a range of settings.

We begin with a brief explanation of the background and the key concepts guiding the review, and then introduce the methodology used to carry it out. We then present an overview of the research evidence globally, before discussing in depth the evidence on policy and practice interventions working directly with young people, with schools and communities, and with policy actors and organizations at national and district levels. Our analysis pays particular attention to the scope of interventions, including the ways in which SRGBV is understood and addressed; the policy processes invoked by the interventions; and the nature of the evidence used to evaluate policy and practice. The review concludes that there is much to be learned from recent promising interventions addressing aspects of SRGBV in low- and middle-income countries, but that a number of important gaps in our knowledge base remain. These are hindering efforts to develop sustainable, contextually relevant actions to address SRGBV.

1.1 Background to the report

This report has been written during the first stage of the End Gender Violence in Schools initiative. This is a partnership between UNICEF, the University College London Institute of Education, the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative, the Global Partnership for Education and partners in Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Togo and Zambia (2015–2017), funded through the Global Partnership for Education global and regional activities grant portfolio. The project is using an action research approach designed to strengthen evidence-based policy enactment on SRGBV in the four countries. It will also provide evidence that will help other countries to better understand SRGBV, as well as policies and practices that they can effectively apply.1 Action research is a form of enquiry that is led by the users of the research and enables practitioners to take a systematic approach to reflecting on and evaluating their work, in light of disciplinary knowledge in the field, with the aim of improving both practice and the knowledge base (McNiff and Whitehead, 2011). The project’s approach involves working closely with policymakers and practitioners in the education sector to review the issues relating to SRGBV in their country contexts, and to strengthen evidence-based policy and practice at national, district and local levels. This literature review aims both to inform reflections by all project partners, and to contribute to global debates on how to address SRGBV and promote safe and supportive learning environments in a range of different settings.

1.2 Policy and practice on SRGBV: Definitional debates

Recent interventions on SRGBV by policymakers and practitioners have evolved from widely differing regional and local concerns about the
nature of violence in schools, and approaches to understanding gender inequality. Reviewing the evidence over a decade ago, Dunne, Humphreys and Leach (2006) noted that concerns about violence in schools in Latin America focused on gang- or drug-related violence, in Asia on corporal punishment, and in Europe and North America on bullying. Only in Africa was a gender lens used, where concerns about sexual violence emerged from work related to the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and concerns emerged about the reasons for gender disparities in achieving global Education for All goals. Elsewhere, they noted, much of the work and reporting on violence experienced by children was gender-blind. While this pattern persists to an extent in 2016, as evidenced by the search for studies in this review discussed below, there is increasing recognition that gender-based violence is a concern that spans all societies, and all socio-economic groups within them. This has generated growing consensus around the term school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV). This describes physical, sexual and psychological acts of violence, underpinned by norms, stereotypes, inequalities and exclusions. It is recognized that SRGBV violates human rights, and undermines the potential of girls and boys to learn and develop with dignity, confidence and self-esteem. This consensus building is illustrated by 58 countries signing up in April 2015 to the first-ever United Nations resolution on SRGBV at the 196th session of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (196/EX/30, 2015), with agreement on the following definition:

School-related gender-based violence

(a) is an expression of gender stereotyping and gender inequality at work in all of our societies, the reproduction of which is sustained through that violence;

(b) includes all forms of violence and threats of violence directed specifically against a pupil because of gender and/or that affects girls and boys disproportionately, as the case may be;

(c) can be of a physical, sexual or psychological nature and take the form of intimidation, punishment, ostracism, corporal punishment, bullying, humiliation and degrading treatments, harassment, sexual abuses and exploitation;

(d) can be inflicted by pupils, teachers or members of the educational community;

(e) can occur: within the school; in its outbuildings; on the way to or from school; during extracurricular activities or through the increasingly widespread use of information and communication technology (ICT) (cyberbullying, sexual harassment through mobile phones);

(f) can have serious and long-term consequences such as: loss of confidence and self-esteem, impaired physical and psychological health, early and unintended pregnancies, depressions, reduced learning achievement, absenteeism and drop-out, aggressive behaviours etc.

(196/EX/30, 2015)
The Incheon Declaration adopted by more than 130 education ministers at the World Education Forum in May 2015 laid the vision for Education 2030 and included specific language around gender-based violence in education:

“We recognize the importance of gender equality in achieving the right to education for all. We are therefore committed to supporting gender sensitive policies, planning and learning environments; mainstreaming gender issues in teacher training and curricula; and eliminating gender-based discrimination and violence in schools.”


While the term SRGBV is now widely used, it may be understood differently by different actors. For example, the reference in this term to gender carries a number of different meanings. Gender is sometimes used simply as a shorthand for ‘men and women’. However, it also describes the socio-cultural characteristics of masculinity and femininity as articulated by individuals and through cultural practices, while sex describes the biological characteristics of men and women. Gender norms impose codes about what is appropriate and ‘normal’ behaviour for a girl or boy, man or woman, within a particular school, community or societal context. As such, gender is subject to change, and varies over time and between locations. Gender is also a structuring feature of all societies, shaping political, economic and social institutions, as well as relations between individuals. Gender is often an area addressed in policy and practice, as it is seen as a particularly malleable area where power relations can be reformed, and aspects of social interaction changed.

Gender-based violence also carries different meanings. The term has been widely used in research and activism on violence against women to denote how acts of domestic abuse, intimate partner violence, and sexual violence are deeply embedded in gendered power relations, with violence used by men to maintain unequal hierarchies and enforce norms about male dominance and female submission (Walby, 1990, Jakobsen, 2014). Increasing recognition that such forms of violence are also commonplace in the lives of school-age girls has brought concerns about sexual violence into closer alignment with global agendas on violence against children (Pinheiro, 2006). However, SRGBV is not only concerned with violence against girls, or with sexual violence. Understandings of gender as socially constructed, and reinforced in everyday practice in schools, have shifted the lens in trying to understand SRGBV. This has led to an emphasis on how violence can be used to reinforce gender norms, through punishing a person who is perceived to violate them, often triggering feelings of shame and self-blame in the victim (Robeyns, 2007). Where violence is used to police received ideas of what acceptable gender norms are, male and female students who do not appear to conform may be targeted on the basis of their sex, sexuality or gender. Many acts of bullying between boys or girls that take place in schools have a gender component, often intersecting with other social categorisations, like ethnicity, religion, physical appearance or ability.

SRGBV may be most acute where gender inequalities combine with other inequalities, such as economic poverty in the case of school girls coerced into sex by older men to pay for school fees (Heslop et al., 2015), or disability in the increased risk of sexual abuse faced by girls with disabilities in some contexts (Devries et al., 2014). The UNESCO definition of SRGBV also refers to corporal punishment, in recognition of the ways in which physical punishments in school are gendered practices, often performed and experienced differently by male and female students and teachers (Humphreys, 2008). There is ample evidence on how schools themselves may reinforce violence through their curricula, pedagogies, management structures and inequitable systems (Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997; Davies, 2004). This multi-dimensional view of SRGBV, therefore, reaches beyond the acts and their effects, to encompass the causes of violence.
in everyday interactions, norms, institutions and structures of inequality. The extent to which these multi-dimensional framings are a feature of the research, policy and practice on SRGBV is a key question for this review.

Children’s experiences of violence in or around school are affected by the actors and organizations whose roles are to intervene to prevent, mitigate or respond to violence. The term policy enactment is used in this report to reflect how actions relating to policy take place at many levels (international, national, local, school) and involve many different actors. While the term ‘implementation’ describes how policy is converted into practice, often in a top-down direction, the term ‘enactment’ signals the continuous, interactive nature of activity related to policy. It includes the negotiations involved in developing policies, allocating resources, prioritizing and planning across sectors, and in putting plans into practice, which involve a wide range of policy actors at international, national, provincial, district and local levels, who may have different positions with regard to promoting or opposing policy initiatives at different moments (Ball et al., 2012). A range of ideas, types of evidence, institutional forms and power relations shape policymaking at a national and international level. Interpreting and implementing policy in a range of sites is also the outcome of engagements with ideas, evidence, institutional forms and power relations. These policy processes affect practice addressing SRGBV in a specific location. The ways in which SRGBV interventions are influenced by and shape these policy processes is a second key question for this review.

Policy and practice on SRGBV may be shaped by various types of evidence. In their formation, interventions may draw on research, already published or in the form of data from a range of participating actors, including sometimes children themselves. They may also collect data in the course of implementation, to monitor, evaluate, modify and improve their intervention. If the intervention is time limited, then data may be collected after an intervention has ended, to see whether it was effective, and worth replicating or scaling up, or to examine whether the effects of policy and practice on SRGBV will be sustained over time. While there is a considerable body of research evidence discussed in this review, there are critical questions about whether, how or why people use evidence in developing action. The ways in which evidence is or could be used to inform policy and practice is a third question for this review.

The review examines research evidence on policy and practice interventions in a range of sites – with groups of young people on sexual violence, gender norms and inequalities, bullying or peer violence, gangs and youth violence, and effects on girls and boys of war and conflict; work with teachers and school organizational cultures; work with families and communities; with local government and intermediary institutions, such as teacher training colleges, trade unions; and with national legislative and policy frameworks. Policy enactments involve engagements with ideas, evidence, institutional forms and power relations across these sites. For example, a district education authority wanting to develop a framework for teaching sex and relationships education in their schools will need to seek information about the national policies and guidance, the training offered by teacher training institutions, materials and curricula already under way in their schools, and the disparate perspectives, practices and norms within their local communities among young people, parents, religious leaders and others. A school wanting to strengthen support for girls and boys on the effects of a recent violent conflict between two population groups in the district will need to understand: the impacts of conflict on young people, and how these vary for different groups according to gender, ethnicity or income, etc.; the ways teachers may also be affected; how other schools in the district have adjusted their teaching processes and systems; how to engage parents and community leaders; and the training, resources and support that can be drawn on from the district education office, health and welfare professionals, or from national policies or action plans. These examples illustrate how evidence on interventions operates at multiple levels.

Figure 2 illustrates these relationships through a schematic web. The nodes represent sites of
A schematic web for reviewing evidence on policy and practice on SRGBV

Figure 2
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policy or practice, including interventions working directly with groups of young people; interventions working with families and communities; interventions with teachers or school systems; interventions with district education officials, teacher training institutions, police, teacher unions, or health officials; and interventions at national level to build legislative and policy frameworks. The lines between the nodes depict how we might expect interventions linking policy and practice to take place across levels and at multiple levels.

In section 3 of this report, we discuss the evidence at each node of this review, and in section 4.1 we return to this web to draw some conclusions about whether the current research evidence provides adequate evidence to join the threads of the web. In summary, our review asks the following questions:

1. What does research evidence tell us about the kinds of policies and practices being used to address SRGBV, and in what contexts around the world? What concepts and ideas underpin these interventions, and what are the implications for addressing SRGBV?
2. What is the evidence on how interventions on SRGBV engage with education policy processes at and across national, district and local levels, and with contextual features, including political, economic and social conditions?
3. How can research evidence and data-gathering tools be used effectively to inform policy and practice on SRGBV across a range of settings?

These three questions about meanings and focus, policy processes, and forms of evidence will help us to address our overarching question about how to strengthen policy and practice on SRGBV in a range of different settings.

### 1.3 The challenges of researching SRGBV

There are substantial and increasingly well-documented conceptual, methodological and ethical challenges to conducting research on gender violence in education (e.g. Leach, 2015; Leach et al., 2012; UNICEF, 2014; Parkes et al., 2013). As discussed above (section 1.1), SRGBV is understood and interpreted in varying ways. Quantitative research instruments often attempt to measure self-reported experience of violence (usually violence victimization and sometimes perpetration), as attitudes and knowledge are not very good predictors of behaviour (Leach et al., 2012). However, the terms used to describe violence vary considerably, and may not capture the meanings young people may place on violence (Leach, 2015). Since violence is deeply rooted in the social norms and conditions of specific contexts, there are particular challenges with attempts to apply standard international instruments to capture violence in different locations. For example, the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) collects data on school safety and violence, but its origin in high-income countries leads it to collect data on poor discipline and pupil violence towards other students and teachers (Mullis et al., 2012), but not on students’ experiences of physical punishments, or of sexual violence, so it may not capture or reflect many young people’s experiences of SRGBV in many contexts. Added to this, different time frames, locations, age groups, perpetrators, and types and severity of violence all make it extremely difficult to compare survey findings across locations to get a broad picture of SRGBV (UNICEF, 2014).

In addition to these definitional challenges, arguably the greatest challenges to collecting data on SRGBV concern the taboos and silences that surround many forms of violence (particularly sexual violence). A study of Action Aid’s Stop Violence Against Girls in Schools project found that in the Mozambique site, girls’ reports of experience of violence went from a very low base at the start of the project, to a considerable increase after five years of campaigning and working with girls, schools and community systems to create safer environments. Girls were more likely at the end of the project to seek help, and qualitative evidence suggested that girls were more likely to recognize and challenge violence (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). Increases in violence victimization data over the course of an intervention may therefore indicate success in enabling women and girls to report on incidences rather than an actual increase in
violence. This example illustrates the importance of looking critically at multiple sources of data to help build a picture of SRGBV in a particular context.

There are a host of ethical concerns relating to collecting data from children on such sensitive issues (see Leach, 2015 for a thorough overview). Hierarchies between adults conducting research and children being asked questions can elicit fear, resulting in children responding with what they think an adult may want to hear. Many of the studies discussed in this review address these concerns through using same sex researchers, minimizing social distance – for example, through language, status or ethnicity – and high levels of training to help data collectors create a trusting and child-friendly environment.

Qualitative researchers have addressed these ethical and definitional challenges through using a range of creative methods with groups of children (including drama, art and other participatory learning and action techniques). These approaches address power imbalances and can generate rich data to help understand the meanings and context of violence. But they may be better at eliciting general discussions about norms and practices rather than providing robust evidence on changes in broad-based patterns of violence (Leach, 2015).

Many forms of qualitative research emphasize spending longer amounts of time in communities with participants to build trust and openness to discussing sensitive issues. Some methodologies have developed to involve several repeated interviews or other research activities with individuals with a gradual build-up towards more sensitive topics (Leach, 2006). These issues are more difficult to address in one-off surveys, but recent developments in using technology for surveys holds promise for reliable, cost-effective research in low- and middle-income countries. For example, a study comparing four survey formats identified that an audio computer-assisted survey instrument, which involves questions spoken over headphones and multiple choice responses on a screen, elicited the most honest responses on sensitive issues due to perceptions of greater privacy and confidentiality, and reduced the potential for researcher errors in data inputting (Langhaug et al., 2011).

Additional ethical concerns are around safety and risk to young people from participating in the research, as well as the safety and well-being of researchers. By recounting experiences of violence, young people can risk unearthing distressing memories or placing themselves at risk of further violence if involvement in a study is discovered. Efforts to collect data from young people therefore need to establish careful research protocols that lay out processes for general support available to young people and when action may be taken to protect children who are at risk of violence (e.g. Parkes and Heslop, 2013; Devries et al., 2015).

Many studies in this review have sought to address these challenges. In reviewing the evidence, we have taken into consideration whether and how the research has used an ethical approach, and how they have attempted to develop research approaches that are both sensitive and robust in the evidence they provide on policy and practice on SRGBV.

1.4 Methodology

1.4.1 Developing the review approach

The three questions outlined in section 1.2 above concerning scope and conceptual underpinning, policy processes and evidence have guided our approach, and distinguished it from previous reviews. There are a number of existing reviews that have aimed to determine ‘what works’ in addressing phenomena that closely overlap with or have a bearing on SRGBV. Their scope has tended to be narrower than in this review – for example, focusing on interventions on specific types of violence, such as preventing intimate partner violence (De Koker et al., 2014; Heise, 2011), child abuse/maltreatment (Mikton and Butchart, 2009; Colucci and Hassan, 2014), or childhood aggression (Wilson and Lipsey, 2005; Mytton et al., 2006). Three reviews addressing SRGBV have been undertaken recently. Two focused more on examining promising sites of non-governmental organization (NGO) practice, drawing on evidence from primarily grey literature and discussions...
with practitioners (Leach et al., 2012; Leach et al., 2014). Another focused on how SRGBV policy has been enacted in four countries (Parkes, 2015). None have entailed a comprehensive global review of rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of policy and interventions in tackling SRGBV. Our multi-dimensional definition of SRGBV broadens the scope of our review to include studies of interventions on multiple forms of violence experienced by girls and boys in and around schools.

The inclusion criteria for evidence in a review undoubtedly shapes its findings. In this review we have consciously tried to expand on the criteria used in similar reviews to help us answer the questions posed. Our approach has been to include two review levels; ‘light reviews’ of articles meeting our minimum criteria, and ‘detailed reviews’ of a smaller number of articles that meet a more rigorous set of criteria. These criteria are summarized in the boxes below, and are followed by an explanation of their selection and use.

1.4.2 Review process
The review was split into five stages. Figure 3, presents the logical flow of our work at each of the stages, with further explanations about each stage set out below.

**Stage 1: Identification of literature**
Nearly all studies identified for review were published in peer reviewed journals. We searched for literature relating to SRGBV policy and interventions from 2000, when the field of work on SRGBV began to expand (Parkes, 2015). Before then the few studies that existed tended to be gender-blind.

We searched the bibliographic databases Educational Resource Information Centre, Web of Science, and PubMed using the search terms: (school* OR student* OR pupil*) AND (violence OR corporal) AND (gender OR girl* OR sexual* OR female) AND (programme* OR policy* OR intervention* OR evaluation* OR change). There will be a language bias in the review, as the vast majority of articles identified through the database searches and team knowledge were in English. However, we have made attempts to capture and review some key work in other key languages, including some in Dutch, French, Portuguese and Spanish.

We repeated the search without the final search term, but limiting the search to low- and middle-income countries (using World Bank classifications). This enabled us to identify studies that may not be specifically about an intervention but that may provide important background contextual information about the nature of SRGBV or may provide useful insights for policy in such countries. The bibliographic searches identified 2,388 unique articles after removing duplicates.

We also identified 145 studies through manual searches on complementary databases and organization websites including Eldis, Sexual Violence Research Initiative, UNESCO, UNICEF, the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative, Plan, Save the Children, the Forum for African Women Educationalists, Concern and ActionAid, and added these along with studies based on team knowledge of the field.

All articles were entered into the systematic review software EPPI Reviewer, which allowed us to manage the reviews of such a large number of articles, code reviews according to our specified criteria, and keep a transparent record of decisions made throughout the review process.

**Stage 2: First-level screening**
The first screening excluded 1,855 of the 2,525 articles that were clearly outside the scope of the study (i.e., not about gender violence, not about school-age children, not an evaluation of an SRGBV intervention, not research). The first screening was based on the title, and abstract where necessary.

**Stage 3: Screening for inclusion for light review**
A further 499 articles were excluded in the second screening based on reviewing the abstract, and full article where necessary – the majority by scope. Further articles were excluded because of a lack of gender analysis, they were deemed to be of insufficient quality, they could not be accessed, or
Resources were retained for next phase
Resources were excluded
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First phase: Identification of resources
2388 references retained from bibliographic database search
137 references manually added through other searches and research team input

Second phase: First screening
2525 references retained for first screening on title/abstract
1855 references excluded on scope from title/abstract
20 references unavailable

Third phase: Second screening
670 references retained for second screening
15 references excluded on rigour
40 references excluded on gender
421 references excluded on scope

Fourth phase: Light review
171 references retained for light review

Fifth phase: Detailed review
49 references retained for detailed review
272 references retained for background
28 references retained for methodology
58 references retained for systematic/literature reviews

References used for the literature review

Flow chart for review

Figure 3
Light review inclusion criteria

1. Does the publication engage with and make well-substantiated reference to an approach (e.g., policy/practice intervention) addressing SRGBV?

One way in which our review is distinguished from previous reviews is in the attention to policy enactment. As discussed above, we are concerned not just with laws, strategies and guidelines for institutions, but with understandings and practice across different levels. This includes interventions by NGOs or schools at local levels. Often, interventions are influenced by broader sets of ideas from global declarations or national governments, and our review is concerned with how these interconnect with and relate to social, political and economic structures, institutions, and norms, cultures and identities. We have therefore included in the review not just the small number of studies that refer explicitly to ‘policy’, but also programmes and interventions that we consider constitute the broad field of policy enactment in multiple sites.

Another question has been how to define what counts as ‘school-related’. We have not confined selection of studies to those concerned only with violence on school premises or the journey to school, since violence experienced in the home or community can have an important bearing on the lives of young people in school. For example, an education policy that excludes pregnant schoolgirls from school may render these girls vulnerable to sexual exploitation in communities. Therefore, we have included in the view evidence on interventions related to school-going or school-age young people, who are in or out of school, and have included violence that takes place in any settings of children’s lives.

2. Does the publication offer a gendered analysis (e.g., disaggregating programme effects by sex or using gender theory to analyse policy)?

One dilemma has been whether to exclude studies that do not include a gendered analysis. However, this would cut out huge swathes of SRGBV work, for example, much on bullying and corporal punishment. As discussed in section 1.1, studies in these areas have often been gender-blind, but this does not mean that gender does not play a part in the acts themselves, or in the ways actors engage with interventions. We excluded studies where there was no mention of gender at all, but included those which referred in any way to gender, including those that merely disaggregated their data by sex. This enabled us to draw out how gender may affect girls’ or boys’ responses to interventions, albeit often in a relatively superficial way. Most studies selected for detailed review had a fuller gender lens, but this was because they tended to meet our other criteria discussed (see detailed review inclusion criteria box below). This enabled the review to examine in greater depth how interventions address not just the acts of violence, but the links to social norms, including gender relations, and structural inequalities.

3. Is there any evidence of rigour in the analysis of the policy/practice approach (e.g., robust methodology/persuasive analysis/strong theoretical underpinning/detailed account of intervention, etc.)?

Another distinctive feature of our review is the way we defined ‘effectiveness’ and ‘rigour’ in analysing the research evidence on interventions. Many previous reviews have tended to understand and assess the effectiveness of interventions using fairly narrow criteria, and have limited the studies included accordingly. Criteria used have usually been methodologically based on sample sizes, use of controls, reliability of measures used, preference for experimental or quasi-experimental designs (often randomized control trials (RCTs)), and approaches assessing measurable change in a set of pre-determined outcomes, such as changes in attitudes, knowledge or behaviours related to violence (e.g., Ellsberg et al. 2015; Fagan and Catalano, 2013; De Koker et al., 2014; Colucci and Hassan, 2014; Whitaker et al., 2006; Knerr et al., 2013; Coyle, 2005). Our approach has been to expand our inclusion criteria, rating studies according to their theoretical underpinning (including conceptualization of gender and violence), their contextual engagement, how participatory a design is, and their attention to ethics, as well as standard criteria of sample size and reliability. This means the review includes qualitative as well as quantitative and mixed methodology research, which brings in nuanced analyses that help us understand how policy and practice interventions play out and whether they are successful in different contexts around the world. We were not looking for ‘generalizability’, because we consider that features of context make it very difficult to assume impacts of interventions are generalizable. Instead, we were concerned with how features of context shaped the intervention and its impact. However, we did pay particular attention to interventions that were on a large scale or were located in different contexts (for example, a multi-country study or a study working in rural and urban areas).
they were in a language that the team could not read (see Figure 3). Further explanation of the criteria can be seen in the box on the opposite page.

Some of the articles that were excluded on scope because they were not an evaluation of an intervention or policy but did shed light on the nature of SRGBV were ‘kept for background’. Notes were taken and fed into the review where they helped to shed light on the field of study. Others were ‘kept for methodology’, providing particularly useful insights into research, monitoring and evaluation of SRGBV, and hence useful for the third question guiding this review. A number of articles were meta-analysis studies, rather than studies of a particular intervention. These systematic reviews, literature reviews, best practice and policy guides were reviewed separately and fed into our overall analysis.

**Stage 4: Light review**

The 171 articles included for light review were those that met the criteria noted above. A coding system was used to record the review for each article in relation to questions 1–10 listed below. We also made notes on each article analysing implications for SRGBV policy enactment (question 10). The light review enabled us to map the broad field of research and intervention on SRGBV globally, as discussed in section 2 below.

### Questions used for light review

1. What methodology does the publication use to discuss/review the policy/practice/ intervention?  
2. What is/are the main focus of the policy/practice?  
3. What level is the policy/practice concerned with?  
4. In which country/countries did the policy/practice take place?  
5. Who were the main target groups?  
6. Who is responsible for enacting the policy/programme?  
7. Is the intervention short stand-alone or long term, sustained?  
8. How is gender violence understood and addressed in the intervention?  
9. Do you recommend this article for the detailed review?  
10. What were the implications for SRGBV policy/practice/monitoring and evaluation?
**Stage 5: Detailed reviews**

At this stage we wanted to select a smaller number of articles that we could analyse in more detail to help us answer the research questions. The box below sets out the criteria we used in this process.

---

**Detailed review inclusion criteria**

1. Does the study have **contextual relevance** to interventions globally (e.g., is it based in the global south, or working with marginalized low-income groups elsewhere?)

2. Does the study assess the effectiveness of a **sustained** policy or intervention on SRGBV? Does it include detailed discussion of **policy**?

These criteria were used to pick up and expand on our earlier inclusion criteria on rigour, including how evidence can help us understand what makes approaches effective in different contexts. Most existing reviews focus mainly on studies in the United States and other high-income countries, reflecting the overall balance of research sites, though there were some valuable reviews that pay particular attention to studies from low- and middle-income countries (e.g. Knerr et al., 2011; Fulu et al., 2014; Ellsberg et al., 2015; Leach et al., 2014; Lundgren and Amin, 2015). To have global relevance, we prioritized research from low- and middle-income country contexts. Studies from the United States have often focused on interventions that require high levels of resourcing and infrastructure, which can limit their global relevance. At the same time, there are lessons that can be drawn from them. Studies in high-income countries were included at the light review stage, but their inclusion for detailed review depended on the extent to which the study was judged to have relevance for poor contexts. This could mean a study that was working with a particularly marginalized community in a high-income context would be selected for detailed review, whereas one working with a general population was not. This helped us to utilize these studies, while not allowing them to dominate and skew the review.

The concern in this review with policy enactment (discussed in the box detailing light review inclusion criteria) entails a need to be identifying sustained and sustainable approaches. Approaches that have been developed in participatory ways are well contextualized, involve popular participation and/or engagement with governance processes over a longer period of time, and are likely to lead to more sustainable change. We therefore wanted to analyse in more detail at this stage interventions that had these features. Acknowledging the lack of literature on policy enactment, we also included articles that specifically analysed policy processes and could shed light on policy enactment. We hope that these broader criteria enable us to draw on a wide range of robust evidence that helps us address the concerns guiding this review.

---

Forty-nine articles were included for a detailed review. At this stage, articles were read carefully and analysed using a number of guiding questions, which evaluated the research methodologies used, and described and evaluated the intervention. The questions guiding our analysis are listed in the box below. The detailed review generated the analysis of approaches with potential for addressing SRGBV in a range of settings, as discussed in section 3 below.
Questions used for detailed review

1. **Methodology evaluation**
   What methodology does the publication use to discuss/review the policy/practice/intervention, and how persuasive or robust is this evidence? Discuss and evaluate theoretical grounding (e.g., conceptualization of gender and violence); practical/operational value; contextualized design; wide-ranging critical review of evidence; sample size, methods, scale, reliability/generalizability, ecological validity, participatory approach; and attention to ethical issues.

2. **Methodology rating**
   On the basis of your evaluation above, how would you rate the rigour of the methodological approach?
   High/Medium/Low

3. **Methodological insights**
   What insights does the publication provide into what kinds of methodologies for gathering evidence, including monitoring and evaluation frameworks and tools, have most potential for policy enactment on SRGBV?

4. **Insights on contextual factors**
   What insights does the publication provide into how contextual features, including political, economic and social conditions, and education policy processes influence effectiveness of SRGBV policy enactments (at national/district/local level)?

5. **Intervention description**
   Briefly describe the approach of the policy/practice/intervention to addressing SRGBV (e.g., focus, theoretical underpinning, design, implementation).

6. **Intervention sustainability / ecological validity**
   Describe the sustainability and ecological validity of the policy/practice/intervention
   i. Is there professional buy-in/engagement? e.g., action plans; training
   ii. Is it politically/culturally popular and sustained? e.g., media attention; evidence of local interest/support
   iii. Is it contextually sensitive and embedded? e.g., participatory design; local conditions taken into account in planning/implementation; evidence of responsiveness to local concern

7. **Effectiveness evaluation**
   On the basis of the overall evidence, evaluate the effectiveness of the policy/practice/intervention. Which aspects of the intervention were effective? Which were not effective? In what way were they effective (e.g., reduction of violence, increased knowledge, changing perceptions, changing norms)? Did the intervention have an uneven impact (and for which people, and in which places, was the change greatest/smallest)? What are your critiques of the policy/programme?

8. **Effectiveness rating**
   On the basis of your evaluation above, how would you rate the effectiveness of the intervention? Effective/promising/ineffective/unclear

9. **Policy insights**
   Does the publication offer insights into how policy enactments can be strengthened?
The light review of 171 articles yielded some distinctive patterns on the nature of evidence on SRGBV policies and interventions around the globe, as summarized in Table 1.

Quantitative studies dominated the evidence base, comprising 106 out of the 171 studies reviewed. Qualitative studies were a minority, comprising only 30 studies. Some studies combined more than one methodological approach; 19 used both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

In terms of the focus of the interventions discussed in the articles reviewed, approximately half were aimed at preventing sexual violence, usually working directly with girls and boys and often using some form of sex and relationships education. A considerable number of the reviewed interventions aimed to prevent or respond to aggressive behaviour, including bullying and other violence between or by young people. Only a few studies looked at gender violence in war or conflict settings, and a small number focused on
institutional interventions, such as addressing school disciplinary systems.

Work addressing sexual violence through teaching on gender norms and sex and relationships education tended to touch on many other areas – with a large number of studies combining this with sexual violence reporting and boys’ and girls’ aggression. The majority of studies addressing sexual violence through gender norms were based in sub-Saharan African contexts (38), and there were also a number on this theme located in North America (27).

Almost all of the interventions reviewed had worked at the level of the school/community (152), and few looked at national (20) or regional government (11). Only three studies examined interventions that worked at all three levels. Only four studies looked across countries, while one was across continents, with attention to international policies.

In terms of the groups that were the focus of the interventions, more than three quarters of the reviewed articles reported on interventions that had worked with both girls and boys (112), while a further 21 were carried out with girls only and 8 with boys only. With regard to interventions aimed at adults, nearly four times more interventions worked with teachers (51) than school leadership (14), which may raise questions about the lack of whole school approaches being implemented or researched (this is discussed further in section 3.2 below).

The majority of studies reporting on work with schools or children attending school were derived from work at the secondary level (113). Forty-one reported research at the primary level, and only two reported work at the pre-primary level. The interventions targeting older children were focused on sexual violence, gangs and aggression. Interventions on corporal punishment were the only ones more focused on primary rather than secondary schooling (eight).

Only a small number of reviewed interventions were led by government institutions – the majority being led by NGOs or research organizations. The majority of the interventions had been in place for less than a year. Many of these were delivered in short weekly sessions, totalling the equivalent of less than a week of full-time training, and raising questions about whether ongoing engagement and gains made would be sustained. These themes will be looked at further in our analysis.

The largest number of research studies on interventions relating to SRGBV comes from the United States. Here, as in a number of European studies, experimental/quasi-experimental designs, including RCTs, are the standard approach, comprising 55 out of the 64 studies based in North America. A number of these studies report on interventions driven by local or state-wide mandates on schools or school districts to address specific forms of violence (such as preventing date rape, orienting adolescents away from gangs or gun crime). In many of these, dedicated funds from school districts have been used to buy in an intervention from an agency, and an evaluation has been part of the process. These interventions tend to be quite narrowly framed in terms of how violence and gender were understood. Thus more than half of all the American and European studies reviewed understood gender as one of many variables in how people responded to interventions (for example, many studies compared boys’ and girls’ responses with an intervention). Very few of these studies analysed how gendered institutions, relationships, norms and identities shaped understandings, experiences and responses to gender violence. A driving force of many RCTs was identifying interventions with ‘scalability’ and ‘value for money’, as funders and governments are interested in high-impact, low-cost interventions. Hence they tend to target and measure outcomes on a particular group rather than addressing multiple groups at multiple levels. Experimental designs, where the ‘treatment’ needs to be standardized and
Table 1: Characteristics of studies and interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology used to evaluate the intervention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods (qualitative/quantitative)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy analysis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-oriented or action research</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal/sustained research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level that the policy is concerned with</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended (National policies)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (e.g. district/provincial officials, NGOs, teacher unions, teacher training institutions, police etc.)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate (schools, peers, families, communities)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main focus of the policy/practice/intervention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing boys' or girls' aggressive behaviour</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering peer violence, exclusion and marginalisation</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing authoritarian, violent disciplinary systems</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing gang/youth violence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing violence in war/conflict</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support for individuals post-violence</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence reporting and referral systems</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing sexual violence through developing more gender equitable school institutions and cultures</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing sexual violence through teaching on gendered interactions and norms, sex and relationships</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of the policy is concerned with</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended (National policies)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (e.g. district/provincial officials, NGOs, teacher unions, teacher training institutions, police etc.)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate (schools, peers, families, communities)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of studies by region</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central Asia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and South-East Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main target groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolgirls and boys</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolgirls only</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolboys only</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children out of school</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leadership</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leadership or religious leaders</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State actors at district/provincial level (e.g. District Education Officials, health/welfare services, teacher training institutions, trade unions)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level policy makers (e.g., Ministry of Education staff; Ministers of Justice, Gender, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-state actors (e.g., NGOs, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, movements, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of schooling involved</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of the intervention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than three months</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months-1 year</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer term</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine school/classroom practice/structure</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Totals often do not add up to 171 because many studies fell into more than one category.
controlled, meant that few quantitative studies reported on the messiness of interventions, and many did not give a great deal of information situating the intervention within particular contexts and policy processes.

The interventions reviewed in low- and middle-income countries were less likely to use experimental designs. They have evolved in somewhat different ways from the North American studies that have tended to evaluate bought-in interventions. They often have a remit broader than addressing particular kinds of behaviours, and more participatory research and evaluation designs. Many provide more information regarding the relationship with state institutions and policy processes, compared with the North American studies (see Table 3), and a number have more extensive discussion of gender. These studies are often associated with international aid, led by bilateral or multilateral agencies or global NGOs, and are in some cases undertaken in partnership with governments. A substantial proportion of interventions reviewed

### Table 2: Focus of intervention by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Intervention</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>Middle East and North Africa</th>
<th>Latin America and the Caribbean</th>
<th>South and Central Asia</th>
<th>East and South-East Asia</th>
<th>Oceania</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>North America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing boys’ or girls’ aggressive behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering peer violence, exclusion and marginalisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing authoritarian, violent disciplinary systems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing gang/youth violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing violence in war/conflict</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support for individuals post-violence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence responses: Reporting and referral systems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing sexual violence through developing more gender-equitable school institutions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing sexual violence through teaching on gendered norms, sex and relationships</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total studies by region</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Numbers do not add up to totals as many studies address more than one focus area.
from sub-Saharan Africa targeted sexual violence. Many of these have emerged from the health sector and concerns about gender inequality and violence that underpin women’s vulnerability to HIV and AIDS. Studies reviewed from sub-Saharan Africa were much more likely than those reviewed from North America to situate interventions addressing sexual violence within an analysis of school organizational cultures.

Only 10 studies in the review assessed SRGBV interventions in Latin America or the Caribbean. Here, interventions aiming to prevent gang violence make up a third of the small number of these studies (see Table 3). These studies tend to provide information situating the intervention in relation to the local socio-economic and political contexts (see section 3.2.3 below).

Only 15 studies from the Middle East, North Africa and Central and South Asia met our review criteria (see Table 3). Interventions covered a broad range of areas, with less attention to gang and sexual violence than in other regions, except for a small number of South Asian studies, mainly from India, that have aimed to prevent sexual violence through teaching on gendered norms, sex and relationships.

2.1 Conclusion

This mapping of the distribution of studies on SRGBV interventions draws attention to some distinct patterns. Overall, there are few long-term evaluations, with most studies focusing on interventions lasting less than a year, and with the emphasis on group work with girls and boys, making few connections to the policy processes surrounding these activities. The two regions providing most evidence differ in their conceptual underpinnings, attention to policy processes, and research designs. North American studies of interventions used robust scientific designs, but lacked the participatory, contextualized designs of studies in sub-Saharan Africa. Studies of interventions in low- and middle-income countries tended to engage with more multi-dimensional gender framings, and they were more likely than those in high-income countries to pay some attention to policy beyond the immediate level of school and community. This meant that the balance of studies included for detailed review shifted away from high-income countries. Of the 49 articles meeting the criteria, 32 were in sub-Saharan Africa, 7 were in South Asia, 5 were in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 6 were in the United States, Europe and East Asia combined. The next section of the review focuses mainly on the interventions discussed in these studies.

Table 3: Level of intervention by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Involving national and international policy makers (extended level)</th>
<th>Intermediate level, e.g. local government</th>
<th>Intermediate level, e.g. peers, family, school</th>
<th>Total studies by region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and South-East Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Numbers do not add up to totals as many studies address more than one focus area.
We turn now to reviewing the research evidence on policies and practices. As discussed above, the majority of studies focused on work with groups of girls and boys, and we begin by reviewing the evidence on these, before turning to the research on interventions with school curricula and school systems, and with parents and communities. We turn then to consider policy enactment at national and district levels, about which there is far less evidence. For each of these areas, we discuss the evidence on how interventions engage with policy processes and other contextual dynamics; how the research and interventions engage with ideas about gender, and other intersecting inequalities; and what kinds of methodologies and forms of evaluation are used to produce the evidence.

3.1 Working with groups of young people on gender, sex and violence

The largest number of interventions included in our review worked directly with groups of young
Evidence suggests

- The most promising approaches involve reflection and consciousness-raising on gender identities, norms and inequalities that shape the risk and experience of sexual violence.
- Single sex groups (e.g., girls’ and boys’ clubs) can provide ‘safe spaces’ for building awareness about gender equality, violence prevention and redress, together with some mixed group sessions – but more work is needed on their sustainability.
- Skilled facilitation is important and can be sustained through well-trained and supported teacher and peer mentors.
- The onus of change can be placed too heavily on girls if work with them is not combined with other forms of intervention.

people on sex, gender and violence, and there has been much effort, investment and demand for evidence concentrated in this area. Much of the work concentrates on sub-Saharan Africa, where efforts to prevent HIV and AIDS among young people increasingly acknowledge the need to address sexual violence and gender inequality in relationships (e.g. Mantell et al., 2006; Van der Heijden and Swartz; 2014; Doyle et al., 2010; Rijsdijk et al., 2011; Jewkes et al., 2008). Other work is oriented within frameworks emphasizing girls’ education, violence prevention and child protection (e.g., Daluxolo and Moletsane, 2015; Heslop et al., 2015; Sinclair et al., 2013; Sarnquist et al., 2014; Ogunfowokan and Fajemilehin, 2012; Parkes and Heslop, 2013). There are many other ways these interventions can be analysed – in terms of their theory of change and pedagogical approach, how the intervention is developed and who delivers it, whether they work inside or outside the school setting and curriculum, and whether they work with mixed groups, single-sex groups, or just girls. This can make it quite difficult to disentangle which features of interventions, and in what contexts, hold most promise. Our discussion of the work in this area focuses on three main features relating to the structure and conceptualization of these interventions, namely:

- Mixed groups, separate-sex groups, or just girls;
- Sex and relationships using peer educators; and
- Building critical consciousness and empowerment.

A key concern of much of this work has been the need to create ‘safe spaces’ when working with young people. The approaches that have been developed make considerable efforts to move away from didactic teaching, through adopting methodologies that shift the power dynamics away from rigid adult-child hierarchies, with the aim of creating spaces for open reflection and discussion.

3.1.1 Mixed groups, separate-sex groups, or just girls

A number of studies have identified girls’ clubs as promising interventions for raising awareness about gender roles and rights, and violence prevention and redress (Parkes and Heslop, 2013; Leach et al., 2014). Part of the rationale for girls’ clubs is the provision of ‘safe spaces’ where girls can come together to provide peer support and build solidarity (Parkes and Heslop, 2011). Clubs have been associated with reductions in self-reported sexual coercion (Bandiera et al., 2012). For example, a study in Ethiopia found that club membership led to reductions in levels of early marriage (Erulkar and Muthengi, 2009). Often, interventions working with just girls have emphasized sexual violence response, rather than aiming to change behaviour and norms to prevent sexual violence. The No Means No Worldwide programme worked with secondary school girls in informal settlements in Kenya,
focusing on assessing risk of sexual violence, verbal communication, getting help, and fighting techniques through six sessions that were two hours long each, along with three follow-up sessions at three-month intervals. Rates of sexual assault disclosure decreased and reports of using self-defence tools increased at follow-up; 56 per cent said they had used their skills to fight off an attacker (83 per cent of those said that verbal skills was enough) (Sinclair et al., 2013). The effectiveness of this intervention was attributed to the highly rigorous selection and training process for local facilitators recruited and small groups of no more than 15 girls. Although this may sound difficult to sustain, it reports a low cost of $1.75 per girl supported.

The single-sex composition of these clubs has been justified to counteract male dominance within school spaces, and to provide safer spaces to speak about intimate and painful issues. Their effectiveness has been associated with the provision of trained female mentors, who can act as role models and offer support and guidance, often assisted by manuals produced by international/national agencies (USAID, 2008). Studies have, however, raised concerns about the fairness of selection for club members, including whether the most marginalized girls may be denied entry to the clubs, how to provide ongoing support for mentors, and how to institutionalize the clubs within school cultures to enhance their sustainability (Leach et al., 2014).

The highlighted example of Girls’ Clubs in Kenya, Ghana and Mozambique illustrates how clubs may have positive effects on girls’ self-confidence and willingness to challenge violence, but it also reminds us of the significance of the surrounding social context. Clubs, often added on to the end of the school day, can be seen as detached from rather than integrated within policy enactment in education, health, welfare, and security and justice. The evaluations to date have been short term, and little is known on whether the effects are sustained following the end of funded programmes (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). Unless they are embedded within multi-dimensional interventions, the onus is put on girls to be agents of change, without a concomitant expectation on those around them.

Girls’ Clubs in Kenya, Ghana and Mozambique

The end-line study for ActionAid’s five year project – Stop Violence Against Girls in School (SVAGS) – found that girls who were members of the project’s girls’ clubs had significantly more knowledge about laws, support organizations and violence reporting mechanisms, and more gender-equitable attitudes than girls who were not club members (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). SVAGS worked in 13 schools and communities in Ghana, 15 in Kenya and 14 in Mozambique. The mixed-method study took place in schools and communities, with data collected from 2,739 respondents. Club activities included guided discussions, games, debates and drama, visits to other communities, and outreach activities. They also worked on advocating in their communities on girls’ rights to schooling and safety. Club members in Mozambique were almost twice as likely as non-club members (64 per cent compared with 35 per cent) to have reported their own experiences of violence to someone. This shows that in this context, the clubs enabled girls to translate their knowledge and attitudes into action: speaking out about sexual violence. While these findings support other studies that have identified single-sex clubs as promising interventions (Leach et al., 2014), they also reveal how the contexts in which interventions take place influence the effectiveness of these interventions. The project communities in Mozambique, not far from the capital city of Maputo, had more access to support services, information and social networks, and this may have contributed to the capacity of the clubs, in this context, to enable girls to take action on violence.
ActionAid’s Stop Violence Against Girls in School project, for example, developed additional boys’ clubs following baseline research findings concerning the absence of boys from the intervention. There is now a persuasive body of evidence on the value of engaging boys and young men in group work, with the emphasis on self-reflection on norms about masculinity and gender relations, in order to build gender equality and prevent gender-based violence. (Lundgren et al., 2013, Peacock and Barker, 2014). Though there are a few examples of interventions addressing masculinities based in schools (Barker et al., 2012), the majority has taken place in communities (see section 3.4.3 below).

An increasing number of interventions are working with girls and boys together, in light of concerns that the transformation of gender relations and structures requires engagement with both men and women (Ellsberg et al., 2015). Save the Children’s Choices in Nepal started out as an intervention to encourage 10–14-year-old boys to reflect on gender roles, norms and power, but formative research with boys at the start led to a shift towards a relational approach with community-based child clubs. Though this was a short-term intervention (weekly sessions over a three-month period), there were significant changes in gender-equitable attitudes among boys and girls who participated in the groups compared with controls – changes that were also noted by parents and siblings (Lundgren et al., 2013). While these approaches involving girls and boys together have been promising, some interventions working with mixed groups have reported boys dominating discussions (e.g. Mantell et al., 2006).

Other interventions have engaged with girls and boys in synchronized ways but involve separate sex groupings with periodic joining together for specific discussions or activities. One example is the Gender Equity Movements in Mumbai, India. This involved school-based discussions and debates on gender, the body and violence in mixed and single-sex groups of 12–14-year-olds, along with whole school activities and work with teachers and parents. Where whole school activities were combined with group work, the intervention was effective in changing self-reported attitudes to gender and violence, with girls increasingly opposing gender inequality, and boys reporting that they were doing more chores at home, teasing girls less and using less abusive language. Both reported they would take action in relation to sexual harassment (Bhatla, 2012). Another successful intervention, Stepping Stones (see section 3.4.4 for further discussion) involved a similar format of separating and periodically combining young women and men as a way to facilitate dialogue and joint problem-solving related to masculinities and femininities (Welbourn, 1995). These synchronized approaches may combine the benefits of both girls and mixed-group interventions, although more long-term evaluations are needed.

### 3.1.2 Sex and relationships education through peer educators

Another way of providing ‘safe spaces’ for young people to work on preventing sexual violence and promoting healthy, non-violent relationships has been through youth-led education, or peer education. This attempts to bypass teacher-pupil hierarchies, with the rationale that young people are better able to have frank and non-judgemental discussions with their peers about issues relating to sex. Some peer-led programmes take place outside the school setting, but those we reviewed take place largely within schools. The Regai Dzive Shiri RCT in Zimbabwe sought to replicate another, largely unsuccessful, Sex and Relationships Education trial in the United Republic of Tanzania (Doyle et al., 2010), but using peer educators instead of teachers. It saw modest changes in knowledge and attitudes but not behaviour (measured through sexual health, not violence outcomes) (Cowan et al., 2010), although results were better than the original teacher-led intervention. Another youth-led RCT in schools in Canada saw benefits to some groups but not others, with little analysis to understand why results were mixed (Connolly et al., 2015).

An intervention in South Africa worked with peer educators to develop the peer-led Mpondombili curriculum alongside teachers and nurse mentors (Mantell et al., 2006). This aimed to build bridges between these groups, where usually teachers
Peer education in South Africa

Vhutshilo is a peer education programme addressing transactional sex and sexual exploitation in South Africa. It consists of a 13-week curriculum designed for 14–16-year-old adolescents led by peer educators aged 17–19 years old, in poor peri-urban and rural areas where violence and transactional sex is a common feature of sexual relationships. The curriculum aims to stimulate discussion around the normative aspects of sexual risk, situations young people may regularly face and feelings they have. The session on which the small-scale, in-depth qualitative research study focused was on transactional sex (Van der Heijden and Swartz, 2014). The topics were felt to be more suited to a peer-led approach, aiming to undo cultural and traditional beliefs, allow peers to experience discomfort together, and foster a context of mutual help. However, in reality, the negative consequences of transactional sexual relationships (of which the young people were very aware) ended up becoming the focus of the sessions, which deemed them unhealthy, exploitative and socially immoral, and they were not given the opportunity to engage in the more ambiguous features of these relationships. Using evidence from across sub-Saharan Africa, the researchers discussed how many young women can feel they have a lot to gain, such as financial freedoms, luxury goods, social and peer respect and sexual pleasure, and less to lose from such relationships. The researchers concluded that the discussion could have been approached in different ways – for example, discussing other strategies to overcome socio-economic constraints and how to protect themselves from the negative consequences of transactional sexual relationships. They discussed how the programme needs a more nuanced approach, finding ways to discuss the complexity and different tensions around these relationships, critically engaging with the underlying values behind motivations for sexual relationships with a material exchange dimension, such as peer status, consumerism and sexual pleasure.

3.1.3 Critical consciousness and empowerment

Other interventions have worked with people who are older or who have received more substantial training and may have paid attention to creating ‘safe spaces’ through pedagogical approaches. Sometimes facilitators are experts/professionals (such as nurses, NGO staff or researchers themselves), or local community members who are carefully selected and extensively trained. Most take place with young people in community settings. Outcomes from the existing research evidence tend to be more promising than those interventions based in schools (Ellsberg et al., 2015), but they (or at least those relying on outside experts delivering a curriculum) may be less sustainable in addressing SRGBV than those working within school structures. Ultimately, it may be the underlying theory of change, training of facilitators, and pedagogical approach that are more important than the setting or facilitators themselves. For example, one intervention working with schoolgirls had a rather limited theory of change: that changes in knowledge and attitudes would lead to changes in behaviour.

and nurses were judgemental about young people engaging in sexual relationships. The adults also acted as additional support for peer educators, role models who were embedded in local services. This is a good example of a curriculum that is embedded in context, participatory in design, and addresses the social factors underlying sexual risk (including gender roles and inequalities), sexual violence and coercion, and managing abusive situations. The small-scale qualitative evaluation identified many positive perceptions of and learning from the programme, but did not assess overall effectiveness in terms of sexual violence.

Working with peer educators has the advantage of building the capacity of local young people, and most interventions have reported positive effects for the peer educators themselves, whether that is increased confidence, leadership skills and knowledge or more transformative effects (Daluxolo and Moletsane, 2015). However, this example raises questions about the capacity of these approaches to be transformative for learners, or whether there is a risk of them reinforcing established norms and stereotypes.
But the intervention did not address values or beliefs beyond sexual abuse being wrong, and unsurprisingly resulted in improved knowledge but not changes in attitudes to sexual violence (e.g. Ogunfowokan and Fajemilehin, 2012). Many interventions, particularly those in the public health field and United States-based interventions, use individual behaviour change models. These include the Theory of Reasoned Action, Theory of Planned Behaviour, the Health Belief Model and other social cognitive theories. These all have different emphases, involving, for example, the importance of identifying personal risk factors, planning a change, and personal belief in being able to make that change before it can occur. They also tend to focus on individual values, beliefs, skills and attitudes. These programmes have been criticised for failing to take into consideration the structural determinants of sexual behaviour (such as gender inequalities and poverty) that may shape sexual violence (Edstrom et al., 2002, Heslop and Banda, 2013, Kim et al., 2007).

However, many approaches that claim to use individual behaviour change models do also address some social norms and structural determinants, so lines are rather more blurred in practice. Interventions using Social Norms Approaches are increasingly popular (Mackie et al., 2014), although there are few rigorously evaluated studies of SRGBV interventions using this approach. Some interventions, particularly in high-income countries, have encouraged young people to reflect on social and cultural norms, in order to address discrimination on the basis of perceived gender or sexual identities as well as others such as ethnicity and social class. A study in schools in the Netherlands found that two-hour group sessions, held four times, on identity, culture, honour and legal consequences of honour-related violence led to some shifts in self-reported attitudes about, for example, the importance associated with girls’ sexual purity for honour, among Dutch, Moroccan and Turkish young people attending Dutch schools (Cihangir, 2013).

The most promising approaches to work on sexual violence are those that bring in an empowerment approach, and involve reflection and consciousness-raising on gender identities and inequalities that may shape how, whether and why sexual violence is enacted. These interventions are influenced by the work of Paulo Freire and emphasize deep personal reflection (often including experiences of witnessing, being a victim of and perpetrating violence). This is then situated within society’s rules – for example, about gender – and in structural inequalities that govern thoughts and behaviours. The process of reflection often involves deconstructing gendered identities that may be harmful and coming to see them as produced through inequitable structures rather than natural – a process of developing critical consciousness (Gibbs et al., 2014). Stepping Stones is the most well-known example and has been used in more than 40 countries, adapted for 17 settings, and translated into 13 languages (Jewkes et al., 2010). An RCT trial with 2,776 mostly school-going young people aged 15–26 in South Africa found that the intervention had reduced young men’s reported perpetration of sexual violence, with some evidence of reduction in perpetration of rape, transactional and casual sex, drug and alcohol misuse and depression (sustained at 12 and increased at 24 months). Reported changes for young women were not statistically significant (Jewkes et al., 2008).

There are other examples of small-scale interventions using gender transformative pedagogies (e.g. Daluxolo and Moletsane, 2015), although evidence of long-term impact is less clear. Despite the Stepping Stones intervention model being one of the most promising, the authors suggest that the limited impact on women may be linked to: a) the adaptation of the original approach (Welbourn, 1995) to work only with young men and women for this trial and not groups of older men and women too. Qualitative evidence suggests that young women in relationships outside of the Stepping Stones intervention group, often with older men, struggled to negotiate new norms in relationships; and/or b) other structural features, such as poverty, that limited women’s sexual agency (Jewkes et al., 2010).
3.1.4 Conclusion
The range of variables involved in working with girls and boys on sexual violence make it difficult to identify which approaches are most effective. However, our review suggests that the most promising practices manage to create ‘safe spaces’ for reflection, dialogue and learning (Gibbs et al., 2014). In these spaces, people work with trusted peers and social differences are reduced; participation techniques such as body mapping and drama are used to help participants speak openly on a range of topics and discuss, envisage and try out alternative ways of doing and being (Campbell and Cornish, 2010). Single-sex groups and peer-led interventions can be promising ways of creating safe spaces, but the skill needed to create and maintain them is substantial. In unsuccessful interventions working with young people on sexual violence, it is common to observe that these safe spaces are compromised in some way, through didactic teaching, moralizing approaches, unmanaged power dynamics within groups or external interruptions from untrusted groups (e.g., Ogunfowokan and Fajemilehin, 2012; Van der Heijden and Swartz, 2014). Without addressing the complex meanings and power dynamics associated with sex and violence in local contexts, there is a risk of approaches reducing rather than enhancing agency. For example, in helping girls avoid unwanted sexual advances, some interventions have reinforced the notion that all coercion is violent, making it difficult to discuss complex issues such as transactional sex, where the borders between consent and coercion may often be unclear (Heslop et al., 2015, Van der Heijden and Swartz, 2014).

The participatory approaches of most of these interventions with young people on gender, sex and violence mean that they are quite well grounded in local contexts, but they are frequently entirely separate from school systems. There is insufficient evidence on how to embed these interventions, which are often led by NGOs or international agencies, within the fabric of schools and broader policy processes, and how to sustain their effects over the long term.

3.2 Working with groups of young people on peer violence, gangs, violent crime, war and conflict

Evidence suggests

- Promising group-work approaches to bullying, including homophobic and cyber bullying, involve reflection on beliefs and stereotypes, recognizing and regulating emotions, and communication and conflict resolution – they are more effective when combined with preventive whole school approaches.

- Psychosocial interventions in war zones need to be carefully tailored to local conditions, as they can have unforeseen negative effects on some groups of children.

- Youth gang involvement has been deterred through ‘holistic’ community-based programmes to develop critical thinking, reflection and interpersonal skills, along with socio-economic support/training.

- Much more evidence is needed in these areas from lower- and middle-income countries, and using a gender lens.

In marked contrast to interventions addressing violence through group work with young people on sexuality, sexual violence and gender relations, the large body of evidence on interventions with young people to prevent and respond to interpersonal violence in schools and communities is located mainly in high-income countries and pays little attention to gender. This gender-blindness takes many studies outside the scope of this review. However, as discussed in the introduction (section 1.2), these forms of public and private violence impact on girls’ and boys’ lives in ways which are deeply influenced by gendered identities, norms and inequalities. We have reviewed studies of interventions where there is some attention to gender, although in some cases they merely consist of brief references to
sex-disaggregated findings. The interventions fall into three broad categories:

- Groups that address bullying;
- Psychosocial interventions with young people in war zones; and
- Group-work approaches to prevent gangs and violent crime.

Much of this work is underpinned by psychological theories and focuses on developing social skills and cognition, including conflict resolution and empathy, or on improving children’s mental health. As we discuss below, the evidence on the effectiveness of ‘off-the-shelf’ interventions with groups of young people in these thematic areas has not been promising, and a recurring theme has been the need for more contextualized approaches. More promising approaches to bullying, including work on homophobic and cyber bullying, combine group work with young people with work on school systems and institutional cultures (see section 3.2.1 below). Group work with young people related to gang violence, crime, war and conflict has paid much less attention to school contexts, but some studies have emphasized the importance of tailoring interventions to the specific conditions of local communities affected in varying ways by war and conflict, insecurity and inequality. With one or two exceptions, there is a remarkable absence across these thematic areas of interventions using a gender lens centrally in their work. Thus there is little evidence on policy enactment and practices to address the effects of commonplace sexual violence associated with war, conflict and gang neighbourhoods on young people and schools. However, there is some promising work on masculinities, from Latin America.

### 3.2.1 Interventions that address bullying in schools

The vast majority of studies of interventions on bullying identified in this review are from the United States and Europe, with hardly any studies on interventions in low- and middle-income countries. Bullying refers to the attempt to impose power over another person, through verbal and physical intimidation and aggression, often on a regular basis. It may be used to marginalize, denigrate and exclude young people who are perceived as outside the norm of a given group, including those seen as acting in ways that are contrary to normative gender codes (Johnson and Gastic, 2014). For example, in trying to shore up their own social status within the peer group, a boy might denigrate another boy perceived as weak or insufficiently manly. Young people who are marginalized in schools on the basis of gender, sexuality, special educational needs, poverty or other minority status may be particularly likely to be targeted (Devries et al., 2014; Dunne, 2007). Bearing in mind these links between bullying and inequalities, it is concerning that there is such a lack of evidence from low- and middle-income countries on interventions addressing these issues with young people.

Most of the studies identified on this area through our literature searches were located in high-income countries. Many of these combine a mix of group work and whole school approaches. Interventions with young people have tended to shift away from addressing negative behaviours towards building social and emotional competencies, such as how to recognize and regulate emotions, communicate with others, cope with stressful situations, and resolve conflicts (Farrell et al., 2001; Lewis et al., 2013; Fagan and Catalano, 2013; Domino, 2013). Often, programmes involve specialists working with teachers to incorporate these approaches into routine personal, social or life skills lessons (WHO, 2015), although there are a few that engage older peers to act as role models, such as the North American Resolve It/Solve it programme (Fagan and Catalano, 2013; Connolly et al., 2015). A few interventions we identified included discussions with young people about gender relations, norms and inequalities (including sexism, racism, sexual harassment and gender violence), within broader discussions about respectful relationships and social responsibility (Buote and Berglund, 2010). However, evidence on reductions in levels of bullying following these interventions is mixed (Espelage et al., 2015).

A growing number of studies around the world have drawn attention to high levels of homophobic bullying in schools (Hansen, 2007; Davies and
McInnes, 2012; Mitchell et al., 2014), although relatively few have examined the effectiveness of interventions in this area. A United Kingdom review of approaches to tackle homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying in schools concluded that the limited available research evidence supported group work with young people reflecting on their own sexual values, beliefs and stereotypes, with their discussions facilitated by teachers and outside experts. The review concluded that such interactive teaching approaches were most promising when combined with whole school approaches (see 3.3.2 below) and that these preventive approaches were more effective than intervening after the bullying has taken place (Mitchell et al., 2014).

Cyber bullying, which refers to the intentional and repeated harm inflicted through the use of cell phones, computers and other electronic media, has also been a growing concern around the world. A number of studies have found that, as with other forms of bullying, for victims, perpetrators and bystanders it affects learning, self-esteem, depression and loneliness (Chisholm, 2014). An Austrian study of an anti-bullying programme (ViSC) that begins by addressing the role of the school system in bullying prevention, before working directly with pupils, successfully reduced cyber bullying by girls and boys, and cyber-victimization of girls (but not boys) (Gradinger et al., 2015). This finding supports other studies that have found anti-bullying approaches focusing both on school systems and on group work with young people can be effective in reducing different forms of bullying (Slee and Mohyla, 2007; Mitchell et al., 2014; Chisholm, 2014). While a growing number of studies have drawn attention to the ways in which new technologies are being used for sexual harassment – for example, through boys using mobile phones and the Internet to humiliate and coerce girlfriends to have sex (Barter et al., 2009), there are few studies of policy and practice in this area (Shariff and Gouin, 2006). Much more research is needed on interventions in low- and middle-income countries on this emerging area of bullying and harassment in cyberspace.

### 3.2.2 Psychosocial interventions with young people in war zones

War and armed conflict are highly gendered, with men more likely to suffer injury or death through combat, and sexual violence disproportionately affecting women and girls in schools and communities, including refugee camps (Sharkey, 2008; Kirk, 2007). However, none of the reviewed studies addressed interventions with young people on the gendered dimensions of conflict. Studies of interventions in war zones have concentrated on mental health and psychosocial support, and have generally paid little attention to gender beyond noting that girls and boys sometimes differ in their post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms, and some studies (in northern Uganda, Indonesia and Nepal) have found that girls appear to respond better to psychosocial interventions, though in other studies that has not been the case (Tol et al., 2010). A key finding of several of these studies has been that intervention effects vary across different contexts, and between children. For example, an RCT of a school-based mental health intervention in a war-affected setting of northern Sri Lanka that used cognitive behavioural techniques and arts-based activities found that there were some effects on boys and children who had been less exposed to the war, but that for girls there was a greater reduction in post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms in the control group, who had not been in the intervention (Tol et al., 2012). The authors concluded that interventions in volatile areas need to be very carefully planned and tailored for local contexts, as they may have unforeseen negative effects for some children, while being valuable for others. Mixed results have also been found in studies of interventions in Burundi (Tol et al., 2014) and Palestine (Diab et al., 2015). Reviewing 53 quantitative and qualitative studies on the resilience and mental health of children living in areas of armed conflict in low- and middle-income countries, Tol, Song and Jordans (2013) concluded that interventions need to begin with detailed contextual studies, and aim to build on children’s resilience through work with families, schools and communities that is carefully tailored to specific contexts. They signal the importance of monitoring and evaluation to identify any unanticipated harmful impacts of the intervention itself – a point
that has been remarkably absent from most of the research considered in this review.

3.2.3 Group-work approaches to prevent gangs and violent crime

There is quite a substantial literature from the USA on violence prevention interventions that involve group work with young people on reducing violent and antisocial behaviour, with a view to preventing youth crime. Often these are targeted at particular groups of young people who have been identified as at particularly high risk of entry into crime. These may be because of individual characteristics, or because they live in communities where there are high levels of neighbourhood crime, gangs, a local supply of guns and illicit drugs, high levels of income inequality, unemployment and concentrated poverty (WHO, 2015). A meta-analysis of studies of school-based programmes identified a shift from interventions targeting single risk factors towards interventions that address several domains (Alford and Derzon, 2014). They reviewed a number of United States ‘off-the-shelf’ programmes that had been tested in multiple trials, but found that there were few replications, with relatively little support for these programmes being effective in reducing a range of violence and anti-social behavioural outcomes. A review of research on therapeutic interventions with young people already involved in violent crime found that cognitive behaviour therapy, carried out by trained mental health professionals or social workers, could reduce violence and re-offending, though some studies had high rates of recidivism (WHO, 2015). The group work attempted to help young people to problem-solve through recognizing and modifying thinking patterns that had in the past led to negative actions, and some interventions also engaged with relationships within the family and community. However, the research evidence was all from high-income countries, and the high costs of such interventions and reliance on highly trained professionals means that these interventions are unlikely to be feasible in low- and middle-income country contexts with limited provision of mental health services (WHO, 2015).

In Latin America, there have been a large number of community-based interventions with young people aiming to deter them from gangs and criminal violence (Barker, 2003). Unlike many of the ‘off-the-shelf’ programmes criticized by Alford and Derzon (2014), some of these interventions engage young people in the design stages, and have developed holistic methodologies, as discussed in an ethnographic study explored in more detail below (Wilding, 2015).

Engaging boys – and girls – in gang interventions in Brazil

Wilding (2015) undertook a qualitative study with 13-20-year-olds in a favela of Rio de Janeiro, where gang violence was intense, with multiple repercussions in the lives of young women and men. The young people were participants in two violence prevention projects: ROTAS (Rotas de Fuga/Escape Routes) and LPP (Luta pela Paz/Fight for Peace). Both interventions were effective in the use of ‘holistic’ approaches – integrating family support, social support, informal learning spaces, alongside sports (e.g., boxing) and more targeted activities to develop critical thinking, reflection and interpersonal skills, with the overall aim to engage young people at risk and discourage involvement in gang structures. Young people were involved in the design and management of the projects. Both were popular with the young people and achieved positive outcomes in terms of deterring gang involvement. However, while they engaged to an extent with structural inequalities around race and class, gender was viewed in a narrow way, primarily as a link between masculinity and violence, and neglecting the concerns of young women. The projects were designed initially to work with young men, who were perceived as at greater risk from the gangs, yet take-up of the projects included as many young women as young men. While young women were welcomed, they tended to be viewed as ‘assets not actors’ – with their presence viewed as providing a means to help the projects achieve their aims with young men. While showcasing two interventions that are in many ways exemplary, the study demonstrates the importance of addressing the gendered implications of urban violence.
While many of these Latin American violence prevention interventions have been community based, a few have extended into schools. Evaluations of *Escola Aberta* (Open School Initiative), a programme that combines cultural, artistic and sport activities with workshops on diversity, rights and citizenship held in schools opened at the weekend, noted a reduction in some forms of violence, including threats and theft (Waiselfisz and Maciel, 2003; Aniceto França et al., 2013). While, as the case study illustrates, gender bias is evident in some of these programmes (Wilding, 2015), these interventions from Latin America have a number of strengths, in their multi-dimensional conceptualizations of violence, the engagement of young people in policy processes, and in building research into programme design.

### 3.2.4 Conclusion

Considerable attention has been paid in these interventions with young people on bullying, war, gang and violent crime to the interpersonal and psychological skills needed to cope with adversity and prevent youth violence. The evidence presented indicates that for these approaches to be effective, they need to engage with contexts of school, community and the broader political economy, and much more work is needed in low- and middle-income countries. Often the interventions are ‘off-the-shelf’, lacking attention to policy processes, though the examples of violence prevention interventions in Latin America did engage with policy actors and organizations, as well as young people themselves, in the design and management of the community-based interventions. It seems, however, that there is scope for these interventions to learn from those interventions on gender, sex and violence discussed in section 3.1 above. These different strands of interventions working directly with young people appear to have developed along parallel lines, with work on rights of children (as in bullying interventions) and youth (as in gang prevention) taking a different pathway from the work associated with women’s rights, and there is scope for greater dialogue between these approaches.

### 3.3 Working with schools

#### Evidence suggests

- Teachers’ confidence to address SRGBV can be strengthened by supporting their reflection on their own values, beliefs and personal histories; providing curriculum materials and training in strategies to address discrimination and violence; and training in interactive, inclusive pedagogies.
- Engaging whole school communities (including their leadership) in developing and sustaining policies, protocol and practices, can reduce violence and promote non-violent, equitable norms.
- Though evidence is weak on whether interventions targeting school infrastructure (e.g., toilets) reduce violence, well-resourced and managed schools may be better able to sustain SRGBV work – more research is needed to establish the pathways.

While some of the group work with girls and boys discussed above in sections 3.1 and 3.2 takes place on the school premises, apart from the work on bullying most of these programmes appeared to have little engagement with school policies and practices, and often they were led by ‘outsiders’ – NGO workers or experts with specialist skills. Sometimes the distinction from the mainstream school curriculum and teaching approaches appeared to contribute to their effectiveness. For example, the young people valued distinct spaces away from the usual routines and hierarchies to discuss and reflect on issues relating to SRGBV, and the creative curricula and specialist expertise of trainers. But there are major questions about the sustainability of approaches that are not closely integrated within the everyday life of schools. In this section, we turn to SRGBV interventions that
are part and parcel of school life, including:

- interventions with teachers; and
- school systems: whole school approaches.

The review findings on policy and practice in schools indicate that there is a need for more robust evidence on interventions with teachers on SRGBV and on the effectiveness of whole school approaches that work across different levels of school management, policy and practice. There are a number of studies that show how, in particular contexts, interventions with teachers and school communities can make a difference to SRGBV, including corporal punishment in schools. Some of this work engages with policy at the level of the school, but often the school-based work is somewhat disconnected from broader policy processes, and more work is needed on translating and implementing national laws and policies at regional or district level, or into school practices.

### 3.3.1 Working with teachers

While above (sections 3.1 and 3.2), we discussed a large literature on the content of group training with girls and boys on SRGBV, much less attention has been paid to working with teachers on these issues. This is particularly concerning because of the evidence on how teachers, even when not overtly condoning violence, perpetuate gender violence through reinforcing prejudice and stereotypes (Humphreys, 2008). Some forms of violence may be seen as legitimate by teachers. For example, many studies have found widespread support among teachers for corporal punishment, which is seen as a necessary component of education, leading to resistance to legislation or school policies banning physical punishment (Morrow and Singh, 2015; Tao, 2015). Teaching about sex and relationships with young people (beyond abstinence) may be contrary to religious or cultural beliefs about sex outside marriage.

A Canadian study of cyber bullying and cyber harassment identified a ‘wall of silence’ among teachers and school administrators, in which fears of litigation and lack of knowledge about the complexity of bullying, with intersecting influences of race, gender, sexual orientation and (dis)ability, prevented teachers from intervening in cases of cyber violence even when school policies were in place (Shariff and Gouin, 2006). This study illustrates how even where there are laws and policies in place at national and school levels, it may be extremely difficult for teachers to enact these in their everyday classroom practices.

A number of studies have addressed these concerns through examining how teachers can be supported to talk about personal, sensitive and difficult topics with young people. Teachers in Mexico who received 40 hours training in interactive pedagogies were later able to tackle difficult subjects like gender norms and risky sexual behaviour in elementary school life skills classes (Pick et al., 2007). A study in a Colombian city affected by high levels of violence and marginalization found that an intervention with preschool and primary school teachers, that involved workshops on teaching skills in violence prevention (promoting cooperation, managing violence, respecting difference and self-esteem) along with group counselling for teachers and caregivers, was effective in reducing boys’ and girls’ aggression three years later (Duque et al., 2007). The work with teachers and parents took place over the course of a year. In contrast, an intervention in Uganda that used a cascade approach providing a week’s training to teachers, who were then tasked with tackling sex education in after-school classes had limited effectiveness, and the researchers concluded that more attention to the educational context was needed (Rijsdijk et al., 2011). There are occasional examples of promising low-cost short interventions with school staff. For example, an intervention involving training high school cricket coaches in India (2015; Miller et al., 2014) and athletics coaches in the United States (Jaime et al., 2015) has shown some promise in influencing young men’s attitudes over the short term. This involved minimal training (1 hour in the United States, and 12 hours in India) for coaches in using scripted cards as a way of intervening when young athletes use misogynist or sexually abusive language. Notably, however, when the intervention was adapted from the United States to India, the training was extended to work with cricket coaches on their own gendered attitudes, with provision of scripts alone not...
In training teachers to talk about sexual violence with girls in South Africa, Dreyer et al. (2001) found it necessary to work first with teachers on their own personal experiences and histories of violence. Chege, in Kenya, also found that memory work with student teachers enabled them to reflect on violence in their own childhoods, and to use these reflections to reconstruct non-violent teaching approaches (Chege, 2006). Although working with university student peer educators rather than teachers, another study found that a week-long workshop where the first three days were spent understanding and reflecting on own experiences of gender violence and then two days developing a school curriculum addressing sexual violence had a transformative effect on those involved, though it is not clear how much they were then able to put these experiences into practice in their professional work (Daluxolo and Moletsane, 2015).

The strongest evidence of effective teaching approaches in our review came from interventions that shifted away from education as knowledge transmission, in which there is a one-way transfer of information from teacher to students, to more dialogic, negotiated pedagogies, as in the highlighted example below.

Several studies have explored methodologies for working with teachers, in enabling them to reflect on their own experiences and perspectives of violence. Interventions with teachers in South Africa have used video-making workshops to encourage teachers to reflect collectively on gender violence in their schools and communities through making and editing films, which they then use to stimulate community discussions (Moletsane et al., 2015; de Lange and Mitchell, 2014). Others have explored how to use curriculum texts to facilitate children's learning on gender inequalities and violence. For example, two South African studies have involved teacher researchers in attempting to build critical literacy into their classes, through developing carefully designed worksheets that invite children to question scenarios in sexist advertising material (Ralfe, 2009) or stories about violence (Balfour, 2003). While both interventions met with some success in raising awareness about gender inequality, a key learning from Ralfe's study was the importance of tailoring an intervention to the local contexts. The working class school in which her intervention took considered sufficient to changing practices (Miller et al., 2014).

Inviting Backchat

McLaughlin et al. (2015) undertook a three-year action research project across 16 primary schools that brought into dialogue teachers and pupils and other adult stakeholders in developing a Sex and Relationships Education curriculum in schools in Kenya, Ghana, Swaziland, Botswana, South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania. Key to the success of the intervention was allowing an extended period time for discussion and reflection on deeply held beliefs. After an initial phase of listening to and feeding back children's concerns to adult stakeholders, teachers led ‘curriculum development groups’ with pupils, parents, community members and an NGO representative, and they co-constructed a curriculum embedded in local context, with the help of a toolkit designed by the researcher. Topics emerging included seduction, gender roles, abuses of power through transactional sex, rape and sugar daddies, and gender bullying or ‘eve-teasing’. Teaching approaches shifted from mechanistic/moralistic/fact-based approaches to sexuality education, to more relational approaches, based on problem-solving about dilemmas. Each lesson was trialled by pupils, and revised following their feedback. The authors report that deep shifts in perception occurred among pupils and adults, who realized that the young people had worthwhile knowledge and could be taken seriously. While external facilitation was important in constructing these participatory spaces, the engagement of teachers, pupils and community members as catalysts for change over a three-year period strengthened the sustainability of the approach within these communities.
place was severely under-resourced, and the Grade 9 pupils lacked the basic literacy skills needed to read critically. Structural inequalities hampered the efficacy of her attempts to teach using a critical literacy approach.

While more research evidence is needed on the teaching approaches that hold most promise in tackling SRGBV, the evidence presented here demonstrates that working with teachers to reflect on their own attitudes, and on the influences of broader policies, structural inequalities and norms on relationships within their classrooms, can help them to gain skills and confidence to influence how young people engage with forms of violence. However, shifts in teachers’ classroom practices to prevent gender discrimination and violence are unlikely to be sustained without ongoing support through policies and plans and school-wide interventions that offer training, curriculum materials, and engagement with broader school communities.

3.3.2 Whole school approaches

Using systemic change in schools to address SRGBV has been viewed in two very different ways in previous reviews. Some reviews (e.g. Mitchell et al., 2014, on LGBT bullying) and guidance notes (e.g. Fancy and McAslan Fraser, 2014; Mitchell et al., 2014) have advocated ‘whole school approaches’ that address areas such as leadership, policy development, curriculum planning, school ethos, pupil voice and partnerships with parents and local communities. Others are more doubtful about schools as sites for SRGBV interventions. Reviewing interventions on violence against women and girls, Ellsberg et al. (2015) conclude that the lack of robust, quantitative studies means that evidence on school-based programmes from high-income countries ‘has not been encouraging’ (none of the interventions in low- and middle-income countries met their criteria for inclusion). Fulu (2014) concludes that there is insufficient evidence about school interventions on violence against women and girls to make recommendations. Leach, Dunne and Salvi (2014) distinguish between what they term ‘whole school’ versus ‘violence only’ SRGBV programmes, concluding that whole school approaches (that embed SRGBV issues within a broader programme of educational support) may have more lasting impact, but may risk diffusion and be more difficult to manage than programmes focusing directly on SRGBV, since the intervention is working at multiple levels simultaneously. However, they admit that the evidence here is limited.

A key drawback appears to be the lack of robust research evidence for either side of this discussion. There is an intuitive logic to the notion that working at multiple levels in a school will have a greater impact on SRGBV. However, proving that this is the case is complex, entailing close examination of multiple pathways for change – and there are few studies that examine this. There are some qualitative studies and a small number of RCTs that begin to unpack how whole school approaches might be effective ways to deal with SRGBV.

Several studies have looked at how a school ethos may be established that enables children to feel safe. A UNICEF global evaluation of child-friendly schools in 2009 found that students, and particularly female students, felt safer and more supported in such schools (UNICEF, 2009). These child-friendly schools focused and promoted five principles: i) inclusive, ii) effective for learning, iii) healthy and protective of children, iv) gender sensitive, and v) involved with children, families and communities. Evaluations of UNICEF’s Rights Respecting Schools, which work in conflict or post-conflict settings to develop awareness of rights and respect in relationships across the school community, have found positive effects over several years on children’s self-esteem, conflict-resolution approaches and attitudes to diversity, including ethnicity, religion and disability, though the evaluation did not explore attitudes to gender (Davies, 2008, Sebba and Robinson, 2010). An Australian study compared schools on the basis of their ‘school connectedness’, meaning the extent to which students felt safe and supported at school (Chapman et al., 2014). This found that young people in ‘connected schools’, where there were clear norms, values and boundaries relating to unsafe behaviour among students, teachers and the wider school environment,
were more willing to protect their friends from risky behaviours, such as fighting and excessive alcohol use. A study in Spain found that a dialogic process bringing in different perspectives at school level (including girls, boys, mothers and fathers, teachers and experts) through a task group on SRGBV challenged negative normalized practices (Oliver et al., 2009). For example, rather than dismissing a case perceived as minor sexual harassment, teachers in the task team were more likely to intervene and develop strategies following discussions that enabled them to see how others felt. Collaboration and solidarity contributed to strengthening the capacity of school members to intervene on SRGBV. A review of school-based support for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender pupils in the United States concluded that the most promising approaches combined anti-harassment policies in school, supportive teachers willing to take action on violence and harassment, and gay/straight alliances, in the form of after-school clubs (Hansen, 2007). While these studies show how addressing school ethos systemically can enable children to feel safe and supported, they have not demonstrated clear reductions in levels of violence and they are nested in a range of different policy environments, often in high-income countries. One recent study (Devries et al., 2015), however, has shown how an intervention led by an NGO in Uganda that sets out to build a whole school approach to violence prevention has led to significant reductions in use of corporal punishment.

The Good Schools study offers pointers about the support that might be needed to help a school develop a whole school approach to counter violence. In this case, the support came from NGO staff with specialist training, with initial workshops followed up by regular phone or face to face ongoing support, and monitoring throughout the 18-month intervention period.

An Australian study used monthly meetings between researchers and school leaders to develop an action research approach to preventing youth crime (Reid, 2009). Building the ‘emotional capital’ of the school leaders, and offering a set of practical scenarios for how to deal with difficult situations, were viewed as valuable ways to strengthen school leadership on these issues. These studies caution against quick-fix training approaches, signalling the importance of creating spaces for ongoing discussion and reflection among teachers, school management and other members of school communities as they attempt to change their practices.

**The Good School Toolkit in Uganda**

Using a randomised control trial with 3820 children in 42 primary schools in Luwero District, Uganda, Devries et al. (2015) explored the effects of the Good School Toolkit, an intervention led by a Uganda NGO, Raising Voices. The Toolkit has six steps, to take schools through a process of change, which includes developing an action plan following initial information gathering with the school community (including teachers, parents and children), and activity guides related to creating a better learning environment, respecting each other, understanding power relationships, using non-violent discipline, and how to improve teaching techniques. Raising Voices staff members provided one-to-one support to two teacher protagonists and at least two student protagonists per school. The Good Schools Study found that over an 18-month period, violence by teachers in intervention schools reduced considerably. For example, past week violence was lower in the intervention (31 per cent) than the control schools (48 per cent, p<0.0001). The Toolkit was highly effective for both sexes, but the effects were more marked for boys. It is unclear why the programme appears to have been more effective for boys, but the authors surmise that it may have been linked to gender-differentiated punishments, with boys less likely to be punished for fighting in school, while girls’ household chores continued to result in lateness and tiredness at school, and subsequent punishment. However, more research is needed to understand these pathways.
Another study addressed vulnerability to HIV and violence through developing a whole school approach to sex education. The Primary School Action for Better Health project worked in more than 2,000 schools in Kenya and facilitated training and school action plan development with schools, community and religious leadership, students and parents to develop participatory school action plans. The intervention involved further training with teachers on sexuality education and other school-based initiatives such as question boxes, information corners, health clubs and interschool competitions. District Education Officers were supported in monitoring duties and teacher training institutions were also involved in training. Whilst there were some positive outcomes, such as pupils reporting delaying sex, teachers continued to struggle to discuss condoms, as they saw it as going against church teaching. They also identified that addressing the connection between girls’ experience of poverty and their vulnerability to early sex, and addressing silences around sexuality, required engagement from the broader community and were crucial to the success of such interventions (ODI, 2003).

Many of the studies on whole school approaches to addressing violence have focused on children’s rights, without a gendered analysis. There are, however, studies that consider how gender suffuses school disciplinary systems. For example, a qualitative study in four schools in Botswana described how male and female teachers used corporal punishment routinely to exert their masculine authority, with male teachers sometimes using it less than female teachers, because the students perceived men as carrying inherent authority – so just having a cane nearby was enough to instil discipline for men but not for women (Humphreys, 2008). Other studies have examined how to develop and evaluate gender-friendly schools, such as CARE’s Common Indicators Framework, that looks at attainment, equality (including gender-sensitive perceptions of teachers, children and school communities), quality (learning environment and pedagogies) and empowerment (girls’ agency, strategic relations, structural environment) (Miske et al., 2010). One study that used a clear gender lens was a small-scale investigation of the effectiveness of school policy and curriculum in ‘undoing gender’ in a school in Zambia (Bajaj, 2009). The study compared a low-cost non-governmental private secondary school with a government school and found that in the private school, pupils were less likely to hold attitudes supporting wife beating, defilement and early marriage. These findings were attributed to the school’s ethos and leadership valuing equity, non-violence, peace and social justice; the single-sex campuses, which enabled girls and boys to take on less gender-stereotyped roles (such as boys cleaning, girls drumming); and assemblies and curricula time devoted to human values and rights. While these elements appear to have influenced the norms, sub-culture and identities within the school, links with the community outside school appear to have been weak. For example, the authors describe the school as an ‘oasis of safety’, from which girls were reluctant to return home at weekends. They also view the effectiveness of the school to be partly attributed to the better conditions for teachers, longer teaching days and smaller class sizes in comparison with the government school.

This study, like the Good Schools study, points to some of the complexity in building whole school approaches to address SRGBV. While both interventions were able to promote non-violent, equitable norms, and the Good Schools Toolkit reduced children’s experiences of violence in school, their effectiveness was affected by socio-economic structures and resources, with poor working conditions and infrastructures impacting on the capabilities of teachers to create safe, equitable schools. While some studies (Bajaj, 2009) conclude that single-sex provision contributed to more equitable norms, other studies have disputed this, drawing attention to physical and verbal violence in single-sex schools for girls (Bhana and Pillay, 2011) and boys (Morrell, 2001). The ‘undoing gender’ intervention appeared not to engage with norms outside school. The Good Schools Toolkit did attempt to engage with parents, viewing them as key members of the school community, but the study did not ascertain whether there had been any changes within families in punishment practices. More research is needed to establish the
potential for whole school interventions to work with families and communities on norms, cultures and identities that counter SRGBV, and to engage with other layers of policy enactment.

A number of interventions have focused on improving structures and resources in schools in order to improve education for girls, or girls and boys, such as BRIGHT’s girl-friendly schools in Burkina Faso, which combined school construction and sanitary facilities, financial incentives, and mobilizing community support (Kazianga et al., 2013), and WASH, which improved water, sanitation and hygiene in schools, including building sex-segregated toilets and spaces near the toilets to change and wash menstrual pads (Fulu et al., 2014). While both programmes have had positive impacts on girls’ access to school, there is insufficient evidence on the impact of infrastructural interventions on SRGBV or girls’ perceptions of safety around school toilets (Fulu et al., 2014).

Taken together, these findings suggest that focusing on one aspect of school structures, such as improving the safety of school buildings, will have limited effects on SRGBV. Whole school approaches, that combine school policy, training and ongoing support for school staff, engagement of school management and the broader school community, and participatory engagement in reflecting, reviewing and developing action plans on issues relating to violence, inclusion and inequality, by pupils as well as staff, have strong potential.

### 3.3.3 Conclusion

Evidence from the work with teachers and with whole schools on SRGBV points to the importance and complexity of constructing schools as ‘safe spaces’ for generating equitable, inclusive relationships among their members, and clarity in the norms, values and boundaries for dealing with unsafe behaviour. While there are a few studies on how to achieve this through developing criticality in curricula and learning materials, and ongoing support for teachers and school leaders, much more evidence is needed on these approaches to building policies in schools, and linking these to broader policy processes, to integrate work on SRGBV into the routine life of schools.

### 3.4 Work with communities

**Evidence suggests**

- Collaborative engagement on tackling SRGBV with parents, and community and religious gatekeepers can be established through social-norm approaches that recognize positive, dynamic features of cultural identities and practices.
- Interventions with men and boys involving reflection on norms about masculinity, relationship dynamics and livelihoods have reduced partner violence – more work is needed on their impact on children.
- Interventions combining a focus on gender relations and economic empowerment have reduced intimate partner violence, and improved earnings and equitable relationships.
- More evidence is needed on integrating community and school-based approaches.

Much evidence already reviewed has highlighted the way gender violence in and around schools is embedded within broader social norms, pointing to the importance of work outside of schools with the broader community. Efforts in this area have fallen into two main categories: those that work with parents (often of young children) in an attempt to reduce ‘risk factors’ to later violent behaviour in children, and those that work with parents and/or other members of communities or address poverty, as well as to help create a supportive environment for work on SRGBV. Specific categories include:

- parenting programmes;
- working with communities;
- working with men and boys; and
- work addressing poverty, gender and violence.
Some studies of community-level interventions have traced the disparate, conflicting perspectives within communities that create resistance to policy implementation on SRGBV at local levels. Laws and policies on SRGBV may be invoked to support community-based interventions, but the more effective interventions with parents and communities have stressed the need to engage positively with gendered, ethnic and cultural identities and practices related to SRGBV. Others have started to address the links between poverty and gender violence through including an economic empowerment component, with promising results.

3.4.1 Parenting programmes
A body of literature addresses the role of parents in supporting the positive development of their children and avoiding maltreatment or abuse. The vast majority of studies identifying effective approaches originate in the United States (Fagan and Catalano, 2013). Approaches tend to teach parenting skills and help avoid conflict in the home. However, very few studies have taken place in low- and middle-income countries – one review found that less than 1 per cent of evidence relates to these contexts (Mikton and Butchart, 2009) – and questions have been raised regarding the feasibility of a state programme of home visits by trained health professionals in low-income contexts due to their high cost (Fulu et al., 2014). In low- and middle-income countries, evaluated interventions have focused on helping pregnant women or new mothers understand their children’s development and needs and have been found to be effective in promoting healthy child-parent relationships and development (Knerr et al., 2011). However, they have not assessed longer-term outcomes for children, and evidence is not available to show a direct effect on violence experienced by children, nor on reducing later violence by children. An intervention in Colombia worked with children aged 3–11, their parents and teachers in poor communities with high levels of community violence, with an assumption that integrating parents and educators in reflection on how education and upbringing practices impact on children can reduce aggression in young children. The intervention worked with parents through six workshops, three sessions of family counselling and home visits to address family dynamics that may affect aggression. Aggression levels reduced and pro-social behaviours increased for both boys and girls, although longer-term effects are not clear, and there is insufficient knowledge on the process of change (Duque et al., 2007).

These initiatives have tended to be gender-blind, and do not consider how gendered social norms and identities may be operating within the household, may shape gender violence and inequalities, and how they can be changed. The review identified one intervention in the United States, however, that did take this approach. Local community-based organizations and schools in two Midwestern cities helped identify black fathers who were not living with their children, who participated in a 45-hour training programme that addressed aspects of masculinity, fatherhood and communication with children. Evidence suggested improvements in many areas, including communications about sex and relationships, and increased intentions of fathers to avoid violence. However, it did not reduce aggressive behaviours among sons, and long-term impact was not assessed (Caldwell et al., 2010).

The number of interventions evaluated in low- and middle-income countries is very limited, and thus it is difficult to draw clear conclusions as to the potential of parent-targeted programmes in relation to addressing SRGBV in this context.

3.4.2 Working with communities
Parkes (2015) has highlighted how policy processes on SRGBV do not pay enough attention to local conditions and norms, even though wider community support can be critical in enhancing the acceptance and sustainability of interventions, and in particular child protection mechanisms. For example, in one Indonesian study, parents described how the new child rights and protection legislation affected their perceived ability to raise their children properly, and felt that their children no longer acknowledged adults as deserving of respect; they felt there had been a reversal of the power dynamics and an erosion of important
cultural values (Stark et al., 2012). In this context, some forms of violence were understood as a critical part of raising a respectable and responsible member of the community, and restrictions on violence against children were perceived as a direct threat to parents’ roles as disciplinarians and also to community stability. The study also identified that notions of family honour and shame were critical to whether violence against children would be reported beyond the family.

ActionAid’s Stop Violence Against Girls in Schools project in Ghana, Kenya and Mozambique is one of the only systematically evaluated SRGBV interventions designed to work at multiple levels (Leach et al., 2012). Although the project primarily aimed to empower girls and work in school settings, it also involved work with parents and community members to strengthen reporting mechanisms and create safer communities. The intervention was effective in creating a discourse prioritizing girls’ education and supporting girls to challenge violence, although the evidence on the extent to which girls were able to follow through intentions with actions (for example, in reporting violence) was less clear (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). Community members were supported and mobilized to act as links between girls in communities with poor access to services and child protection mechanisms, and there were instances when these worked effectively to help realize girls’ rights. But there was also a quagmire of issues that affected the local enactment of national policies protecting girls from violence. These include understandings about childhood, discipline and innocence, chaste femininities, family shame and community cohesion above individual rights (Parkes et al., 2013). The study highlighted how, in contexts of poverty, notions of justice were often driven by material concerns (such as financial provisions for a pregnancy resulting from a forced or coercive sexual encounter between an older man and schoolgirl) rather than individual human rights or justice concerns (Parkes and Heslop 2011). The attention to community engagement in this project highlights the challenges and opportunities in tackling issues that are embedded in social, cultural and religious contexts. The Stop Violence intervention was firmly oriented within a rights framework and this could sometimes emphasize change based on laws rather than through reflection on norms and values and a more collaborative process towards change. Occasionally backlash was felt in certain sections of the communities who did not agree with the changes that were being proposed (Parkes and Heslop, 2013).

Evidence is also emerging to support a set of approaches where, rather than pitting policy or intervention aims against cultural norms, aspects of cultural identity are harnessed to feed into a shared direction towards more gender-equitable relationships and schools. For example, the Fathers and Sons intervention discussed earlier used an approach that emphasized taking pride in cultural heritage (Caldwell et al., 2010). Another study found that a United States intervention, working with Hispanic pupils, which emphasized ethnic and cultural pride rather than viewing culture as problematic for gender equality, was effective in reducing incidence of dating violence and increasing gender-equitable attitudes among young people (Enriquez et al., 2012). An intervention working with parents in Zimbabwe to help them support their adolescent children in negotiating healthy and safe relationships involved identifying traditional and religious teachings that were supportive of the messages of the programme (Cowan et al., 2010). Appreciative inquiry is a human rights-based approach to social change that UNICEF and others use to promote and strengthen dialogue, while at the same time discovering core strengths of stakeholders in the education sector as a base for innovation and growth. Care USA used the approach in Burundi focusing on the positive – both existing and possible (Care USA, 2007). The Social Norms Approach, which is gaining popularity in framing interventions addressing sensitive issues, emphasizes that doing work in communities to create new positive norms is more effective at changing behaviour than a focus on challenging existing norms that can be harmful (Mackie et al., 2014). A community programme on female genital mutilation was successful in
reducing approval and reported practice through working with traditional and religious leaders as well as community members (Diop et al., 2004). The broad participatory approach and involvement of community gatekeepers prompted changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices that were diffused through the community as changes were seen in those who had not directly attended training sessions. The project was developed by a local NGO in partnership with communities over a number of years and is an example of how sustained participatory processes and working with multiple groups can effect change on sensitive issues.

3.4.3 Working with men and boys
Some interventions have paid particular attention to working with men to address gender violence. A number of studies in a range of different low- and middle-income country contexts have highlighted that schoolgirls’ involvement in sexual relationships with boys and men outside the school setting is common, and often exploitative or coerced; defined by age, status and economic asymmetries (Luke, 2003, Heslop et al., 2015). Two interventions, Yaar i - Dost i in India and Programme H in Brazil, have worked with young men in facilitated sessions that reflect on gender and sexual norms and violence (in the Indian intervention this was accompanied by a local lifestyle social marketing campaign including street plays, and sharing promotional and educational materials). Both have had positive impacts on reported partner violence, communication with partners about sex, and sexual health outcomes (Verma et al., 2008; Pulerwitz et al., 2006). There are a growing number of these programmes in low- and middle-income countries, often situated within HIV/AIDS programmes, and evolving from group education to incorporate community mobilization, working with both sexes, and public policy engagement (Fulu et al., 2014). When the gender transformative community-based intervention Stepping Stones (see 3.4.4 for a further discussion) (which involved training around gender and sexual relationships) was linked with an economic empowerment intervention, it was found to be more effective than the original intervention alone. Men reported less conflict, spending more time with their main partners, and less time with additional partners. The analysis suggested that rather than a wholesale reconstruction of masculinity, a more subtle shift was seen. Men moved away from more ‘harmful’ aspects of a dominant youth masculinity towards a form of masculinity where they were better able to enact their aims of livelihood provision and setting up more stable homes. This allowed them to demonstrate more equitable sexual/romantic relationships (Jewkes et al., 2014).

While these community-based interventions involving men and boys have had promise in addressing gender and sexual health, policies and interventions focusing on gender violence in and around the education system have tended to play insufficient attention to dynamics outside schools. This includes idealized or unchallenged sexually predatory masculinities – and how they may impact on girls’ rights and education, especially where transactional and intergenerational sex is common.

3.4.4 Work addressing poverty, gender and violence
Women and girls’ lack of economic independence and access to resources is a feature of gender inequality and can contribute to exploitative and potentially violent relationships (Jewkes and Morrell, 2010). Some community programmes have attempted to address the economic roots of gender inequality and violence through working to address poverty and economic inequality. Interventions tend to be either in the form of micro-finance (or saving or loan groups), or developing income generating skills with women. The picture is very mixed for those that focus on economic empowerment without including a social empowerment or gender equality component, with some interventions actually increasing risk of violence (Fulu et al., 2014). Meanwhile interventions that include both components appear more promising. One such example is Stepping Stones and Creating Futures (Jewkes et al., 2014).
The emerging evidence is that the economic empowerment combined with gender empowerment has enabled greater change through addressing the key local structural conditions producing violence. It is, however, not clear how such an intervention may work with schoolchildren – or whether an intervention like this with parents of school-age children may also contribute to addressing SRGBV through reducing poverty and gender inequalities in the household and community. An RCT in Uganda assessed an economic empowerment intervention working with secondary school-age girls (including those who were in and not in school) in an intensive after-school club five days a week. The clubs were run by a locally chosen mentor who was trained and supported by the NGO BRAC. The activities focused on improving vocational skills to encourage self-employment and improving knowledge to reduce sexually risky behaviour, along with fun activities such as games or drama. Young women became more engaged in economic activity, mostly through self-employment, and reported less coerced sex and more condom use (Bandiera et al., 2012). Moreover, there was no adverse effect on school enrolment rates, and the authors suggest that there is little trade-off between income-generating activity and schooling among adolescent girls. This suggests promise for interventions working to build schoolgirls’ own economic assets, but more research is needed to look at how this kind of support affects girls’ longer-term trajectories regarding schooling and work as well as experiences of violence.

3.4.5 Conclusion
Although there is emerging evidence that working with communities in different ways can help create a vital supportive environment for challenging SRGBV, there are currently not enough clearly evaluated policies and interventions that have a focus on working within schools on gender violence combined with a strong community based intervention – for example, working with traditional and religious leaders to understand how local norms and institutions can reinforce or challenge messages that support gender inequalities and violence. There are opportunities for work in education to link with and learn from health promotion programmes that have a strong record of community based interventions, particularly those addressing sexuality. There is also a need for evaluated interventions that systematically examine child protection mechanisms and what can improve their working for girls and boys in resource-poor settings. There is also scope to investigate the potential role of local organizations such as women’s or faith groups to support policy enactment.

Many of the successful interventions reviewed have been carefully situated in their contexts,
participatory in design, and sustainable. This leads towards the conclusion that interventions that work with multiple groups at multiple levels will be more effective. Indeed, a review of intimate partner violence initiatives found that all the interventions identified that had a clear positive impact on partner violence experienced and perpetrated were multi-component, working across the school and community and with teachers, parents and community workers as well as young people (De Koker et al., 2014). However, another review of youth violence prevention initiatives has questioned this and found that narrowly framed interventions can have clear impacts (Fagan and Catalano, 2013). There is certainly a question about whether the impact of broad interventions that attempt to tackle multiple areas may end up being diluted. But it is very difficult to make a clear assessment of this point because narrow short-term interventions tend to have narrow, short-term and self-reported measures of change – that may not take into account the dynamics that are happening around those involved over long periods of time.

3.5 Policy enactment at national and district levels

A recurring theme from the evidence on interventions with children and schools discussed above is the lack of attention to policy processes beyond the locale of the intervention. In this section, we consider the evidence on interventions by policy actors and organizations at national level. There has been a large expansion of policy activity relating to SRGBV. However, there is very little evidence on the effectiveness of interventions that focus on changing laws, developing policy or working with macro institutions; and even less work on interventions

Evidence suggests

- There has been a large expansion of international and national policy activity relating to SRGBV, especially on bullying and corporal punishment, but there are few studies that provide evidence on policy processes, or their impact.
- Comprehensive, inter-sectoral planning across government departments needs to combine with action plans and guidelines supported by resources and training at all levels of policy enactment.
- Strengthened dialogue between national and local policy actors are needed to identify how to address potential barriers to implementation on sensitive and controversial issues linked to gender and violence.
- Media campaigns can be effective ways to address social norms around gender and violence at a large scale, with some multi-level interventions combining this work effectively with community programmes.
- Partnerships between government ministries of education, researchers and civil society organizations may have potential to strengthen evidence building and use.
- District education officials, medical, welfare and judicial services, policy, teachers unions and teacher training institutions are key actors in policy enactment, yet are mostly missing from research evidence on SRGBV.
- Better integration of services (e.g., one-stop centres, or specialist police stations), with resources and well-trained staff, and strengthened links between formal and informal child protection structures, have potential to improve responses to SRGBV, but more evidence is needed.
- Critical reflection on values, norms, professional cultures and institutional arrangements has potential to strengthen policy enactment at the level of the ‘missing middle’.
at district level by officials and organizations tasked with disseminating, implementing and monitoring policy. Interventions reviewed fall into the following areas:

- Legislative and policy frameworks;
- Media campaigns; and
- District-level policy enactments: The missing piece of the jigsaw.

The small body of work reviewed in these areas raises a number of critical concerns. There are a number of fault lines in the policy process, which can prevent laws and policies on SRGBV from being effectively implemented. Some of these relate to competing priorities among government departments, and the need for a solid evidence base from which to build plans, though more research is needed to investigate these processes in depth in specific contexts. Sometimes laws are implemented, but in ways that increase gender and other inequalities, and there is a clear need to evaluate how national and local policy actors connect. There is also a need to better understand the links between mass media campaigns and policy enactment. At district level, the very small evidence base reveals how political, social and economic conditions and norms, institutional arrangements and intersecting identities shape the activity of officials tasked with translating laws and policies on SRGBV in schools and communities. At all levels, the policy actors have insufficient data upon which to formulate, monitor and strengthen legislative and policy enactment. Much more work is needed to understand these policy processes, and the connections between them if we are to make substantive inroads in addressing SRGBV.

3.5.1 Legislative and policy frameworks
Developments in legislation, policy and justice can act as tools and levers to create the conditions for wider change – when they are designed, implemented and supported well, taking account of particular local contexts. However, the existence of legislation or policy simply as text does little to address a problem. In the area of SRGBV, there is very limited evidence on the effectiveness of interventions, which focus on changing laws, developing policy or working with macro institutions.

Over the past 20 years, there has been a considerable increase in attention to SRGBV in global, regional and national policies. The adoption of many of these laws, or support for treaties or forms of soft power, have been influenced by movements for women’s and children’s rights, as shown in table 4. The references to tackling violence in the sustainable development goals on education (goal 4) and gender (goal 5), and peaceful, just and inclusive societies (goal 16) are illustrative of the growing international impetus to tackle SRGBV and violence against children.

In the wake of the United Nations World Report on Violence Against Children in 2006, global and regional initiatives on violence against children accelerated, along with national laws and policies, although one review points out that these interventions have tended to focus on bullying or corporal punishment without examining the ways in which forms of violence are interlinked, and underpinned by inequitable norms and practices, and have sidelined gender-based violence (Leach et al., 2014).

Previous reviews in related areas to SRGBV have highlighted a number of problems related to policy-making and implementation. For example, in relation to gender-based violence in low- and middle-income countries more broadly, Ellsberg et al. (2015) report that although a growing number of countries have developed national policy in this area, its implementation is patchy, with problems with budget allocation and support from key actors, such as the judiciary and police, both deliberate and unintended. Looking at gender violence in schools in the developing world, Dunne, Humphreys and Leach (2006) highlight political and bureaucratic resistance as central problems in enacting legislation and policy. Policymakers have been criticized for lacking political will, and for fragmented legislative frameworks, as well as for creating national policies without action plans, training or resourcing to support implementation (Leach et al., 2014).
Table 4: Timeline on global declarations on violence against women and children (adapted from Parkes and Unterhalter 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s rights</th>
<th>Children’s rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)</td>
<td>Education as a fundamental human right; states required to take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in manner consistent with child’s human dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliged countries to pledge to take measures to eliminate discrimination against women</td>
<td>1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)</td>
<td>Education as a fundamental human right; states required to take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in manner consistent with child’s human dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 Vienna Declaration</td>
<td>Called for elimination of violence in public and private life as a human rights obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (DEVAW)</td>
<td>UN appointed Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (SRVAW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (DEVAW)</td>
<td>UN appointed Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (SRVAW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action</td>
<td>Opposition to violence against women recognised as integral to realisation of equality, development and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action</td>
<td>Opposition to violence against women recognised as integral to realisation of equality, development and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Dakar Framework for Action on Education For All</td>
<td>2000 Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals on education for all children (EFA), especially girls, to have access to and complete basic education cycle by 2015</td>
<td>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education, ensuring that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women, eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005 and at all levels of education by 2015</td>
<td>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women, eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005 and at all levels of education by 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandates protection of women and girls during and after conflict and greater involvement of women in conflict resolution, peace building and peace keeping</td>
<td>Provided more detailed protection for children from forms of violence, including sale of children, child prostitution and pornography, and involvement and rehabilitation of children in armed conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s rights</td>
<td>Children’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Ending Violence Against Women: From Words to Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>2006 UN Report of Violence Against Children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report commissioned by UN Secretary General</td>
<td>Violence against children defined as ‘All forms of physical and mental violence, injury and abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Violence Against Children (SRSG) to assist governments, international organisations and civil society to work towards ending violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1820</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly recognises sexual violence as a security issue and weapon of war and emphasise the importance of women’s participation in peace processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Sustainable Development Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015 Sustainable Development Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets include:</td>
<td>Targets include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere</td>
<td>By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation</td>
<td>Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, nonviolent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation</td>
<td>Eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels</td>
<td>Ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 16: Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies**

Targets include:

**By 2030:**

End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Strengthen relevant national institutions to prevent violence

Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development

*Note: Some targets have been compressed; full language can be found at [www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/].*
A key concern in the research has been with failures in translating laws and policies from national to local levels. A number of studies in South Africa have considered why there appears to be a disconnect between a constitution and legislative framework that enshrines rights to equality, dignity and freedom from violence, and school and classroom practices that sustain violence and gender inequality (Rafie, 2009, Wadesango et al., 2011). A study of the Western Cape Government’s New Integrated Provincial Violence Prevention Policy Framework praised the policy shift away from a traditional criminal justice and security-centred approach to a more comprehensive inter-sectoral ‘whole-of-government’ approach (Matzopoulos and Myers, 2014). While this joined-up approach led to a broad range of actions, its effectiveness in the first year was hampered by conflict with intra-departmental priorities, competing policies and directives, and the need for a solid evidence base from which to build action plans. A study of perpetration of sexual violence by teachers in Gauteng Province criticized the inadequacy of structures and processes at multiple layers of policy enactment to hold educators accountable (Centre for Applied Legal Studies and Clinic, 2014). Drawing on desk research and interviews with government officials, NGOs, police and community members, the study found inconsistencies in the laws and lack of coordination among those institutions to which disciplinary proceedings were delegated.

This meant that teachers were reluctant to report colleagues who were perpetrators. Where teachers were found guilty of sexual offences, they were dismissed but not struck off the register, so could find work in other schools. Although there were guidelines for schools, there was no legal requirement for schools to follow them, and their distribution was uneven, with training inadequate.

These South African studies have provided valuable insights into blockages in the process of policy enactment. There is a small amount of research documenting efforts to lobby governments to create more responsive legislative and policy frameworks in relation to SRGBV, but there is currently a lack of robust evidence on the effectiveness of these efforts in influencing policymakers. NGO interventions combining community interventions with national policy lobbying have included USAID’s advocacy work for revisions to teacher codes of conduct in Malawi and Ghana (USAID, 2008), ActionAid’s lobbying with the Kenyan Education Ministry to ensure teachers found guilty of sexual offences are not just transferred to another school, or their campaign in Mozambique to reject Decree 39 (2003) that removes pregnant schoolgirls from school to evening education classes (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). These advocacy activities in ActionAid’s Stop Violence Against Girls project were monitored at national and district level through annual interviews with government officials.

Disjunctures between national and local policy enactments, and the costs for young women and men

A longitudinal ethnographic study examined the unforeseen consequences of amendment in 1990 to the Defilement Law in Uganda, through which the age of sexual consent was raised from 14 to 18 and the maximum sentence increased to hanging (Parikh, 2012). While the changes flowed from feminist lobbying with a view to targeting sexual exploitation by ‘sugar daddies’ and paedophiles, Parikh’s careful analysis of court records and interviews with young women and men over a 10-year period revealed how class, age and gender hierarchies shaped how the law was applied at local level to reinforce patriarchal privilege. While the law succeeded in increasing criminal convictions, it was mainly poorer young men, often in consensual relationships with young women, who were convicted, while sugar daddies were able to bribe their way out of convictions. Young women in turn were denied the opportunity to choose to have sexual relationships, since their parents or others may report such relationships. The macro-level intervention failed to take into account the varying perspectives, norms and inequalities at local levels.
officials. In all three countries, government officials interviewed were universal in their verbal support for challenging gender violence in schools, and there was an increase in these officials reporting taking action during their work to prevent SRGBV, such as funding activities. But once the project ended, there was no further follow-up to track changes over the longer term.

A study in Uganda provides a good illustration of some other complexities of policy enactment at both national and local level (Parikh, 2012). Along with issues such as lack of knowledge, political or financial support, the process of enactment can itself throw up unintended consequences, as shown in the highlighted example.

This study from Uganda, together with those from South Africa discussed above, point to the importance of creating top-down and bottom-up dialogues between national and local policy actors, as well as evaluating how they connect. At both levels the meanings of gender and violence may be contested, with existing hierarchies of power working to sustain rather than transform norms and structures of inequality in which strategies to address SRGBV become entangled. While struggles over policy enactment in education are well documented (e.g., Ball et al., 2012), when the issues are sensitive and controversial, as is often the case in addressing SRGBV, the potential for such disjunctures increases, as has also been noted in a United States study of the challenges of implementing policies relating to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation at classroom level (Knotts, 2009). This suggests addressing the processes and support for implementation of policy is a valuable exercise, and that more work is needed on different ways of evaluating the enactment of policy.

An instance where one study reports some success in building partnerships among policy actors is in the education sector in Colombia (Fevre, 2015). Here there was consensus on the importance of addressing gangs and criminal violence through violence prevention work in schools, and commitment of policy leaders, and partnerships between the Ministry of Education, researchers and civil society organizations, who have worked together to develop research-informed indicators on citizenship competencies and school climate.

The studies reviewed in this section show that developing shared concepts, sensitivity to local and national contexts, carefully tailored indicators, political support, cross-sectoral communication, training and resources all appear to be important components in policy work in this area, but much more research is needed to find effective ways to build these policy dialogues.

3.5.2 Media campaigns
Alongside legislation and policy, public media campaigns can be viewed as another lever for change. They seek to shape the broad societal architecture in which SRGBV takes place, to create a climate less conducive to violence. However, some studies have shown how the media can have the opposite effect. A study of printed media reports on school violence in South Africa, for example, found that reports dwelled on ‘blood and guts’ reporting, with violence presented as an individual rather than societal problem, and little attention in news articles to emotional or sexual violence, and thus in the view of the author the media failed to elicit social responsibility (Jacobs, 2014). In contrast, the review identified how a number of interventions have deployed the media to mobilize public opinion against gender violence.

Use of public campaigns using different media channels and outputs has been used as a stand-alone approach as well as in conjunction with other methods as part of larger interventions. The impacts of such methods are notoriously challenging to evaluate rigorously, due to the impossibility of controlling for other influences, and establishing a causal link with relevant outcome measures. There was one study included for detailed review focused entirely on a public campaign taking the form of a soap opera, Soul City (Goldstein et al., 2005), and three studies which included a public campaign as a substantial component (Solórzano et al., 2008; Pulerwitz et al., 2006; Verma et al., 2008). All of these studies focus on some aspect of HIV/AIDS prevention and sexual health, rather than specifically addressing SRGBV.
However, they are relevant in the current context, particularly as several directly address gender norms and inequality in relation to the subject matter. All four studies’ interventions using public campaigns were evaluated using the criteria of the current review as promising or effective in their approach. This supports the idea that mass media methods can be a useful component to an effective intervention. This is also supported by other reviews on related topics such as those carried out by the World Health Organization (WHO, 2010) on violence prevention and by Di Clemente et al. on interventions to reduce adolescent sexual risk behaviours (Di Clemente et al., 2007).

Soul City, a national, multi-channel (TV, radio and newspaper) ‘edutainment’ drama run over a period of months in South Africa, dealt with a range of real-life topics including sexual health, illness and relationships. Its evaluation ran over eight months and it was found to produce: positive change in perception of others’ attitudes (i.e., perceived norms) towards people with HIV/AIDS; an increase in people’s sense of personal risk in relation to sexual health; an increase in people’s likelihood of discussing HIV/AIDS (and this increased with increasing exposure to the intervention); and an increase in likelihood of asking a partner to use a condom. The radio drama component of the intervention was found to relate to an increase in helping someone with HIV/AIDS, and an increase in people having asked their partners to have an HIV test (Goldstein et al., 2005). In contrast to the study on the enactment of the legal consent law in Uganda discussed above (Parikh, 2012), this intervention appeared to pay considerable attention to addressing inequality and stigma.

A programme examined by Solarzano (2008) involved a multi-component programme in Nicaragua including a TV ‘soap’, a call-in radio show, materials for use by local groups, and community-based activities. This was found to be highly effective in improving attitudes among the general population in relation to gender-equity, and improving HIV knowledge, understanding and risk behaviours. For example, at the end-line, 22 per cent of responses which did not agree with the statement ‘women who carry condoms in their bags are easy’ were attributable to the intervention. A key point of learning which can be drawn from these different studies is the importance and value of careful research and development in creating relevant and engaging outputs. The ‘edutainment’ developed in these studies is found to reach a wide audience, and to be highly engaging and enjoyed, often intergenerationally within families (for example, in terms of repeat viewing figures, 47 per cent of Soul City viewers watched 9–13 episodes). Clear communication, engaging content and retaining participants is vital for any intervention to be effective. The way in which these programmes deliver this provides learning applicable to other new and developing interventions, including those tackling SRGBV.

3.5.3 District level policy enactments: The missing piece of the jigsaw

Our discussion of the extended level of national laws and policies (see 3.5.1 above) referred to the importance of creating top-down and bottom-up dialogues between national and local policy actors. Missing from this discussion was the layer in between – the intermediate level of local government, including district education officials, hospitals and district health officials, welfare, legal and judicial systems and police services, teacher unions and teacher training institutions, all of whom are key actors in policy enactment. These are the policy actors and organizations young people will be unlikely to interact with on an everyday basis, but they provide critical services in response to violence, and in training, supporting and monitoring the work of schools and communities in relation to SRGBV. They are potentially key actors in translating – both to convert the national level policies into local actions, and to help ensure that local perspectives influence policy-making processes. But they have been described as the ‘missing middle’ of global education policy (Unterhalter et al., 2012). Most of these intermediate-level actors and organizations are remarkably absent from the SRGBV research literature.

Teachers unions, for example, are rarely mentioned in the research literature, with the exception of a few studies that mention the importance of
viewing unions as stakeholders – for example, in developing and implementing codes of practice for addressing sexual misconduct by teachers (UNESCO, 2015b), or in reviewing policy around school safety in contexts of violent conflict (EI, 2008). While traditionally unions have viewed their remit as collective bargaining and campaigning for workers’ rights, they can be an important force for social change (Phelan, 2007). They often have strong socio-political links with education ministries, institutes and district officials, and as ‘insiders’, could arguably have greater influence in changing policy than ‘outsider’ activists, such as NGOs (Santoro and McGuire, 1997). But while there seems strong potential for unions to act as intermediaries between national policy actors and local actors, there is little of evidence of this taking place on issues relating to SRGBV. However, a recent positive development was the Education International Resolution to end SRGBV passed during the Congress, July 2015. This commits member unions to collaborate with the United Nations and other actors to combat SRGBV both within their membership and through outreach.

A small number of studies reviewed mentioned the need for more joined-up work between services, particularly in the provision of health, welfare, police and judicial services following up cases of violence. One-stop centres, providing multi-disciplinary, integrated services in a single location, have been used in a number of countries, including Zambia and Kenya (Keesbury and Onyango-ouma, 2012). A study in the United States found that provision of multi-disciplinary Sexual Assault Response Teams and specialist Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners increased the number of sexual assault prosecutions, particularly for cases involving younger adolescents (13–15 years old) and when there were no other overlapping interventions in the area (Campbell et al., 2012). Specialist police stations with female officers focusing on violence against women and girls have become increasingly common in low- and middle-income countries, particularly in Latin America and South Asia, though one review concludes that, although in some cases this has led to an increase in women reporting violence, the types and quality of services provided are variable and there is not yet evidence on their effectiveness (Elsberg et al., 2015). While teacher training is often used in the interventions on SRGBV, none of the studies reviewed discussed how to mainstream a curriculum on SRGBV for trainee teachers into the routine courses in teacher training institutions, or evaluated the effectiveness of different kinds of teacher training on SRGBV related issues.

Two main concerns arise from work on SRGBV at the intermediate level. Firstly, in many LMIC settings poorly resourced services have been unable to provide adequate support in following up cases of violence, lacking trained staff and facilities to implement child protection protocol (Parkes and Heslop, 2013, Leach et al., 2014). While some interventions, such as ActionAid’s Stop Violence Against Girls in School, have worked to build community-based structures that coordinate between informal and formal justice systems, there was little evidence over the life of the project of an increase in referrals to police or health provision, suggesting that the project had very limited impact on the formal protection systems (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). Second, a number of studies have identified the need to engage these intermediate actors in reflection on their own values, norms and professional cultures. A study in Kenya and South Africa found that stereotypical views among district education officials resulted in a tendency to blame the poor for gender inequalities in schools (Unterhalter et al., 2012). A study with trainee medical personnel in Nicaragua found that although student doctors and nurses rejected gender-based violence, they viewed violence as a personal problem rather than linked to norms and inequalities, and there was a need for medical school curricula to engage with gender perspectives (Rodriguez-Bolanos et al., 2005). Studies with NGO staff working on gender projects in schools in Bangladesh (De Jaeghere and Wiger, 2013) and India (Sharma et al., 2013) have found that their approaches to working with teachers are bound up with their own gendered identities, formed through complex personal, cultural and professional histories.

This small body of evidence points to the importance of analysing how the political, social
and economic conditions combine with norms, professional cultures, institutional arrangements and intersecting identities in influencing how interventions are received and implemented at official levels, yet most studies do not investigate these dynamics. Better understanding of these relationships at the intermediate level may help to shed insights on this important but neglected layer in the jigsaw of SRGBV policy enactment.

3.5.4 Methodologies for gathering evidence for SRGBV policy enactment
The lack of evidence available limits policy enactment, and there are increasing efforts to address this. A global interagency Child Protection Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group was set up by UNICEF and Save the Children with partners, and one of its tasks was to facilitate the establishment of monitoring and evaluation guidelines. The group undertook a review of quantitative studies and found major variation in definitions used, measures, and approaches to ethics, with studies often not meeting basic standards in quantitative research, e.g., in sampling, data entry and analysis (UNICEF, 2014). Since then a Global Working Group on SRGBV has evolved, coordinated by the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative and UNESCO, and including a research task team led by USAID, which is currently working to strengthen the use of evidence, research and monitoring and evaluation tools for policy and practice.

Policy and decision makers need a range of information to understand and inform policy enactment in their countries. As this review shows, there are a range of issues that cut across the ability of institutions to address SRGBV and wider social norms and conditions that may contribute to it. These work at all levels from national, through provincial/regional and district government processes to policy enactment in schools and communities, and data is needed at each level, and across levels. Evidence is needed on the nature of SRGBV, who is most affected and why, what processes contribute to SRGBV and how they can be changed, how patterns may be changing and what is helping and hindering change.

There are some instruments that have been developed in related fields to help policy actors reflect on and review policy and practice in their countries. One that has been developed by UNESCO to address primarily homophobic bullying in schools has considerable potential to inform work on SRGBV as it is concerned with building a holistic picture that looks at policies, laws, training given to officials, supportive school environments, awareness raising campaigns and national monitoring at national and local levels. The tools are completed by policy personnel and civil society organizations (UNESCO 2015). Another instrument has been developed to collect data on existence and funding of policies and laws in various aspects of violence against women (including training professionals and multi-sectoral coordination). Data were collected and an index developed to compare performance across 70 countries (Htun and Weldon, 2012). Mikton et al. (2013) developed and applied an instrument designed to assess child maltreatment prevention readiness in 6 countries (Brazil, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and South Africa) based on eight dimensions of readiness through collecting data from experts in each country. Four consistent gaps were identified across all countries: lack of skilled professionals, lack of knowledge and expertise to implement child maltreatment prevention programmes on a large scale and lack of institutions to train these professionals; inadequate funding, infrastructure and equipment; rarity of outcome evaluations of child maltreatment prevention programmes; and an absence of nationally representative surveys of the prevalence of child maltreatment. These top-down tools involve asking national-level representatives about national-level criteria and sometimes asking for judgements about the availability of local-level criteria, but do not actually compile lower-level data or make links between levels. There is a notable gap in any data monitoring of the ‘missing middle’.

Data collection on reported cases of SRGBV has potential to be collected from schools, police, judiciary, health services and other support organizations. However, in many countries, records
are poor, incomplete and inconsistent, and thus not reliable sources in gaining any holistic picture of SRGBV (UNICEF, 2014). There is indeed much work to be done on developing reporting systems, coordination of different bodies and developing data systems to better record cases of SRGBV. Even at a global level data on gender relations in schools has been identified as a key missing area (Unterhalter, 2015). However, some fairly small-scale but interesting work has been done to collect data at school level, usually linked to NGO-led projects, which could have potential for adaptation and scale-up. ActionAid’s Stop Violence Against Girls in School project developed a basic ‘girl-friendly school’ checklist, to assist with project monitoring and evaluation, which included 10 criteria covering policies, plans, teacher training and infrastructure aimed to counter violence against girls. However, concerns were raised about its crudeness in capturing how schools were changing to better address gender violence and in the subjectivity of school head reporting (Parkes and Heslop, 2013). Care International developed a Common Indicators Framework that does not specifically collect data on violence, but which acts as a useful tool to collect and reflect on data on gender in schools, including equality, quality and empowerment (Miske et al., 2010). Tools that gather data for analysis elsewhere as well as facilitate local compilation and reflection can help school and community leaders and district-level leaders to understand and take effective action on SRGBV. The Transforming Education for Girls in Tanzania and Nigeria project developed a school profile tool that compiled survey data collected on gender and schooling (including gender parity measures as well as actions taken on gender) into a user-friendly format for each school and with district averages, which helped education professionals and NGO staff discuss and formulate action plans at different levels (Heslop et al., 2010). Hence there are some promising initiatives, but more work is needed to see whether and how they could be developed for use within education systems. There are challenges in attempting to gather data on gender and violence through EMIS systems, including the ethical risks of collecting violence prevalence data from children discussed in the introduction (see section 1.3 above). It may be possible to collect data on aspects of what schools are doing to address gender violence and effectiveness of prevention and response systems, but there are risks of biased reporting linked to concerns over subjectivity, performance and funding.

In order to understand what violence is experienced by whom, and how it may be
changing, data are needed directly from young people. The only school-based surveys that regularly collect data across multiple countries on SRGBV are the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMS) and the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SAQMEC) study. Questions in the first two surveys are oriented towards high-income countries – e.g., focusing on students being hurt by other students and on teachers’ feelings about safety and discipline in schools. Coverage is almost exclusively in high-income countries, with just a few low- and middle-income countries involved, including South Africa, Botswana, Colombia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand (Mullis et al., 2012). Meanwhile, the SACMEQ study has good coverage across most Southern and Eastern African countries, but its data on sexual harassment, bullying and fights are drawn from the ‘perception’ of school heads, who may underestimate the extent of violence if it is seen to reflect poorly on the school.

Population-based surveys that are regularly carried out across countries may offer a better balance of cost and reliability in gathering evidence on prevalence of SRGBV (UNICEF, 2014). The most promising are the USAID-supported Demographic and Health Surveys, which have very good coverage over low- and middle-income countries involved, including South Africa, Botswana, Colombia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand (Mullis et al., 2012). Meanwhile, the SACMEQ study has good coverage across most Southern and Eastern African countries, but its data on sexual harassment, bullying and fights are drawn from the ‘perception’ of school heads, who may underestimate the extent of violence if it is seen to reflect poorly on the school.

3.5.5 Conclusion
This discussion of national policies, media campaigns, the ‘missing middle’ of policy enactment and the tools for building evidence to inform policy highlights some major gaps in the work to address SRGBV. There are some studies highlighting issues about whether laws and policies are implemented in ways that are fair and do not increase gender and other inequalities. There are studies on how to build widespread knowledge, understanding and confidence to take appropriate action, through for example media campaigns. There are not, however, studies that look at how these two processes intersect with each other. Thus, what may be needed are broad-based interventions, and studies that examine effectiveness in specific contexts of these broad, multi-level interventions. Work is needed also that sheds light on how policy processes work, and how they can be more effectively engaged with in relation to SRGBV. Much work is needed on the kinds of research tools that can enable these analyses.
This review set out to examine the research evidence on how to strengthen policy and practice on SRGBV in a range of different settings. Three interlinked questions guided our approach:

1. What does research evidence tell us about the kinds of policies and practices being used to address SRGBV, and in what contexts around the world? What concepts and ideas underpin these interventions, and what are the implications for addressing SRGBV?
2. What is the evidence on how interventions on SRGBV engage with education policy processes at and across national, district and local levels, and with contextual features, including political, economic and social conditions?
3. How can research evidence and data-gathering tools be used effectively to inform policy and practice on SRGBV across a range of settings?

Conclusion: Building a web of evidence to counter SRGBV
4.1 Evidence on SRGBV policy enactment

Our analysis included a ‘light’ review of 171 studies, from which we mapped some broad patterns of work on SRGBV around the world. We then refined our focus to a ‘detailed’ review of a smaller number of studies that provided evidence on policy or practice on SRGBV with contextual relevance to work globally, and particularly in low- and middle-income countries. The discussion of these studies was organized by the locus of the intervention; work with groups of young people on sexual violence, gender norms and inequalities, bullying or peer violence, gangs and youth violence, and on effects of war and conflict; work with teachers and school organizational cultures; work with families and communities; work with local government and intermediary institutions, such as teacher training colleges and trade unions; and work with national legislative and policy frameworks. All these were considered to be significant nodes of policy enactment on SRGBV: sites where negotiations involved in putting policy plans into practice take place. Policy-making and policy implementation involve engagements with ideas, evidence, institutional forms and power relations across these nodes. We proposed a schematic web to depict these connections, which we reproduce again here, along with a second ‘web’ which shows the findings of the review.

The differences between the two diagrams illustrate some of the key findings of the review – that while we have good evidence in some areas, there are many gaps. In particular, much more research evidence is needed on how interventions on SRGBV can and should engage with education policy processes.

The nodes in the second diagram illustrate the amount of evidence on interventions with different actors and institutions, showing that most of the research focuses on interventions involving group work with young people. Very little of the research examines work at the level of national or district policy. The lines in the diagram illustrate where there is substantial evidence linking the work across different areas of policy enactment. Where there are no lines between nodes, the evidence is slim or virtually non-existent. The juxtaposition of the two diagrams reveals the missing threads in our current evidence on policy and practice to address SRGBV. We turn now to discuss the promising evidence identified by the review, before discussing the gaps in detail.

Some of the most promising evidence is from work with groups of young people and communities in low- and middle-income countries on sexual violence and gender inequalities in relationships (see sections 3.1 and 3.4 above). A number of interventions in these settings have developed approaches which build ‘safe spaces’ where asymmetries of power are eroded, though, for example, single-sex groups sometimes combined with mixed-sex groups, or through peer educators, along with carefully trained specialist inputs. Within these spaces, there have been shifts in attitudes and practices relating to sexual violence through work that builds critical consciousness and empowerment, addresses norms in peer groups and communities, and confronts structural inequalities, including combining work on gender violence with economic empowerment. Much of this work has involved older adolescents, and has taken place in sub-Saharan Africa. More evidence is needed from other regions and involving younger girls and boys.

There is a smaller amount of evidence from work with young people and communities linked to gang prevention. There are similar threads in this work to that discussed above – with creation of ‘safe spaces’ for critical self-reflection and dialogue again important. These interventions, which have mainly taken place in Latin America, have been effective in engaging young men in reflecting on norms about masculinity, and have addressed structural barriers at the community level. However, they have paid less attention to work with girls on sexual violence and gender inequalities in their relationships with young men in these settings.

There is also some promising evidence linking work with groups of young people with work
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with teachers and school systems on bullying, with a small amount of this work using a gender lens to look at areas like cyber bullying or cyber harassment and homophobic bullying. Very little of this work has taken place in low- and middle-income countries (see section 3.2.1). Again, the work has explored how to construct ‘safe spaces’ for members of school communities to reflect on personal beliefs, values and stereotypes, and to work on building respectful relationships, and recognizing and confronting discrimination and abuse in school settings. Along with work on corporal punishment (see section 3.3.2), these interventions have started to pinpoint features of whole school approaches to SRGBV, including attention to building inclusive and equitable school policies and protocols, engaging school leadership, and developing curricula and teaching approaches that are sensitive to the norms and structural inequalities within the relationships in their classrooms.

The key finding evident in the schematic ‘web’ (see Figure 5) is how few are the connections between the nodes, and we turn now to discussing these missing threads.

More evidence is needed on how schools can become safe spaces for addressing sexual violence, norms about masculinity and femininity, and inequalities in relationships. Though many studies discuss interventions that are located on school premises, often they are led by external ‘experts’ and operate outside the mainstream school curriculum. Sustaining and institutionalising change in schools will require much more attention to supporting school staff in leading these initiatives, and using their skills to integrate SRGBV approaches within safe, equitable school organizational cultures. More research is needed on the kinds of support, training, professional development and resources that could be provided by Teacher Training Institutions, trade unions, District Education Offices, health professionals – in other words, by those policy actors at the ‘missing middle’.

There is also scope for improving linkages between schools and communities. More evidence is needed on how to work on issues of violence and gender with fathers, mothers, religious and traditional leaders, and local activist groups. Promising approaches recognize complex hierarchies of power within communities, build on positive aspects of gendered, ethnic and cultural identities, and some try to address structural inequalities and constraints along with gender empowerment. Such approaches need to be long term, and involve multiple components.

Work at national and district level can only be effective if policy is transformed into practice, and the absence of threads connected to these nodes in the diagram indicates that these are major gaps in the evidence on SRGBV (see sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.3). The review found a few studies that identified blockages in policy arcs, including competing priorities and pressures within and between government departments, a need for greater clarity in responsibilities for policy enactment, and greater coordination between education, health, welfare and judicial services. There are hardly any studies of top-down initiatives, and a lack of research on policy development and the process of change. Also absent from the review was evidence on mechanisms for feeding up from the grass-roots, so that policy activity takes into account diversity of local ideas, norms, structures and conditions. Another reason cited by some of these studies for the disconnects between levels of policy activity is the lack of a solid evidence base.

As well as the gaps in the types of research evidence discussed so far, the review has identified weaknesses in the methodologies used to gather evidence on SRGBV. The majority of studies identified in our literature searches were of short-term programmes of less than a year, and the research evidence was often drawn from evaluations at a moment of practice, commonly at or soon after the end of an intervention. There is very little long-term follow-up, or reflection on the links to different policy ecologies, that would enable policy makers to draw conclusions about sustainability of the interventions.

Our mapping exercise (see section 2 above) identified distinct patterns in the intervention
research in the two regions where the most work has been carried out – the United States and sub-Saharan Africa. Studies in the United States tend to operate as packaged, off-the-shelf (rather than locally developed) interventions with experimental or quasi-experimental designs of narrow focus, and often gender is one of many variables. Their methods tend to be robust and reliable, but they rarely generate explanations about how change may have occurred in some contexts but not others, or with certain people, or how change may have been unexpected. The studies in sub-Saharan Africa use a range of study designs, including qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches, of variable quality in terms of rigour and reliability. Some have strengths around their contextualisation, participatory and flexible designs that are lacking in much of the work from high-income counties. There is a need for more longitudinal studies and policy analyses that trace processes of enacting SRGBV work over time. The methods across these research studies are difficult to adapt for routine data collection, partly because of the ethical and methodological challenges (see sections 1.3 and 3.5.4 above) which require complex designs and highly skilled researchers. More work is needed with policy actors on how to gather qualitative and quantitative evidence to inform policy. Also critical is work with policy actors on interpreting evidence.

4.2 Strengthening policy and practice on SRGBV

Despite the gaps identified in this review, there are a huge number of rich insights to be gained from the existing evidence, and scope to strengthen partnerships between policy actors, practitioners and academics in determining the relevance of these studies across a range of settings. Figure 6 sums up the key findings from the review addressing our overarching question on what the research evidence tells us about how to strengthen policy and practice on SRGBV in a range of different settings.

The upper boxes depict the policy and practice approaches identified in the review as having promise for addressing SRGBV. Each of the approaches is relevant for all the groups of actors and institutions within the arc of policy and programming (depicted at the next level). In other words, these broad approaches can be conceived as operating across the nested levels. The most effective approaches identified by the review drew on a multi-dimensional framing of violence, as depicted in the circle. In other words, they aimed to reduce or prevent acts of physical, sexual and psychological violence through also addressing the norms, identities, institutions and structural inequalities surrounding and shaping that violence. The diagram also specifies longer-term outcomes which we theorize will emerge from the reduction in SRGBV generated when these policy and practice approaches work together. These outcomes include creating a climate of change on SRGBV, and having a framework of policies, laws and action plans that are enacted at all levels to support prevention and elimination of SRGBV. Also envisaged are future generations of teachers, parents and girls and boys with the capability to value openness and diversity, to challenge – and to live lives free from – violence.

A key approach is the creation of safe spaces for reflection on personal experiences, beliefs and values in relation to violence and gender. Increasing reflexivity helps to build critical consciousness on prejudice and injustice, enabling people to recognise forms of violence. Taking action to prevent, report, intervene or protect from violence also requires knowledge about, for example, how to report, intervene or follow up a case of sexual violence. Taking action on violence is rarely straightforward, likely to invoke sensitivity, taboos and outright hostility, and the more effective interventions rely on skilled, specialist leadership. This has clear implications for training (pre-service and in-service) for teachers and other professionals working routinely with young people. Effective approaches create ‘safe’ learning environments, attempting to erode hierarchies by creating participatory, inclusive spaces for deliberation. For example, setting up student committees to involve young people in decision-making in schools and strengthening schools’ operational cultures. Some of the
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interventions actively engaged young people in planning interventions, so that they were carefully tailored to the local context, and in monitoring and reviewing the interventions over time.

These approaches, relating to reflection, knowledge building and learning environments, are features of promising interventions at school and community level, but they are also relevant to the other actors at national, regional and district levels. Prejudice and stereotyping, taboos and contestations over sensitive, controversial topics operate at all levels of society. Thus enabling reflexivity, knowledge and participatory dialogue among, for example, policymakers, teacher unions or district health and education officials will be a valuable form of intervention. However, we found little research evidence of such approaches.

At these intermediary and national levels of policy enactment, being able to draw on robust research evidence is important, so that the policies and action plans are guided by the best available knowledge of approaches to SRGBV in that particular context. This includes having access to qualitative and quantitative research findings as well as the capacity to gather and interpret data. Also important at these levels are cross-sectoral alliances and collaborations. Work at national and district level can only be effective if policy is transformed into practice. The review found hardly any studies of top-down initiatives. A few studies identified blockages in policy arcs including; competing priorities and pressures within and between government departments; a need for greater clarity in responsibilities for policy enactment; and greater coordination between education, health, welfare and judicial services. Also absent from the review was evidence on mechanisms for feeding up from the grass-roots, so that policy activity takes into account diversity of local ideas, norms, structures and conditions.

While these approaches related to research evidence and connections across sectors, services and institutions are features of work at national and district levels, they are also valuable for local levels of intervention. For example, girls and boys will clearly benefit from coordinated service provision, and up-to-date knowledge about research evidence on SRGBV may strengthen their capacity to prevent and respond to violence.

These key approaches have strong potential across the nested layers of actors and institutions to challenge SRGBV, though more evidence is needed to delineate how to operationalize these in different contexts. The most effective approaches identified by the review engage with and address a multi-dimensional framing of violence. In other words, they aim to reduce or prevent acts of physical, sexual and psychological violence through also addressing the norms, identities, institutions and structural inequalities surrounding and shaping that violence. The diagram also specifies longer-term outcomes which we theorize will emerge from the transformations to SRGBV generated when these policy and practice approaches work together. These outcomes include enhancing the climate of change on SRGBV, and having a framework of policies, laws and action plans that are enacted at all levels to support prevention and elimination of SRGBV. Also envisaged are future generations of teachers, parents and girls and boys with the capability to value openness and diversity, to challenge, and to live lives free from violence.

4.3 Conclusion

In some ways, this review has offered a very critical picture of our current state of knowledge on SRGBV, identifying major gaps and weaknesses in our evidence base. Globally, research has been skewed towards evaluations of short-term interventions, with little long-term follow-up to ascertain sustainability and potential to scale up. The research evidence offers little guidance on the costs of interventions. While there is a growing evidence base on violence prevention interventions with groups of children, work that is not specifically focused on sexual violence tends very often to be gender-blind. Some of the most promising interventions, however, are multi-layered, and address the links between violence, identities, norms and intersecting structural inequalities. Much more work is needed on how to sustain and institutionalize work on gender and violence in schools and communities. There is very
little reflection on policy enactment processes to ensure change is sustained at all levels. Finally, more attention is needed to how to develop and use research and how to gather evidence that supports policy development and enactment.

We began this review by commenting on the growing interest and consensus around the need to build evidence-based approaches to intervening on SRGBV. The review has identified a number of gaps, blockages and contestations in evidence on policy and practice. There are, however, a growing number of studies of positive interventions among young people, in schools, families and communities, and among local, district and national policy actors and organizations. Building evidence to trace the threads between these levels of policy enactment will be key to transforming norms and structures of inequality in which the strategies to address violence become entangled.
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**ENDNOTES**

1 The Global Partnership for Education supports 61 developing countries – for a full list of countries see [www.globalpartnership.org/developing-countries](http://www.globalpartnership.org/developing-countries).

2 Available at [http://oer.educ.cam.ac.uk/wiki/ASKAIDS](http://oer.educ.cam.ac.uk/wiki/ASKAIDS).

3 [http://download.ei-ie.org/SiteDirectory/7thWorldCongress/Documents/CONGRESS%20RESOLUTIONS/Final/EN/3.01E_SRGBV_FINAL.docx](http://download.ei-ie.org/SiteDirectory/7thWorldCongress/Documents/CONGRESS%20RESOLUTIONS/Final/EN/3.01E_SRGBV_FINAL.docx) (retrieved 15/02/16).