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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is based on formative research conducted in November and December of 2015 to provide information on the nature, extent, and impact of school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV) on pupils' retention in three districts in Uganda: Mbarara, Hoima, and Mukono. This research explored how teachers, caregivers, community members, and government officials respond to issues of school safety to uphold children's right to an education that is free from violence. This summary presents study objectives, study design, tools, ethical protocols, key findings, and recommendations.

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- Identify and understand the types, extents, and consequences of SRGBV in Uganda as experienced by boys and girls;
- Identify and understand the existing child-protection, reporting, and response systems in the district, school, and community, including the knowledge and use of and satisfaction with these instruments among teachers, pupils, and parents;
- Develop an understanding of the characteristics of school life that reinforce or mitigate violence;
- Understand the existing norms, beliefs, practices, and risk factors that promote, reinforce, or mitigate SRGBV;
- Recognize how pupils avoid and cope with potential incidences of SRGBV;
- Discern teachers’ and communities’ actual and perceived roles in preventing and mitigating the impact of SRGBV; and
- Solicit ideas from teachers, pupils, out-of-school youths, community members, and other stakeholders about what can be done to prevent and mitigate the impact of SRGBV.

Our study design combined purposeful and random sampling to maximize representation with a total of six schools. The study population included 6–7 year olds in Primary (P)1–P2, 8–10 year olds in P3–P4, 11–14 year olds in P5–P7, and pupils over 15 years of age in any class. Head teachers, teachers, school support staff, school management committee (SMC) members, parents/guardians, out-of-school youths, and key stakeholders at the village, sub-county, district, and national levels were interviewed or participated in focus group discussions (FGDs).

Data for the formative research study were collected through qualitative and quantitative methods: 1) participatory learning and action (PLA) workshops with pupils of all age groups; 2) FGDs with parents/guardians of pupils in study schools, SMC members, teachers, and a mixed group (males and females) of village or Local Council One (LC1) stakeholders; and 3) individual interviews with...
selected pupils, head teachers, selected teachers, school support staff, out-of-
school youths, and key stakeholder at the sub-county and national levels.

Ethical standards were ensured through an extensive review of the survey
protocols by the School of Biomedical Sciences Research and Ethics Committee,
Makerere University College of Health Sciences, and the Institutional Review
Board (IRB) of RTI International. Protocols were put into place for briefing study
participants regarding consent and/or assent. Participants were free to not
participate in the study if they felt uncomfortable at any point.

MAIN FINDINGS

The study confirmed a number of findings from the literature on SRGBV in
Ugandan schools. An overwhelmingly high tolerance for violence exists at the
societal level, which legitimizes and justifies the violence that occurs in schools.
Additionally, the research indicates that children lack protection, nurturing, and
respect from many influential adults in their lives and from those who have legal
mandates to protect children against SRGBV. Indeed, all forms of SRGBV,
including corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and bullying, were reported by
study participants.

Pupils encounter high levels of corporal punishment: Just under 50% of pupils
interviewed had heard of someone who had experienced corporal punishment,
and 20% had witnessed it. Other respondents believed that corporal punishment
is a “normal” way to discipline children, despite the Ministry of Education, Science,
Technology, and Sports (MoES) 2006 ban on corporal punishment.

The data also clearly show how rigid and inequitable gender norms, roles, and
expectations define boys’ and girls’ positions in society and how they have made
girls and other groups more vulnerable to SRGBV. Both pupils with disabilities and
orphans and vulnerable children (OVC) experience increased school related
violence. Additionally, because of their exposure to violence in schools, many
pupils feel unhappy at school. All the individually interviewed girls and boys
indicated that they knew unhappy pupils. Furthermore, 15% of girls were unhappy
because of sexual harassment. The data also indicate sexual harassment against
boys exists. This finding requires further exploration to ensure that interventions
are sufficiently holistic to improve gender equality in schools and communities.

Bullying is common in schools and is experienced by all pupils. Eighty percent of
those interviewed had heard of someone being bullied, and nearly the same
percentage had witnessed bullying. Boys are particularly affected by bullying and
harsh corporal punishment. However, bullying is viewed by parents and caregivers
as an acceptable and expected part of school life.

Of the teachers interviewed in FGDs, 33% believed that SRGBV has serious
psychological and emotional implications for pupils. Additionally, the parents
interviewed in FGDs were highly concerned about the emotional effects, and 55%
suggested that the result would be pupils dropping out of school. Overall, the data
show that experiencing violence or even the threat of SRGBV often results in
irregular school attendance, dropout, and poor school performance, in addition to
other effects on pupils’ socio-emotional well-being and health.

Not much confidence exists in the reporting and referral mechanisms that could
support those pupils who are faced with high levels of violence in schools. Across
all sites, 85% of pupils expressed that they were not confident in reporting cases
of SRGBV, and 90% were unhappy with how cases are handled when they do report. All respondents—from teachers to caregivers—stated that they were not happy with the support and services received through referral and reporting mechanisms.

Despite this bleak panorama, the research captured specific, optimistic ideas from pupils on what needs to be done to prevent and respond to SRGBV. Indeed, they considered it necessary for all stakeholders to be involved and attached key roles and responsibilities to each one:

- 13% feel it is the role of teachers to offer counseling and guidance.
- 26% of pupils indicated that the neighbors and communities have responsibilities to help when a parent is not available.
- 12% said that radio must sensitize pupils to dangers on the way to and from school and that friends should report incidents of SRGBV to police and teachers.

**KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

SRGBV usually exists within a complex social and cultural context. To root it out, the inequalities between girls and boys, some of which are caused by entrenched social norms and expectations about the roles of girls and boys and those of women and men, must be addressed. Social, institutional, and environmental barriers to equality between all pupils regardless of, e.g., sex, gender, disability, and home life must be removed.

All stakeholders must work in an intentional and coordinated way to prevent and end SRGBV. Pupils, teachers, administrators, parents, government officials, religious leaders, and others in the community need to engage to create an environment that protects, nurtures, and respects pupils. In doing so, they will not only help pupils who have been affected by SRGBV heal and eventually feel safe but will also profoundly assist pupils who have not been affected in shaping their identities.

Although detailed recommendations for individual stakeholder groups are presented in the full report, in this section, we provide four broad recommendations based on the SRGBV data analysis:

- Take a holistic and long-term approach to preventing and responding to SRGBV: Any efforts addressing SRGBV should see schools as integrated parts of the community rather than as individually functioning microsystems. Attention should be paid at all times to what is happening in pupils’ immediate surroundings; outside the classrooms, such as in latrines, the bushes and forests outside the school premises, and on the way to and from school; and at home and within the family, such as the occurrence of parental negligence, drug abuse, or violence between parents.
- Attempt to improve the school environment based on input and actions from all stakeholders, including pupils. These attempts must include improving school infrastructure, such as classrooms and clean latrines, and the availability and functionality of the existing guidance, counseling, and support services, both within and outside school settings.
• Empower and give voice to children. All efforts to prevent and respond to SRGBV must be designed, led, monitored, and evaluated with the participation of children, and these efforts should utilize child-centered learning approaches and interactions as part of their methodologies. Additionally, the good practices of children’s clubs, anti-acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) clubs, and School-Family Initiatives, in which children are involved in discussing and decision-making regarding changing the school environment, should be implemented.

• Empower, train, and support school staff to improve relations between pupils, between teachers and pupils, between teachers, and between school authorities and communities to create a more caring environment in which no one harms pupils and, if incidents do occur freely utilizes the response and reporting mechanisms and identifies and addresses the barriers to reporting.
1.0 INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

School-related gender-based violence (SRGBV) is a developmental issue affecting millions of girls and boys in schools worldwide. It impacts their health and socio-emotional well-being, contributes to increased absenteeism and low retention, and affects pupils’ performance. In Uganda, pupils throughout primary and secondary schools are affected by violence ranging from emotional abuse and bullying (46%) to corporal punishment (74%) and sexual abuse (77%).\(^1\)

The Literacy Achievement and Retention Activity (LARA) is committed to researching and focusing more intentionally on how SRGBV affects girls and boys differently and how it impacts pupils with disabilities and orphans. To this end, as a first step, LARA conducted formative research to further inform SRGBV interventions in Uganda.

1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), partnering closely with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Uganda and the Global Partnership for Education, introduced an early grade reading (EGR) program in 12 local languages and English in 85 out of the 112 districts in Uganda (see box).

In addition to implementing the EGR program, USAID/Uganda LARA will work to reduce gender-based violence (GBV) in schools. The working hypothesis predicts the following link between retention and literacy: Reducing SRGBV will increase pupils’ retention by allowing them to focus on their lessons and feel secure in their learning environment, thereby improving their ability to learn to read. This hypothesis assumes that the EGR component will include improved EGR instruction.

Thus, LARA has two main objectives:

- Result (R)1 relates to improving reading skills for early primary grade pupils (P1-P4). To achieve this goal, R1 will focus on strengthening the capacity of MoES and other educational stakeholders to deliver EGR.
- R2 focuses on strengthening the capacity of MoES’s systems to provide a positive and supportive learning climate in and around schools in which

---

incidents of SRGBV are recognized, responded to, prevented, and reduced.

These two objectives will be accomplished by providing systemic capacity building of the education system, school-level support, and community- and household-level support and encouraging the participation of community and household members.

This five-year (April 2015–April 2020) USAID/Uganda investment is implemented by RTI International in partnership with World Vision (WV).

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Children have a fundamental right to obtain an education in an environment that is free from violence. However, in schools worldwide, pupils experience a wide range of gendered violence, including physical and emotional bullying, corporal punishment and other non-sexual forms of violence, and sexual harassment and abuse, at school and while traveling to and from school. These behaviors constitute what is referred to as SRGBV. For the purpose of this study, SRGBV is defined as follows:

“SRGBV includes violence or abuse that is based on gendered stereotypes or that targets students on the basis of their sex, sexuality, or gender identities. SRGBV and abuse reinforce gender roles and perpetuate gender inequalities. SRGBV includes rape, unwanted sexual touching, unwanted sexual comments, corporal punishment, bullying, and other forms of non-sexual intimidation or abuse, such as verbal harassment or exploitative labor in schools. Unequal power relations between adults and children and between males and females contribute to this violence, which can occur in the school, on school grounds, while going to and from school, or in school dormitories and may be perpetrated by teachers, students, or community members. Both girls and boys can be victims and perpetrators. SRGBV results in sexual, physical, or psychological harm to girls and boys.”

A number of contextual realities exist in Uganda that make it difficult, uncomfortable, and/or unsafe for pupils to attend school. Children in Uganda experience high levels of violence at the hands of adults and peers at home and school and in their communities (Leach, Slade, & Dunne, 2012). Some of the GBV that occurs in and around Ugandan schools includes corporal punishment, sexual harassment of girls by boys and of boys by girls, psychological mistreatment, and sexual violence or abuse.

Although most sexual harassment is assumed to involve boys harassing girls, in Uganda, girls have also been reported to sexually harass boys (Leach, Dunne, & Salvi, 2014). Furthermore, girls experience derogatory language from teachers regarding their physical appearance and intellect, which belittles them, decreases their confidence and concentration, and ultimately affects their performance (Management Systems International [MSI], 2008). In 2001, the rate of sexual harassment among pupils was 41%, and in 2007, rates as high as 58% were reported. United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) study indicated that these percentages rose to 77% (UNICEF 20132).

---

Despite the 2006 Government of Uganda (GoU) MoES’s ban on corporal punishment, according to the 2012 MoES study, most children in Uganda (74.3%) reported having experienced caning by an adult in school. Pupils also experience sexual abuse in Uganda. A study on violence against children (VAC) in Uganda (Naker, 2005) found that more than 24% of male and female pupils reported that sexual violence occurred at school. This result was corroborated by a 2004 ActionAid International Uganda study (MSI, 2008), which revealed that nearly 40% of pupils had experienced some form of GBV while going to and from school. Although the exact extent to which experiencing violence increases pupil dropout or decreases school performance is not known, Plan Uganda reported (Leach et al., 2014) that dropout and poor performance were two negative impacts of experiencing violence at school.

Finally, violence in Ugandan schools is higher and increasing at a faster rate than that in schools in neighboring countries, such as Kenya and Tanzania (MoES & UNICEF, 2015). According to the MoES (2015), the sexual harassment of pupils by teachers has more than doubled in the past seven years, far exceeding the increases observed in Kenya and Tanzania.³

1.4 PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The SRGBV Formative Assessment is a qualitative formative study designed to provide information on the nature, extent, and impact, especially regarding education outcomes and retention, of SRGBV in three Ugandan districts and how teachers, caregivers, community members, and government officials respond to issues of school safety to uphold children’s right to an education that is free from violence.

1.4.1 PURPOSE

The aim of this research is to generate Uganda-specific information to inform the design of SRGBV-prevention interventions, LARA’s impact evaluation design, and the subsequent development of assessment tools for measuring the project’s performance. Specifically, the SRGBV Formative Assessment explores the following topics:

- Characteristics of school life that reinforce or mitigate violence;
- Types, extents, and consequences of SRGBV in Uganda as experienced by boys and girls;
- Child-protection, reporting, and response systems existing in the district, school, and community, including the knowledge and use of and satisfaction with these instruments among teachers, pupils, and parents; how pupils avoid and cope with potential incidences of SRGBV; and
- Teachers’ and communities’ actual and perceived roles in preventing and mitigating the impact of SRGBV.

Researching the topics created opportunities to engage solicit ideas from teachers, pupils, out-of-school youths, community members, and other

³ The rise in SRGBV incidence is likely a result of two phenomena: an actual increase in SRGBV incidence and improved reporting of such occurrences.
stakeholders about what can be done to prevent and mitigate the impact of SRGBV.

1.4.2 SIGNIFICANCE

The significance of this study is directly related to the necessity of and moral obligation to design an intervention that is both relevant to and informed by the context in which it will be implemented. This formative assessment is designed to generate the information necessary to meet these requirements and include stakeholder voices in developing the interventions from which they will ultimately benefit. This is not only a moral obligation to the intervention’s beneficiaries but is also known to contribute to maximizing their benefit and ensuring the sustainability of the achieved results. Only by fully involving beneficiaries in the design will these interventions “take root” and be owned and sustained in the country.
2.0 THE SRGBV RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 STUDY POPULATION

The study population included male and female pupils selected from each of the following age groups: 6–7 years in P1–P2, 8–10 years in P3–P4, 11–14 years in P5–P7, and over 15 years in any class. Other study participants included head teachers, teachers, school support staff, school management committee (SMC) members, parents/guardians, out-of-school-youths, and key stakeholders at the village, sub-county, district, and national levels.

2.2 SAMPLING STRATEGY: DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS

The sampling strategy combines purposeful and random sampling: purposeful at the district and school levels and random at the pupil level, except for pupils with disabilities and orphans.

The following subsections describe the sampling strategies used for districts, schools, pupils, teachers, other school staff, caregivers, out-of-school youths, and a wide range of stakeholders selected from the local council (LC), sub-county, district, and national levels of governance. Given the nature of this assessment, no statistically significant reporting is possible.

The study was conducted in three out of the 28 LARA target districts in western and central Uganda: Mbarara and Hoima Districts in the western region and Mukono in the central region. These districts were purposefully selected because they either have or are close to a WV Area Development Program (ADP) office. This proximity enhances the management efficiency by leveraging WV’s established relationships with the district authorities, schools, and communities. Representation of the three activity-targeted languages was another condition for district selection.

To select the schools, predetermined criteria based on the schools’ founding bodies, as indicated in the Education Management Information System (EMIS), were generated. The founding bodies included Catholic, Anglican, Islamic, private (entrepreneur), military, and government-based organizations. Founding bodies have different philosophies that guide school practices. Therefore, ensuring that the key types of founding bodies are represented will facilitate learning from these differing perspectives and practices.

A total of six schools were selected for this study. The military school was chosen from Mbarara, which was the only one of the three selected to include such a school. To select the remaining five schools, all schools in the three districts were randomized based on their EMIS numbers (only schools with P1–P7 were included). The schools were then selected by scanning through the randomized list until a school in each of the remaining categories per district was identified. If a district already had two schools, we continued down the list until an appropriate school in another district was found and selected. Through this process, two schools were selected from each of the three districts for a total of six schools.
2.3 PARTICIPANT SELECTION AND CONSENTING AND ASSENTING PROCEDURES

2.3.1 PUPILS

The pupil sample was selected from among those permitted by their parents to participate in the study. On the first day, before data collection began, the research team briefed parents/guardians with children in the school. School officials, selected local leaders, the LARA staff, and all 16 members of the research team assigned to the district participated in the briefing meeting.

During the meeting, participants were briefed about the study and exactly what the children would do if they were selected to participate, and they were encouraged to ask questions. The parents/guardians were asked to give permission for their children to participate in the study. Subsequently, the parents were invited to speak with a researcher to ask further questions on a one-on-one basis and to give or withhold consent for their children to participate.

A sampling frame of eligible children (those whose parents gave consent) by age group, gender, and special needs (OVC and disabled children) was developed. A list of eligible pupils whose parents or guardians had provided consent and who were present at the school was generated by the research team supervisor. A skip number sampling interval was selected by dividing the total number of eligible pupils present in the class by the number of pupils required for each class. Then, a random start number between one and the sampling interval determined according to a table of random numbers was used to identify the starting point. After selecting the first pupil, the remaining pupils were selected by counting down the list using the skip count number. When the end of the list was reached, the team supervisors then circled back to the top of the list and continue counting until the required sample was attained plus four replacements—two boys and two girls—per age group.

After obtaining the required samples, the research team checked whether orphans and disabled pupils were included in the samples for each age group. The study aimed to include at least two orphans (one boy and one girl) and at least two disabled pupils (including one boy and one girl) in each age group, but the teams were unable to realize this target (especially the target number of disabled pupils) in some schools. If they were included (and appropriate pupils were still listed in the sampling frame), then the names of pupils in these two categories were listed separately, and the required sub-samples of orphans and disabled pupils were selected randomly for each age group using the systematic random sampling procedures explained above. Any orphan or disabled pupil selected during this second round of sampling replaced the last pupil of the corresponding sex who did not fall within these special categories in the sample. To ensure that orphans and disabled pupils were sampled, head teachers were encouraged to take special care in recruiting the guardians of orphans and disabled pupils in the school to attend the briefing meeting at which they were asked to give permission for their children to participate in the study.

Selected pupils were then briefed about the study, first in a group setting and then in an individual setting. In the group setting, the pupils were not asked to inform the researchers whether they did or did not want to participate in the study. They were told that they were free to not participate but that they should inform the researcher about their wish to not participate during the individual assenting. In
the individual setting, each sampled pupil was given a printed copy of the assent form.

The assent was read to the pupils verbatim in English and/or the local language, or if the pupil was a fluent reader and preferred to read the assent form him/herself, he or she was asked to read it aloud or to read along with the researcher so that the researcher could confirm that the pupil was reading it correctly and understood what he or she read. The pupils were then asked at specific points while reading the form if they had any questions or needed something clarified or if they wanted to stop and leave.

At the end of the presentation of the assent form, each pupil was asked again if he or she wanted to participate in the study or not, and their decision to participate or not was recorded by the assessor. Two witnesses from the research team signed each form. Pupils 18 years old and above are legally consenting adults, and their consent was sought individually after attending the briefing meeting at the school.

A sub-sample of pupils was randomly selected for individual interviews from the list of pupils who participated in the PLA workshops using the same skip count procedures used to select pupils. In addition, all selected orphans and disabled pupils who participated in the participatory learning and action (PLA) workshops were individually interviewed.

2.3.2 TEACHERS AND SUPPORT STAFF

The head teacher assisted the research team in generating the list of male and female teachers (P1–P7) present in the school. The sampling interval (skip count) and random start number were determined using the same formula as that used for the pupils. A maximum of five male teachers and five female teachers were systematically selected from the list to participate in focus group discussions (FGDs).

In instances where fewer than five teachers were present at the time of the study, all those present were automatically selected. In addition, a two-stage sampling method was used to select male and female teachers to participate in individual interviews. Each school has a designated Senior Male Teacher and Senior Female Teacher whose role, in addition to teaching, is to provide guidance and support to pupils. First, the Senior Male Teacher and Senior Female Teacher of each school were selected for individual interviews. Second, two additional teachers (one male and one female) who were not the Senior Male or Senior Female Teacher were randomly selected for individual interviews.

The head teacher was asked to participate in an individual interview. If a school did not have a head teacher at the time of data collection, then a deputy head teacher was individually interviewed. One female and one male support staff were also randomly selected from a list of support staff available at the school on the day of data collection and asked to participate in an individual interview.

Each selected participant (teacher/head teacher/support staff) was seated in a private place, briefed about the study, and given a consent form, which they read, agreed or disagreed to participate, and then signed. The signed consent form was collected and checked to confirm the decision before the questionnaire was administered to those who agreed to participate in the study.
2.3.3 OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTHS

Out-of-school youths and their parents/guardians were mobilized for a briefing meeting in which they were informed about the study. Following the group briefing, in one-on-one session with parents/guardians, members of the research team provided two copies of the parental permission form to each parent or guardian, read the form out loud, explained each section in the local language, and then gave the parents/guardians a chance to provide or withhold consent for their out-of-school children to participate in the study. Parents/guardians retained one copy of the consent form, and the research team retained the other. A sampling frame of youths with parental/guardian consent was generated and used to randomly select out-of-school youths to participate in individual interviews.

After selection, the research team invited the selected youths to a quiet area or room to brief them further about the study. After the briefing, the participants moved one by one to the area where the assessor was seated and were given an assent form (emancipated youths [i.e., youths who are married or take care of their own livelihoods] were given consent forms).

The individual assent form was read to each youth verbatim in English and/or the local language, or if the youth was a fluent reader, he or she read it him or herself. After the presentation of the assent form, each youth was asked if he or she would like to participate in the study or not, and the decision was recorded by the assessor. Two witnesses from the research team signed each form. Emancipated out-of-school youths gave their own consent because they were considered emancipated minors (and, thus, legally allowed to give their own consent). Their consent was recorded after the consent form was read and explained to them.

2.3.4 PARENTS/GUARDIANS, SMC MEMBERS, AND KEY STAKEHOLDERS FROM VILLAGE, SUB COUNTY, DISTRICT AND NATIONAL LEVEL

All parents/guardians who attended the briefing meeting at the school were asked to give consent to participate in separate male and female parent/guardian FGDs. Team supervisors generated sampling frames of the male and female parents/guardians who agreed to participate in the study. Systematic random sampling was then used to select the required parent/guardian samples.

All SMC members were invited to participate in the FGD held for each school because of their shared responsibility for school administration and supervision. The SMCs are responsible for providing quality assurance monitoring of service delivery in primary schools on behalf of the government, including oversight of the professionalism and behavior of teachers, support staff, and managers. Thus, the SMC is in a position to provide important information about the safety of the school and the nature and extent of SRGBV.

Key stakeholder at the village, sub-county, district, and national levels were purposively selected based on their roles in the reporting, tracking, referral, and response chain relating to violence against children in schools (VACiS). These stakeholders were separated into four groups: Stakeholders at the village level (LC1) participated in a mixed stakeholders meeting, whereas those at the sub-county (LC3), district (LC5), and national levels participated in individual interviews (see Annex B for an overview of the individuals interviewed in each of these groups).
The consenting procedures for the key stakeholders involved giving each participant two copies of the consent form after briefing them about the study. The form was either read to the participant or read along with the participant (depending on the participant's level of literacy), and then, each participant signed the form to indicate whether they agreed or declined to participate in the study. Participants who could not write were asked about their decision, and the relevant check-box was marked by a member of the research team to indicate whether consent was given or not. Two members of the research team signed as witnesses when verbal consent was given. One copy of the form was retained by the participant, and the other was retained by the research team.

2.4 DATA-COLLECTION METHODS, INSTRUMENTS, AND TEAM

2.4.1 METHODS

Data for this study were collected through the following:

- PLA workshops with pupils of all age groups;
- FGDs with parents/guardians of pupils in study schools, SMC members, teachers, and a mixed-gender group of village or LC1 stakeholders; and
- Individual interviews with selected pupils, head teachers, selected teachers, school support staff, out-of-school youths, and key stakeholders at the sub-county and national levels.

2.4.2 DATA-COLLECTION TOOLS

PLA workshop

At the beginning of each PLA workshop, pupils were presented (one at a time) with three SRGBV scenarios, one for each general type of SRGBV: 1) bullying and other forms of non-sexual violence, 2) corporal punishment, and 3) sexual harassment and violence. The scenarios were read by a facilitator. Following the reading of each scenario, the pupils discussed it using a guided set of questions in the form of activities or exercises, as follows:

- Cage trap

In this activity, pupils were presented with a grid depicting a “trap” made by planting sticks in the ground and tying a network of string between them. Within the cells of the “trap”, the pupils were asked to drop pieces of paper on which they had written (or told a facilitator to write) issues/problems they face and the factors that keep them trapped in those problems.

- Validating and prioritizing safe school issues

The facilitator wrote the three types of SRGBV (corporal punishment, bullying, and sexual harassment) on the floor or on a manila card. Using the pieces of paper from the cage trap activity on which the pupils had written (or told a facilitator to write) the issues/problems they face, the facilitator facilitated a discussion to identify the type of SRGBV corresponding to each issue/problem. Subsequently, the facilitator asked the participants one-by-one to vote on each identified issue/problem by allocating the appropriate number of beans to each of the three types of SRGBV (the most beans denotes the most important issue). The facilitator then noted the number of beans allocated to each issue. Finally, the recorded votes were aggregated to identify the most important type of SRGBV.
affecting each particular PLA group (comprising pupils of the same gender and age group).

- **Problem tree**

The problem tree was used to map out both the effects and root causes of the most important type of SRGBV affecting each PLA group. A tree was sketched on a piece of paper, and the most important type of SRGBV identified by the group was written on the trunk. The effects identified by the participants were then written on the leaves, and the root causes were written on the roots. Deeper root causes were written lower than shallow ones, and links were drawn to show which shallow causes stem from which deeper root causes. The facilitators were available to assist in writing out the pupils’ shared responses during the PLA workshops.

- **Risk mapping**

The risk mapping activity provided pupils an opportunity to identify safe and unsafe places for both boys and girls in their school. With the facilitator, pupils engaged in a transect walk to identify safe and unsafe locations within the school. Subsequently, a map of the school was drawn on manila paper, and the safe and unsafe places were marked.

- **Umbrella of care**

In this activity, pupils drew an umbrella over a sketch of themselves, and inside the umbrella, they wrote the names or drew pictures of the various individuals who care for them/help them in the school and the community. Then, they wrote descriptions of how each individual helps them.

- **Venn diagram tool**

The purpose of this activity is to map all relevant stakeholders, emphasizing the parties who are responsible for addressing SRGBV issues. The names of different duty bearers and stakeholders, whether formal or informal, were written in circles. Their degrees of influence were denoted by the sizes of the circles, and the amounts of overlap in their roles were denoted by the degrees to which the circles overlapped.

**FGDs**

FGDs were supported by facilitation guides designed to stimulate interactive dialogue among participants regarding their knowledge on SRGBV, the natures and extents of different types of SRGBV, and the participants’ attitudes and beliefs about the gender norms, power relations, and harmful community practices that often serve to produce and perpetuate SRGBV.

In addition, the FGDs sought to develop in-depth information about the existing instruments for child protection and the informal and formal systems available for reporting and responding to incidences of SRGBV. Open-ended questions focused on the characteristics of life at school, including information about staff relations, teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil relations, formal structures and rules guiding pupil behavior, disciplinary strategies, safety, teacher quality, avenues for teacher professional development, and levels of pupil engagement and sense of “belonging” in the school. Finally, the FGDs also sought to learn more about the patterns of pupil attendance and school retention during a single school year and across years.
Individual interviews

Similar to the group discussions, the individual interviews focused on obtaining information on the nature and extent of the experience of SRGBV; attitudes about gender norms, practices, and power relations; the characteristics of school life; and the patterns of attendance and retention during the school year and across years during the primary school cycle. For pupils, the interviews incorporated icebreakers to establish a child-friendly environment.

2.4.3 TESTING OF DATA-COLLECTION TOOLS

After Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the assessment tools were pretested in one school with a few pupils, parents, and other intended interviewees. The consenting and assenting procedures were followed for the pretest. The pretest indicated that respondents understood the questions but also unearthed complexities in administering the tools, such as questions that were difficult for 6–8-year-old pupils and participant fatigue resulting from the length of the questionnaires. Based on the pretest, some edits were effected on the tools, but no significant changes were made to the structure of the questions. The final instruments were reproduced in sufficient quantities and used to collect data from participants.

2.4.4 DATA-COLLECTION TEAMS

There were three data-collection teams—one for each selected district (Hoima, Mbarara, and Mukono). Each team consisted of 16 members: 12 facilitators (six male and six female) who shared the functions of facilitation, interviewing, and note-taking; two supervisors (one male and one female); and two professional guidance counselors (one male and one female). Each member of the data-collection team was conversant in the predominant local language utilized at each selected school.

All data collectors and supervisors participated in a two-week training program that supported three learning objectives:

1) to develop a deep understanding of the nature of SRGBV, the gender norms and power relations that produce and perpetuate it, and the mediating factors that serve to attenuate or perpetuate it;
2) to develop the sensitivities needed to facilitate discussions on SRGBV and be responsive to the social-emotional needs of informants and fellow data collectors to ensure that the on-site and referral sources of support are accessed in a discreet and timely manner; and
3) to obtain a thorough understanding of the goals of the research and field protocol and develop the competencies and confidences needed to conduct the data-collection activities according to the protocol.

2.4.5 DATA-COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Before each research team traveled to the assigned district, the education officers of the selected districts were informed about the reasons for the study and the data-collection period. The head teachers of all selected schools were also informed about their obligations in the study and the actual dates of data collection. On the day they traveled to perform field work, each district research team was given the data-collection manual and materials.
In every study school, head teachers, teachers, support staff, and parents/guardians were briefed about the reasons for, importance of, and sample selection processes used in the study. Other participants outside the school setting, including out-of-school youths, LC1 leaders, and key informants at the sub-county, district, and national levels, were also briefed about the study before data collection. Data collection in each school and among the respective stakeholders required two weeks.

All of the sampled pupils with parental permission and child assent participated in a PLA workshop. The PLA workshops occurred in a private venue within the school. The desired location was determined by the research team with the help of the school administration. In each school, separate PLA workshops were held for boys and girls in four different age groups (6–7, 8–10, 11–14, and 15 years and above). Each workshop included a maximum of 12 pupils (six boys or six girls) and three facilitators (a lead facilitator, a note-taker, and a supervisor, all of the same sex as the group).

The data were collected as follows:

- **PLA workshops**

  The interactive PLA processes were adapted to support pupils in reflecting specifically about SRGBV acts, including bullying and other forms of non-sexual intimidation, harsh forms of punishment, and sexual harassment and abuse. This was facilitated by an ice-breaker session in which small story-based scenarios about an incidence of SRGBV (e.g., bullying, harsh punishment or humiliation, or sexual harassment) were presented to the participating pupils, followed by a general discussion period.

  During the workshop, the facilitators, building on the pupils’ artwork and discussions as appropriate, guided the pupils to focus on incidences of SRGBV. Pupils were provided opportunities to write and/or verbally explain their comments related to the activity. The note-taker wrote down all verbal comments.

  As for all of the activities, in the PLA workshops, frequent “check-ins” with participating pupils were performed to give the pupils opportunities to share their feelings about the activity and any fears they may have related to the discussions, to remind them that a counselor was available if desired, and to give them a chance to discontinue their participation if they wished. The PLA workshops took approximately four–five hours. Therefore, two snack breaks and a lunch were provided.

- **FGDs**

  FGDs, supported by specific facilitation guidelines, were conducted with participants selected from the following populations: teachers, SMC members, parents/caregivers, and a mixed-gender group of LC1 stakeholders. Except for those involving SMC members, all FGDs were conducted separately for males and females and were facilitated by researchers of the same gender. Each focus group included a moderator, a note-taker, and an observer. The observer was responsible for tape recording the sessions. During the group discussions, participants were discouraged from disclosing personal experiences of SRGBV or experiences of violence that they had heard about or witnessed. They were also discouraged from using the names of people affected by SRGBV at the beginning
of the FGD and periodically thereafter. Each FGD lasted approximately one–two hours.

- Individual interviews

The interviews of teachers, school staff, and pupils were held in a private location where others could not hear or see the nature of the activity. Key stakeholders at the local, district, and national levels of governance were interviewed in their offices or in a private room near their office. The individual interviews were facilitated by a moderator and a note-taker, who also audio taped the interview if the interviewee gave permission. Unlike the FGDs, individuals participating in individual interviews were not discouraged from sharing personal or witnessed experiences or experiences that they had heard of. However, the facilitator made it very clear to the interviewee that the disclosure of specific SRGBV experiences was not expected or necessarily desirable.

To establish a child-friendly atmosphere, individual interviews with pupils involved the presentation of the same SRGBV scenarios discussed with their peers during the PLA. These stories provided a context for pupil reflection regarding different acts of SRGBV and a private context in which they could disclose personal experiences related to the acts SRGBV introduced in the story scenarios. As above, pupils were not required to discuss anything they did not want to. The individual interviews were designed to take no more than one hour.

2.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical standards were ensured through a Full Review of the survey protocols by the School of Biomedical Sciences Research and Ethics Committee, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, and the IRB of RTI.

In addition, parents of eligible pupils aged below 18 years and all study participants were taken through a consenting process using appropriate pre-printed consent and assent forms. The consenting/assenting was performed in an individual setting after the plenary participant briefing. The consent and assent forms explained the study’s title and purpose, sample-selection approach, interview duration, provisions for confidentiality, potential risks and mitigation measures, participants’ benefits and rights, and investigators. Two guidance counselors (male and female) were available to provide responsive psychosocial support to participants and any member of the research team as needed. The participants were also told that their names were not required and that all personal identifiers would be eliminated at the data-analysis stage.

2.6 QUALITY CONTROL

The three-stage selection process of the research teams and rigorous training of the team members are other critical elements of quality control. First, resumes were reviewed, and checks were conducted to ensure that candidates had no record of child abuse. Second, interviews were held. Third, short-listed candidates were tested. As a result, a research team with experience in qualitative and quantitative research, fluency in English and the language spoken in the study area, good interpersonal and communication skills, and experience working with children was recruited and trained.

During the FGDs and PLA workshops, each study group was assigned a moderator, note-taker, and observer/recorder, and individual interviews included a
moderator and note-taker. In addition, the male and female supervisors monitored all field activities and maintained gender alignment so that only same-sex supervisors were involved in the PLA and FGD activities. Team supervisors supervised the sample-selection and data-collection processes and resolved all emerging challenges as much as possible before, during, and after data collection.

Three Field Monitors (including the LARA Monitoring and Evaluation [M&E] Coordinator, the LARA M&E Officer, and a PLA expert from WV) provided oversight to each district team to forestall errors in the data-collection process as early as they were able and ensure that the data collected were of the highest quality possible.

The teams held daily debriefing sessions immediately after the field work to discuss any issues/matters that arose during the day and plan for the following day’s work. During these debriefing sessions, supervisors checked the notes from the FGDs and PLA workshops and key informant interviews for completeness and to ensure that all of that day’s targeted participants had been covered.

To ensure confidentiality, all data-collection tools were inserted in clearly labeled envelopes indicating the participant category and sealed on a daily basis. Data from most of the FGDs and individual interviews were audio recorded and transcribed by professional transcriptionists. The draft report will be submitted to internal peer reviewers from both WV and RTI. This process ensured a high-quality dataset.

2.7 DATA CODING AND ANALYSIS

Data were captured using a digital audio recorder, and the note-taker ensured that notes were taken during the interview. After the data collection was completed, the data were transcribed verbatim and translated into English, and then, the handwritten transcripts were anonymized and assigned unique numbers. Before coding, a team of 10 graduate-level research assistants different from those involved in the actual data collection was identified and trained to assist in the coding process. Coding started with a trial process that involved randomly sampling five of the transcripts from each of the tools used for data collection. This pre-test aimed to identify the key issues emerging from each of the questions asked during the interview. This process led to the development of the code book (or list of variables) for each assessment tool that was then used during the coding and data-entry processes.

An Excel workbook was used to enter and store data. The coding team read through each of the transcripts, highlighted the textual data synonymous with a particular code under each question in the transcript, and assigned a code number similar to that of the respective research question. Within the master sheet, a corresponding tally was then entered in the cell matching that particular code and the respective transcript. This process continued until all the transcripts had been entered. The frequencies of the tallies were then summed, and the counts of the numbers of transcripts bearing the respective code were totaled in the last two columns of each codebook.

During the analysis, the team adopted a thematic content analysis technique. This technique involved analyzing and presenting the results according to the pre-determined set of themes to inform the design of bridges to activities. To handle the pre-determined themes, the analysis team reviewed the various tools and
identified questions whose responses would provide answers fitting under the pre-determined themes.

These questions were then grouped together under each theme to generate the dummy data analysis plan. The short summaries of the responses to each of the questions in the various tools were then pile sorted to identify the key emerging sub-themes. These sub-themes were then triangulated using data from other sources, such as the field notes and PLA diagrams. The results are presented under each set of pre-determined themes. Interesting quotations representing each of the sub-themes were extracted from the transcripts and used in the report to highlight the respondents’ voices.
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 LOOKING AHEAD: KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

SRGBV is a physical or emotional act that occurs within a specific social and cultural context, and changing this context to ameliorate SRGBV is possible. Both women and men need better laws and school policies to prevent this violence and protect girls’ and boys’ right to a safe education. Additionally, we need campaigns to raise awareness about the problem and to educate people about appropriate behavior, and we must all encourage gender equality in our schools and communities. Pupils require teachers who can model non-violence in the classroom, and teachers must be knowledgeable about positive, non-violent forms of discipline. Finally, all who are working to end SRGBV need to involve pupils, teachers, administrators, parents, religious leaders, and others community members in this effort.

The research findings obtained through this assessment confirm the global literature review, as expected. Thus, the researchers can offer recommendations for both addressing specific issues and achieving long-term effects on SRGBV programming, as follows:

3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALL

- Take a holistic and long-term approach to preventing and responding to SRGBV: Any efforts addressing SRGBV should consider schools as an integrated part of the community rather than as individually functioning microsystems.
- Attempt to improve the availability and functionality of the existing guidance, counseling, and support services both within and outside school settings. Efforts should be made to improve reporting and referral mechanisms so that pupils, parents, teachers, and school administration are confident that SRGBV incidences will be handled.
- Empower and give voice to children: All efforts to prevent and respond to SRGBV should be designed, led, monitored, and evaluated with the participation of children, and these efforts should utilize child-centered learning approaches and interactions as part of their methodologies. The good practices of children’s clubs, anti-acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) clubs, and School-Family Initiatives, in which children are involved in discussing and decision-making regarding changing the school climate, should be implemented.

3.3 FOR THE GOU

The GoU has a critical role to play in addressing SRGBV. It must ensure that specific, appropriate, consistent, gender-sensitive, and transformative SRGBV policies are in place. It must guarantee that institutional and school procedural protocols, policies, and frameworks and teacher codes of conduct that
comprehensively and specifically address SRGBV are promulgated, consolidated, and implemented. Finally, the GoU is in a unique position to raise awareness and knowledge of these laws and regulations. Disseminating reliable and up-to-date information about SRGBV legislation is an important step in preventing and responding to SRGBV in Uganda. We also recommend the following:

- Strengthen the commitment of policymakers to address SRGBV issues by providing funding for preventing and responding to SRGBV and developing and implementing the legal and policy framework, including widely disseminating study findings and pursuing additional research on SRGBV in Uganda.
- Clarify the conceptual understandings and definitions of SRGBV through systematic and comprehensive efforts. These efforts must include the various forms of SRGBV, such as sexual harassment and abuse, bullying, corporal punishment, physical and verbal violence.
- Develop supplementary materials and enhance teacher’s guides to include guidance on the mandatory equality of roles within these settings and its implementation. Identify and train teachers/head teachers to be key agents of change responsible for the implementation of this curriculum.4
- Demand and support improving the functionality of reporting and referral mechanisms.

3.4 FOR PROGRAMMATIC PARTNERS ON THE GROUND

- Build and expand strategic partnerships to increase the effectiveness, impact, outreach, visibility, and sustainability of efforts addressing SRGBV and engage with a diverse range of partners in the education and other sectors. Establish partnerships with schools and SMCs, child clubs, anti-AIDS clubs, and communities. Involving parents in the prevention of, response to, and reporting of SRGBV may be the first step in building fruitful partnerships and raising awareness about services and available support.
- Support the GoU in enhancing the existing curriculum by strengthening gender equality and promoting rights.
- Address the multiple individual vulnerabilities that different pupils face in schools. Programmatic efforts must explicitly focus on the multiple vulnerabilities of specific populations in educational settings (e.g., girls, boys, feminine boys, masculine girls, pupils with disabilities, and orphans).
- Create and widely share alternatives to violence. Implement school-based gender-transformative efforts involving a wide range of stakeholders, including parents, teachers, school staff, SMCs, and child and family protection officers, and provide education on non-violent methods of child rearing and positive disciplinary techniques for classroom management.

---

3.5 FOR SCHOOLS AND THE EDUCATION SECTOR

Efforts to address SRGBV must involve the whole school environment, including pupils, teachers, non-teaching school staff, parents, caregivers, community and religious leaders, authorities, and government officials, all of whom are in a position to bring about change. For these groups, we recommend the following:

- Raise awareness about current national-, district-, and school-level SRGBV-related laws and regulations among teachers, head teachers, SMCs, and other teaching and non-teaching school staff to encourage reporting and adherence to those laws and regulations at all levels of the school structure.

- Implement a comprehensive, rights-based curriculum on gender roles, rights, equality, and non-violence in schools, including guidance and training for teachers, head teachers, and other school staff, and develop awareness-raising materials/campaigns.

- Raise awareness of SRGBV among pupils in a sensitive manner. This is important to prevent the problem from persisting. Greater awareness around SRGBV should be accompanied by information for both pupils and their parents and caregivers regarding where and how to seek, access, and use resources in case of SRGBV.

- Involve schools, teaching and non-teaching school staff, and management in efforts to prevent and respond to SRGBV through the following:
  - Development or strengthening, adaptation, and implementation of teacher codes of conduct applicable to all staff and pupils. Special emphasis should be placed on confronting and challenging all forms of violence in schools.
  - Incorporation of alternative forms of discipline into teacher trainings and classroom/teaching methodologies. Tools should be developed to help teachers move away from physical and corporal punishment and towards non-violent teaching methods.
  - Engagement with other ongoing school-based activities, programs, or community campaigns (e.g., anti-AIDS clubs and School-Family Initiatives) to raise awareness about SRGBV.

3.6 FOR THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

As illustrated throughout this report, knowledge gaps remains, and insufficient, sex-disaggregated, credible data exist regarding the gendered causes and nature of SRGBV in Uganda. Cross-country comparable data are also incomplete, and concerning gaps in the research across Uganda’s districts remain. For these reasons, we recommend the following:

- Whereas previous research efforts have focused on the prevalence of SRGBV in Uganda, the current research focus now should be on the gendered nature of the classroom: what types of violence affect boys, girls, and other special categories of children; such as disabled children; when it happens to boys, girls, and other special categories of children; how various types of SRGBV affect boys, girls, and other special categories of children differently; and who perpetrates violence against
boys, girls, and other special categories of children within and outside of the school setting. Although this assessment collected data relating to these issues, the sample size was not sufficiently large to make generalizations.

- Considering the rapidly changing policy environment, comprehensively consolidating existing policies and legal frameworks related to SRGBV is urgently needed. The best method to achieve this would be to build on the work UNICEF and MoES have done to measure the exact progress and identify where gaps remain.

- Addressing the following under-researched forms of SRGBV is an urgent task:
  - SRGBV in private, military and religious schools;
  - Peer-on-peer, bullying, and cyber-bullying; and
  - VAC with disabilities, orphans, and those with special learning needs.

### 3.7 FOR THE MEDIA

- The media, including local radio stations, community newspapers, printed media, and social forums, play an important role in preventing and responding to SRGBV. Specifically, they can do the following:
  - Promote children’s rights by implementing awareness campaigns, radio discussions, and forums to discuss the risk factors, underlying causes, and devastating consequences of SRGBV;
  - Facilitate a social environment in which violence is not accepted by influencing practices in schools and beyond that reject the violent exercise of authority by teachers, question negative behaviors within and outside the classroom, and provide education about positive and non-violent alternative forms of discipline; and
  - Establish reporting practices that go beyond “numbers” and “incidents”, that are gender transformative, and that have formats and contents targeted to specific audiences.

---

4.0 STUDY LIMITATIONS AND INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 LIMITATIONS

This study encountered the following challenges that might have affected the integrity of the results:

4.1.1 QUALITATIVE STUDY

Despite the careful design, there are limitations to this research. This work was primarily a qualitative research study that allowed space for adequate probing. However, the time limitations of the interviews often did not permit the data collectors to clarify or verify certain information that could have shed more light on the situation of violence in and around schools. In Uganda, the nomenclature at government levels down to communities and schools is “violence against children in schools”. The terms “violence” and “abuse” were sometimes used interchangeably, which made fully comprehending the responses relating to participants’ knowledge of and experiences with violence challenging. Furthermore, LARA is focused on rural settings with extreme poverty and traditional social norms. It is unclear whether the findings can be extrapolated to urban settings in which fewer inequalities may exist.

4.1.2 INABILITY TO EXPANSIVELY MAP EXISTING CHILD-PROTECTION SYSTEMS

Most participants lacked adequate knowledge of the existing child-protection structures, and thus, it was difficult to comprehensively map out the child-protection, reporting, and response systems within the districts, schools, and communities. However, the study gathered useful information on the perceived and actual roles of different stakeholders in preventing and mitigating the impact of SRGBV, laying the groundwork for developing a referral web for SRGBV and supporting schools and communities in using it.

4.1.3 INABILITY TO RECRUIT THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTHS IN THE COMMUNITIES

Because the study was focused on schools, a misconception arose in the community suggesting that the study aimed to arrest children who were not in school because attendance is mandated by a government policy through the Universal Primary Education law, and thus, youths went into hiding, despite the fact that information about the study was provided during community mobilization. As a result, we were unable to obtain the required sample of out-of-school youths in many communities. Therefore, we lost some of the details regarding their experiences as subjects who could provide abundant information supporting the
need to streamline some of the unique elements of the school environment that may have contributed to their leaving school.

4.1.4 GENERALIZABILITY OF THE RESULTS

In this study, as with many qualitative studies, data were collected in only six schools (two from each of three districts). The study’s goal was to learn about the experience of SRGBV from pupils in a variety of types of schools in Uganda, including schools in rural and urban settings. Thus, we were able to better understand the presentation of SRGBV in a variety of settings, but because this study was a qualitative inquiry, we were unable to compare data from one setting to another, as is true for most qualitative research. Obtaining generalizable findings was not the intention of this research.

4.1.5 SELF-REPORTED DATA

Data gathered through PLA workshops, individual interviews, and focus groups were self-reported data and, thus, limited by the fact that they cannot be independently verified. Whatever participants said had to be taken at face value. However, we were able to capture different dimensions of the same phenomenon after triangulating the data captured from different sources, such as individual pupil interviews, multi-stakeholder interviews, and FGDs. In addition, during their individual interviews, many teachers preferred to mention SRGBV experiences they had witnessed or heard of elsewhere rather than any that had occurred in their current schools. Thus, ascertaining the actual extents of SRGBV in the sampled schools was difficult.

4.2 INTERPRETATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.2.1 UNDERSTANDING OF CHILD ABUSE AND VAC

Child abuse and VAC are contested concepts with different definitions and perspectives. For example, child abuse was mostly interpreted as an overall violation or denial of children’s rights, whereas VAC was most frequently referred to as the mistreatment of children without further specification. Although some of the respondents described child abuse as actual or potential harm to a child’s health, development, or dignity (e.g., maltreatment; parental neglect, including not providing care, necessities, and basics, such as food; and physical or sexual abuse), others lacked comprehensive knowledge on the exact meaning of the term.

Most respondents who participated in the research indicated that VAC means one or more types of abuses (e.g., corporal punishment, sexual harassment, or bullying), but none of them were able to list all forms of physical or mental violence, such as injury and abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, and sexual abuse. Although the testimonies clearly indicate that violence in and outside schools is neither hidden nor mysterious and that men and women and boys and girls are abundantly aware of the problem, our research confirms that the understanding of SRGBV varies. This varied understanding made it difficult to understand the exact circumstances in schools. We also found that children and adults lacked reliable sources of information and familiarity with

Consensus is lacking among members of every group on what constitutes child abuse or VAC, including in schools, on the way to/from schools, and outside the school environment.
an adequate framework for comprehending these terms. This scarcity of information influences the definition of SRGBV and generates different definitions, potentially increasing the complexity of the prevention, response to, and reporting of SRGBV.

4.2.2 UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHARACTERISTICS THAT REINFORCE OR MITIGATE AGAINST VIOLENCE

The root causes and driving factors of SRGBV

Our research may not have captured all of the root causes and motivations underlying SRGBV, and in some settings, different reasons may be more common. However, the study findings confirm that SRGBV is not rooted in or driven by one or two motivations but is rather a function of multiple factors that interact at the individual, family, community, and society levels. We found, for example, that teacher’s unprofessional behavior and conduct were associated with the sexual harassment of pupils in schools and that teachers’ beliefs in their superiority, authority, and power over pupils were associated with corporal punishment, the beating of pupils, and their punishment with strenuous chores or classroom or garden work. Pupils’ individual behaviors, such as copying and transferring negative attitudes and behaviors witnessed at home into the school environment, were correlated with experiencing bullying and led to further discrimination and punishment in schools. We found that violating some community norms, such as by dressing immodestly, was associated with girls being judged and blamed for having experienced sexual harassment, abuse, or even rape.

Our study also affirms that SRGBV is common and persists in schools because of complex patterns of socio-cultural and economic structures or conditions. Examples of these conditions include pupils’ poor family backgrounds or lack of necessities; social structures, norms, or ills, such as ignorance and poor implementation of SRGBV laws; moral degeneration, which is understood as moving away from socially acceptable positive values and behaviors; and having to travel long distances to/from school. All of these conditions have been associated with increased experiences and perpetration of violence among pupils. These factors, in turn, are related to pupils not always feeling happy in school, disliking school, underperforming, skipping school, or dropping out altogether.

Our research revealed that gender inequality and rigid social and gender norms and expectations for children create complex causes and patterns of SRGBV. The data clearly show that existing rigid and inequitable gender norms, roles, and expectation define boys’ and girls’ positions in society. For instance, a large majority of teachers agreed with the following statement: “It is girls’ role to cook and clean”. Such gender inequity in society breeds wider social inequities in educational settings, which are, in this case, being manifested through SRGBV. Furthermore, the lack of conformity to commonly accepted roles or the inability to fulfill certain social and gender expectations translates into pupils experiencing incidents of violence, harassment, punishment, and discrimination in schools.

4.2.3 MAGNITUDE AND MANIFESTATION OF SRGBV

Findings from the study confirm that the problem of SRGBV is overwhelming and that VACIS and violence on the way to or from schools constitute an all-too-real part of life for Ugandan children. Furthermore, school is a place where
discriminatory practices and behaviors exist and where pupils experience social and gendered discrimination and marginalization.

In schools, pupils are exposed to beatings, emotional violence, physical violence, sexual harassment, abuse and rape, name-calling, and various forms of discrimination and exclusion. Confirming previous research-based evidence from Uganda, we found that the most common types of SRGBV are corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and bullying.

Pupils are at risk of violence perpetrated by numerous actors in their immediate school environment, including teachers, head teachers, and fellow pupils. However, interestingly, SRGBV extends beyond school settings and includes the school surroundings, and the routes to and from schools. The most commonly referenced types of violence in those settings included physical violence, sexual harassment and abuse, parental negligence, and bullying. Additionally, the most commonly referenced outside-of-school perpetrators of violence included other pupils, parents, relatives, caregivers, community members, and strangers.

The research findings confirm that pupils do not feel safe and protected in school. Among the members who testified from all groups, the sexual harassment of pupils in schools and on the way to or from school, corporal punishment, heavy punishment and beating of pupils in schools, bullying, parental negligence and poverty, and dropping out of school because of SRGBV were the utmost concerns related to SRGBV.

**Gendered nature of SRGBV**

The gendered dimension of SRGBV has been largely ignored in previous research efforts in Uganda. If previous questions addressed the types of violence pupils experience in schools, our focus should now shift to the gendered nature of the classroom and the need to understand the types of violence experienced by boys and girls, when this violence affects boys and girls, who perpetrates violent acts specifically against boys and girls, and finally, how different types of school-related violence affect boys, girls, and other special categories of children differently.

Through in-depth interviews and group discussions, we found that SRGBV is not limited to one or two types of abuse but is rather a complex phenomenon that plays out differently for different pupils in schools. Members of every group in our research testified regarding the gendered nature of SRGBV and revealed that girls experience SRGBV more than other pupils. Girls are especially vulnerable to sexual harassment and abuse and experience different risk levels when they walk long distances to reach school. In contrast, boys seem to be more affected by corporal punishment and bullying in schools, whereas heavy punishment and bullying were reported to be common among boys outside the school settings. Our research also found some evidence suggesting a rise in the sexual harassment of boys by teachers in schools, but our limited data do not allow formative conclusions to be drawn.

**School-related violence based on social markers**

The very strong patriarchal and hierarchical character of the classrooms, which is based on unequal social power, disproportionately values and labels different pupils. Our research found that social markers, such as age, appearance, disability, and socio-economic family background, are triggers of violence in schools. Additionally, we determined that boys are experiencing sexual violence in school and the school girls are the main perpetrators. Younger pupils experience
more bullying from their older pupils; however, the longer a pupil stay in school the higher the chances that they are exposed to SRGBV. Children with disability and orphans regardless of their gender are more prone to the three manifestations of violence.

We found that such widespread gender- and social marker-based violence is often institutionalized and, hence, normalized in school settings. This reflects a reality in which pupils are considered to have low status in the social and school hierarchy, and in turn, this low status is viewed as a justification for teachers, head teachers, and others to use power to exercise control, discipline, and coercion. The punishment of pupils in schools is often perceived as a “normal” way to establish a hierarchy between teachers and pupils or to reinforce certain rules or behaviors in classrooms (e.g., coming to school on time, maintaining appropriate personal hygiene, keeping the school environment clean, and using English). As such, various forms of punishment become a “just” method of controlling and disciplining pupils. Furthermore, when obedience by children is seen as an overarching imperative for, e.g., respecting the rules of school conduct, punishment is an accepted and, sometimes, preferred way of “teaching pupils their place”. The research findings also indicate that such obedience is often imposed through heavy or corporal punishment and is also often accepted by parents, caregivers, and pupils themselves as necessary to establish classroom discipline or improve performance.

**Experiencing violence at home**

Although not captured by quantitative data, the qualitative findings of the research suggest that most pupils experience multiple forms of violence and abuse outside the school setting, i.e., in the family, at home, and in the community. Parental negligence, heavy work load within the household, severe beatings and heavy punishments at home, and sexual harassment and rape by family or community members were the most commonly indicated types of violence experienced and witnessed outside the school setting. As a young female describing her experiences outside school said, “I saw a child of about 3 years of age who was raped by a man. And it also happened to me”.

These results are similar to global findings suggesting that violence is a function of multiple factors that interact at various levels of the “social ecology”, i.e., not only at the level of the individual but also at the household, community, and societal levels.

**4.2.4 RECOGNIZING THE CONSEQUENCES OF SRGBV AS EXPERIENCED BY BOYS AND GIRLS**

Generally, the consequences of VAC have been well-documented globally and, recently, in Uganda. However, less is known about the specific impacts of SRGBV on pupils in the Ugandan context. Our study revealed that pupils in schools suffer a range of devastating consequences of SRGBV, including impacts on their health, behavior, and learning outcomes.

Psychological distress/torture is the most common consequence of SRGBV that affects pupils, impacting their mental and physical well-being, literacy achievement and performance, and school retention. The second most commonly indicated impact of SRGBV reported by members of all groups was school absenteeism and dropout.
We found that physical violence negatively impacts pupils’ educational outcomes, resulting in decreased participation and lower school performance. Sexual violence has a particular effect on absenteeism and dropping out, especially the sexual harassment and abuse of girls, which leads to teen pregnancy and consequent early marriage and is associated with high rates of girls dropping out of school. We also found that experiencing physical violence and corporal punishment in classrooms was associated with emotional problems. Gender and social discrimination has profound consequences on pupils’ active participation in class and their ability to seek academic excellence and makes pupils more vulnerable to emotional and psychological problems. Finally, the results showed that experiencing or witnessing violence in schools seriously impacts pupils’ psycho-emotional well-being and, as mentioned earlier, is associated with the perpetration of violence.

These findings have several serious implications. SRGBV continues to impact pupils and has severe physical and psychological health implications. The experience or even the threat of SRGBV often results in irregular attendance, dropout, or poor school performance. Witnessing or experiencing violence in schools may have irreversible consequences for pupils relating to perpetrating or experiencing additional violence in their adult lives.

**Witnessing violence in schools**

In addition to experiencing SRGBV, pupils witness violent acts at staggeringly high rates. In our research, both pupils and out-of-school youth testified to having heard of and witnessed someone being punished, beaten, bullied, or even sexually abused. For example, almost 80% of pupils had heard of someone who had experienced bullying, and approximately the same proportion had witnessed someone being bullied. Witnessing or experiencing violence has profound intergenerational consequences. Childhood experiences of violence are associated with gender-inequitable attitudes in adulthood, the acceptance of violence either as a victim or a perpetrator in future relationships, and negative parenting outcomes. A review of the global literature also suggests that when SRGBV is as prevalent as it is in Uganda, pupils start to suffer from depression, suicidal feelings, and an inability to control their anger. Although this association has not been fully explored in our research, the data indicate that children, in addition to experiencing and witnessing violence, also perpetrate violence, copying the negative and violent attitudes and behaviors of their peers, teachers, parents, and caregivers.

**4.2.5 EXISTING CHILD-PROTECTION, REPORTING, AND RESPONSE SYSTEMS AND THE KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH THESE INSTRUMENTS**

**Prevention of and response to SRGBV**

Our research did not find any commonly accepted practices for preventing SRGBV, nor did we learn of any existing strategies for promoting positive and healthy relationships and interactions between children. However, the investigation revealed that across all groups studied, providing counseling and reporting to higher authorities or police were the most frequently reported school-level approaches to responding to SRGBV (non-sexual or sexual violence and abuse experienced by pupils at the hands of teachers). More specifically, no comprehensive and holistic SRGBV prevention and response strategies exist in
schools. Clearly, members of almost every group interviewed in the research lack consensus regarding which actor is the final authority in preventing, responding to, or reporting SRGBV and the exact roles and responsibilities of these actors in addressing school-related violence. Additionally, our research found that respondents—stakeholders, caregivers and parents, teachers, head teachers, and other school staff—do not always play their parts in preventing, responding to, and reporting SRGBV. Furthermore, when they do, they are met with inadequate response from the authorities, and thus, in the end, they are less inclined to trust and use the formal reporting system. Even when they know that doing so is their responsibility, they do not accept this responsibility because the processes are flawed. However, as clearly indicated by many pupils and young people interviewed, parents and teachers are typically as the first and most important points of contact; they are often the first to be reported to and the first to provide care. These findings raise a serious concern that responsibilities and blame can be easily shifted from one group to another, thereby leaving the problems unresolved.

The violence that boys, girls, and other special categories of children experience in schools, around schools, and on the way to and from school does not happen in a vacuum. Recognizing the crucial roles that all actors and stakeholders can play in protecting children from violence and ensuring their health and well-being is crucial. However, we must also understand the specific responsibilities that each stakeholder has in addressing SRGBV. Our study affirms that, in addition to a comprehensive and holistic approach to preventing, responding to, and reporting SRGBV, a collaborative multi-partner and multi-sectoral approach is also required. The first step in this direction would be to clarify who is responsible for what in and outside school settings.

Reporting of SRGBV

Our study revealed that pupils in schools are not confident regarding reporting incidents of SRGBV. Furthermore, pupils, youths, and adults lack awareness of and familiarity with the existing mechanisms and school reporting structures and comprehensive information on how to report.

The very low number of people who witnessed or experienced SRGBV and felt compelled to report it suggests the existence of cultural taboos, social stigma, or even shame associated with openly reporting violence.

Although some pupils report incidents of SRGBV to teachers, head teachers, or school administration, most tend to be reluctant to report acts of school-related violence, especially those perpetrated by teachers, because they fear reprisal and possible punishment, ridicule, or re-victimization or think they will not be believed.

---

6 For example, if a head teacher reports to police, as is his or her responsibility. He or she will be called to the station or court multiple times to defend him/herself, only to have the proceeding cancelled. Each time he or she goes, it costs transport money. In the end, people cannot afford to get involved because of the financial costs and the impact on their reputations.
Pupils fear speaking out because they understand the stigma attached to victims (e.g., the shame and re-victimization associated with early pregnancy resulting from sexual abuse in school).

Most young respondents in the study indicated that “it is difficult to get support”. This lack of trust and confidence in school structures and school management discourages them from reporting perpetrators of violence who are teachers, school staff, or fellow pupils. Moreover, increased individual vulnerability to violence perpetrated by peers, teachers, school staff, and others with whom pupils interact in schools and on the way to or from schools may further discourage them from reporting incidents of SRGBV.

**Awareness and familiarity with laws pertaining to SRGBV**

The respondents lack awareness of and familiarity with national-, local-, and school-level legal measures to prevent SRGBV and protect children from violence. In none of the sample groups did we find that men, women, boys, or girls were well informed of their rights, entitlements, and obligations, or familiar with key laws and regulations preventing SRGBV. Shockingly, even the school staff, i.e., the teachers, head teachers, and SMCs who stand at the forefront of child protection in schools, were unaware of, for instance, the MOES’s recent ban on all acts of VAC in schools, institutes, and colleges.

This finding points to the obvious disconnect between the existence of such laws on the national or district level and their application on a local or school level and to a fundamental lack of understanding of these laws and regulations. This is seriously concerning and may further exacerbate and intensify the pervasiveness of SRGBV.

**Familiarity with organizations that provide SRGBV-related services and support**

Although progress has been made in addressing SRGBV, including legislative developments, various research efforts in Uganda, and the establishment and growth of school-based interventions, in this study, the respondents lacked familiarity with the existing and active organizations in the district, school, and community that provide services and support for those affected by SRGBV. Specifically, we found a lack of awareness among respondents regarding where and how to access such support and how those services are being used. The collective testimony of a large number of respondents demonstrates the need to support such work in close collaboration with school officials, educational institutions, government agencies and officials, and other school authorities able to stimulate and sustain efforts to prevent, respond to, and report SRGBV.

---

Our Study Confirms the Following:

- The attitudes and perceptions regarding SRGBV of pupils, teachers and school staff, caregivers, parents, and stakeholders are complex.
- These attitudes have been influenced by personal experiences and observations and by the values and norms prevalent in their communities and taught to them. Thus, their understandings of gender roles and identities are clearly lived as much as learned.

---
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4.2.6 IDENTIFYING THE EXISTING NORMS, BELIEFS, PRACTICES, AND RISK FACTORS THAT PROMOTE, REINFORCE, OR MITIGATE AGAINST SRGBV

Gender inequality in classrooms

The attitudes and perceptions among the study population regarding gender and social roles and responsibilities were inextricably linked to their views on and acceptance of SRGBV. The beliefs expressed in the study reflect an environment that is heavily gender inequitable and in which SRGBV is accepted as an inevitable characteristic of school life. Men and women and boys and girls are ascribed well defined and often rigid gender and social roles, and transgressing against these roles is often used to justify SRGBV. For example, in the study, girls’ short school skirts were seen as justification for sexual harassment, and boys’ stubbornness and their adolescent age were considered as justification for heavy and corporal punishment. Distinct gender and social roles and expectations for males and females of all ages pervade all areas of life, including the family/home, school, and the community at large. Whereas some roles may seem benign, for example, that girls should marry before the age of 18, over time, these stringent gender expectations facilitate perceptions and attitudes that serve to legitimize SRGBV.

Findings from this study depict a patriarchal landscape in which only a few effective drivers of non-violence exist in and outside the school setting: a friendly and safe school environment; good, helpful, and knowledgeable teachers; and respectful and friendly peers. Although many pupils, young people, and adult men and women recognize the equality of men and women in theory, they perpetuate inequality in practice. The patriarchal gender roles, hegemonic masculinities, and socially valued gender identities expressed among respondents are reflected in acts of SRGBV, which foster the sense that girls and women are subordinate to men and boys and that “a man should have the final decision at home”. However, some of the findings also suggest an interest and willingness among young people to discuss and address issues of SRGBV, although their understanding of such issues is oftentimes low. Therefore, these pupils and young people could be key partners in addressing SRGBV and promoting non-violence and gender equality.

Acceptance of violence

SRGBV is viewed largely as a part of school life and, thus, often persists unnoticed and unpunished. Violence is widely considered acceptable, and deep-rooted social norms and practices shape the patterns of violence and abuse in classrooms, on the way to/from schools, and outside the school setting. SRGBV is often tolerated as part of the wider acceptance of violence at home and in communities and society. The testimonies of stakeholders, school staff, parents, caregivers, and pupils confirm that the acceptability of violence contributes to the perception that some forms of abuse in school are “normal”, some as being abusive, and others as an inevitable part of pupils’ school life. For instance, in this study, parents and caregivers who stated that they encouraged their children to fight back in schools (e.g., to seek revenge for being bullied by other pupils) see bullying an inevitable and accepted part of school life. Other forms of violence in school, such as corporal punishment, are considered to be a legitimate component of educating and raising children.
The hierarchical social structures in Uganda have perpetuated a culture of inequalities and violence. This strong hierarchical arrangement, which is based on unequal social structures, has found its way into schools. In educational settings, pupils may be considered to have a low status in the social and school hierarchy, and this low status could be viewed as a justification for teachers, school staff, and others to use power to exercise control, discipline, and coercion.

These findings have serious implications: Teachers exercise various forms of SRGBV to establish or maintain their superiority, authority, and power over pupils. Additionally, teachers, other adults, and even older pupils in schools, who are in positions of authority over younger pupils, take advantage of their superior status. As such, highly hierarchical and authoritarian classrooms, in which an adult has power over pupils, become fertile breeding grounds for SRGBV.
5.0 RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS, NORMS, BELIEFS, AND RISK FACTORS THAT PROMOTE, REINFORCE, OR MITIGATE AGAINST SRGBV

5.1.1 PUPILS

Finding: Pupils value education and want to do well in school to succeed in life.

Individual interviews with pupils revealed why they want to do well in class, how far they would like to go in school, how completing school would help them when they grow up, and what their aspirations are after school (Table 1):

- Almost 60% of all individually interviewed pupils, across all age groups, categories, and locations, indicated that they wanted to do well in class to pass exams.

- Almost all pupils interviewed reported a desire to advance in their education (93%). Among them, approximately 50% said that they wanted to go as far as a tertiary level of education, 33% desired to reach the secondary level, and 11% wanted to complete P7. Interestingly, those who wished to finish P7 were all female pupils. The distribution of gender among those aiming to reach the secondary and tertiary levels is nearly even.

- Slightly more than 90% of all individually interviewed pupils, across all age groups, sexes, categories, and geographical locations, said that they wanted to have a career after finishing school. Additionally, approximately 37% of the pupils indicated a desire to acquire assets, and roughly 31% also said that they wanted to help their parents after finishing school.

- Almost 60% of all the individually interviewed female and male pupils responded that completing school would allow them to have a professional career. Additionally, 43% believed that doing so would allow them to prosper in life, whereas just above 37% indicated that completing school would allow them to help their family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. The value of education according to pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want to do well in class to pass exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to attend tertiary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to pursue a career after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe that finishing school would help with career goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finding. Pupils like to go to school but often feel unhappy.

This study sought to better understand the characteristics of school life that may reinforce or mitigate the impact of SRGBV in Uganda (Table 2).

We found that, across all sexes, age groups, categories, and geographical locations, pupils appreciated teachers’ abilities to teach well (87%), the support of teachers (46%) and a supportive school climate (38%). More than 95% of all individually interviewed pupils said that teachers listen to them and help them with their studies, and 70% indicated that they feel they can ask the teacher for help with schoolwork.

Individually interviewed pupils (55%) indicated that most pupils feel happy in school, 30% said that pupils are not happy, and 15% did not provide an answer. When probed further and asked differently (“Are there some pupils who feel mostly unhappy?”), almost 92% of all individually interviewed female and male pupils said that some pupils seem mostly unhappy in school.

When asked about the reasons for their unhappiness, 65% indicated a lack of necessities and basics (e.g., food at school and school materials), 40% stated mistreatment and teasing/bullying at school by teachers and other pupils, 15% indicated sexual harassment, and 15% reported poor performance (e.g., not being able to cope with the educational curriculum, feeling unhappy with their own performance at school, and lacking the willingness to continue coming to school) as the reasons for their unhappiness. Overall, pupils identified undisciplined pupils (60%) and teacher misconduct as aspects they dislike about school life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. The most cited reasons for pupils’ unhappiness at school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessities and basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistreatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing and bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding. In Uganda, SRGBV is a function of multiple factors that interact at the individual, family, community, and society levels.

This research explored some of the reasons why SRGBV persists in Uganda. We found that in Uganda, SRGBV is a function of multiple factors that interact at the individual, family, community, and society levels. Among the most frequently reported reasons for SRGBV were parental negligence, poor family background, and late arrival to school. Pupil’s lack of discipline; adolescent age, characterized by a desire to explore, experiment, and
try things out; unconventional dressing (e.g., revealing clothes that are short and tight clothes or altered school uniforms); drug abuse; and poverty were specific reasons reported by individually interviewed pupils for corporal punishment and sexual harassment in schools.

5.1.2 AVOIDING AND COPING WITH POTENTIAL INCIDENCES OF SRGBV

Finding. Pupils must obey rules in schools, but only a few know them.

In this study, pupils were asked a series of questions about some of the existing norms, beliefs, practices, and risk factors that promote, reinforce, or mitigate against SRGBV. We found that pupils in schools must obey rules, but only a few know them. In the individual interviews, approximately 85% of all pupils agreed that a pupil must obey rules in school (have discipline in school); however, only half of the respondents knew the existing rules (e.g., coming to school on time, maintaining appropriate personal hygiene, keeping the school environment clean, and using English), and 20% did not know any rules at all.

Finding. Pupils lack the skills to protect themselves from violence and are not aware of how they can seek assistance as a survivor of SRGBV.

To a limited extent, the research explored how pupils in schools cope with and avoid potential incidences of SRGBV. Although the pupils knew to avoid risky places and sometimes risky situations, they did not necessarily have the skills to protect themselves from bullying, corporal punishment and sexual harassment experience and seeking assistance (e.g., by seeking teacher support, seeking appropriate care and treatment and utilizing other support services). For example, when pupils (377 participating in PLA activities) were asked what they can do to avoid SRGBV, 10% indicated that pupils should avoid risky places in the school, 4% said pupils should remain in protected areas, 9% indicated that pupils should not play in areas known to be unsafe (e.g., roads and bushes), and 4% said that pupils should listen to headmasters.

5.1.3 OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

Finding. Out-of-school youth uniformly agreed that VAC means the mistreatment of children, such as by corporal punishment, bullying, and rape.

Out-of-school youth were asked about their understanding of child abuse and VAC, and their response were distributed among sexual abuse, corporal punishment, bullying, and verbal abuse (Table 3). When probed further, most of this group (75%) chose the term “mistreatment of children”, which encompassed the aforementioned types of violence and the following: the denial of children’s rights (33%), disability (17%), death/sickness (44%), dropping out of school (94%), and verbal abuse/insult (25%). (More information on the impact of SRGBV is presented in the section “Types, Nature, Extent, and Impact of SRGBV” below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Definition of violence as understood by out-of-school youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual abuse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporal punishment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bullying</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal abuse</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.4 TEACHERS

Finding. Pupils are not always happy at school, and various individual, societal, and structural factors influence their negative experiences in school.

To better understand the characteristics of school life that reinforce or mitigate against SRGBV, teachers were asked to share their opinions regarding whether pupils are happy at school. Of those who responded, slightly more than half indicated that pupils are happy (11 teachers), and the rest thought that the pupils are not happy (eight teachers)

Further, when probed to discuss school-climate and factors that may reinforce or mitigate the impact of SRGBV, teachers listed the following:

- Pervasiveness of corporal punishment (approximately 30%);
- Parental negligence, including failure to give children food to take to school; provide scholastic materials, such as books or pens; or pay school fees indicated (27%);
- Approximately a quarter of teachers indicated that Poor school environment, poor teacher conduct, and/or insults from other pupils (approximately 25%); and
- Having to travel long distances to schools and the government’s inability to honor its commitments regarding ensuring the quality of education and safety of pupils in schools (less than 10%).

5.1.5 HEAD TEACHERS

To better understand the factors that reinforce or mitigate against violence, head teachers were asked about the reasons for various types of SRGBV and, specifically, why teachers sexually assault pupils and why non-sexual VAC occurs in schools.

Finding. Teachers’ unprofessional behavior is the most reported reason for the sexual assault of pupils.

This research revealed some consensus among head teachers: Approximately 50% of head teachers indicated that teachers’ unprofessional behavior is the most frequent reason for the sexual assault of pupils. A very small number of head teachers (approximately 4% of all respondents) also identified pupils’ adolescent age and the influence of pornography on pupils (e.g., exposure to inappropriate content through social and other media) as the reasons for sexual VACiS.

Finding. Teacher feelings of superiority are a driving force of non-sexual VACIS according to head teachers.

In the FGD, head teachers suggested that teachers’ feelings of superiority and power over others constitute a driving force for the perpetration of non-sexual
VACiS (32% of head teachers listed thinking one is superior then others as a reason for such violence). Although the interview was not designed to discern what types of misconduct teachers engage in, Table 4 provides an overview of head teachers’ views on the types of violence pupils face most frequently.

### Table 4. SRGBV faced by pupils according to head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy punishment</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of children’s rights</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.6 SMCS

**Finding. There is a lack of consensus among SMC members regarding what constitutes child abuse.**

SMC members were asked about their understanding of child abuse, and the results revealed that SMC members have limited knowledge of what constitutes child abuse in school/SRGBV in Uganda. For example, a quarter (25%) of all respondents indicated that child abuse means the mistreatment of a child, 13% indicated sexual harassment and verbal abuse, and approximately 8% referred to child abuse as corporal punishment and bullying. None of the respondents suggested that child abuse includes all of the above types of violence (Table 5).

### Table 5. SRGBV faced by pupils according to SMC members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mistreatment of child</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finding. Teachers’ unprofessional behavior, the lack of school materials and meals, and unsafe and poor school environments are the major reasons for pupils’ unhappiness at school.**

The FGDs allowed the research team to better understand SMC members’ perception of the school life characteristics and other individual-, community-, and society-level factors that may reinforce or mitigate VACIS. First, we found several protective characteristics regarding to pupils’ positive school experiences. The most commonly mentioned reasons for pupils’ happiness at school were having school materials, meals, a good teacher, a friendly environment, and good infrastructure. We also identified negative aspects of school life experiences that may contribute to pupils’ experiences of SRGBV. According to SMC members, the most common reasons for pupils’ unhappiness at school are the unprofessional behavior of teachers in schools, inadequate school materials, and poor school infrastructure (e.g., bushes and forests on school premises, unsafe school buildings, crowded classrooms, and limited seating arrangements), followed by not having meals and an unfriendly school environment (e.g., threats and
experiences of violence in school, especially corporal punishment and sexual harassment) (Table 6).

**Table 6. Why teachers assault pupils according to SMC members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad pupil behavior</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favors</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent dress code</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of self-esteem</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.7 CAREGIVERS

**Finding.** Caregivers primarily understand child abuse as the violation of children's rights, heavy punishment, and sexual abuse.

Caregivers were asked about their understanding of child abuse. The FGDs revealed that most respondents considered child abuse to constitute the violation of children's rights. However, a significant proportion also reported heavy punishment and sexual abuse of children. Specifically, approximately 62% of caregivers said that child abuse means the violation of children's rights, approximately 51% said heavy punishment, and 38% said sexual abuse. Only three respondents indicated bullying.

5.1.8 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

**Finding.** Most stakeholders understand child abuse as denying children’s rights, but a large proportion lack consensus on what constitutes VAC.

Most stakeholders\(^8\) understand child abuse as denying children’s rights, but a large proportion lack consensus and depth regarding what constitutes VAC. For instance, the FGD revealed that most stakeholders understand child abuse as comprising a single type of abuse, rather than a variety of abusive and violent acts. For example, although most stakeholders (59%) referred to child abuse as denying children’s rights, a smaller proportion indicated the torture of a child (19%), corporal punishment or abuse and sexual harassment of a child (14%), or the failure to provide children with school materials and basics, the denial of food, the mistreatment of a child, or the violation of children by step-parents. Some stakeholders also reported that parents not giving parental love, overworking and beating children, and defiling children can be considered acts of child abuse. Interestingly, two stakeholders identified child abuse as child sacrifice, which is practiced in some parts of Uganda to purify and cleanse from disease (Table 7).

Similar patterns were observed when stakeholders were asked about the meaning of VAC, revealing a lack of consensus regarding what constitutes a violent act.

---

\(^8\) To protect stakeholders’ confidentiality, this report does not list the stakeholders. Indeed, the sample size is so small that the participants could be easily identified. It is sufficient to know that they comprised a mix of government officials from different districts.
against a child. The most referenced meaning was child mistreatment (approximately 25% of the respondents). Between 16 and 12% indicated the violation/denial of rights, the violation of children by step-parents, the abuse and harassment of children, the failure to satisfy children’s basic needs, or the use of corporal punishment. A smaller proportion (approximately 8%) indicated sexual harassment, and a few respondents (between one and four) interpreted VAC as parents’ failure to provide their child with school materials, overworking children, or child neglect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Violence as defined by stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mistreatment of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of children’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defilement and sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice of a child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.9 MIXED STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Finding. The respondents identified VAC as the mistreatment of children, including sexual or verbal abuse, corporal punishment, child mistreatment, and/or bullying.

When asked about their understanding of VAC, a large majority of respondents indicated the mistreatment of children, and approximately half of the respondents also said that VAC means corporal punishment. When probed about the meaning of child abuse, approximately 50% of stakeholders identified one or more of the following: sexual abuse, corporal punishment, mistreatment of a child, bullying, and/or verbal abuse (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Violence as defined by mixed stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding. Pupils’ poor family backgrounds, “too much freedom”, and the influence of TV and other media are the most frequent reasons for SRGBV.

The mixed stakeholder group was asked about the reasons why SRGBV is so prevalent in schools. The responses were mixed, but the most frequently reported reasons were pupils’ poor family environments, “too much freedom” (a belief among adults that currently, children have abundant freedom to do whatever they want, have no obligations, and do not want to listen to others/adults), and/or the
influence of media (e.g., exposure to inappropriate and often sexual and violent content through TV, social media, radio, papers, and magazines). Two respondents also suggested pupils' desires for good grades and drug abuse as reasons for the pervasiveness of SRGBV in schools.

5.2 TYPES, NATURE, EXTENT, AND IMPACT OF SRGBV

5.2.1 PUPILS

Finding. Large proportions of pupils experience various types of SRGBV, but only a few tell someone about it or report it.

Individual interviews provided an opportunity to discuss the extent of SRGBV among pupils. The findings suggest that large proportions of pupils experience SRGBV, but only a few report it or tell someone about it. For example, approximately 30% of all respondents said they had experienced some type of SRGBV in the past week, and approximately 45% said that something like this has happened to them or a friend or family member. Among these pupils, half reported feeling unhappy because of those experiences, and half told someone about it or reported it. A number of pupils (five out of 76 [7%]) indicated that they were abused, walked away, reported it to someone, and felt very unhappy about it. Pupils’ responses to the question “what did you do when you heard about or experienced SRGBV?” are listed in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. What did you do when you heard about or experienced SRGBV?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was abused, walked away, report it, and felt unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforted those who were abused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding. Most pupils in schools witness various types of violence at high rates.

Individual interviews with pupils revealed that a large majority have heard of and witnessed the following types of violence in schools (Figure 1):

- **Bullying**: almost 80% of individually interviewed pupils said that they have heard of someone who experienced bullying or mistreatment, and 70% of these students said that they witnessed someone being bullied.

Finding. SRGBV also affects pupils with disabilities and orphans. "Pupils don't want to play with one girl because she is not clever and she can't even read one sentence. When she tries to join them, they beat her and throw stones at her"  
Male respondent, orphan, 9
- **Corporal Punishment**: just under 40% said that they have heard of someone experiencing corporal punishment, and 17% said that they have witnessed corporal punishment.

- **Sexual Harassment**: 9% of respondents said that they have heard about someone being sexually harassed in school, but none indicated that they had witnessed sexual harassment in school.

**Figure 1. Proportion of pupils who have heard of and witnessed forms of violence at school**

![Bar chart showing proportions of pupils who have heard of and witnessed different forms of violence at school.]

**Finding. Pupils are at risk of violence perpetrated by numerous actors in their immediate environments in and outside the school premises.**

The PLA participants identified teachers (approximately 14%), prefects and pupils (10%), parents (7%), strangers (5%), other family members (4%), and older pupils from upper classes (3%) as the most frequent perpetrators of violence in schools. When the same question was asked using a different approach, the pupils provided a slightly different picture of who harms pupils at school (Table 10). When averaged across these categories, pupils/prefects and teachers most frequently

*“Boys are beaten like cows claiming girls are weak, yet sometimes, the girls are the troublemakers in class. When I become a teacher, I will beat stubborn girls the same way.”*

PLA boys, 15+ group

*“There is a male teacher here at school, he was teaching P4. He asked girls from P6 to come and clean the library. They came to the library, but as they were cleaning, he started touching their breasts.”*

Female pupil, 15+

*“Here we are beaten heavily as revenge when the teacher’s pay is delayed, and they take it out on us when they don’t have money.”*

PLA boys, 11–14 group
harm pupils (12%), followed by parents and strangers/big men (8%), other family and community members (7%), police (5%), and pupils from upper classes (4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. SRGBV perpetrators according to pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Umbrella of Care</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils/prefects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big men/strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family/community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We found that approximately 18% of all male and female participants consider bushes and forests around the school and empty latrines on the school premises as risky places, roughly the same proportion (17%) identified classrooms as risky, and 10% cited school playgrounds. Some age-, gender-, and location-specific particularities existed among the respondents:

- Many girls and 8–10-year-old boys from several districts identified empty latrines as risky. Girls reported sexual harassment perpetrated by teachers, fellow pupils, and community members, and boys identified sexual harassment and corporal punishment as the specific types of violence that occur in those places. Some pupils identified bushes and forest and classrooms and playgrounds in schools as risky places. They also indicated that teachers, fellow pupils, and community members were the perpetrators of violence in those places and that bullying perpetrated by fellow pupils was the specific type of violence occurring in those places. Finding. Emotional distress, poor performance in school, and dropping out of school are the most frequent consequence of SRGBV, and boys, girls, and other special categories of children are impacted differently.

Findings from the PLA with pupils indicate emotional distress (approximately 15%), poor performance in classes (13%), increased indiscipline (approximately 11%), injury (6%), and dropping out of school (7%) as consequences of SRGBV (Figure 2). In addition, the results from the PLA confirm the gendered nature of these impacts. For instance, approximately 10% of all participants reported early marriage as a specific impact of SRGBV on girls. We also found some in one school that boys aged 11-4 indicated increased indiscipline as a specific impact on SRGBV on boys, whereas girls aged 8-10 identified emotional distress as the most common impact of SRGBV on girls.
5.2.2 OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

Finding. Corporal punishment was the most prevalent type of SRGBV indicated by the respondents.

To better understand the types, extents, and impacts of SRGBV in Uganda, out-of-school youth were asked to identify some of the most persistent types of VACiS. This group’s responses were similar to those of the primary school pupils. According to more than half of the respondents (58%), corporal punishment and sexual violence were the two most prevalent types of SRGBV.

When asked about their greatest concerns related to SRGBV, Out of school youth identified the following categories of SRGBV:

- Bullying
- Corporal punishment (approximately 30%)
- Sexual violence which begins with sexual harassment, inappropriate touching (approximately 20%), and may end with rape and early marriage (e.g., early marriage because of the sexual abuse of a female pupil who becomes pregnant and drops out of school or the withdrawal of a pupil from school for an early marriage).

Discussions with out-of-school youth affirmed the gendered manifestation of SRGBV: 39% of the out-of-school youth indicated that girls experience SRGBV more than boys. However, 25% thought that boys experience SRGBV more often, and 11% said disabled pupils experience SRGBV more than others.

Finding. Out-of-school youth identified dropping out of school as the most frequent impact of SRGBV on pupils.

This research sought to gather information about out-of-school youths’ perceptions regarding the impacts of SRGBV, and we found that the most frequently reported consequence was dropping out of school. For example, over 90% of the interviewed out-of-school youth indicated that pupils leave school for the following specific reasons: bullying, corporal punishment and sexual harassment and violence; indeed, many of the respondents identified themselves as school-goers who left school because of such experiences. A smaller proportion of respondents (approximately 28%) identified sickness (e.g., sexually transmitted infections [STIs] or HIV/AIDS infection resulting from sexual abuse) and death as consequences of SRGBV.

“Corporal punishment in some schools is severe. In that school where I was, although corporal punishment like beating was refused, still the teachers would beat us severely, and one could get tired of beating” – female informant

“SRGBV extent is big, and this is because there are no rules governing the perpetrators” – female informant

“Teachers defiling children in school is common, and it is the biggest problem” – female informant

“Both children that are orphans and from poor families are the ones that are mostly affected by such issue [SRGBV] and parental negligence” – young male, 15

“My biggest concern is defilement children by teachers, and this is because it affects them in a way of being infected with HIV” – female informant
Disability (e.g., injury) was identified by approximately 25% of respondents, and roughly 23% indicated lower school performance. A similar proportion of out-of-school youth (21%) also mentioned re-victimization and increased mistreatment in school (e.g., increased experiences of SRGBV because of on-going discrimination), and 17% identified teen pregnancy (e.g., resulting from sexual abuse) as impacts of SRGBV on pupils in school.

Finding. The violence at school experienced or witnessed by out-of-school-youth primarily consists of sexual violence and corporal punishment.

When asked what types of violence they had witnessed or experienced, more than half of the interviewed out-of-school youth listed sexual violence (58%) and corporal punishment (56%), followed by the denial of children’s rights (33%) and verbal abuse (25%). When asked about the impact of SRGBV on pupils, most indicated that SRGVB led to dropping out of school (94%) (Table 11).

Table 11: Impact of SRGVB on pupils according to out-of-school youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropping out of school</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury/sickness/death</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower school performance</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-victimization</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 TEACHERS

Finding. Teachers lack consensus regarding what constitutes child abuse, but most regard such abuse as a mix of the violation of children’s rights, corporal punishment, and bullying.

Similar to the other groups studied here, the FGDs with 48 teachers deepened our knowledge about their understanding of the meaning of SRGVB in Uganda. More than half of all teachers (55%) said that they understand child abuse as the violation of children’s rights. A large proportion (48%) also indicated corporal punishment and bullying, whereas a smaller proportion (approximately 11% of all respondents) described child abuse as the denial of health care, treatment, and medication when a child is sick. No difference was found between male and female respondents or between the districts and schools selected. However, only one third of all teachers indicated that child abuse encompassed all of the above types of abuse.
Finding. SRGBV manifests in diverse ways and extends beyond physical and sexual violence or bullying in schools.

The findings from the interviews with teachers also shed light on the nature of SRGBV. We found that all three types of SRGBV—corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and bullying—continue to be common and affect pupils in schools. For instance, when asked to define what is happening in schools in relation to the abuse of children, the largest proportion of respondents (40%) indicated heavy punishment (e.g., allotting heavy repercussions to children for even a slight deviation from the accepted rules, regulations, and behaviors in schools), 20% indicated sexual harassment, and approximately 15% mentioned the denial of school materials, such as books and pens, by teachers. However, the FGDs also revealed that SRGBV extended beyond the three types of violence reported. For instance, a small proportion of respondents (10%) also indicated discrimination against children by teachers based on sex and various social markers.

Moreover, when asked about the gendered nature of SRGBV, more than half of all teachers indicated that girls experience SRGBV more frequently than boys and other special categories of children.

Finding. According to teachers, the perpetration of SRGBV is driven by several interrelated individual, societal, and structural factors.

This research sought to better understand some of the motivations for violence in schools.

**Sexual violence.** Teachers were asked to highlight the reasons why some pupils have experienced sexual violence. Sexual violence is associated with several interrelated and interconnected individual, social, and structural factors. In the FGDs, almost 30% of respondents said that the reason underlying the sexual violence of pupils is teacher ignorance, and approximately the same proportion mentioned how pupils dress in school. Of these respondents, 16% also indicated the laxity of school administration, and 4% cited pupil-teacher sexual relationships in which the adult teacher takes advantage of a pupil by providing money or gifts in exchange for sexual favors, and the materialistic nature of pupils, who desire money and gifts.

**Non-sexual harassment:** A small proportion of teachers (8%) indicated one or both of the following reasons for the non-sexual harassment of pupils in schools: pupils’ non-apologetic natures and the laxity of society. Interestingly, teachers transferring stress onto pupils was specifically mentioned by respondents in the Mbarara and Mukono districts, and pupils’ stubbornness was specified by four respondents in the Hoima district. Some reasons for peer-to-peer violence in schools were also identified: pupils’ poor family background, which leads to bullying (35%); peer-on-peer violence resulting from pupils defending themselves against bullying or other acts of violence in school (27%); and pupils’ need to exact revenge for experiencing violence in school (approximately 20%). Approximately 10% of teachers said that pupils’ personalities and insecurities underlie peer-to-peer violence.

“Some children behave certain way because of the way they are brought up at home. Some parents use vulgar language at home, and their children learn that and end up calling their fellow children names and also abusing them”

Female teacher
Finding. Early pregnancies related to sexual abuse in schools and early marriages resulting from dropping out of school were reported as the greatest concerns related to SRGBV.

Approximately 20% of teachers representing all three districts mentioned female pupils becoming pregnant as a result of defilement or sexual abuse in school or on the way to or from school and early marriages resulting from female pupils dropping out of school. Less than 10% of those who responded said that the greatest concerns are bullying, absenteeism, and pupils dropping out. Corporal punishment was identified by a small fraction of teachers (less than 4%).

Finding. Pupils suffer a range of devastating consequences of SRGBV, including impacts on health, behavior, and learning outcomes.

Findings from the FGDs with teachers confirmed that pupils suffer a range of devastating consequences of SRGBV that impact their well-being and academic excellence. For instance, 40% of teachers indicated that SRGBV results in lower school performance, almost 33% mentioned negative psychological impacts, and 21% cited medical concerns (e.g., injury resulting from physical violence or becoming infected with STIs or HIV/AIDS because of sexual abuse) (Table 12). We also found that the consequences of SRGBV go beyond negative health and learning outcomes. Interestingly, 12% of teachers indicated that SRGBV, especially sexual abuse, results in the re-victimization of pupils (e.g., further discrimination) in schools, and approximately 9% mentioned pupils’ increased hooliganism. One teacher identified early pregnancy of female pupils as a direct impact of SRGBV.

Table 12. Consequences of SRGBV for pupils according to teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor school performance</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological/emotional Distress</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical concerns</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-victimization</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooliganism</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen pregnancy</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding. Pupils skipping and dropping out of school were the two most commonly reported impacts of SRGBV on school retention among teachers.

The FGDs with teachers confirmed that skipping and dropping out of school were the two most common impacts of SRGBV on school retention (17%). It should be noted that the response rate was low.
5.2.4 HEAD TEACHER, SENIOR MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS

Finding. Most head teachers and senior male and female teachers understand child abuse as the violation of children’s rights, but they lack consensus regarding what constitutes VAC.

Similar to the other groups interviewed, head teachers (6) and teachers (18) were asked about their perceptions of the meaning of child abuse. Among the informants, child abuse was mostly understood as the violation of children’s rights, heavy punishment, sexual abuse, and bullying. Informants selected the following items within a list of items, 75% identified children’s rights, 46% identified heavy punishment, 30% as sexual abuse, and 12% as bullying. Only 8% of the respondents indicated that child abuse encompassed all of the above.

Finding. Corporal punishment, parental negligence, and poverty are the greatest concerns related to SRGBV among head teachers.

Head teachers were asked to identify their greatest concerns related to SRGBV, and they reported corporal punishment, parental negligence, and poverty. Approximately 25% of the head teachers indicated corporal punishment and parental negligence, and roughly 21% cited poverty. Bullying was identified as a concern by three head teachers (approximately 12% of all respondents). Early marriage, which often results from sexual abuse in or on the way to or from school, was also noted.

In addition, when asked about the most common types of SRGBV in their schools, seven out of the 10 head teachers who responded (all from one primary school) indicated sexual harassment.

Finding. Emotional distress was the most reported impact of SRGBV on pupils’ well-being, and dropping out of school was the most reported impact on school retention.

The teachers were asked about the impacts of SRGBV. In the FGDs, approximately 50% of respondents identified emotional distress (e.g., feeling down, powerless, and feeling bad about oneself) as a major impact on pupils’ well-being. Three head teachers (approximately 12% of all respondents) indicated hooliganism (e.g., damaging school property, acting rebellious and chaotic, or exhibiting violence towards teachers because of experiencing or witnessing violence in school) and/or school absenteeism. When asked specifically about the impacts of SRGBV on school retention, approximately 50% of respondents noted school dropout, and two head teachers cited skipping school (Table 13).
Table 13. Impact of SRGBV according to head teachers and senior male and female teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional distress</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping out of school</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooliganism</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School absenteeism</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases and stunted growth</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.5 SMCS

Finding. Various individual-, community-, and society-level factors influence the prevalence and types of SRGBV in schools.

First, SMC members were asked about the reasons underlying the sexual, verbal, or physical abuse of children by adults. A very small proportion of SMC members (approximately 8%) indicated “favor” (providing children with small amounts of money, gifts, or sweets in exchange for sexual favors), indecent dress, the desire for material things, and/or teachers’ low self-esteem (e.g., not being happy or not believing in one’s own skills and qualifications). When probed further regarding the reasons that teachers (Table 14) sexually abuse pupils in school, the most common answers (approximately 11%) were “favor”, indecent dress code (e.g., female pupils dressing in short and tight skirts), low or loss of self-esteem among teachers, and teachers’ “bad behavior” (e.g., inappropriate touching of girls, enticing pupils with gifts and money in exchange for sexual favors, and making pupils perform gardening in exchange for good grades or as punishment).

Second, SMC members were asked to share their opinions regarding the reasons why pupils abuse one another. Only a small group of SMC members responded (7% of all respondents), and they indicated poor family background, pupils’ undisciplined behavior/indiscipline in school (e.g., exhibiting a rebellious nature or seeking revenge for bullying), parental negligence (e.g., parents not caring about their child’s behavior in school), and government interventions (the lack of specific policies to address bullying and violence among pupils in schools) roughly equally.

Table 14. Why teachers abuse children according to SMC members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent dress code</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of self-esteem</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for material things</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad behavior</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding. Mistreatment of children, corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and parental negligence were identified as the most common forms of SRGBV.

The FGDs explored the perceptions and knowledge among SMC members regarding the extents and types of SRGBV in schools as experienced by boys and girls. When asked about the types of SRGBV, 20% of respondents identified
sexual harassment, and 13% noted corporal punishment, and/or the mistreatment of children/denial of children’s rights (Figure 3). Of all the respondents, 10% also cited bullying, and 15% mentioned parental negligence (e.g., parents not giving their children food for school or not paying their school fees).

Further, regarding the most common types of SRGBV, 23% of the respondents identified child mistreatment; 18% indicated sexual harassment, corporal punishment, and/or parental negligence; and approximately 8% mentioned name-calling by pupils and teachers. Five respondents also indicated that rape in schools was a common type of SRGBV.

**Finding.** SMC members believe that girls and other vulnerable pupils are at higher risk of SRGBV.

This research also sought to explore the gendered nature of violence in schools. Despite the low response rate, we found that twice as many SMC members believe that girls experience SRGBV more. Additionally, one SMC member indicated that orphans experience SRGBV more than other pupils.

**Finding.** Dropping out of school, sexual harassment, and name-calling are the greatest concerns related to violence in schools among SMC members.

The FGDs sought to determine the greatest concerns among SMC members regarding SRGBV against pupils. Approximately 15% of respondents said that they were concerned about dropping out of school because of various types of SRGBV, whereas 13% indicated sexual harassment and name-calling.

**Finding.** Dropping out of school, sickness, and death\(^9\) are the most frequent impacts of SRGBV according to SMC members.

SMC members were asked about the impact of SRGBV, and they responded that dropping out of school, sickness, and death (e.g., sickness and death as a consequence of being sexually abused by someone with STIs/HIV/AIDS)
consequence of being infected with STIs and/or HIV/AIDS because of sexual abuse) were the most frequent impacts of SRGBV. Only one third shared their opinions regarding the impact of SRGBV, and these were mixed. Approximately 33% of SMC members mentioned dropping out of school, and roughly 20% indicated sickness and death (e.g., STIs and/or HIV/AIDS resulting from the sexual abuse of a pupil in or on the way to/from school). A smaller proportion (approximately 8% of all SMC members) noted sexual harassment, corporal punishment, and/or disability.

5.2.6 CAREGIVERS

Finding. Corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and parental negligence are the most prevalent types of SRGBV.

Finding. Some pupils experience SRGBV more frequently because of their gender or disability status.

To better understand the types, extents, and consequences of SRGBV in Uganda, caregivers were asked to discuss the types of SRGBV that are prevalent in schools. The FGDs revealed that corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and parental negligence were the most prevalent types of SRGBV. Specifically, 25% of respondents indicated sexual harassment, 21% cited corporal punishment and negligence, and approximately 10% mentioned bullying. A few also indicated early marriage.

We investigated whether caregivers feel that particular groups of pupils experience SRGBV more than others. Our findings confirm that some pupils in school experience SRGBV more frequently than others simply because of their sex or disability status. For example, half of all caregivers (50%) indicated that girls experience more SRGBV, whereas only one respondent suggested that boys experience more SRGBV. Disabled pupils and OVC were thought to experience more SRGBV than other pupils by 10% of caregivers.

Finding. The most frequently reported impacts of SRGBV on pupils are emotional distress and dropping out of school.

The FGDs with caregivers provided the research team with an opportunity to discuss some of the consequences of SRGBV. Over half of the caregivers (55%) reported emotional distress (e.g., depression, feelings of inadequacy, and feeling bad or down because of the experience of SRGBV, especially sexual harassment and abuse) as the most frequent impacts of SRGBV on pupils. Hooliganism (e.g., acting out characterized by bullying others and damaging school properties) and absenteeism (e.g., skipping classes or not coming to school at all) were identified by a smaller proportion of caregivers (approximately 10% of all respondents). Additionally, 5% of respondents also mentioned acquired diseases (e.g., STIs or HIV/AIDS resulting from sexual abuse) and/or stunted growth. Regarding the
impacts of SRGBV on school retention, the largest proportion of caregivers (40%) noted dropping out of school (Figure 4). Two caregivers said pupils skip school because of their experience of various types of violence in and on the way to/from school.

Finding. Teachers’ highly unprofessional conduct and authoritarian attitudes towards pupils are central to SRGBV.

We found that teachers’ unprofessional behavior and authoritarian attitudes towards pupils at schools was the most reported reason for sexual violence in schools. For instance, almost 50% of caregivers (more females than males) mentioned the following reasons for the sexual assault of pupils in schools:

- exhibiting unprofessional behaviors, e.g., male teachers inappropriately touching young female pupils or teachers enticing pupils with money and gifts in exchange for sexual favors);
- feeling superiority to pupils, i.e., teachers feeling that they always have the final word;
- feeling more important than pupils;
- being exposed to “pornography” and “indecency”, e.g., the influence of the inappropriate content in social media, TV, and newspapers on how pupils—especially girls—act in schools and on whether they dress in short and tight skirts; and
- being of adolescent age, e.g., pupils’ desiring to explore, experiment, and try out different things and being rebellious in schools associated with their pubescence.

Similar to sexual violence, the reasons for non-sexual violence include teachers believing that they are superior (indicated by 27% of respondents). In addition, one caregiver indicated that SRGBV results from pupils’ need to exert “revenge” (e.g., pupils seeking revenge by assaulting other pupils) and receiving instructions from parents (e.g., to fight back and defend themselves next time they are assaulted by someone in school) as two main reasons for non-sexual violence in schools.
Finding. Counseling and reporting to higher authorities are the two most commonly reported school-level practices to address SRGBV.

In the FGDs, we sought to better understand caregivers’ perceptions regarding school-level practices for responding to incidents of SRGBV. We found that, according to caregivers, providing counseling in response to abuse and reporting sexual assault in school to higher authorities are the most common practices to respond to SRGBV (Figure 5). When asked about actions school take against child abuse, 62% of caregivers indicated that schools provide counseling to abused pupils. Additionally, half of those respondents also noted reporting incidents of child abuse to higher authorities (30%). Three caregivers indicated that the school follows the teachers’ code of conduct, punishes teachers, and/or does nothing. When probed further about what is done when a sexual assault occurs in school, a large majority of respondents (73%) said that incidents are reported to higher authorities, and 27% indicated that the school provides counseling and medical care.

Finding. Caregivers lack awareness of and familiarity with organizations providing support in response to SRGBV.

Caregivers were asked to reflect on the government and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), such as community-based organizations, in their village that provide assistance, counseling, care, and support to children who have experienced physical, psychological, or sexual violence and abuse. Similar to the findings from other groups, the FGDs revealed caregivers’ very limited level of familiarity with such organizations. When asked to name a few, only a very small number of caregivers (five) indicated having heard of the school-based or community-based HIV/AIDS clubs run by various NGOs: The Ugandan Women’s Effort to Save Orphans (UWESCO), churches, and/or USAID.

Finding. Most caregivers believe that the school administration or government is responsible for preventing SRGBV.

Caregivers were also asked about whose responsibility it is to prevent SRGBV, and most caregivers responded that the school administration is responsible. However, they were somewhat unclear regarding their own roles and responsibilities in this regard. The FGDs revealed that among caregivers, 31% believe that the school administration or government is responsible, whereas 17%
indicated that it is the community’s responsibility. One caregiver said that the Senior Male and Female Teachers are specifically responsible for preventing SRGBV. However, the results of the FGDs confirm that caregivers and parents do not always know their own roles in preventing, responding to, and reporting incidents of SRGBV.

5.2.7 STAKEHOLDERS

Finding. According to stakeholders, SRGBV is simultaneously driven by teachers, pupils, and the community.

To better understand the types, extents, and impacts of SRGBV in Uganda, stakeholders were asked to name some of the reasons why SRGBV persists. Based on their answers, we identified three main causes of SRGBV:

- First, SRGBV is caused by school characteristics and teachers overall failure to follow their code of conduct or exhibit respect towards others, their lack of awareness of and familiarity with the laws and regulations pertaining to SRGBV, their belief that some pupils in schools are old enough to have sex, and their own desires.

- Second, SRGBV is caused by society-level characteristics, such as drug abuse in the community, poverty, and/or cultural beliefs, which underpin and justify various acts of abuse and VACiS.

- Finally, the FGDs revealed that stakeholders believe SRGBV is caused by the pupils themselves, such as by copying their parents’ negative/violent/non-equitable behaviors and/or dressing indecently.

A number of stakeholders suggested that SRGBV is part of live in their society and communities.

Finding. SRGBV is prevalent and persists in schools because of complex patterns of individual behavior, societal attitudes, norms, and socio-cultural and economic structures or conditions.

The FGDs with stakeholders confirmed that SRGBV is prevalent in Ugandan schools and persists not because of one or two factors but, rather, is driven and sustained by a host of whys and wherefores, such as individual behaviors and attitudes, society-wide norms and structures, and socio-cultural and economic conditions.

- Teachers’ individual behaviors, such as failing to exercise self-control, exerting authority over pupils and taking advantage of them (indicated by approximately a quarter of respondents), failing to exhibit professionalism and ethics, believing that children should be raised and disciplined through punishment, transferring their problems and frustrations onto
children (indicated by approximately 16% of respondents), and admiring some of their pupils;

- **Parents' behaviors**, such as neglecting or failing to take care of their children;

- **Pupils' individual behaviors**, such as copying and transferring the negative attitudes and behaviors they witness at home into the school environment (indicated by 28% of respondents), exhibiting stubbornness and jealousy, or dressing indecently (12%);

- **Economic conditions**, such as having a poor background, lacking basic necessities (indicated by 23%), or living in slums;

- **Social structures, norms, or societal ills**, such as being ignorant of or poorly implementing SRGBV laws, abusing drugs, degenerating morally (moving away from socially acceptable positive values and behaviors; indicated by approximately 20% of respondents), having to travel long distances to/from school and encounter dangers along the way (e.g., boda-boda drivers who harass girls or men who rape young girls), being exposed to the bad influences of peer groups, living with HIV and AIDS, or being influenced by TV and social media.

Two stakeholders also indicated bloodstains on female pupils’ uniforms during their menstrual periods, one stakeholder mentioned the influence of witchcraft, one cited rumors about teachers’ or pupils’ behaviors in schools, and another mentioned the belief among some that “sex with young girls restores the blood”.

**Finding. The prevailing gender and social norms create complex causes of SRGBV.**

This research also sought to better understand the gendered nature of SRGBV in Uganda. Stakeholders were asked about the reasons why SRGBV happens to girls and boys specifically. We found that the prevailing rigid social norms and practices and the well-defined gender roles and expectations in Uganda create complex causes and patterns of VACiS. For example, stakeholders’ reasons for why violence against girls occurs in schools included the following: Girls are the weaker sex, they are vulnerable and have submissive natures, they socialize readily, they entice teachers and are easily enticed by offers of money from men, they dress indecently and look mature, and they constitute the majority in the community. In contrast, their reasons for school-related violence against boys included the following: Boys are
young and naïve; they come from poor backgrounds; they are of adolescent age and have short tempers; and they want to explore, prove their strength, or show their superiority.

Finding. Not all stakeholders agree that SRGBV is prevalent in Ugandan schools.

The FGDs with stakeholders revealed the extent of SRGBV in Uganda and how SRGBV is manifested. When specifically asked about the prevalence of SRGBV, 40% indicated that it is common and increasing. Additionally, a number of stakeholders suggested that SRGBV is more common in government schools. One stakeholder indicated that SRGBV is a normal part of Ugandan culture, whereas 11% felt that SRGBV was not that common. The most commonly indicated types of SRGBV were child abuse and corporal punishment.

Finding. Sexual harassment and corporal punishment of pupils are the two greatest concerns related to SRGBV among stakeholders.

When asked about their greatest concerns related to SRGBV, 34% of stakeholders indicated sexual harassment, and 24% cited corporal punishment. Other concerns included parental negligence (i.e., parents not giving their children meals to take to school or school materials), teachers beating and punishing pupils, administrators failing to consider girls when making decisions and/or bullying among pupils. Similar to the results of the FGDs with out-of-school youth and teachers, stakeholders indicated that they were concerned about early marriage.

Finding. Gender, age, and other social markers are triggers for VACiS.

The research findings confirmed that pupils’ genders and social markers, such as their age, disability status, socio-economic background, appearance, or even the way he or she dresses, can become a rationale for violence in schools. When asked whether some pupils experience more SRGBV than others, overall, more stakeholders indicated that girls experience more SRGBV because of their sex (a few suggested that SRGBV affects boys and girls equally).

When asked about the specific types of violence that affect boys and girls, one third of the stakeholders indicated that girls are specifically affected by sexual harassment, and approximately 15% stated that corporal punishment and bullying mostly affect boys. Some stakeholders suggested that boys tend to be subjected to heavy punishment because they are believed to be more powerful and stronger than girls.

Further, notably, 21%–23% of all stakeholders indicated that older pupils abuse younger ones in schools and that having a poor family background is one reason why some pupils experience more violence in schools than others. In addition, 18% identified disability as
a basis for SRGBV. Among the other social markers that trigger disproportionate SRGBV targeting one group of pupils over another included the following: exhibiting poor school performance (11%), being an orphan (10%), living with a stepmother (5%), having a youthful appearance (girls) (8%), being HIV/AIDS positive (5%), being new at school (5%), and being abandoned by parents (3%). One stakeholder also mentioned that rural pupils experience more SRGBV than urban ones (Table 15).

Table 15. Social markers that trigger SRGBV among pupils according to stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Marker</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibiting poor school performance</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an orphan</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a step-parent</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a youthful appearance (girls)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being HIV/AIDS positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being new at the school</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being abandoned by parents</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a rural pupil</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding. Dropping out of school was the most reported impact of SRGBV on pupils.

The FGDs with stakeholders revealed the specific impacts of SRGBV on school retention. When asked about the various consequences of SRGBV on pupils and their school life, most stakeholders (66%) mentioned dropping out of school, and 28% said poor school performance. These findings are in good agreement with those of the discussions with other groups.

Moreover, approximately a quarter of the respondents indicated that dropping out of school is directly related to sexual harassment (e.g., a girl may leave school because she became pregnant after being sexually abused). Otherwise, maybe the following would work: “A number of respondents also indicated that feelings of fear, depression, or unhappiness (e.g., resulting from corporal punishment and heavy beatings by teachers or bullying by other pupils) and the pregnancy of female pupils resulting from sexual abuse are negative consequences of SRGBV that affect pupils’
learning outcomes and school retention. Some stakeholders also cited girls’ lack of sanitary pads or washrooms as a reason for them to drop out of school.

**Finding. The consequences of SRGBV extend beyond negative learning outcomes and affect the health and well-being of pupils in schools in Uganda.**

This research revealed that many stakeholders believe the impacts of SRGBV are not limited to negative learning outcomes and instead lead to many negative effects on the health, well-being, and overall lives of Ugandan children (Figure 6). Some examples are as follows:

- early marriage (54%);
- sickness and STIs among pupils (41%);
- child pregnancies (35%);
- psychological torture (34%);
- increased fighting and pupils hitting each other (e.g., pupils fighting with one another or opposing various types of mistreatment in school, such as beatings and heavy punishment) and/or death\(^\text{10}\) (24%),
- increased numbers of pupils dropping out of school and ending up on the street and increased criminal activity among children (16%);
- family dissolution (two stakeholders); and
- improved school performance (one stakeholder).

The mentioned impacts of SRGBV on the school were as follows: tainted school image, lower school performance, failure of schools to attract new pupils, and school closure. Its impacts on the community were as follows: a lack of educated children and increased rates of crime.

\(^{10}\) Deaths related to HIV/AIDS contracted through sexual abuse.
5.2.8 MIXED STAKEHOLDERS

Finding. Corporal punishment, sexual harassment, and bullying persist in schools.

The FGDs with individuals in the mixed stakeholder group revealed the extent of SRGBV. We found that various types of VAC are prevalent in schools and that their impacts include negative health and learning outcomes for children. Individuals were asked about which types of SRGBV are especially serious in schools. Approximately 14% of the respondents identified corporal punishment, and roughly the same proportion identified sexual harassment and/or bullying. Overall, sexual harassment was said to affect girls more than boys, although reports of teachers sexually abusing boys have also been recorded.

Finding. Emotional distress and lower performance in school are the most frequently reported impacts of SRGBV on pupils.

Individuals in the mixed stakeholder group were asked a series of questions about the impact of SRGBV on pupils, schools, and communities at large: 23% of the respondents mentioned psychological torture (e.g., emotional distress, feeling bad about oneself, or depression), and approximately half of those also indicated poor school performance and dropping out. 

"In class, teachers gives good grades to children and so end up loving them or impregnating them"
Informant, Child Protection Unit

"Female teachers get young boys at school and start buying for them gifts to entice and after that end up using them for sex because they don’t want old men out there, and sometimes, they can be HIV positive so they want to take advantage of these young boys since they do not have diseases"
Sub county official

"Caning in school is a big problem, which affects children’s performance or they end up leaving school"
Informant, Children Protection Unit

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaving school/homeless</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in Criminal Activity</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Students</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Fights/Strikes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Marriage</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor School Performance</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Drop Out</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
out of school (Table 16). When asked about the impacts of SRGBV on schools and communities at large, equal proportions of respondents (approximately 23%) reported increased rates of crime among children, and roughly 15% mentioned diseases (e.g., STI or HIV/AIDS resulting from sexual abuse), disability (injury caused by violence), and/or death and the fact that SRGBV taints the school’s image. A number of respondents indicated also that SRGBV results in early marriages in their community.

Table 16: Mixed stakeholders’ perceptions of the impacts of SRGBV on children’s health, well-being, and school retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological torture/distress</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor school performance</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping out of school</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased crime rates among children</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tainted school image</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 EXISTING CHILD-PROTECTION, REPORTING, AND RESPONSE SYSTEMS

5.3.1 PUPILS

Finding. To address SRGBV, schools can improve the school environment and punish perpetrators.

We investigated what schools and other stakeholders can do to protect pupils from SRGBV. Improving the school environment (e.g., better infrastructure and safety and clean latrines) and punishing perpetrators were the two tasks to address SRGBV that were most frequently reported by stakeholders. In two of the studied districts, 8–10- and 11–14-year-old boys and girls suggested improving the school environment or school security, having spies to relay information on what happens in corridors, punishing perpetrators, and providing guidance and counseling.

Finding. Pupils in schools are not confident in reporting SRGBV.

The discussions with pupils aimed to determine their level of satisfaction with the existing child-protection, response, and reporting mechanisms. The PLA revealed an overwhelming lack of confidence among male and female pupils in reporting incidents of SRGBV. Indeed, 85% of all male and female respondents across all groups and research sites said that they did not feel confident in reporting incidents of bullying, corporal punishment, and sexual abuse. However, a small proportion (approximately 7%) of male and female respondents indicated that they were confident in reporting. When probed further and asked about their confidence regarding reporting specific types of SRGBV, 61% in reporting bullying, 39% said that they were confident in reporting corporal punishment, and only 12% in reporting sexual harassment.
Finding. Pupils are not happy with how SRGBV cases are handled, are not satisfied with the support and services they receive, and say “it is difficult to get support”.

The PLA also explored the level of satisfaction among pupils regarding the type of service and support they receive and how SRGBV incidents are handled.

Through three different games—The Risk Mapping Tool, The Cage Trap, and The Umbrella of Care—pupils were asked a simple question: Are you satisfied with the way that cases of SRGBV are handled? Most pupils said “no”. Indeed, more than 95% of pupils said that it is difficult to get support, all of the pupils indicated that they are not satisfied with the support and services they received, and as many as 90% of them reported that they are dissatisfied with how these cases are handled.

Finding. Pupils mostly report violence to head teachers, teachers, and parents, but they lack comprehensive knowledge of where and how to report.

The PLA exercise also examined where pupils report violence or the bad things that happen to them in school. We found that although they report incidents of SRGBV, they generally do not have a clear understanding and knowledge of where or to whom they should report such incidents. Although only a small number of pupils responded, approximately 17% said that pupils report violence to police, roughly 15% to headmasters and teachers, 11% to parents, and approximately 6% to the LC chairman, a religious leader, a health worker, or a relative.

5.3.2 OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

Finding. Higher authorities were the most commonly indicated entity to which pupils reported incidents of violence.

The research sought to better understand the existing child-protection, reporting, and response systems and the knowledge and use of and satisfaction with these instruments among out-of-school youth. We found that reporting to higher authorities was the most common practice in reporting incidents of SRGBV. When asked what they do when they see incidents of SRGBV, 53% stated that they reported it to a higher authority, 22% to elders or parents, and 17% to the school administration.

To contextualize this question, the researchers probed the subjects further and asked what they do when they see a pupil they know bullied. Among the youth who gave one or more responses, 53% indicated that they reported such incidents to the school administration, roughly 42% to parents/elders, and approximately the same proportion to local authorities. In addition to these responses, 25% indicated that they reported it to the police, and the same proportion mentioned counseling (e.g., providing an opportunity to discuss the incident and giving the victim advice on what to do next).

When asked about the school-level response to pupils being abused at school, approximately 28% of respondents said that the school provides counseling and guidance, 17% mentioned arrests of the perpetrator of the violent act, and 25% of the participants indicated that the case is passed along to higher authorities.
5.3.3 TEACHERS

Finding. Teachers have limited awareness of the laws and regulations pertaining to SRGBV.

The discussions with teachers allowed us to ask a series of questions related to the systems and structures for the response and prevention of SRGBV. First, teachers were asked about their knowledge of and familiarity with any national-, regional-, district-, or school-level laws and regulations pertaining to SRGBV. Only a handful of teachers (four out of 48) indicated being familiar with the school-level SMC handbook and/or The Children Act of the Republic of Uganda.

Finding. Teachers’ knowledge of organizations that provide support in cases of SRGBV is limited.

This research inquired about teachers’ knowledge of or familiarity with the organizations that provide assistance, counseling, care, and support to children who experience physical, psychological, or sexual violence, including in schools. Only some teachers knew of such organizations: 23 out of 48 indicated some familiarity with these organizations and mentioned international agencies, NGOs, religious affiliates, and activist clubs. Additionally, four teachers in this groups indicated that they were also familiar with School-Family Initiatives11, which are school-based meet-ups to discuss various subjects deemed important by the pupils in school. According to teachers, often, no organizations that provide support or help in cases of SRGBV exist in their communities.

Finding. Only some teachers are familiar with the school-level response to SRGBV.

Teachers were also asked about their knowledge of the school-level responses to child abuse (Table 17), and only a few indicated familiarity. For example, approximately 40% of teachers indicated reporting to a higher authority (e.g., a head teacher or vice-chairperson of the LC where the school is located) and referring pupils to the Senior Male or Female Teacher for counseling and guidance, 35% mentioned reporting to “management” (head teacher or SMC), and three teachers said that their school would punish the teacher. When probed further and asked about what schools do when a teacher sexually assaults a pupil, only a few knew of any practice: eight out of 48 teachers indicated that the school reported such incidents, and five said that the schools disciplined such teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. School-level responses to SRGBV according to teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to a higher authority (head teacher or LC vice-chairperson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to Sr. Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline the teachers for sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 School Family Initiatives (SFI) is implemented through USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program. SFI are school-based discussion with teachers, pupils and out of school youth aimed at improving knowledge about HIV/AIDS. Informants did not refer directly to the USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program which is not working in the study same area.
### Table 17. School-level responses to SRGBV according to teachers

| Report sexual abuse | 10% |

**Finding. Teachers do not recognize their own roles and responsibilities in addressing SRGBV.**

Teachers were asked to share their opinions about whose responsibility it is to prevent SRGBV. The results from the FGDs suggest that teachers do not necessarily recognize their own role and responsibilities in preventing SRGBV but instead believe that others should act to address SRGBV. Among the few respondents, 20% said that the government and parents/communities are responsible for preventing SRGBV, and 10% mentioned that this responsibility falls on the pupils themselves. Approximately 8% of the respondents also identified the school administration, and one teacher mentioned religious leaders.

When probed further about the particular roles of these actors, i.e., the school, parents, and community, in preventing SRGBV, 21% of teachers said that the role of school is to encourage parents to prevent incidents of SRGBV, and 10% indicated that schools must reinforce the existing rules and regulations pertaining to SRGBV. An equal proportion of respondents (10%) indicated that the role of parents is to provide guidance or counseling to their children and to both stop insulting their children and using vulgar language and regulate their children’s exposure to violent and inappropriate content on TV because children may mimic what they see and bring it into the school environment. In contrast, the role of the community in preventing SRGBV was described as providing sensitization regarding the issue of SRGBV. Two teachers indicated that the community should organize discussions with children and parents about children’s rights, positive discipline techniques, and non-violence, and one teacher said that the community should discipline children.

#### 5.3.4 HEAD TEACHERS, SENIOR WOMEN AND SENIOR MEN

**Finding. Head teachers senior women and senior men familiarity with the organizations that provide support in cases of SRGBV in Uganda is very low.**

This research gained insights regarding head teachers’ knowledge and practices in preventing, responding to, and reporting SRGBV. First, head teachers, senior women and men were asked about their knowledge of government organizations or NGOs that provide support to children who have experienced various types of SRGBV. We found that head teachers have a limited knowledge of such organizations and are not familiar with their services. Although a very small number of informants responded (five out of 24), those who did respond mentioned churches; USAID; School-Family Initiatives,
which are school-based meet-ups to discuss various subjects deemed important by the pupils in school; UWESO; anti-AIDS clubs; and school/families.

**Finding. Providing counseling and reporting to relevant authorities are the two most commonly indicated school-level practices in addressing SRGBV.**

Head teachers were also asked about their school-level practices in responding to child abuse, and they most commonly indicated providing counseling in response to child abuse and reporting incidents of sexual harassment to relevant authorities (Figure 7). Specifically, 17 out of 24 head teachers and senior male and female teachers (approximately 71% of all respondents) said that the school (e.g., specifically the Senior Male or Female Teacher) provides counseling for pupils (e.g., guidance and opportunities for discussion), and nine head teachers (37% of all respondents) indicated that child abuse is reported (e.g., to higher authorities in the school or to the police). Following the teachers’ code of conduct, punishing perpetrators of violence (teachers and pupils) in response to child abuse in school, and not doing anything were mentioned by two head teachers.

Head teachers, senior women and men were probed about school-level practices in cases of the sexual violence of pupils in schools. Most respondents (83%) indicated that schools report such cases to relevant authorities. Out of these 40% indicated that schools also provide counseling/medical care to sexually harassed pupils. However, one head teacher reported that nothing is done when a pupil is sexually assaulted.

### 5.3.5 STAKEHOLDERS

**Finding. Stakeholders lack familiarity with the national laws and regulations that specifically address SRGBV.**

We found that stakeholders lack familiarity with the regulations that specifically address SRGBV, and therefore, their satisfaction with the implementation of these laws is unknown. Similar to the findings from other groups interviewed in this work, only a few stakeholders indicated that they had knowledge of the children status act, corporal punishment policy, Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, and teachers’ code of conduct. Furthermore, less than 7% of all stakeholders identified local government acts, educational acts, or OVC acts. Even fewer (less than 4%) mentioned LC status, Penal Code, school acts, laws on defilement, SFI, gender policy, and the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards (BRMS). Several stakeholders explicitly stated that, currently, there are no laws regarding SRGBV in their community.

---

12 UWESO was founded in 1986 by Ugandan mothers committed to providing relief aid to needy children left parentless by the civil turbulence in the early mid-1980s and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. For more information, please see: http://uweso.org/
Finding. Stakeholders lack knowledge of common practices in reporting SRGBV and have limited awareness of reporting procedures.

Stakeholders were asked a series of questions regarding common practices in schools for reporting incidents of SRGBV. We found that stakeholders lack knowledge about these common practices and that their awareness of existing reporting procedures, i.e., who should report violence to whom and when, is also limited.

For instance, 20% indicated that the common practice is to report incidents to the relevant authorities, 15% mentioned that schools provide responsive counseling to pupils (i.e., speaking with them), 8% stated that the teacher is talked to and disciplined, and 6% said that the school management meets and decides what to do or the school brings teachers and parents together to discuss the case. A small proportion of stakeholders (6%) indicated that the schools dismisses, suspends, or expels teachers who commit an act of VAC. Finally, one stakeholder indicated that the school provides biblical teaching to teachers.

The stakeholder interviews revealed the following common practices involving pupils, parents, head teachers, and others in school for reporting SRGBV:

- Pupils report to teachers and parents (21%);
- Parents and relatives report to the police (15%);
- Neighbors, parents, and teachers report to local leaders (11%);
- Pupils report to the police (8%);
- Pupils report to SMCs (7%);
- Local leaders report to the police (5%); and
- Head teachers report to higher authorities, and teachers report to the Director of Studies, who is a teacher in charge of academic affairs in school (3%).

Finding. Stakeholders lack familiarity with the organizations that provide support and assistance in cases of SRGBV and are unclear about when and how these services are used.

In this research, several questions were asked about stakeholders’ familiarity with, perceived availability of, and satisfaction with existing reporting mechanisms and structures and the organizations that provide support and assistance in addressing SRGBV in Uganda. Although approximately 40 organizations were mentioned, only a very small number of stakeholders were able to identify any of them. Among the most commonly indicated were MIFUMI13, UWESO, WV, and/or Child Protection Units14. A follow-up question inquired about stakeholders’

---

13 MIFUMI is an international non-governmental women’s rights focus organization in Uganda.
14 Other organizations identified by the stakeholders included the following: Child Development Center, KRDEP, Foundation of Orphan Children, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Integrated Community Based Initiatives (ICOBI), Kanaama Interactive Community Support (KICS), Rweibaare Orphans and Needy Children’s Organisation (RONCO), Uganda Women and Children Organisation (UWCO), Bantawa, Fruits for the Hungry, African Centre for Trade and Development (ACTADE), African Movement for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (AMPCAN), Meeting Point, KANAMA, Uganda Society for Disabled Children (USDC), Bread for the World, Hoima Caritas Development Organization (HOCADEO), Compassion Uganda,
knowledge regarding when these organizations’ services are used. Very few stakeholders provided answers; their responses did not indicate one or more specific instances when such services would be used and were widely varied.

Stakeholders reported that such services were mostly commonly used by pupils from poor families and when children’s rights abuse and VAC are involved (approximately 18%). Furthermore, 11% mentioned the provision of basic necessities to orphans, and 6% noted that these services were used in cases of sexual harassment. When probed further about how these services are used, 15% indicated that they help to sensitize communities about SRGBV issues and provide responsive psychosocial services and support to pupils, and 8% mentioned that they provide basic necessities (e.g., food and school materials) to pupils and orphans.

Finding. Stakeholders do not recognize own roles in preventing SRGBV, and only a few believe that everyone is responsible for preventing and responding to SRGBV.

Similar to the other groups interviewed in this research, stakeholders were asked to share their opinions about who is responsible for preventing SRGBV. The results from the FGDs suggested that stakeholders do not always recognize their own role and instead consider others to bear this responsibility. Furthermore, we found that only a few of them believe that everyone is responsible for preventing SRGBV. The agents most commonly identified by stakeholders included the following: parents (49%), head teachers (38%), the government (28%), the police (25%), probation officers (11%), local leaders (23%), and everyone (18%). A smaller proportion (8‒12%) mentioned pupils, the community, and/or the CDO.

5.3.8 MIXED STAKEHOLDERS

Finding. Mixed stakeholders believe that schools and communities have distinct roles and responsibilities in addressing SRGBV.

This research explored mixed stakeholders’ perceptions regarding the prevention of and response to SRGBV in Uganda. We found that mixed stakeholders believe that schools and communities have distinct roles and responsibilities in preventing and responding to SRGBV and also lack a clear consensus about who should be doing what. For example, when asked about how schools provide help when SRGBV occurs, 26% of respondents said that schools provide guidance and counselling, and approximately the same proportion suggested that they punish perpetrators or monitor teachers.

When probed further and asked to discuss how the community can help provide support in cases of SRGBV, 18% mentioned “teaching morals” (e.g., emphasizing previously accepted and recognized positive and protective societal values and norms), and approximately the same proportion cited reporting incidents of SRGBV. Of the respondents, 10% suggested that SRGBV should be prevented by
implementing various government-level efforts (e.g., enacting policies and laws) or by having parents and teachers provide guidance and counselling in schools.

**Finding. Mixed stakeholders have limited awareness of formal/informal child-protection mechanisms.**

The mixed stakeholder group was presented with a series of questions relating to the existence and utilization of various child-protection mechanisms in Uganda and the patterns of SRGBV reporting. We found that mixed stakeholders have limited awareness of formal or informal child-protection mechanisms or structures. They were asked to identify the formal/informal mechanisms that exist to protect pupils from violence in schools. Of the respondents, 13% noted school-based rules and regulations (e.g., teachers’ code of conduct and bans on corporal punishment in schools), 11% mentioned organizations (e.g., institutions that provide various forms of support and assistance to children), a small proportion (5%) indicated SMCs, and two respondents cited local leaders.

**Finding. Pupils do not report violence because they fear re-victimization, punishment, and ridicule.**

The mixed stakeholder FGDs also revealed the motivations underlying the limited reporting of SRGBV by pupils. When asked about the specific reasons pupils do not report SRGBV, small but equal numbers of respondents indicated that pupils’ fear re-victimization, punishment, and ridicule; and that pupils’ parents do not care (e.g., parents do not intervene in or follow up on incidents of SRGBV or do not respond to or report them). One respondent suggested that pupils do not report these incidents because of friendships between teachers and parents (e.g., close relationships may limit or prohibit reporting and response).

When asked what could be done to increase reporting, most of those who responded recommended providing guidance and counselling to pupils and teachers and strengthening parent-teacher-pupil relationships (e.g., collaborating to prevent, respond to, and report SRGBV). A small number of respondents also suggested encouraging reporting and engaging local leaders.

### 5.4 ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED ROLES IN PREVENTING AND MITIGATING THE IMPACT OF SRGBV

#### 5.4.1 PUPILS

**Finding.** According to pupils in schools, the school administration plays an important role in protecting them from SRGBV.

This research also sought to understand pupils’ perceptions of who exactly protects them from violence in schools and revealed that pupils believe the school administration plays an important role.

**Finding.** Pupils consider all stakeholders to be important in preventing SRGBV but attach specific roles and particular responsibilities to each.

The PLA with pupils provided an opportunity to discuss in depth various actors’ roles and responsibilities in the prevention of SRGBV. The results showed that pupils assign different responsibilities to different stakeholders:

- **Teachers:**
  - punish pupils (32%);
  - offer guidance and counselling (13%).
report incidents of SRGBV to higher authorities (10%); and
provide first aid when a pupil is injured (6%).

- **LCs**: work to protect children’s rights and report incidents of SRGBV to the police (27%);
- **Neighbors and communities**: provide help when a parent is not around (26%);
- **Radio**: sensitize pupils about dangers on the way to and from school (12%) and messages alert the parents to observe the community environment for any incidents (8%);
- **Friends**: report incidents of SRGBV to the police and teachers (12%);
- **Parents**: protect children (28%), take children to obtain treatment (11%), and offer guidance and counseling (10%);
- **Police**: investigate incidents of SRGBV (32%), protect children’s rights (12%), and advise pupils to stay in school (7%);
- **Religious leaders**: protect children from violence (22%) and pray for the pupils and their parents (14%); and
- **NGOs**: provide school materials to disabled pupils and support in addressing SRGBV (7%).

The following actors were assigned various roles and responsibilities by less than 6% of all PLA respondents: parents: provide necessities and basics; nurses and doctors: offer counseling and guidance; LCs: offer advice to pupils; District Education Officer (DEO) and Resident District Commissioner (RDC): work together to ensure the safety of pupils; members of parliament: provide school materials, encourage teachers to treat pupils well, promote the provision of guidance and counseling; and monitor progress of report incidents of SRGBV.

**Finding. Parents and teachers play important roles in addressing SRGBV but have different responsibilities.**

This research provided insights into pupils’ perceptions of who is responsible for responding to SRGBV and in what capacity they should act. The results from the PLA indicate that parents and teachers are the two most important actors and that their roles in providing guidance and counseling and reporting of incidents of SRGBV. Both male and female respondents identified that parents and teachers are the most essential agents in responding to SRGBV but assigned the various roles and responsibilities differently, as shown below.

According to female pupils:
- **Parents and teachers**: provide guidance, counseling, and support and report incidents of SRGBV;
- **Police, DEOs, and RDCs**: work to ensure the safety of all children and investigate incidents of SRGBV; and
- **Local radio stations**: raise awareness about SRGBV issues, including the risks of violence on the way to/from school; sensitize pupils and communities at large about SRGBV issues; and notify community members about incidents of SRGBV.

According to male pupils:
• **Parents and matrons**: protect pupils from SRGBV;

• **Police**: protect pupils from and investigate incidents of SRGBV;

• **School staff, including teachers and nurses, and community members, such as members of parliament**: provide advice, guidance, and counseling to pupils; and directly respond to SRGBV, such as by treating pupils when they are sick or helping them when their parents are not around. Members of parliament were also identified as being responsible for providing school materials to pupils with disabilities and orphans and encouraging teachers to treat all pupils well;

• **Prefects, LCs, and teachers**: report or provide support for reporting SRGBV; and

• **NGOs and religious leaders**: provide counselling and emotional support to SRGBV survivors.

**Finding.** The collaborative nature of the response to SRGBV by stakeholders is essential.

We also found that female and male pupils consider the direct collaboration among all actors—teachers and parents, community members and neighbors, religious leaders, LCs, and friends—to be essential in ensuring adequate response to SRGBV. For instance, parents must collaborate with teachers and LCs in reporting violence to the police or higher authorities, and teachers, neighbors, and community members should help when parents are not around.

### 5.4.2 OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

**Finding. Most respondents agree that it is wrong for a man to beat his female partner but support men assuming the dominant position in society.**

This study explored some of the existing norms and beliefs among out-of-school youth that promote, reinforce, or mitigate against SRGBV. The out-of-school youth were presented with a series of statements and asked if they agreed or disagreed.

All of the youth interviewed disagreed with the statement that “since girls have to get married, they should not go to school” (Table 18). Additionally, 81% disagreed with the statement that “girls should marry before the age of 18”, and one male agreed with it. When the youth were prompted to discuss some of their attitudes relating to GBV and presented with the statement “a mother should tolerate violence from the father in order to keep the family together”, 53% of the respondents disagreed with the statement, whereas 17% agreed. Furthermore, 77% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that “a boy should beat his girlfriend when she disobeys him”, whereas approximately 23% agreed with it. When asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement “boys are generally more intelligent than girls”, 64% disagreed, but almost 42% agreed. Finally, 81% of male and female youth agreed with the statement “a man should have the final decision at home”, and a smaller proportion of respondents (28%) said that woman should have the final decision.
Table 18. Proportions of respondents who disagreed with statements relating to social markers that usually promote SRGBV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since girls have to get married, they should not go to school</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls should marry before the age of 18</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mother should tolerate violence from the father in order to keep the family together</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boy should beat his girlfriend when she disobeys him</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man should have the final decision at home</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys more intelligent than girls</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.3 TEACHERS
Finding. Distinct, well-defined, and rigid gender and social norms persist in all areas of life.

This research explored teachers’ attitudes relating to gender and social norms in Uganda by presenting a set of statements representing commonly held societal notions and beliefs. We found that distinct and well-defined gender and social norms pervade all areas of life and may influence the nature and extent of SRGBV. For example, teachers were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement “men should make decisions in the family”. To further investigate their attitudes, teachers were asked about boys’ and girls’ roles in Uganda. Approximately 45% of the teachers said that boys are responsible for milking cows. Equal proportions of the male and female teachers interviewed (40%) said that boys are also responsible for maintaining and repairing their parents’ houses. Across all sites, equal proportions of the male and female teachers interviewed (approximately 50%) stated that girls’ roles include cooking and cleaning.

5.4.4 HEAD TEACHERS
Finding. Head teachers assign responsibility for the prevention of SRGBV to multiple stakeholders.

Sixteen head teachers gave their opinions about the parties who are responsible for preventing SRGBV, allocating responsibility to parents, communities, the school administration, and/or the government. The largest proportion of head teachers (42%) indicated that it is the parents’ responsibility alone, 38% cited the school administration, and 33% mentioned the government (Table 19). Five head teachers (approximately 21% of all respondents) allocated this responsibility to communities. Interestingly, only one head teacher noted the importance of the Senior Male and Female Teachers, who have key roles in reporting, tracking, referring, and responding to cases of SRGBV in Uganda, according to the National Strategic Plan on VACiS.
Table 19. Head teachers’ perspectives regarding the parties responsible for preventing SRGBV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School administration</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Male/Female Teachers</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.5 SMCS

Finding. Most SMCs report acts of SRGBV to the police, but they lack a clear conceptualization of the common practice in addressing SRGBV.

This research sought to better understand SMCS’ practices in preventing, responding to, and reporting SRGBV. We found that SMC members lack a clear conceptualization and knowledge of the procedures involved in preventing, responding to, or reporting SRGBV. For example, when asked about what SMCS do about VACiS, they answered as follows:

- Reporting to the police (20%);
- Counseling the teachers involved (e.g., reprimanding teachers for their inappropriate behaviors) (15%);
- Investigating incidents of SRGBV (12%);
- Inviting teachers to discuss the case (10%); and
- Calling for committee meetings to resolve issues (two SMC members).

When asked “What do you do when a pupil pushes another pupil?”, 15% indicated that SMCS reported the incident to the police so that the teacher could be arrested, 12% mentioned reprimanding and counseling the teacher, and approximately the same proportion said that SMCS took the pupil to the hospital (e.g., in case of injury) or invited the parent to take the pupil home.

In addition, the participants were asked what SMCS do when a teacher sexually harasses a pupil in school. Less than half of the SMC members answered, and their responses were mixed. Approximately 18% said that they report such incidents to relevant authorities, 5% of them noted that they referred pupils to referral facilities, and 8% indicated they advocated for the dismissal of the teacher or spoke with the pupil about the case.

Finding. Awareness and familiarity with the legal frameworks protecting pupils from violence in schools is very limited among SMC members.

The FGDs explored SMC members’ knowledge of national SRGBV laws and revealed that they have very limited awareness or familiarity with any of the legal frameworks protecting pupils from violence in schools. Only 17 out of 40 SMC members knew about any protective laws or regulations, and few of them could identify more than one existing measure. The indicated measures included the teachers’ code of conduct and the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda.
Finding. SMC members have limited knowledge and lack consensus regarding their roles and responsibilities involved in preventing SRGBV.

This research aimed to better understand SMC members’ perceptions about their roles and responsibilities in preventing SRGBV. SMC members were asked to share their opinions about who is responsible for preventing SRGBV, and we found limited knowledge and a lack of consensus among them. Indeed, only half of all the SMC members (20 out of 40) responded, and of them, 20% indicated that parents and schools are responsible, and half stated that the responsibility rested on NGOs and the community.

5.4.6 STAKEHOLDERS

Finding. Although they are changing, deeply ingrained and rigid gender norms continue to define local Ugandan communities.

We noted the existence of specific gender norms that define men’s and women’s position in Ugandan society. For instance, when asked about women’s roles and responsibilities in Ugandan society, 46% of the stakeholders suggested that, nowadays, women can work outside the home, and 30% indicated that they can also own property. However, approximately one quarter of the respondents stated women’s roles are to perform all domestic chores and properly raise children, and roughly 12% suggested that females should not own property.

Regarding men, the largest proportion of respondents (approximately 34%) indicated that men are responsible for providing basic needs (e.g., shelter, food for the family, and school fees for pupils). A quarter of those who responded also mentioned that men should own property, and slightly less than a quarter indicated that men should be responsible for making final decisions at home and should provide security (e.g., financial and overall household stability).

Another quarter of the stakeholders stated that men and women should make household-level decisions together.

5.4.7 MIXED STAKEHOLDERS

Finding. Individual-, family/home-, community-, and society-level factors influence and sustain the pervasiveness of SRGBV.

The FGDs with mixed stakeholders sought to better understand some of the existing norms, beliefs, practices, and risk factors that promote, reinforce, or mitigate against SRGBV in Uganda. This research revealed that different individual-, family/home-, community-, and society-level factors place pupils at risk of various types of SRGBV. The respondents were asked about what factors increase pupils’ risk of various forms of SRGBV, specifically bullying, corporal punishment, and sexual harassment. We found the following:

- **Bullying**: poor family background, adolescent age, disability, lack of control measures, teacher-parent disagreements, and traditions and beliefs;
• **Corporal punishment:** teachers’ unprofessional behaviors and teacher-parent disagreements, leading to teachers beating pupils at school; and

• **Sexual harassment:** teachers’ sexual “greed”, exposure to risky environment (e.g., risky places and peer groups in the community/school exerting negative influences, teachers’ unprofessional behaviors, and drug abuse among pupils.
ANNEX A: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review played an important role in the formative assessment by providing information to the activity obtained from the professional literature on SRGBV in Uganda. This review summarizes the available findings on the extent and impact of various types of SRGBV and the past and current interventions in Uganda, situating them in the context of global and regional best practices in combatting SRGBV.

SRGBV is a global phenomenon that affects pupil safety, retention, and learning. However, global-scale evidence of the problem and effective interventions is not well established (Leach et al., 2014). Four major quantitative studies have surveyed Ugandan children regarding their experiences of violence, including SRGBV, but none has utilized a nationally representative sample. Only one, the baseline for the Good Schools Study project (implemented with the local NGO Raising Voices), has been published in a peer-reviewed journal (Devries et al., 2014a). This study involved only one district (Luwero) and surveyed 3,706 upper primary (P5–P7) pupils and teachers. The 2005 VAC study in Uganda surveyed 1,000 children ages 8–18 both in and out of school in five diverse districts across the country (Naker, 2005), as well as adults. In 2013, the MoES and UNICEF conducted a survey on child protection and safety at school in eight districts, including 30 primary schools and 10 secondary schools (MoES & UNICEF, 2013). In 2011, African Network for the Prevention and Protection of Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN) Uganda conducted a survey on VAC that involved 990 primary school pupils in five districts (age range unspecified) (ANPPCAN, 2011). The findings of these studies are summarized below.

PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

In this section, we focus on the physical violence experienced by pupils in schools at the hands of staff members. Rates of physical VAC at school, including corporal punishment, are high: approximately 74–94% of pupils. According to Devries et al. (2014a), 93.3% of boys and 94.2% of girls attending primary school reported a lifetime experience of physical violence from a school staff member, with 52% of respondents reporting violence in the last week. Findings from the MoES/UNICEF study (2013) indicated that 74.3% of pupils reported having been caned at school. In the VAC survey, 98.3% of children reported experiencing physical violence in their lifetime (any perpetrator), and 31% had experienced physical violence in the last week (Naker, 2005). In this latter study, 28.6% of children said that they mainly experienced such violence at school. In the 2011 ANPPCAN study, 81.5% of children indicated being physically beaten at school.

Devries et al. (2014a) found no statistical difference between boys and girls reporting physical violence from school staff. However, the prevalence of lifetime physical violence from persons other than school staff was higher among girls (54.8% versus 43.7% of boys). Severe physical violence (defined as choking, burning, stabbing, or severe beating) was reported by 7% of respondents in this survey, with 1.8% having experienced severe physical violence in the past week.
(Devries et al., 2014a). Girls were more likely to report moderate injuries (both in their lifetime and in the last week) than boys, and this difference was statistically significant. In the VAC study, boys were more likely to report severe forms of violence (home and school experiences taken together), including burning or being tied up or severely beaten, although the statistical significance was not calculated (Naker, 2005).

Among school staff, 80.6% of male staff and 75.7% of female staff reported having ever used physical VAC (Devries et al., 2014a); no significant difference was found based on staff gender. Devries et al. (2014a) also investigated teachers’ experiences of intimate partner violence, childhood sexual abuse, and the perpetration of violence outside of the school, all of which were found to be predictors of male teachers’ VAC. The studies of Devries et al. (2014a) and MoES/UNICEF (2013) revealed that while school staff were most likely to commit violence, children also reported that older pupils were perpetrators of violence, including physical, sexual, and emotional violence. The 2011 ANPPCAN study found that of all the physical violence reported by children, 73% was perpetrated by teachers, 15% by fellow pupils, and 12% by parents/guardians. The VAC study also uncovered both teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil physical violence (Naker, 2005). Findings from the MoES/UNICEF study indicated that in 30% of cases, the experiences of physical violence victimization were perpetrated by another pupil. Head teacher practices included calling parents into the schools to settle disciplinary issues, whereby parents often responded by caning their children at the school in front of the other pupils.

The 2011 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey included questions related to GBV (Uganda Bureau of Statistics [UBOS] & ICF International, 2012). Of men and women aged 15–49 who had ever experienced violence, 19.8% of females and 21.0% of males reported that teachers had committed physical violence against them. The rates were much higher for never-married (presumably younger) respondents, with 56.6% of females and 34.3% of males reporting that teachers had committed physical violence.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Variations in the reported rates of sexual violence were found among the major child-focused Uganda studies. Devries et al. (2014a) found that 2.3% of girls and 1.9% of boys reported experiencing sexual violence from school staff. Girls’ lifetime experience of sexual violence from perpetrators other than school staff was significantly higher than that of boys (11.8% of girls versus 2.5% of boys). The 2013 MoES/UNICEF findings on the prevalence of sexual violence at school were much higher than those presented by Devries et al. (2014a), with respondents reporting experiences of sexual violence at school as high as 77.7% among primary school pupils and 82% among secondary school pupils. In the MoES/UNICEF study, 51% of the victims were between the ages of 10 and 13 years, and 40.6% were between 14 and 17 years old. Among those reporting sexual violence in school in the MoES/UNICEF study, 67% identified male teachers as the perpetrators.

In the VAC survey (Naker, 2005), 75.8% of the sampled children reported having at least one experience of sexual violence in their lifetime, with 10.7% indicating
that they experienced sexual violence at least once a week. In total, 46.5% of girls and 27.6% of boys reported being sexually touched against their will (by any person). Of the girls, 20.5% reported being forced to have sex, compared to 13.5% of boys. Regarding the locations where this violence occurred, 32.2% of children said they experienced sexual violence mainly at home, 24.3% said mainly at school, and 34.2% said at home and at school. Girls in their late teens (15–18 years old) generally reported greater frequencies of sexual violence. The respondents identified adults as the main perpetrators, but many school girls also reported pressure from older male pupils and teachers (Naker, 2005). Although statistical significance was not discussed in that study, pupils in school were more likely to report being forced to kiss on the mouth, to experience unwanted sexual exposure, to touch someone, and to have sex compared to out-of-school children. This difference may reflect the use of coerced sex to obtain school fees or better grades. Out-of-school youth were more likely to report unwanted sexual touching and sexual harassment.

ANPPCAN found that 24% of children reported verbal sexual harassment (of these, 63% were girls). Fellow children were the main perpetrators (32%), followed by teachers (12%). Twenty-five percent of children surveyed reported being touched/fondled, with the proportions of girl and boy victims being similar to those found for verbal harassment (66% and 34%, respectively). Again, the main perpetrators were other children, with only 5% reporting fondling from teachers. Eight percent of children reported forced sex; here, teachers constituted 26% of the perpetrators, other children made up 49%, and parents/guardians were reported by 13%.

Regarding adult-focused surveys, the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) III educational survey provides some data on sexual violence, which were obtained by surveying head teachers in 15 Sub-Saharan educational systems, including Uganda. In Uganda, more than 40% of head teachers reported that teacher-pupil sexual harassment occurred “sometimes” or “often”. Sixty percent of the head teachers surveyed indicated that pupil-pupil sexual harassment occurred “sometimes” or “often” (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] & United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative [UNGEI], 2015). In the 2011 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey, 1.1% of women aged 15–49 who had experienced forced sexual intercourse stated that the perpetrator was a teacher. No men reported teachers as perpetrators (UBOS & ICF, 2012).

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT, VIOLENCE, AND ABUSE**

Emotional violence, including bullying, often can be rooted in inequitable gender relationships and can take gender-differentiated forms, with boys being more likely to use physical aggression and girls being more likely to use verbal or relational aggression (Leach et al., 2014). Devries et al. (2014a) found similar levels of experienced emotional violence and neglect among girls and boys (48.6% and 49.4%, respectively). The MoES/UNICEF study focused on differences by age: 46% reported emotional abuse, which was more common in primary school (56%) than in secondary school (41%). The respondents identified teachers as perpetrators roughly half the time. Additionally, approximately 43% of respondents
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15 In Naker’s study, school-based violence and violence outside of the school were not differentiated. Thus, these results relate to all reports of violence in and out of school.
reported bullying in school (46% in primary and 31% in secondary). This result is consistent with VAC’s findings that younger children were more likely to report bullying (Naker, 2005). Naker’s study also revealed that emotional violence in general was a nearly universal experience and was reported by 98.2% of the children surveyed. Of these, regarding the location where the violence occurred, 42.6% said that they experienced it mainly at home, 21.2% said mainly at school, and 35.5% said both at home and at school (Naker, 2005). At school, teachers and older pupils were named as the perpetrators, whereas at home, fathers and stepmothers were most likely to be the perpetrators of emotional violence. Qualitative data gathered through the VAC study provide information pertinent to SRGBV. For example, many older boys felt teachers were more likely to humiliate them because they were competing with them for the older girls’ attention. Teachers may also have feared retaliation if they used physical violence against older boys and thus resorted to emotional violence.

In the ANPPCAN study, 57% of the children reported having been bullied and threatened while at school. Most (62%) cited fellow pupils as the perpetrators, followed by teachers. The interviews revealed that some teachers, who were banned from using corporal punishment, relied on emotional violence to maintain classroom control (ANPPCAN, 2011).

EXPERIENCE OF SRGBV AMONG DISABLED PUPILS

Disability puts pupils at risk in gender-differentiated ways. Devries et al. (2014b) found that disabled girls were more likely to report violence than non-disabled girls, whereas disabled and non-disabled boys reported similar levels of violence (any form, any perpetrator). Disabled girls experienced more physical violence than non-disabled girls and reported nearly twice as many experiences of sexual violence victimization (23%) than their non-disabled female peers; this difference was statistically significant. Disabled boys reported experiencing nearly twice as many incidences of sexual violence than their non-disabled male peers. However, no major differences in the levels of emotional violence or neglect were noted. The patterns of violence committed by school staff against pupils with disabilities varied by gender (Devries et al., 2014b). School staff were more likely to be emotionally violent or neglectful towards disabled boys but less likely to be physically violent to them. School staff were also found to perpetuate emotional and physical violence equally against disabled girls. Significant differences were found between disabled and non-disabled pupils in their experiences of sexual violence victimization. Among girls, 7.8% of disabled girls reported experiencing sexual violence perpetrated by male peers compared to 3.7% of non-disabled girls in the study. Disabled boys reported more than four times as many incidences of sexual violence than their non-disabled male peers (Devries et al., 2014b).

PUPIL ATTENDANCE AND RETENTION

In Uganda, one of the largest studies of out-of-school youth was conducted by Mpyangu, Ochen, Onyango, and Lubaale (2014). This team sampled households in 12 districts and four refugee areas and interviewed the heads of households. The findings differed notably according to the region, refugee status, and gender. Nearly 80% of households with children who had dropped out cited household finances as the main reason because the parents and/or non-parent guardians could not cover the costs necessary for schooling. Other reasons given were
related to the need to keep children (especially girls) at home to assist with domestic tasks, such as caring for other children, with 75% of the respondents reporting domestic work as a reason for dropout; 25% cited other work-related reasons, including working on the family business or farm. Of the adults interviewed, 27.5% stated that children in their household dropped out because they were no longer interested in going to school. In this study, safety reasons were much less likely to be reported as a reason for dropping out of school.

“Unsafe at school” was mentioned as a reason for dropping out by only 6.2% of participants (ranging from 13.3% of respondents in the central region to 2.6% in the north). During group discussions, study participants mentioned the reality of teacher-perpetrated violence, including sexual violence. “Unsafe journey” to school was mentioned by 8.1% of respondents, ranging from 15.4% of households in the central region to only 2.5% in the east, as a reason for dropping out. Another point raised in the group discussions was that pupils dropping out were sometimes those who had to repeat grades and were subsequently embarrassed and made fun of by their peers, leading to discouragement and a desire to leave school. Qualitative findings also revealed that harsh punishment, caning, and sexual harassment by teachers were reasons for dropping out, as were teacher absenteeism and crowded classrooms. The respondents also cited crowded classrooms (19.4%) and poor performance by teachers (13.5%).

Another study that investigated dropout among adolescent girls (aged 14–18) in two conflict-affected, rural districts in Northern Uganda found that 41% of girls reported financial reasons as the main reason for dropping out, with 12% mentioning pregnancy (International Center for Research on Women [ICRW] & Forum for African Women Educationalists Uganda [FAWEU], 2014). In the study district that included larger towns, 28% of girls reported not feeling safe at school by age 12, compared to 18% in the more remote district at the same age. Girls endorsing gender-inequitable statements16 were more than two times more likely to drop out of school than those who did not endorse such statements. Overall, the strongest predictors of dropout according to ICRW and FAWEU were age (late start of school), district, mother’s education level, self-rated school performance, gender norms, and lack of parental support for school.

**INTERVENTIONS TO ADDRESS VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS, INCLUDING SRGBV**

**SCHOOL CLUBS**

One of the strong findings in the literature is the positive impact of girls’ clubs. A range of projects have found that girls who are members of clubs have better knowledge of their rights and are more outspoken and confident, more likely report violations, more knowledgeable about HIV/AIDS and life skills, and more likely to challenge norms of discrimination and violence (Leach et al., 2014). Clubs also positively affect boys’ knowledge about children’s rights and their willingness to challenge violence against girls. Plan Uganda established anti-violence clubs as part of its Promoting Safe, Child-friendly Schools in Uganda project, which operated in the Kamuli District in Eastern Uganda during 2008–2011. This project served approximately 16,000 pupils in 20 primary and 10 secondary schools. The anti-violence clubs were cited as a major reason for the reduction in school
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16 Gender-inequitable statements included “Boys deserve more education than girls,” “Girls must marry a boy they have sex with,” and “Women sometimes deserve to be beaten.”
violence (with approximately 75% of pupils and 41% of teachers noting that school violence had decreased) (Leach et al., 2012). Clubs were also part of Plan’s follow-on project Prevention of SRGVBV in Uganda, in partnership with Raising Voices, from 2012 to 2014 (funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency). Raising Voices used the Good School Toolkit to engage pupils in group activities and train pupil advocates. Pupils in schools benefitting from the intervention reported a last-week physical violence rate of 31.0% compared to 48.7% in control schools (Devries et al., 2015). UNICEF has long promoted Girls Education Movement (GEM) clubs in Uganda. By the end of 2008, approximately 1,000 GEM clubs existed, some of which were implemented with local partners, such as FAWEU (Chabott, 2010). GEM clubs engage in enrollment campaigns for young girls, providing education on menstruation management and income-generating activities.

However, some risks are associated with such clubs, including the possibility of excluding the most vulnerable (for example, the poorest girls may be less likely to attend), teachers’ low capacity to run and sustain clubs, and the gap between the attitudes fostered in the clubs and the prevailing cultural norms of the school. In addition, girls-only clubs can incite backlash from boys (Leach et al., 2014). The Plan Uganda project found that boys complained that girls got extra attention and, therefore, attempted to disrupt girls’ sessions (Leach et al., 2012). The Stop Violence against Girls in School (SVAGS) project (implemented by ActionAid with funding from the UK’s Big Lottery Fund) experienced many of these challenges. For example, in schools with very few female teachers, male teachers ended up running the girls’ clubs. Further, the SVAGS final report noted several concerns about the clubs’ sustainability after the project ended (Parkes & Heslop, 2013). In addition, boys came to resent the girls-only clubs, and thus, SVAGS started parallel clubs for boys. Therefore, GEM clubs in Uganda engage boys as strategic allies. Another best practice for clubs is that the teachers in charge of discipline should not be recruited to run clubs (Leach et al., 2014). A UK Department for International Development (DFID) review of GEM clubs cited the need to focus on quality and capacity building rather than simply creating more clubs, with strengthening M&E being especially important to better capture GEM clubs’ impacts on enrollment and retention (DFID, 2009).

SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE

The UNESCO global review identified physical improvements, particularly sex-specific toilet blocks, as a best practice to make school environments safer (Leach et al., 2014). In one study in Uganda, 46% of pupils identified toilets as the riskiest place, with classrooms being the second riskiest place. Girls reported fears of sexual assault, especially when toilets lacked proper doors or shutters (MoES & UNICEF, 2013). A study of primary schools in seven districts found that girls missed more than 10% of school days because of menstruation, citing embarrassment, lack of facilities and/or sanitary pads, and fear of being scolded once they returned to school after missing days because of menstruation (Netherlands Development Organisation [SNV] & the International Rescue Committee [IRC] International Water and Sanitation Centre, 2012). A myriad of projects, many of which were not directly related to SRGVBV, have addressed school infrastructure improvement in Uganda. Plan Uganda did not provide
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17 The two Plan projects were the only Uganda examples highlighted as significant SRGVBV project examples, with reviews highlighting roughly 10 projects as providing the best evidence on SRGVBV programming (Leach et al., 2014; Leach et al., 2012).
infrastructure support as a targeted activity, but their work to create child-friendly schools resulted in cleaner environments, and 47% of the pupils sampled for the final evaluation reported improved sanitation and hygiene as a major benefit of the project (Leach et al., 2012). GEM clubs, SNV, and others have also educated girls about menstruation management, provided pads, and taught girls how to make reusable pads.

PUPIL INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS

Some evidence suggests that pupil involvement in school codes of conduct and class charters, such as those promoted by UNICEF’s child-friendly schools, contributes to reducing violence (Leach et al., 2014). Plan Uganda’s project also prompted the creation of pupil courts/councils to address allegations of pupil-on-pupil violence. The existence of these pupil courts/councils was cited as a contributing factor to the overall reduction in violence (Leach et al., 2012). The USAID-funded Uganda Program for Human and Holistic Development (UPHOLD) project, implemented by John Snow, Inc., engaged 200 Ugandan primary schools in developing Safe School Contracts (SSCs). Participants in a qualitative evaluation stated that the SSCs’ results included improved pupil confidence, reduced harassment and abuse of pupils, greater collective responsibility among teachers and parents, and increased willingness of pupils and teachers to engage in addressing “abuse” issues (Lulua et al., 2007). Although more than 3,000 schools were sensitized to the SSCs, only 200 chose to focus their efforts on SSCs, whereas others prioritized other activities, such as school feeding or hygiene. This behavior may indicate the difficulty of explicitly prioritizing safety in the context of many other pressing needs. However, the evidence is less convincing regarding the impact of pupil participation in school committees (SMCs and Parent-Teacher Associations [PTAs]), especially given the ages and authority structures pervasive in schools (Leach et al., 2014).

TEACHER TRAINING

Alternative discipline/positive discipline.

Teachers generally believe that corporal punishment is needed to maintain discipline (and secure respect) and have expressed limited confidence in positive discipline measures. Some projects, including SVAGS, have found that encouraging teachers to discontinue corporal punishment, such as caning, led to unexpected increases in other forms of harsh punishment, e.g., sitting/squatting for long periods of time or being struck with a hand instead (Parkes & Heslop, 2013). SVAGS concluded that the teachers had been told what not to do without fully building their capacity to successfully use alternative methods. In 2010, MoES developed training materials for primary school teachers in a safe school environment to guide them regarding the development of systems and practices to prevent and respond to the violence faced by children in schools and communities. The themes covered included a safe school environment, child protection, child participation, and responses to abuse allegations (WV, 2013). The IRC has implemented its Healing Classrooms approach in Northern Uganda (and in other conflict-affected areas of the globe), which includes training teachers to promote psychosocial well-being through the use of positive discipline and other techniques. The Good School Toolkit project of Raising Voices trained teacher protagonists, who then taught fellow teachers about positive discipline, classroom management, and other approaches. These efforts were found to significantly
reduce physical VAC in intervention schools compared to control schools (Leach et al., 2015). Plan Uganda actively promoted alternative methods of discipline, and the final evaluation revealed improved teacher-pupil relationships. The evaluation found that in some schools, corporal punishment was no longer practiced, in part because of Plan’s involvement in developing a set of regulations that incorporated a ban on corporal punishment in schools. However, Plan Uganda also encountered significant resistance from community members regarding positive discipline, with some parents withdrawing their children (Leach et al., 2012). Frequently, parents were not sensitized to alternative discipline at school or home (Mpyangu et al., 2014). Little research has addressed parental attitudes towards alternative discipline at home or school. However, the Sexual Violence Research Initiative is piloting parent-focused interventions for the early prevention of sexual violence and GBV (Wight, Siu, Zalwango, Kasule, & Seley, 2015).

Adults’ resistance to the elimination of violence in schools is closely linked to social acceptance of other forms of GBV, including intimate partner violence and child sexual abuse (Leach et al., 2014). The 2005 VAC study in Uganda found that adults were extremely reluctant to even use the term “violence”. Instead, they used words such as “punishment”, emphasizing the use of punishment as a way to guide and teach children through moderate discipline but characterizing severe acts as “mistreatment” (Naker, 2005). SVAGS concluded that achieving effective change regarding the use of corporal punishment necessitated greater engagement with beliefs about child-rearing, teacher training in classroom management, positive discipline, teacher motivation, and school resources to lower the pupil-teacher ratio and improve the available equipment (e.g., desks) (Parkes & Heslop, 2013).

TEACHERS’ GENDER NORMS

One little-studied area is teachers’ own gender norms. However, “the achievement of gendered equality depends a great deal on how teachers construct their own gendered identities” (Leach et al., 2014, p. 24). In other words, a female teacher subscribing to traditional norms of submissiveness is unlikely to be an effective champion for girls, whereas a male teacher may not readily promote gender equality initiatives that threaten his traditional privileges/position of superiority. The SVAGS project found that teachers’ attitudes towards gender norms, such as domestic work or school chores, had not changed much at the end of the five-year study. In contrast, their attitude towards children’s rights exhibited a greater change (i.e., they more openly opposed corporal punishment or asking pupils to do personal errands). At the end of the SVAGS project, teachers in Kenya and Mozambique were more likely than they were at baseline to support teacher dismissal for sexual relationships with pupils and to disagree with the idea that sexual harassment is the girl’s own fault; the findings in Ghana were mixed in Ghana (Parkes & Heslop, 2013).

INVOlVING PARENTS AND COMMUNITIES

Uganda is one of three East African research sites in which the project is working with parents to prevent violence through positive discipline; the partners in Uganda are the Child Health and Development Centre, Makerere University, and the Medical Research Council/Uganda Virus Research Institute.
The success with which projects have engaged communities has varied widely, with the evidence showing, at most, some increased capacity and confidence in addressing VAC (Leach et al., 2014).

**SMCs/PTAs.**

Engaging parents through SMCs and PTAs was central to many of the highlighted SRGBV projects. However, these structures can be weak or even non-functioning and are already central to many school-improvement programs. At its midterm, SVAGS had not found SMCs to be more effective than other methods, such as girls’ clubs, and they were not demonstrated to be responsible for the changes noted in the final evaluation (Leach et al., 2012; Parkes & Heslop, 2013).

**AWARENESS RAISING**

To generate broader community awareness about SRGBV, Plan Uganda utilized a child-centered community-development approach (its SRGBV project in 2008–2011 operated in a district with a long-term child-sponsorship operation implemented by Plan). Plan Uganda also utilized the Community Conversation model, in which trained facilitators using PLA tools held conversations in the village on the socio-economic and cultural issues associated with SRGBV (Leach et al., 2012). Regarding the evidence of the impact of awareness raising, the SVAGS endline study found that girls in all three countries reported that physical punishments at home had decreased or stopped, although parents reported more mixed perspectives. Another notable ActionAid-implemented SRGBV project was the 2007–2012 Transforming Education for Girls in Nigeria and Tanzania (TEGINT). TEGINT used “community circles” for awareness raising, which also included household visits, marches, and high-profile events. Traditional leaders participated in some of these circles, reportedly leading to considerable changes in community attitudes and behaviors (Leach et al., 2014).

**SRGBV AND CHILD-PROTECTION REPORTING SYSTEMS**

Improving reporting mechanisms has been a major challenge in programs both globally and in Sub-Saharan Africa. The SVAGS endline study found no major improvements in the support provided by official systems for girls reporting violence (except for an increase in cases reported to police in Mozambique), and many still preferred to use informal/community justice systems. They did find some improved coordination between the informal/formal systems, although the weak formal systems may have limited the sustainability of project interventions. Plan Uganda worked to bring together the informal and formal systems by creating linkages with LC leaders, police, probation and welfare departments, and head teachers. They reported that in 2010 alone, approximately 300 cases of child abuse were referred in the project district (Leach et al., 2012). Other studies have indicated that SMCs play an important role in identifying and forwarding violations to appropriate authorities. A 2012 Plan Uganda study found that the Uganda Police Child and Family Protection Unit received most of its cases from SMCs and school boards (Plan Uganda & Uganda Law Society, 2012). Further, a WV internal report on mapping child-protection systems determined that LCs play a central role in child protection because they serve as a link between formal and informal systems, are mandated by law, and consist entirely of community members. When the family/clan systems fail to resolve issues, they are often referred to the LC as the next course of action (WV, 2013). Although they are accepted and trusted by communities, a major drawback is that LCs may perpetuate harmful traditional
practices (i.e., settling an injustice via monetary compensation or decreeing that a pregnant girl should marry her abuser). Distinct from LCs are Child-protection Committees (CPCs), which often operate from the parish to the district level and work in the context of OVC programming. CPCs coordinate individual and group actors at the parish and village levels to provide community-based services to vulnerable children. However, capacity constraints, including reporting systems, are a barrier to their effective functioning (Plan Uganda & Uganda Law Society, 2012). Furthermore, national coverage by CPCs has not been achieved, no reliable data on the total numbers of CPCs in Uganda exist, and they operate voluntarily and often on an ad hoc basis (WV, 2013). Schools may struggle to discipline or dismiss teachers for inappropriate (or even egregious) behaviors, and often, school administrators feel they can do little else other than report to the district and transfer the teacher elsewhere (ANPPCAN, 2011). MoES and UNICEF (2013) cited inadequate investigation and poor coordination and follow-up by local government probation officers, police, SMCs/PTAs, LCs, and District Inspectors of Schools regarding the use of physical abuse/corporal punishment and failures to maintain confidentiality and safety regarding sexual abuse cases reported by children. Furthermore, District Inspectors did not monitor compliance with corporal punishment bans and, in some cases, solicited bribes (MoES & UNICEF, 2013). Finally, the Uganda Child Helpline, a toll-free number started in 2014 as a way to report child abuse, represents a newer reporting mechanism. It is supported by the Ministry of Gender, Labour, and Social Development (MoGLSD).

Children face multiple barriers to reporting: The person to whom they are supposed to report (e.g., a Senior Male/Female Teacher or parent) may be the perpetrator; they may fear retaliation from the abuser and expulsion from school; they may believe the abuse is a justifiable punishment; and parents/teachers may forbid them to report to others (ANPPCAN, 2011). Of the children reporting sexual violence in the MoES and UNICEF study (2013), 40% of girls and 39% of boys had reported it previously, whereas the others had never done so. Reporting these infractions was mishandled, and the study found that poor handling of investigations at the school level included public confrontations between the pupil and abuser. Plan Uganda has used suggestion boxes in schools as a mechanism for children to report incidents, and the evaluation of the 2008–2011 project in Uganda found that pupils ranked these highly as an indicator of a child-friendly school. Suggestion boxes were reviewed by committees composed of pupils, parents, teachers, and community members, with issues directed to appropriate channels (e.g., issues relating to witchcraft were directed to traditional chiefs, whereas those involving teachers were directed to the head teachers and/or SMCs), but the committees’ commitments to following through with the responses varied. Plan’s 2012–2014 project in Uganda (with Raising Voices) continued to promote this suggestion box mechanism with the caveat that effectiveness depended on the support of the head teacher and committee (Leach et al., 2012).

The inadequacy of responses to reported child abuse cases was illustrated in the follow-up to the Good Schools baseline survey in the Luwero District (Child, Naker, Horton, Walakira, & Devries, 2014). Researchers referred serious cases of abuse (differentiating by urgency), and 14% of the survey respondents (529 children) were referred. Girls were more likely to be referred/meet the criteria for a serious case than boys (9% vs 4%), reflecting girls’ higher experience of forced sex. Nearly half of the referred children had sought help before, often disclosing the abuse to their parents. A tracer study of the referred children following the
baseline study showed that only 3.8% of cases met the full criteria for an adequate response, and only 20% of the referred cases had some type of action taken. More than 60% of the referrals had no action and no developed plan for action. The study partner international NGO (INGO) was responsible for most of the actions, but CDOs at the sub-county level took no action and made no plan for 98% of all the referred cases they received (Child et al., 2014).

CONSIDERATIONS FOR SAMPLE SELECTION

Some highlights of selected lessons learned from the literature review are presented below.

AGE OF BENEFICIARIES

Several of the major studies in Uganda (Devries et al., 2014a; MoES & UNICEF, 2013) focused on upper primary pupils. Because the USAID|Uganda LARA focuses on P1–4, the activity must consider how to survey younger children about violence and the related ethical challenges of surveying this age group. The Naker study (2005) could be a helpful example in this regard because its respondents were as young as age 8. The activity must address the differing prevalence rates of violence according to age because studies have reported a greater incidence of bullying among younger children and a greater incidence of sexual violence among older children. In terms of interventions, the age of the participants in school clubs is another important issue to address because the program seeks to balance early literacy in P1–4 with violence affecting the whole school.

REGIONAL DIFFERENCES

No national data exist for Uganda, and the studies cited cover a patchwork of districts. However, dropouts differ by country region (Mpyangu et al., 2014), and ActionAid’s SVAGS project found important differences in SRGBV in rural versus peri-urban areas (Parkes & Heslop, 2013). The USAID|Uganda LARA must seek to understand regional variations in the prevalence rates and drivers of violence in schools.

BULLYING

Emotional violence and bullying between pupils were not deeply explored in the reviewed Uganda studies. Understanding the nature of bullying at school, including how it varies by age and sex, will be an important area for the activity to explore.

DROPOUTS

The reasons for dropping out are complex, and explicit SRGBV was not often named as the main reason (Mpyangu et al., 2014), although it is seen as a contributing factor. The USAID|Uganda LARA may consider also measuring attendance, with some studies finding that pupils skipped school to avoid SRGBV.

INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING INTERVENTIONS/SCHOOL CLUBS

A fair amount of work on SRGBV has already been done in some regions (e.g., UNICEF’s child-friendly schools, GEM clubs, and SSCs). Thus, given the activity’s broad scope, overlap will occur. Therefore, the project must find a way to leverage and build upon existing efforts.
OLDER CHILDREN/YOUTH VOLUNTEERS

Children were identified as both perpetrators and victims of violence in all the major violence studies in Uganda reviewed here. Although the USAID|Uganda LARA aims to equip older children and youths as volunteers and tutors for young readers, it must prepare older children to appropriately serve in this capacity. Older children/youths run the risk of emulating the negative practices (e.g., corporal punishment) used by teachers and other adults.

Reporting and responding to violence

Child et al.’s (2014) study on children’s experiences of reporting violence, even when assisted by researchers, provides a grim portrait of the inadequacy of child-protection systems at the local and sub-county levels. This will likely be challenging because the activity encourages a robust response to SRGBV while maintaining its programming focus on schools.
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DATA-COLLECTION TEAMS

There were three data-collection teams, one for each selected district (e.g., Hoima, Mbarara, and Mukono). Each team consisted of 16 members: 12 facilitators (six male and six female) who shared the functions of facilitating, interviewing, and note-taking; two supervisors (one male and one female); and two professional guidance counselors (one male and one female). In total, 36 facilitators/interviewers, six supervisors, and six guidance counselors (48 professionals in total) were recruited for this study. Every member of the data-collection teams was conversant in the predominant local language utilized at the selected schools: Luganda, Runyankole/Rukiga, and Runyoro/Rutooro.

TRAINING OF DATA-COLLECTION TEAMS

All data collectors, supervisors, and guidance counselors participated in a two-week training program supporting three learning objectives: 1) develop a deep understanding of the nature of SRGBV, the gender norms and power relations that produce and perpetuate it, and the mediating factors that serve to attenuate or perpetuate it; 2) develop the sensitivities needed to facilitate discussions on SRGBV and be responsive to the social-emotional needs of informants and fellow data collectors to ensure that the on-site and referral sources of support are accessed in a discreet and timely manner; and 3) develop a thorough understanding of the goals of the research and field protocol and develop the competencies and confidences needed to conduct the data-collection activities according to protocol.

SAMPLE SIZE

Table 20 provides an overview of the sample assessed in this work.
### Table 20. Overview of the sample assessed in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>PLA</th>
<th>Parental</th>
<th>Assent</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (age 6–7)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(children provide assent, not individual consent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (age 8–10)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a (see above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (age 11–14)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a (see above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (Age 15+)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a (see above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- PLA workshops will be segregated by gender: 12 boys and 12 girls per school × six schools.
- At least two orphans (one boy and one girl) and two disabled pupils (one boy and one girl) will be selected to participate in the PLA workshops.
- A sub-selection of one boy and one girl (not orphaned or disabled) per school per age group will participate in individual interviews (48 participants).
- A sub-selection of orphans (one boy and one girl per school per age group) will participate in individual interviews (48 participants).
- A sub-selection of disabled pupils (one boy and one girl per school per age group) will participate in individual interviews (48 participants).
- Teacher FGDs will be segregated by gender: five male and five female × six schools (60 total).
- If available, a Senior Male Teacher and Senior Female Teacher per school will be
**Table 20. Overview of the sample assessed in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Parental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Guardians</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Support Staff: One female and one male × six schools will be selected per school using a lottery method (randomly).
- Head Teachers: The head of the institution will participate in an individual interview. If a given school does not have a head teacher at the time of data collection, then a deputy head teacher will be interviewed.
- SM C: SMCs comprise 12 members, and all who attend will be included in a single, mixed-gender FGD. SMCs have varying gender compositions, and thus, we cannot guarantee representativeness.
- Out of School Setting: The FGDs will include 10 females and 10 males × six: parents with children of school-going age, regardless of whether their
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Parental</th>
<th>Assent</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>Assent</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-school Youth</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The individual interviews will involve three females and three males × six:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out-of-school youth (12–17 years old) who have ever attended school will be sampled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emancipated youth will provide individual consent, whereas un-emancipated youth will give assent after their parents have permitted them to participate in the study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Stakeholder Group at the Village (LC1) Level</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FGDs will include nine stakeholders × six:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They will be selected from the LC level, and both sexes will be included to ensure representativeness. However, the proportions cannot be determined currently because different LCs have different gender distributions. The FGDs will be mixed-gender.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following categories will be represented:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village Chair;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traditional Leader;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious Leader(s);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vice Chairperson (in charge of Child Protection);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village Youth Leader;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village Women’s Leader;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village Disability Leader;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village Health Team Member; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>Assent</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>Assent</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county (LC3) Representatives</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (LC5) Representatives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FGDs will involve nine representatives × six:
- Gender segregation at this level is not possible because the genders are not proportionately represented in this context.

The following categories will be represented:
- LC3 Chairperson;
- Senior Assistant Secretary;
- Vice-Chairperson (in charge of Children’s Affairs);
- CDO;
- Coordinating Center Tutor;
- Police Department Child Protection Unit and Gender Desk;
- Sub-County Women’s Leader;
- CPC Chair; and
- CBO or Civil Society Organization Representatives.

Four representatives per district × three districts (=12) will be individually interviewed. Gender segregation at this level is not possible because the genders are not proportionately represented in this context.

The following categories will be represented:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Parental</th>
<th>Assent</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>Assent</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Representatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (age 6–7)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a (children provide assent, not individual consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (age 11–14)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **District Education Officer;**
- **Probation Officer;**
- **Social Services Secretary;**
- **CDO.**

Three representatives at the national level will partake in the study:
- **Director – Basic Education (BE) (MoES);**
- **Commissioner – BE (MoES);**
- **Chairman Inter-sectoral committee, VACIS (MoES);** and
- **Commissioner Children Affairs (MGLSD).**

- **The sample will include 12 boys selected from P1 and P2.**
- **Among the 12 boys, two will be orphans, and two will be pupils with minor disabilities.**
- **A sub-selection of two boys will participate in individual interviews.**

- **The sample will include 12 girls selected from P6 and P7.**
- **Among the 12 girls, two will be orphans, and two will be pupils with minor disabilities.**
- **A sub-selection of two girls will participate in individual interviews.**

- **The interview guide for teachers will be field tested**
Table 20. Overview of the sample assessed in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>PLA</th>
<th>Parental</th>
<th>Assent</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with one male and one female teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Guardians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two FGDs (one involving six males and another involving six females) will be conducted to field test the FGD instrument for parents/guardians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The key informant interview guide will be field tested with least two of the following sub-county staff: the CDO, the Sub-County Women’s Leader, and/or the Child Protection Chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPLOYMENT AND SCHEDULE

Data collection took place over the course of two weeks. Each of the three 16-member data-collection teams was assigned to one of the three target districts. The schedule of preliminary planning with schools and the data collection itself are described in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Data-collection Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Data Collection</td>
<td>• Regional Coordinators and Field Assistants visit selected schools and stakeholders to provide a general briefing and mobilize them for the study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monday | • Briefing of parents, guardians, and SMC members and obtaining parental permission and consent  
• FGD for parents/guardians  
• SMC mixed-gender group discussion  
• Debriefing and compiling of the day’s notes |
| Tuesday | • Development of a sampling frame of pupils (6–7 and 8–10 years) based on the eligible pupils present, followed by pupil sample selection, briefing, and assenting.  
• Gender-disaggregated PLA workshops for pupils 6–7 and 8–10 years old  
• Individual interviews with pupils 6–7 and 8–10 years old  
• Debriefing and compiling of the day’s notes |
| Wednesday | • Development of a sampling frame of pupils (14 and 15+ years) based on the eligible pupils present, followed by pupil sample selection, briefing, and assenting  
• Gender-disaggregated PLA workshops for pupils 14 and 15+ years old  
• Individual interviews with pupils 14 and 15+ years old  
• Debriefing and compiling of the day’s notes |
| Thursday | • Development of sampling frames, sample selection, consenting, and FGDs with teachers  
• Individual interviews with teachers  
• Sampling and individual interviews with support staff  
• Interviews with head teacher  
• Briefing of out-of-school youth and their parents/guardians, obtaining parental permission, and assenting/consenting  
• Individual interviews with out-of-school youth  
• Briefing of stakeholders at the LC1/village level, consenting, and mixed stakeholder dialogue  
• Debriefing and compiling of the day’s notes |
| Friday | • Key informant consenting and interviews at the sub-county and district levels  
• Debriefing and compiling of the day’s notes |

QUALITY CONTROL

Data quality was maintained through the following procedures:

• Carefully selecting and rigorously training the research teams;
• Assigning each FGD and PLA workshop a moderator, note-taker, and observer/recorder;
• Assigning a male and female supervisor to each study team to monitor all field activities and maintain gender alignment so that only same-sex supervisors visited the PLA and FGD activities;
• Tasking team supervisors with supervising sample selection and data collection and resolving challenges, as much as possible, before, during, and after data collection;
• Deploying three Field Monitors (including the LARA M&E Coordinator, the LARA M&E Officer, and a PLA expert from WV) to provide oversight to each district team to forestall errors in the data-collection process early and ensure that the data collected were of the highest quality possible;
• Holding daily debriefing sessions immediately after the field work to discuss any issues/matters that arose during the day and to plan for the following day’s work;
• Having data collectors review the data in the field and record special observations and insights recorded in the field after every day of data collection;
• Audio-recording and transcribing the data from the FGDs and individual interviews using professional transcriptionists; and
• Coding and entering the data at the USAID|Uganda LARA head office by coders under the supervision of a statistician.

DATA ANALYSIS

Group discussion and individual interview data were analyzed by extracting key content and merging it according to relevant themes. The specific procedures followed in this analysis included the following:

• Transcribing all information recorded for each session into typed narratives according to each study question/theme;
• Organizing all notes under each study theme according to emerging coherent themes;
• Assigning unique codes to each coherent theme that emerged;
• Entering all data into the analysis grid manually;
• Clustering emerging themes with similar codes. Team members and analysts searched for patterns, concepts, and explanations, thereby creating descriptive typologies, identifying associations, and providing explanations for patterns and associations;
• Providing a “name” or suitable title for each explanation and clustered description (done by team members);
• Listing all cluster descriptions and extracting citations (together with the respondent’s characteristics) from the original notes matching each cluster description; and
• Incorporating descriptions and citations into a report that analytically describes the factors affecting SRGBV, attendance, and retention.
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The protocol and related consenting and assenting forms were approved by the School of Biomedical Sciences Research and Ethics Committee, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, and the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology. The study was also approved by RTI’s IRB. The requirements for protecting human subjects during investigations of sensitive topics, such as violence and SRGBV, transcend the universal requirements of obtaining informed consent, ensuring confidentiality, and mitigating non-disclosure. The protection of human subjects in investigations of violence and abuse will be addressed throughout the research process and may involve protective actions following the completion of the research.

INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS

All participants were briefed about the study, its goals, activities, and the risks and benefits of participation and were given an opportunity to ask questions in both group and individual settings. In these briefing sessions and during the individual consenting processes, the individuals learned about 1) the potential risk a breach of confidentiality and 2) the requirements for reporting to authorities when a child is deemed to be in danger and what protocols will be used for the reporting and protection of such cases. The consent/assent form was read word for word to the prospective group or individual participants (in English or the local language) to ensure a common understanding of the study objectives, requirements, risks, and benefits. Only individuals who had consented were included in the study.

POTENTIAL RISKS

PHYSICAL RISKS

A participant may share experiences of being bullied, punished harshly, or sexual harassed or abused, which are all forms of SRGBV, in PLA workshop or FGD setting. Not only is there the risk of emotional distress (see below), but there is also the potential for a breach of confidentiality (in conversations taking place after the PLA or FGD) by participants in the same PLA group or FGD. Such a breach of confidence may result in retaliation or other forms of secondary victimization by perpetrators who have learned that their violent behaviors were exposed. Such secondary victimization may take the form of physical or psychological intimidation or even further and intensified perpetration of the original act of violence. Participants were informed about the importance of refraining from using the names of persons involved in a known experience of SRGBV or experiences that they had heard about, and participants in the FGDs were discouraged from sharing personal experiences. It was critical that facilitators made every effort to sustain full anonymity throughout the PLA sessions and FGDs. The processes by which these risks were prevented or mitigated are discussed below (“Protection of Informants”).

PSYCHOLOGICAL/SOCIAL RISKS:

During the course of the study, the participants and researchers may have experienced discomfort and/or emotional distress because of the triggering of negative memories, including, for example, the experience of rape. Although participants were discouraged from using names when discussing sensitive topics and SRGBV experiences during the PLAs and although the sharing of personal
experiences was discouraged in the FGDs, such experiences may have been shared in the group discussions, and names may have been mentioned. As discussed above, such breeches of confidence may lead to secondary victimization in the form of physical or psychological retaliation. For example, when teachers learn that acts of violence they have perpetrated have been disclosed publicly, they may retaliate by humiliating a pupil, involving the parents, or giving the pupil bad marks. Thus, the research protocol and facilitator training supported the prevention of participants from using names when referring to experiences of SRGBV, especially in the PLAs and FGDs to keep this information confidential. The processes by which these risks were prevented or mitigated are discussed below (“Protection of Informants”).

PROTECTION OF INFORMANTS

The research protocol provided a number of strategies for responding to the psychological distress that participants and researchers may have experienced during the course of the study. Strategies to prevent any breaches of confidence occurring during group sessions and to mitigate against the risks of secondary victimization that may result in psychological and physical harm to participants as a result of an unintended breach of confidentiality in group sessions were established.

- A male and a female professional counselor were included in the research team fulltime to offer responsive psychosocial support or referral to counseling for participants or researchers at any time during the study, as needed.
- The research team received orientation on how to detect participants who might be experiencing psychological distress.
- The counselors provided responsive psychosocial support on site as needed and were responsible for assisting in the organization and referral of participants to follow-up psychosocial counseling, medical, or legal/child-protection services, as the need arises.
- The psychosocial, medical, and child-protection support resources within the community were mapped, and service providers were identified.
- The counselors on the research team served as the first point of contact to provide responsive psychosocial support and discuss the process of reporting to the authorities with any participant in danger.
- The National Strategic Plan and National Action Plan on VACiS (2015–2020) lists the Local Chairman as a key actor in the reporting, tracking, referral, and response chain for cases of VACiS.
- The LARA Program Officer embedded in the field worked with relevant authorities to follow-up cases.
ANNEX C: INSTRUMENTS FOR THE SRGBV FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. Pupil Instrument
2. Pupil Reading Stimulus Sheets
3. Pupil Math Stimulus Sheets
4. Teacher Instrument
5. Principal Instrument
6. School Inventory