Appraisal of data available on violence against children in and around schools (VACS)

Jo Heslop, Lucia Quintero Tamez and Jenny Parkes

July 2021

1. Introduction

While violence against children (VAC) has been a long-established global concern, more recently attention has been drawn to how violence occurs in and around schools (VACS) and the role of education in preventing and responding to violence. Whilst awareness about VACS is growing, more robust data are needed to inform policy and practice. Concerns about ethical and methodological challenges may be hampering the inclusion of questions relating to violence in surveys and Education Management Information Systems (EMIS), and in data-informed programming. This resource aims to help Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) country advisers, their teams and partners to make use of existing data and plan for further data if needed to support programming. It will also be of interest to others working to improve data monitoring and use on VACS. This appraisal was prepared with funding support from UKAID.

How to use this guidance note:
This 10-page commentary is accompanied by two tables found in the appendices, which are designed for FCDO country advisers to review the data available in each country.
- The table in appendix 1 shows which cross-national surveys on VACS have been undertaken in which countries. This provides a quick reference for those working in particular countries to get a sense of what data are available. It also compares country coverage of surveys .
- The table in appendix 2 provides key information about each of the surveys, including the kind of data collected, and any strengths and weaknesses as a VACS measure.
- An acronyms list can be found in appendix 3.

2. What key data are needed to inform decision making on violence against children in and around school (VACS)?

One of the challenges underpinning measurement work is a lack of unified conceptualisation and definition around VACS used by global surveys, researchers, governments and development agencies. Work has coalesced around the term SRGBV (school-related gender-based violence), highlighting the gender dimensions of VACS, and as a barrier to girls' education, and has brought some helpful conceptual and policy insights. Violence affecting children in and around school can be **physical, sexual or psychological**. Five forms of violence commonly affecting children in and around schools are **bullying, corporal punishment, sexual harassment, intimate partner violence (IPV) and child abuse**. Whilst there are some overlaps and many links between these types, they are sometimes studied and addressed separately, as there are some

differences around where violence occurs, who perpetrates it, what drives it, and best strategies to address it (Parkes et al 2017, UNGEI 2018). This appraisal does not cover violence associated with wider conflict[1].

Whilst the primary concern is violence occurring in schools by pupils, teachers and other staff, all violence affecting schoolchildren impacts on their schooling. For example, parents who physically punish children at home are more likely to support corporal punishment at school and transactional and exploitative sex involving schoolgirls can link to early pregnancy and marriage and interrupt education. It is therefore important to capture data on all these forms of violence.

Violence against children in and around schools is understood to be underpinned by unequal **gender norms**, reinforced by **structural inequalities** (Parkes et al. 2016, UNESCO 2017). Other social norms – for example, acceptance of some forms of violence and understandings of childhood and discipline – also play a role. Schools are key sites where violence itself, and norms and practices underpinning them, can be reinforced or challenged, but communities, families, other government structures and the role of wider influences such as media and religion also influence norms and practices around gender and VACS (Parkes et al. 2016, UNESCO 2017). Understanding these drivers help to make sense of violence prevalence data and help to point to effective interventions, hence it is important to capture data on these elements and not just violence victimisation.

Disaggregation by sex, age, geographical area, urban/rural, wealth, education level, religion and other markers are all useful to help understand the dynamics of VACS and target interventions.

How schools and other institutions (at school, mid and national level) respond to VACS and try to create a safe and supportive environment is also critical to measure. Data on children's responses to experiences of violence (for example, whether cases are reported to the school or elsewhere) are also indicators of the safety and responsiveness of the school environment.

Table 1: Measures needed to provide a picture of VACS in a given context		
Concept to be measured	**Detail**	**Data sources**
Violence prevalence	Physical, sexual, psychological violence Bullying, corporal punishment, sexual harassment, IPV, child abuse	Surveys with children/young people
Children's responses to violence	Told someone Reported to school Reported to other formal system Action taken	Surveys with children/young people
Norms and structures underpinning violence	Gender norms Violence acceptance Discrimination of minority groups	Surveys with children/young people, school staff and parents
School safety and supportive environment	Commitment, training and knowledge of school leadership, codes of conduct in place, teacher training and support, violence, rights and gender	EMIS and other existing systems (such as school inspection surveys) may collect some of this data. Other data systems may need to be developed. Data can

---

[1] Other types of violence can also affect schoolchildren in specific conflict-affects contexts, including attacks on schools, kidnapping of schoolchildren and child recruitment into conflict. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) is working on strengthening data in this area https://protectingeducation.org/what-we-do/strengthen-monitoring-and-reporting/

	addressed in curriculum, peer support and empowerment processes, safe and responsive reporting systems and accountability, safe school environment, parent and community engagement.	be collected at school, district and national level. Surveys with children/young people, school staff and parents.

Drawn from Parkes et al. 2016, Parkes et al. 2017, UNESCO 2018.

3. Methodological and ethical issues around measuring violence with children

There are significant challenges involved in collecting data on violence against children. Self-response surveys are the most reliable approach to measuring violence prevalence, rather than for example using data from reporting systems (self responses have been found to be up to 75 times higher than captured through formal systems, due to underreporting (Stoltenborgh et al. 2013)).

However, there are risks and societal norms that may prevent children from talking openly about violence they have experienced, especially if violence is perpetrated by authority figures they are not expected to question, for sexual violence where sexual activity is disapproved of, or where a violent act, such as physical punishment, may be widely accepted and not considered violent (Leach 2015, Unicef 2014). These constraints can vary by context. For example, adolescent girls in an urban area with high mobility and access to media may feel less inhibited disclosing sexual violence than those in a remote, conservative community, with strong taboos about premarital sex. Attendance at school may also inhibit disclosure, as sex can be seen to be incompatible with schooling in some contexts (Heslop et al. 2015).

Talking about violence can unearth painful memories or risk repercussions if perpetrators know they have been talking about violence. Surveys need to have robust ethical systems in place, including extensive training for research teams and a child-centred system for following up on child protection cases. Questions need to be very specific to ensure they are not open to interpretation, and be well contextualised and tested so that meanings are clear (Leach 2015, Unicef 2014).

Research suggests that disclosure can increase when people have been involved in interventions that help them to recognise and speak out against violence, and when research methods are more rigorous with stronger attention to ethics (Heslop et al. 2017, Jewkes et al. 2001). In other words, underreporting of violence is widespread, but can be minimised when careful attention is paid to these concerns in research design. This tends to be more possible and likely in surveys that have a large focus on violence compared to those with just a few questions on violence added into larger surveys. In addition, research suggests that audio computer-assisted self-interviews (ACASI) can obtain much higher sexual violence disclosure than face-to-face equivalent surveys, since 'social desirability bias' is reduced (Punjabi et al. 2021).Surveys have not used standardised definitions, and so disclosure may vary according to the wording of questions asked, or differences in population (for example, age group). Thus, violence prevalence data needs to be interpreted carefully and critically, and used in combination with other data (as presented in table 1).

4. Appraisal of global surveys

Approach 1: Using existing survey reports

There are a number of surveys that collect data on elements of VACS, which together provide a fair range of evidence. Table 2 summarises which surveys collect data on which elements of VACS. Surveys have been included that take place in multiple countries and are administered periodically using repeated measures. This allows potential for international comparison and trend analysis. A more detailed description and appraisal of each survey is included in Appendix 2. Different surveys are useful evidence sources for VACS in different ways. For example, the population-based surveys, such as VAC survey, MICS and DHS, provide detailed data that can provide a rich analysis of how different forms of violence vary across different parts of the country and for different groups, and how they relate to beliefs around gender and violence and other drivers such as poverty. Some of the school-based surveys (such as GSHS and HBSC) collect data on the school climate and efforts on violence and safety, such as whether schools have taught students about these issues, whilst others can link violence data to other educational indicators (e.g. TIMSS, PIRLS and PISA), such as attainment at school.

Not every survey has been conducted in every country, and country coverage (and frequency of surveys) varies greatly. Country coverage is detailed in Appendix 1. It highlights that in most countries a number of different surveys have been run (3 being the average for LMICs and most countries in sub-Saharan Africa have 4, 5 or 6), providing a range of data against most areas covered in table 2. As an exemplar, we have selected Zimbabwe (see Table 2, column 3) as a fairly typical country for sub-Saharan Africa in terms of data available, to give a sense of what exists. Whilst Zimbabwe was reported to have 5 surveys undertaken (GSHS, VAC survey, DHS, MICS and SAQMEC), the SAQMEC full report was unavailable online, so data have been taken from the remaining 4 surveys. The GSHS was conducted in 2003, so is now fairly out of date, but the other three surveys have been conducted since 2014.

Table 2: Which surveys collect which data on VACS		
Indicators	**Survey data sources[2]**	***Example from Zimbabwe***
Prevalence of key types of VACS		
Bullying	• HBSC, GSHS • TIMSS, PIRLS, PISA • VAC survey (physical attack by classmate) *(SAQMEC and PASEC ask headteachers and teachers on occurrence of bullying)*	• *60-70% boys and 51-69% girls bullied in the past month, by region (data only given by region not country level) (GSHS 2003)*
Corporal punishment	• GSHS (certain countries) • VAC survey (CP at school and home) • DHS (experiencing post-age 15 by teacher, parent, other)[3] • MICS (CP at home)	• *63% children aged 1-14 subjected to violent discipline at home in past month (according to mothers). Patterns by sex, age, urbanity, province, education and wealth.* • *5% children subjected to severe physical punishment in past month. Patterns by sex, age, urbanity, province, education and wealth.* • *Children aged 3-9 more likely to be subjected to violent discipline than other age groups (MICS 2014).*

---

[2] Note – not all topics mentioned are asked in every country the survey takes place in.

[3] May only capture extreme corporal punishment as wording describes more extreme acts of physical aggression.

		• *19% never-married women aged 15-49 who experienced physical violence named teacher as perpetrator (NOTE – violence worded in a way that may only capture extreme CP) (DHS 2015).*
Sexual harassment	• VAC survey (touching, pressured sex by classmate, teacher, others at school, elsewhere) *(SAQMEC and PASEC ask headteachers and teachers respectively on occurrence of sexual harassment)*	
IPV/ dating violence	• GSHS (some countries) • VAC survey (experiencing and perpetrating physical, witnessing at home, experiencing (first) sex forced, pressured sex, perpetrating rape) • DHS (physical, sexual and emotional violence by partner, ability to negotiate sex, power in decision making in couple, witnessing at home) • MICS (physical, sexual violence by partner)	• *5% 15-19 year old girls and 6% boys had sex before age 15 (below 16 classed as statutory rape). Patterns by wealth, education, rurality.* • *55% of 15-19 year old married girls report their husbands being jealous or angry if they talk to other men. 71% say their husband displays at least one controlling behaviour from a list.* • *45% 15-19 year old married girls have experienced physical, sexual or emotional IPV (broken down by types of violence). Patterns by religion, urbanity, province, education, wealth.* • *Data also available on women's violence against spouse (DHS)* • *4% 13-17 year old girls and 0% boys experienced physical IPV in the past 12 months (VAC survey 2017)*
Child abuse	• GSHS (rape/sexual exploitation, certain countries) • VAC survey (first sex forced by teacher, by others, sexual relationship or exploitative transactional sex with teacher, other adults, sexual assault at school, child marriage) • DHS (forced sex by teacher, others, age at first forced sex, help seeking, FGM) • MICS (FGM, child marriage, child labour)	• *4% 20-24 year old women were married before age 15, and 32% by 18 (legal age of marriage) (for men 0.1% and 1.2% respectively). Patterns by wealth, education, rurality (DHS).* • *29% rural and 14% urban 15-19 year old girls are married. Patterns also by province and wealth.* • *3% 15-19 year old girls were married before age 15. Patterns by province, wealth (MICS).* • *27% of 13-17 year old girls who had had sex were coerced or forced at first sex.* • *7% of 13-17 year old girls who had had sex had received gifts, money, food or favours in exchange for sex (VAC survey).*
Prevalence of violence not defined as above:		
Physical violence	• VAC survey (experiencing, help seeking, perpetrating) • DHS (experiencing post age 15) • MICS (experiencing, help seeking)	• *28% 15-19 year old girls have experienced physical violence since age 15. Patterns by religion, urbanity, province, marital status, education, wealth (DHS).* • *13% 13-17 year old girls and 9% boys experienced physical violence.* • *Of 13-17 year old children attending school, 15% girls and 19% boys experienced physical violence. Patterns also by*

		marriage, orphan, work status and whether they witnessed violence at home. Disclosure was lower for girls and boys out of school.
		• 5% 13-17 year old girls and 7% boys experienced physical violence by an adult caregiver/family member, 5% girls and 4% boys by an adult in the community, and 6% girls and 10% boys by peers.
• Of children attending school, 4% girls and 5% boys experienced physical violence by a male teacher, and 4% girls and 2% boys by a female teacher.
• Of children attending school, 2% girls and 7% boys experienced physical violence by a male classmate, and 2% girls and <1% boys by a female classmate.
• Of students who had experienced physical violence by teachers, 8% schoolgirls and 18% schoolboys had missed school because of it.
• Of students who had experienced physical violence by classmates, 12% schoolgirls and 6% schoolboys had missed school because of it.
• Of those 13-17 year olds who experienced physical violence, 58% girls and 61% boys told someone, 32% girls and 48% boys knew how to seek help, 7% girls and 9% boys sought help and 4% girls and 6% boys received help.
• Of those who told someone, 15% girls and 6% boys told an authority figure (e.g. teacher) (most told relatives, friends or neighbours).
• 50% schoolgirls and 63% schoolboys told someone about physical violence, but only 4% and 9% sought help through services (VAC survey).
Sexual violence	• GSHS (rape, certain countries)
• VAC survey (experiencing, help seeking, perpetrating)
• DHS (experiencing, help seeking)
• MICS (experiencing, help seeking)	• 10% 15-19 year old girls had experienced sexual violence. Patterns by religion, urbanity, province, marital status, education, wealth.
• Of never-married women aged 15-49 who reported experiencing sexual violence, 0.2% disclosed teacher as perpetrator, 2% experienced violence by age 15 (DHS).
• 8% 13-17 year old girls had experienced any sexual violence.
• 3% 13-17 year old girls and 0.4% boys attending school experienced sexual violence. Disclosure was higher for girls out of school (but not boys).
• Of 13-17 year old girls who experienced sexual violence, 2% named perpetrator of most recent incident as an authority figure (including teacher). 5% named classmate. 2% said most recent incident happened at school.
• 57% told someone, 32% knew where to go for help and 12% sought help.
• Of those who told someone, 3% told an authority figure (e.g. teacher (most told relatives, friends or neighbours).
• For those who experienced coerced or forced sex, 48% told someone, 43% knew where to go for help, 21% sought help and 17% received help.
• 15% schoolgirls and 0% schoolboys missed school because of sexual violence
• 56% schoolgirls and 41% schoolboys told someone about sexual violence. 22% and 0% sought help through services, and 16% girls received help (VAC survey).

Psychological violence	• GSHS (certain countries), PISA, ERCE (by teachers) • VAC survey (experiencing)	• *8% 13-17 year old girls and 7% boys experienced emotional violence by a caregiver or adult family member in the past 12 months. Of those parents accounted for the greatest share of emotional violence, followed by aunts, uncles and grandparents (VAC survey).*
All violence	• VAC survey • DHS	• *40% 15-19 year old girls who experienced sexual or physical violence sought help to stop violence. Patterns by religion, urbanity, province, marital status, education, wealth (DHS).*
Drivers of violence:		
Acceptance of unequal gender norms	• VAC survey • DHS • MICS (experience of discrimination)	• *54% 15-19 year old girls and 49% boys accept one or more reasons for IPV (15% of girls and 10% of boys if she refuses to have sex with him) (DHS).* • *32% 13-17 year old girls and 25% boys accept one or more reasons for IPV (VAC survey).* • *71% 13-17 year old girls and 80% boys endorse one or more beliefs that can underpin gender inequalities and violence (e.g. men should decide when to have sex, men need more sex than women) (VAC survey)*
Acceptance of violence	• VAC survey (IPV, CP at home) • DHS (IPV) • MICS (CP, IPV, FGM)	• *38% mothers and 34% fathers believe physical punishment is a necessary part of child rearing. Patterns by age, urbanity, province, education and wealth. (MICS).*
Feeling of safety and supportive structures	• GSHS (school absence due to fear, certain countries, taught about sexual negotiation and conflict resolution) • HSBS (received sex and relationships education) • ERCE (perspective of parents) • VAC survey (community safety) • MICS (community safety)	• *28-42% boys and 40-49% girls did not go to school because they felt unsafe in past 30 days, by region (data only given by region not country level)* • *32-36% boys and 40-49% girls taught what to do if someone tries to force them to have sex (GSHS).*

Whilst an ideal approach might be to design a new or alter an existing survey to capture all elements of VACS and conduct it in all countries, this is too expensive to be realistic. A pragmatic and useful approach to monitoring VACS in LMIC therefore is to take a 'patchwork approach', reviewing and compiling the data available from the surveys that have been carried out at country level in a similar way to the Zimbabwe exemplar above. This enables the maximum use of data available, which is not uniform across countries. In addition to different surveys being undertaken in different countries, surveys are sometimes adapted for different countries, with certain modules or questions omitted or added. This approach is also put forward by UNESCO (2018), who have acknowledged the challenges in building global indicators on school violence.

Approach 2: Undertaking further analysis of existing data

There is also ample scope for making better use of the existing data collected through these surveys, for example by further disaggregating data or looking at the relationships between different indicators. Raw data are available for surveys and further analysis could be undertaken by skilled statisticians. The following are some examples of data that would be useful and exist but are not currently analysed in survey reports:

- DHS – girls and boys aged 15-19 who report being beaten by a teacher, by background characteristics (education, wealth, geographic region, attitudes to violence etc.)

- GSHS – Girls' and boys' experience of sexual violence, by understanding of sexual negotiation and assertiveness, and whether students were taught about sexual negotiation and assertiveness at school.
- GSHS – Girls' and boys' experience of violence, by whether they have been taught about managing conflict peacefully.
- VAC survey – 13-17 year old girls' and boys' experience of physical violence by a teacher, by background characteristics (e.g. education level)

There may be opportunities to influence the kind of analysis that is undertaken by survey teams. UNESCO with UNGEI has set up an expert group - the SRGBV Measurement Action Group - which is aiming to create a model with criteria for how to generate data on SRGBV using different kinds of datasets. The Violence Against Children Survey country reports do not detail school-specific analysis, but this has recently been undertaken separately for 10 countries, mostly in sub-Saharan Africa[4].

Approach 3: Collecting additional data

Data could be more comprehensive if questions were added to surveys (or one 'best fit' survey identified and items added). This might be possible long term, but the process can be complex and lengthy (for the HBSC a minimum of 8 years was estimated from agreement on an additional question to validation for inclusion in the full survey globally – Roberts et al. 2009). Further analysis is needed to inform this approach, including identifying gaps in data across countries (as these are not simply dependent on the surveys undertaken but also the questions included in the surveys at country level), and further investigation as to the opportunities and constraints (e.g. political, financial) for each survey to expand questions or country coverage., The SRGBV Measurement Action Group, whilst primarily looking at how to better use existing data, may also examine the need to strengthen existing surveys. USAID has developed a toolkit to comprehensively evaluate student and teacher experience and beliefs of violence as well as their views on school safety and efforts to address violence[5]. This is not widely implemented, but is a useful resource for work considering the collection of new data.

5. Data on school environment and efforts to address VACS

Data capturing school efforts can help to measure school safety and how supportive the environment is in addressing VACS. The UNGEI-led Global Working Group to End School-Related Gender-Based Violence has developed minimum standards and a monitoring framework to guide work globally, including actions and indicators to monitor comprehensive action on SRGBV (UNGEI 2018). These would need to be adapted to country policy frameworks, but at country or regional level are likely to include:

- % schools that have parents, students and community partners participating in school governance
- % schools implementing a school policy/code of conduct on violence
- % schools with children engaged in violence prevention and response (e.g. discipline committees)
- % schools with teachers trained in positive discipline, gender responsive pedagogies and VACS
- % schools with safe spaces for children to discuss and act on VACS (e.g. girls' clubs)
- % schools implementing curricula on gender, violence and rights
- % schools with (survivor-centred) response mechanisms for VACS
- % schools with separate toilets for male and females.

---

[4] https://www.togetherforgirls.org/schools/#factsheets
[5] https://www.edu-links.org/resources/school-related-gender-based-violence-measurement-toolkit

(UNGEI 2018)

Some of this information is captured by Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) in some countries. However, data quality and accessibility needs to be appraised at country level. In a study in Cote D'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Togo and Zambia this data – though reportedly collected - could not be accessed, even though the Ministries of Education and Unicef were partners in the programme (Parkes et al. 2017). Some of this data may also be captured by other systems, such as School Inspection monitoring.

Data can also be collected at school level, for example:

- Knowledge of different forms of VACS by school leadership and teachers
- % school leaders showing commitment and supportive attitudes to addressing VACS
- Awareness amongst students and staff about content of violence policy
- % teachers trained on VACS, child rights and gender
- % teachers using gender responsive approaches and child discipline techniques
- % students feeling safe at school
- % students who know what makes a healthy or unhealthy relationship
- % students who know how to report violence and what should happen
- % students who have confidence and trust in reporting mechanisms
- % students who feel safe travelling to/from/in school
- Increase in cases reported, increase in referral or action taken

(UNGEI 2018)

Most of these data could be collected through surveys with students and teachers, and a small amount of this data is captured in existing school-based surveys (such as GSHS and HBSC - see Table 2). Work is underway to test and pilot operationalising the Minimum Standards, but this work is at an early stage[6]..

6. Interpreting and using data

The multiplicity of data discussed to capture violence, its drivers, contexts and efforts to address it needs to be interpreted and considered for policy and practice implications in countries. Examples of initiatives where partners come together to examine evidence and identify areas where work is needed have shown to be important in connecting data and action (Parkes et al 2017). The Together for Girls initiative aims to increase impact of the Violence Against Children and Youth Surveys through establishing multi-sectoral steering groups in each country to guide the development of the study, ensure strong buy-in from the start, and oversee a process of reflecting on findings and building them into planning processes across sectors, with the help of a toolkit (Chiang et al., 2016). There are also groups in some countries that bring together researchers, policy makers and development partners to enhance evidence-based decision making, and these can be encouraged and built on (Parkes et al. 2017). There are many qualitative studies on violence against children that provide rich, contextualised analyses of violence that is difficult for survey data to do, and can also be drawn on in guiding policy decisions. Whilst there are some examples of this sort of evidence interpretation and planning taking place at national level, more work is needed to make data available and develop fora to examine evidence at sub-national level.

---

[6] https://www.ungei.org/publication/whole-school-approach-prevent-school-related-gender-based-violence-1

7. Conclusion and recommendations

Although there is no single survey that collects all data needed on VACS in all LMICs, a large amount of relevant data is collected regularly from a range of school-based and population-based surveys. Basic data are available in survey reports online and there is potential for additional analysis to be undertaken to further understand patterns of violence in and around school.

Recommendations for FCDO country advisers and partners:

- Identify which surveys have been undertaken and compile data to create a holistic picture of VACS. If possible work with in-country experts on VACS, including a statistician, to undertake further analysis of existing datasets.
- In countries where there are major gaps in surveys on VACS advocate for key surveys to be undertaken.

Recommendations for FCDO global work:

- Undertake an analysis of which indicators data are collected in which countries, and the last year that data were collected. This will help to visualise data availability globally and identify gaps, which would help feed into any discussions about adding questions into surveys.
- Explore possibilities for further analysis of datasets, either by preparing an analysis guidance framework for countries to take forward or actually conducting data analysis across countries. This could feed into or follow work advocating for survey teams to conduct analysis more targeted to VACS needs, either from previously collected data or going forward.
- Build alliances with other groups working on VACS measurement issues to identify what analysis and discussion has taken place around methodological, political and resource constraints and opportunities to expand surveys (in terms of questions asked, analysis done, countries where the surveys are run or frequency of surveys).
- Consider co-funding and advocacy for the development of global work towards improving consensus and comparability of VACS data, either through commissioning a group (similar to the Washington Group for statistics on disability) or supporting existing groups.

Appendix 1: Key cross-national surveys measuring aspects of violence against children in and around schools: Coverage in low and middle income countries

Low and middle income country	GSHS	HBSC	VAC survey	DHS	MICS	SAQMEC	PASEC	TIMMS/ PIRLS	PISA	ERCE	Total
Afghanistan	X			X	X						3
Albania		X		X	X			X	X		6
Algeria	X				X			X	X		4
American Samoa											0
Angola				X	X	X					3
Argentina	X				X			X	X	X	5
Armenia		X		X				X			3
Azerbaijan		X		X	X			X	X		5
Bangladesh	X			X	X						3
Barbados					X						1
Belarus					X				X		2
Belize	X				X						2
Benin	X			X	X		X				4
Bhutan	X				X						2
Bolivia	X			X	X					X	4
Bosnia and Herzegovina					X			X	X	X	4
Botswana	X		X		X	X		X			6
Brazil				X					X	X	3
Bulgaria		X			X			X	X		4
Burkina Faso				X	X		X				3
Burundi				X	X		X				3
Cabo Verde				X							1
Cambodia	X		X	X			X		X		5
Cameroon				X	X		X				3
Central African Republic				X	X		X				3
Chad				X	X		X				3
China	X				X			X	X		4
Colombia	X		X	X	X				X	X	6
Comoros				X	X		X				3
Congo, Dem. Rep				X	X		X				3
Congo, Rep.				X	X		X				3

Low and middle income country	GSHS	HBSC	VAC survey	DHS	MICS	SAQMEC	PASEC	TIMMS/PIRLS	PISA	ERCE	Total
Costa Rica					X					X	2
Côte d'Ivoire			X	X	X		X				4
Cuba					X					X	2
Djibouti	X				X		X				3
Dominica	X										1
Dominican Republic	X			X	X				X	X	5
Ecuador	X			X						X	3
Egypt, Arab Rep.	X				X			X			4
El Salvador	X		X	X	X			X		X	6
Equatorial Guinea				X	X						2
Eritrea					X						1
Ethiopia				X	X						2
Federated States of Micronesia					X						1
Fiji	X				X						2
Gabon				X	X		X				3
Gambia, The				X	X	X					3
Georgia		X			X			X	X		4
Ghana	X				X			X	X		4
Grenada	X										1
Guatemala	X		X		X				X	X	5
Guinea				X	X		X				3
Guinea-Bissau				X							1
Guyana	X			X	X						3
Haiti			X	X							2
Honduras	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	7
India	X			X	X			X	X		5
Indonesia	X			X	X			X	X		5
Iran, Islamic Rep.					X			X			2
Iraq	X				X						2
Jamaica	X				X						2
Jordan				X	X			X	X		4
Kazakhstan		X		X	X			X	X		5
Kenya	X		X	X	X	X					5
Kiribati	X				X						2

12

Low and middle income country	GSHS	HBSC	VAC survey	DHS	MICS	SAQMEC	PASEC	TIMMS/PIRLS	PISA	ERCE	Total
Korea, Dem. People's Rep.					▓			▓	▓		3
Kosovo				▓				▓	▓		3
Kyrgyz Republic		▓		▓	▓						4
Lao PDR	▓		▓	▓	▓		▓				5
Lebanon	▓				▓			▓	▓		5
Lesotho			▓	▓		▓					4
Liberia	▓			▓	▓						3
Libya	▓				▓						2
Madagascar				▓	▓		▓				3
Malawi	▓		▓	▓	▓	▓					5
Malaysia	▓							▓	▓		3
Maldives	▓			▓							3
Mali				▓	▓		▓				3
Marshall Islands											0
Mauritania	▓			▓	▓		▓				4
Mauritius						▓			▓		3
Mexico				▓	▓			▓	▓	▓	5
Moldova		▓	▓	▓	▓			▓			6
Mongolia	▓				▓			▓			3
Montenegro								▓	▓		2
Morocco	▓			▓				▓	▓		4
Mozambique	▓		▓	▓	▓	▓					5
Myanmar	▓			▓	▓						3
Namibia			▓	▓		▓					4
Nepal	▓			▓	▓						3
Nicaragua				▓	▓					▓	3
Niger				▓	▓		▓				3
Nigeria			▓	▓	▓						3
North Macedonia		▓			▓			▓	▓		5
Pakistan	▓			▓				▓			4
Papua New Guinea					▓						1
Paraguay	▓			▓	▓				▓	▓	5
Peru	▓			▓					▓	▓	4
Philippines	▓			▓	▓			▓	▓		5

Low and middle income country	GSHS	HBSC	VAC survey	DHS	MICS	SAQMEC	PASEC	TIMMS/PIRLS	PISA	ERCE	Total
Russian Federation		X						X	X		3
Rwanda			X	X	X						3
Samoa				X	X						2
São Tomé and Principe				X	X						2
Senegal	X			X	X		X		X		5
Serbia		X	X	X	X			X			5
Sierra Leone	X			X	X						3
Solomon Islands	X										1
Somalia					X						1
South Africa				X		X		X			3
South Sudan					X						1
Sri Lanka	X			X							2
St. Lucia	X										1
St. Vincent and the Grenadines											0
Sudan	X			X	X						3
Suriname	X			X							2
Swaziland	X		X	X	X	X					5
Syrian Arab Republic	X				X			X			3
Tajikistan	X			X	X						3
Tanzania	X		X	X	X	X					5
Thailand	X			X	X			X	X		5
Timor-Leste	X			X							2
Togo				X	X		X				3
Tonga	X			X							2
Trinidad and Tobago				X	X				X		3
Tunisia	X			X	X			X	X		5
Turkey		X		X	X			X	X		5
Turks and Caicos Islands					X						1
Turkmenistan				X	X						2
Tuvalu	X				X						2
Uganda			X	X	X	X					4
Ukraine		X		X	X			X	X		5
Uruguay					X				X	X	3
Uzbekistan		X		X	X						3

Low and middle income country	GSHS	HBSC	VAC survey	DHS	MICS	SAQMEC	PASEC	TIMMS/ PIRLS	PISA	ERCE	Total
Vanuatu	✓				✓						2
Venezuela, RB	✓				✓				✓	✓	4
Vietnam	✓			✓	✓		✓		✓		5
West Bank and Gaza								✓			1
Yemen, Rep.	✓			✓	✓			✓			4
Zambia	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	6
Zimbabwe	✓		✓	✓	✓						5
Total LMICs	72	14	22	91	109	14	25	42	43	18	456

Information accurate as of March 2021.

Appendix 2: Key cross-national surveys measuring aspects of violence against children in and around schools: Description and appraisal

Global School-based student Health Surveys (GSHS) https://www.who.int/ncds/surveillance/gshs/en/

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey collects data from adolescent schoolchildren on risk behaviours linked to poor health. Implemented by WHO and US Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)	Broad coverage across regions and 72 LMICs	Approx. every 6 years (a few countries have not had survey for the past 15 years). No surveys published since 2017.	**School-based** Primary and secondary schools are sampled to provide a cross sectional national sample. Survey is self-completed questionnaire conducted in schools.	**Schoolchildren aged approx. 13-17** Sampling is based on school grades (late primary and early secondary) rather than age, so ages can vary. 13-15 age range is often pulled out for analysis and comparison purposes.	• Bullying experience • Fighting experience • Violence by teacher and intimate partner in few countries	**Core module (all countries):** - Bullying experience (past month) - fighting experience (past year) **Additional questions (certain countries):** - physical violence by intimate partner - rape (any perpetrator) - taught about physical violence at school - school absence due to fear of violence - verbal abuse, physical abuse by a teacher - sex before age 14	• Sex (M, F) • Urban/Rural • Region/province (depending on sample size) • Age sometimes (13-15 & 16-17)

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
Questions and sample are oriented around school, unlike most others. Of the school-oriented surveys this one has the greatest global coverage and the broadest range of questions.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
Only data on bullying is collected across all countries. Other selected types of violence only collected in a small number of countries, although this may expand in time. Surveys conducted very sporadically in many countries.

Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) http://www.hbsc.org

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey aims to assess the health and health behaviour of adolescents. It enables the quantification of patterns of key health behaviours, health indicators and contextual variables. The survey is carried out globally and with global rather than country survey reports produced. Implemented by WHO (regional office for Europe).	49 (mostly European and North American) countries	Every 4 years	**School-based** Each country (region) uses cluster sampling to ensure that the sample is representative of all in the age range. The survey is a self-completed questionnaire (paper or web) administered in the classroom.	**Schoolchildren aged 11, 13- and 15-year-old**	• Bullying experience at school • Fighting experience (questionnaires appear to be uniform across all countries)	• During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight? • How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months? • How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months? • How often have you been bullied in the following ways?: Someone sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails and text messages, or created a website that made fun of me. • How often have you been bullied in the following ways?: Someone took unflattering or inappropriate pictures of me without permission and posted them online.	• Age (11, 13, 15) • Sex (M, F) • Family affluence

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
Good questions on bullying (survey questions add contextual information on what exactly is meant by bullying) and there is an ability to disaggregate data by family affluence (although this data may only be available in raw form).

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
Poor coverage of LMICs. Violence is limited to peer-violence and bullying. No questions on sexual harassment or abuse, IPV or violent disciplining techniques at school or at the home. Because this is one cross-national survey comparisons are made between countries. There are no country reports or more detailed analysis, although this can potentially be carried out from accessing the raw data.

Violence Against Children and Youth Surveys (VAC survey) https://www.togetherforgirls.org/violence-children-surveys/
https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childabuseandneglect/vacs/index.html

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey collects data on multiple forms of violence and on risk factors, protective factors and consequences of violence of children up to the age of 24. Data analyses is complemented by the creation of national actions plans with decision makers. Implemented by U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Together for Girls and national governments.	24 countries mostly LMIC (Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean)	Started in 2010 and has slowly spread to more countries. Two countries so far have done the survey more than once (8-9 year gap).	**Household surveys** Randomly selected and nationally representative sample In person interviews.	**Head of Household**: core questionnaire (background household data) **Males and females ages 13 to 24**: participant questionnaire (violence data)	• Physical violence • Emotional violence • Sexual violence (in and around schools)	• Gender attitudes related to violence (IPV, child physical disciplining) • Perception of safety • Witnessing violence (before the age of 18 and incidence over the last 12 months) • Victimization physical violence (IPV, Peer violence, parents, adult caregivers and other adult relatives, other adults in the community, teachers) • Physical, emotional and sexual violence • Missing schools because of fear • Perpetration physical violence (IPV, general) • Victimization emotional violence (parents, adult caregivers and other adult relatives) • Sexual violence (exploitation, sexual abuse) • Self-inflicted violence • Service seeking and utilization after experiencing violence	• Age group (13-17 years olds or adolescents and 18-24 years olds or young adults) • Sex (M/ F)
Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure There are region-specific core questionnaire tools for Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa and modules that are added according to the context of each country. Questions are very clear and direct and cover a wide range of violent acts. Good ethics protocols. Excellent programme in place that draws on and contextualises evidence with policymakers and partners at national level, considers implications and feeds into policy and practice (Together for Girls).							
Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure Surveys are not conducted on a regular basis and are constrained to funding availability (these household surveys are expensive to run). Sample seems to not large enough to disaggregate as much as would be useful, e.g. by region, wealth, religion (some background data is collected on education level, paid work, marriage, sexual debut), but this can be further investigated. Few questions on school-specific violence.							

Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) https://dhsprogram.com

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
Collects data on population health, HIV and nutrition on large sample sizes between 5,000 and 30,000 households. In addition to the standard survey there are interim DHS surveys which are shorter questionnaires conducted in between rounds of DHS surveys. Implemented by Inner City Fund ICF (funded by USAID) and partners.	Over 90 countries	Approx. every 5 years	**Nationally representative household surveys.** Data are collected of selected nationally and subnationally representative samples of households. In-person interviews.	**Women** of reproductive age (15-49) **Men** age 15-49, 15-54, or 15-59	• Attitude towards women empowerment and domestic violence (core questionnaire) • IPV and FGM (optional questions) • Surveys sometimes include UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) modules, such as: · Child Discipline · Child Labour	• **Core questionnaire women:** Ability to negotiate sexual relations with husband, decision-making with regards to earnings and purchases in the household, attitude toward wife beating (wife beating justified for at least one specific reason) • **Core questionnaire men:** decision-making with regards to earnings and purchases in the household, attitude toward wife beating, respondent's father beat mother. • **Domestic Violence module:** Marital control and emotional, sexual and physical treatment of woman by their husband or partner (details about experiences), physical and sexual violence by previous partner, physical and sexual violence by another person	• Region/province • Sex (M/F) • Age (15-19 is one age group) • Religion • Ethnic group • Urban /rural • Education (none, primary, secondary, more than secondary) • Employment (employed for cash, employed

			(including teacher), help seeking, respondent's mother as a victim of spousal violence.				not for cash, not employed)
			FGM Module women questionnaire: age of FGM, age of daughters' FGM, attitude towards practice				Marital status (never married, married or living together, divorced/separated/widowed)
			Women's status module: power of decision-making with regards to money, family planning, children's schooling and discipline, economic independence, attitude towards gender equity.				Number of living children
							Wealth quintile

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure

It has very good LMIC coverage and frequency of data collection. The disaggregation possibilities and attention to questions on attitudes allow for a more nuanced analysis of gender violence across the population and in different groups. The domestic violence questions are internationally validated measures, and the module is frequently administered in a sub-sample of households with precautions taken to protect the privacy of respondents.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure

The Domestic Violence questions are not part of the core questionnaire but are rather an optional module, countries may decide to include. Furthermore, these questions are only for women and they do not specifically address child or school violence. Girls aged 15-19 can be disaggregated but it is not clear whether samples are large enough to disaggregate further.

Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) https://mics.unicef.org/about

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
Household survey program whose key objective is to monitor the situation of children and women. Children under five years of age are a key population for numerous MICS indicators. Implemented by UNICEF in collaboration with DHS. Government institutions typically carry out the surveys.	Over 116 countries including many LMICs	6 survey rounds. In total. Countries vary with regards to the amounts of surveys conducted and the frequency between each round.	**Household surveys.** Data are collected of selected nationally and subnationally representative samples of households. In-person interviews.	**Women and men** aged 15 to 49 years (individual questionnaires), household questionnaire **Mothers or caretakers of all children** 0-17 (questions about their children)	• Victimisation of assault or robbery, • Felt discriminated against • Feeling safe in neighbourhood • FGM experience, • Child marriage • Attitudes towards domestic violence child discipline child labour, physical punishment of children, IPV & FGM.	• **Violent discipline at home:** Percentage of children age 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past one month *from perspective of mothers* • **FGM:** age of respondent when they underwent FGM, details of daughters' circumcision • **Child marriage**: marriage before 15, marriage before 18, spousal age difference (adults) • **Physical and sexual violence**: experienced violence, before aged 15, experienced IPV (sexual and physical), control, during pregnancy, help seeking (adults) • **Attitudes:** towards wife beating, physical punishment of children, FGM (adults)	• Age • Sex • Education • Wealth • Province/region • Urban/rural • Ethnicity • Religion • Characteristics including those on education sometimes applied in the reports could be analysed using raw data.

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure

Excellent country coverage for LMIC and good opportunities for disaggregation and nuanced analysis. Framing of child discipline questions is appropriate.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure

Questions are focused towards violence at home rather than school. Data on physical punishment taken from perspective of mothers may be underreported (mothers may not want to disclose perpetrating violence).

The Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality Project (SAQMEC) http://www.sacmeq.org/?q=sacmeq-projects

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
SACMEQ projects collect data on performance levels of students and their teachers in the areas of literacy and mathematics. It also focuses on an examination of the conditions of schooling and the quality of education. The later versions of the study have included questions associated with the HIV-AIDS pandemic. Implemented by Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality.	15 Countries of Eastern and Southern Africa	5 to 6 year intervals	School based sample. Self-completed questionnaires.	**Students** (Grade 6 - Final year of primary school) **Teachers** **Head Teachers**	• Peer violence • Sexual violence • Teacher violence (schools)	School Head: • About how often does the school have to deal with the following behaviours of pupils? - Use of abusive language by pupils - Intimidation or bullying of pupils by other pupils, - Physical injury to staff by pupils - Sexual harassment of pupils by other pupils, - Sexual harassment of teachers by pupils - Fights among pupils • About how often does the school have to deal with the following behaviours of teachers? - Intimidation or bullying of pupils by teachers, - Sexual harassment of teachers by other teachers - Sexual harassment of pupils by teachers -Use of abusive language by teachers -Drug abuse by teachers - Alcohol abuse or possession by teachers	• Sex (M/F) • Region • Age

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
One of the few school-based surveys that includes questions on sexual harassment. Questions are uniform and across many countries of interest.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
Questions are reported by head teachers who may not want to disclose problems in their school. It does not give a measure of prevalence as questions are at school not individual level.

Programme d'Analyse des Systèmes Educatifs (PASEC) http://www.pasec.confemen.org

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey collects data on students' levels of literacy and mathematics and contextual data. Implemented by Conference des ministres de l'éducation des etats et gouvernements de la francophonie (Confemen)	Mostly French speaking sub-Saharan Africa	Every 4 years	School based sample. Self-completed questionnaires**.**	**Students** (Grade 2 and Grade 6) **Teachers** **Head Teachers**	• Bullying • Sexual harassment in schools • Child labour (questionnaires appear to be uniform across all countries)	• Proportion of teachers that confirm the existence of "harcèlement morale" (bullying) in the school • Proportion of teachers that confirm the existence of sexual harassment in the school	• Rural/urban • Age • Sex (M/F)

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
One of the few school-based surveys that includes questions on sexual harassment. Questions are uniform and across many countries of interest.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
Questions are not clear as what is meant by harassment or who are the perpetrators of such acts. Teachers may not want to disclose violence occurring at the school. It does not give a measure of prevalence as questions are at school not individual level.

The Trends in International Mathematics and Science (TIMSS) / Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)
http://pirls2021.org/frameworks/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/04/P21_FW_Ch2_Questionnaires.pdf

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey assesses student levels in mathematics and science (TIMSS) and literacy (PIRLS). Implemented by International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement	40 LMICs	TIMMS every 4 PIRLS every 5 years	**School based sample.** Self completed questionnaire	**Students** (Grade 4 and Grade 8) **Teachers** of the assessed classes **Parents or guardians** (of assessed students) **School principal**	• School bullying • School discipline (questionnaires appear to be uniform across all countries, although have changed across survey cycles)	• **Students' reports** about how often they experienced the following bullying behaviours: Made fun of me or called names; left me out of games or activities by other students; spread lies about me; stole something from me; damaged something of mine on purpose; hit or hurt me; made me do things I didn't want to do by other students; sent me nasty or hurtful messages online; shared nasty or hurtful things about me online; shared embarrassing photos of me online; threatened me. • **Principals' reports** of "hardly any problems," "minor problems," or "moderate problems" concerning: intimidation or verbal abuse among students (including texting, emailing, etc.); physical fights among students; intimidation or verbal abuse of teachers or staff (including texting, emailing, etc.).	• Sex • Age • Country • Trends

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
Interesting inclusion of cyberbullying to questionnaire. Provides the possibility to analyse bullying experiences with math and reading achievement.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
Questions on school discipline are only directed to principals who might not want to disclose problems under their leadership.

Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) https://www.oecd.org/pisa/publications/

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey measures student performance in reading, mathematics, and science literacy. As of the 2015 cycle, PISA is administered entirely on computer. Implemented by OECD.	42 LMIC (few in Africa or LICs). PISA for Development introduced an additional 6 LMICs. Assessment questions have become more accessible for developing countries and other questions added/adapted to be more relevant.	Every 3 years	**School-based sample** PISA selects a sample of students that represents the full population of 15-year-old students in each participating country or education system. A minimum of 150 schools are sampled per country. A minimum of 6,300 students is then sampled from across the schools.	**Students** (15 years and 3 months to 16 years and 2 months at the beginning of the testing period attending both public and private schools in grades 7-12)	• Bullying experiences • School disciplinary climate • Teacher emotional violence (only 2015 survey) • PISA for Development asks about safety in/to/from school and sexual harassment (questionnaires appear to be uniform across all countries)	• **School administrators** are asked how often their students' learning is hindered by students lacking respect for teachers, student use of alcohol or illegal drugs, students intimidating or bullying other students and teachers being too strict with students. • Students are asked about the prevalence of **bullying** in school during the past year (being left out, being made fun of, threatened, personal belongings destroyed, hit or pushed by other students, nasty rumours). • Students were asked about **unfair or abusive treatment** by teachers in the 2015 survey (teachers called on me less often than they called on other students, teachers graded me harder than they graded other students, teachers gave me the impression that they think I am less smart than I really am, teachers disciplined me more harshly than other students,	• Sex • School • Country • Grade • Ethnicity (for US sample)

teachers ridiculed me in front of others, teachers said something insulting to me in front of others).

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
Possibility of analysing links between bullying by students or teachers with learning outcomes.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
Measures on school climate and bullying change frequently over the different cycle surveys, but seem to be unform across countries.
Test is oriented towards higher income countries and may be less contextually relevant to LICs, although Pisa for Development is starting to adapt questions in a number of LICs.

Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo (ERCE) https://es.unesco.org/fieldoffice/santiago/llece/TERCE2013

Description	Country Coverage	Frequency	Type of sample	Respondents	Types of violence	Relevant indicators/questions	Disaggregation
The survey aims to monitor the quality of education in the region. It measures learning outcomes in reading, writing, mathematics and science. The survey also measures contextual factors that can affect learning. It is implemented by the Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluacion de la Calidad de la Educacion (LLECE) and UNESCO's regional Latin American and Caribbean office.	19 Latin American countries	Approx. every 6 years	**School based sample**	**Students** (third and sixth grade) **Teachers** of assessed children **Parents** of assessed children	• Classroom climate (existence of aggression, teasing or collaboration) • Community violence (questionnaires appear to be uniform across all countries)	• Classroom climate is measured through two composite measures: the teachers' perception of respect and collaboration in class and third grade students' perception of classroom climate. The teacher's measure includes a Likert question on whether students are aggressive to each other. The third grade student's composite measure includes questions on the prevalence of mockery between classmates and whether teachers get angry at students. • Violence around the school is measured through a composite measure directed to parents which asks how likely is it that the following instances occur in the community: selling and buying of drugs, vandalism, fights between neighbours, fights with weapons, aggressions that result in injury and thefts.	• Country • Sex • Socioeconomic status • Indigenous ethnicity • Type of school (Rural, Public Urban, Private Urban)

Appraisal of strengths as VACS measure
One of the few surveys that provides a measure on the level of violence surrounding a school and gives the possibility of relating this to learning outcomes.

Appraisal of weaknesses as VACS measure
There is no specific information on SRGBV because the items are part of a composite scale on classroom climate.

Appendix 3: List of Acronyms

ACASI	Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interview
BECAN	Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect
CONFEMEN	Conférence des ministres de l'Education des Etats et gouvernements de la Francophonie
CP	Corporal Punishment
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
EMIS	Educational Management Information Systems
ERCE	Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo
FCDO	Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
GSHS	Global School-based Student Health Survey
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
LICs	Low-Income Countries
LMICs	Low-to-Middle-Income Counties
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys
PASEC	Programme d'analyse des systèmes éducatifs de la CONFEMEN
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
SACMEQ	Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality
SRGBV	School-related gender-based violence
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VAC	Violence Against Children
VACS	Violence Against Children in and around Schools

References

Chiang, L. F., Kress, H., Sumner, S. A., Gleckel, J., Kawemama, P., & Gordon, R. N. (2016). Violence Against Children Surveys (VACS): towards a global surveillance system. *Injury prevention*, *22*(Suppl 1), i17-i22.

Heslop, J., Parkes, J., Januario, F., & Sabaa, S. (2019). Making meaning from data on school-related gender-based violence by examining discourse and practice: insights from a mixed methodology study in Ghana and Mozambique. *Compare: a journal of comparative and international education*, *49*(1), 64-80.

Jewkes, R., Penn-Kekana, L., Levin, J., Ratsaka, M., & Schrieber, M. (2001). Prevalence of emotional, physical and sexual abuse of women in three South African provinces. *South African medical journal*, *91*(5), 421-428.

Leach, F. (2015). Researching gender violence in schools in poverty contexts: conceptual and methodological challenges. *Gender Violence in Poverty Contexts, The educational challenge.* London: Routledge.

Parkes, J. L. N., Johnson Ross, F., Heslop, J., Westerveld, R., & Unterhalter, E. (2017). Addressing School-Related Gender-Based Violence in Côte d'Ivoire, Togo, Zambia and Ethiopia: A Cross-country Report. New York: Unicef.

Parkes, J., Heslop, J., Ross, F. J., Westerveld, R., & Unterhalter, E. (2016). A Rigorous Review of Global Research Evidence on Policy and Practice on School-Related Gender-Based Violence. New York: UNICEF.

Punjabi, M., Norman, J., Edwards, L., & Muyingo, P. (2021). Using ACASI to measure gender-based violence in Ugandan primary schools. RTI Press. RTI Press Research Brief No. RB-0025-2104 https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2021.rb.0025.2104

Roberts, C., Freeman, J., Samdal, O., Schnohr, C. W., De Looze, M. E., Gabhainn, S. N., ... & Rasmussen, M. (2009). The Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study: methodological developments and current tensions. *International journal of public health*, *54*(2), 140-150.

Sithole, E. (2003) Global School-Based Health Survey Zimbabwe. *Geneva*: WHO.

Stoltenborgh, M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Alink, L. R. (2013). Cultural–geographical differences in the occurrence of child physical abuse? A meta-analysis of global prevalence. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*(2), 81-94.

Together for Girls (2020) School-related gender-based violence: Zimbabwe. Washington, DC: Together for Girls. https://www.togetherforgirls.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/2021-01-22-SRGBV-Fact-Sheet-ZIMBABWE-Digital.pdf

UNESCO (2018) Let's decide how to measure school violence. Policy Paper 29. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246984

UNICEF (2014). Hidden in plain sight: a statistical analysis of violence against children. *New York: UNICEF*.

UNGEI (2018). A whole school approach to prevent school-related gender-based violence: Minimum standards and monitoring framework. New York: UNGEI. https://www.ungei.org/sites/default/files/A-whole-school-approach-to-prevent-school-related-gender-based-violence-Minimum-Standards-and-Monitoring-Framework-2019-eng.pdf

Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care (2019) Young Adult Survey of Zimbabwe: A Violence Against Children Survey, 2017. *Harare: Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation*

Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency and ICF International (2016). Zimbabwe Demographic and Health Survey 2015: Final Report. *Maryland, USA: ZIMSTAT and ICF International*.

Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency (2015). Zimbabwe Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2014, Final Report. *Harare: UNICEF*.