



## FPS Forensic Psychological Services

### Evaluation Report of the Tender Healthy Relationships Project National Partnership Programme

A study commissioned by Tender and funded by:

The Big Lottery Reaching Communities Fund

The Paul Hamlyn Foundation

The John Ellerman Foundation

The Lankellychase Foundation

Erin Sanders-McDonagh

Shola Apena Rogers

Miranda Horvath

Sara Selwood

\*With research assistance from Chloe Borthwick, Matt Cracknell Charlita Hall, Julia Magnus-George, Caroline Morrison, Caitlyn O'Neil, Aishah Piprawala, Maria Scally, and Pallavi Thota

## Leave or Stay?

Leave or stay?  
Shall I leave, or shall I stay?  
He hits me 20 times a day.  
I know because I count the marks.  
I am becoming apprehensive of his repetitive sparks.

I thought you loved me,  
I thought you cared.  
All along I was really scared.  
Around you I couldn't be myself.  
You put my feeling too high up on the shelf.

I tried to get them; I tried to reach in,  
although, the shelf was too thin.  
The shelf broke down, the feelings fell,  
right on you, covered in your smell.  
All covered in your smell,  
Your remorse felt worse than hell.  
You surrounded by all the feelings,  
Couldn't bear the facings.

Now, we've switched the roles,  
your soul was mine and mine was yours.  
Finally, you relate,  
now, when it's way too late.

Student Poem  
Alsop High School Technology &  
Applied Learning Specialist College  
(Liverpool)  
May 2015

## **Acknowledgements**

The research team would like to thank the young people, teachers, and other professionals who gave up their valuable time to participate in the evaluation. A special thanks to Daisy Douglas at Tender for help over the past three years, and to Susie McDonald and others at Tender who gave feedback on drafts of this report. Thanks also to Jackie Gray for her help with the final stages of the report writing. Finally, thanks to our research assistants who have helped with data entry over the past three years, including: Chloe Borthwick, Matt Cracknell Charlita Hall, Julia Magnus-George, Caroline Morrison, Caitlyn O'Neil, Aishah Piprawala, Maria Scally, and Pallavi Thota.

## **About the research team**

Dr Erin Sanders-McDonagh is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology in the Department of Criminology and Sociology at Middlesex University

Shola Apena Rogers is a Research Associate with the Forensic Psychological Services at Middlesex University

Dr Miranda Horvath is a Reader in Psychology and Deputy Director of the Forensic Psychological Services at Middlesex University.

Professor Sara Selwood is a freelance cultural analyst, and Honorary Professor at UCL. She was previously Head of Cultural Policy and Management at City University London.

**November 2015**

# Contents

<a href="#">1.0 Introduction</a>	6
<a href="#">2.0 Literature review</a>	7
<a href="#">3.0 Methodology</a>	13
<a href="#">3.1 Objectives</a>	13
<a href="#">3.2 Method and analysis</a>	14
<a href="#">3.2.1 Quantitative elements</a>	14
<a href="#">3.2.2 Qualitative elements</a>	15
<a href="#">3.3 Ethics</a>	17
<a href="#">3.4 Challenges to the evaluation</a>	17
<a href="#">4.0 Impact of the Tender Healthy Relationships Project</a>	18
<a href="#">4.1 Impact on students: Knowledge and understanding of domestic violence and abuse</a>	18
<a href="#">4.1.1 Prevalence of domestic violence</a>	18
<a href="#">4.1.2 Understanding control and coercion</a>	22
<a href="#">4.1.3 Women as victims of domestic violence</a>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<a href="#">4.1.4 Seeking support</a>	24
<a href="#">4.1.5 Early warning signs and prevention</a>	25
<a href="#">4.1.6 Summary of student findings</a>	29
<a href="#">4.2 Wider impacts: Teacher’s experiences of the project</a>	30
<a href="#">4.2.1 Findings from INSET questionnaires</a>	30
<a href="#">4.2.2 Changes to the students</a>	34
<a href="#">4.2.3 Summary of the findings</a>	34
<a href="#">5.0 Effective implementation of the partnership</a>	36
<a href="#">5.1 Selecting students for the workshops</a>	36
<a href="#">5.2 Delivery support</a>	39
<a href="#">5.3 Organizing workshops: Challenges of working with schools</a>	40
<a href="#">5.4 Tender materials</a>	41
<a href="#">5.5. Framing ‘healthy’ relationships</a>	43
<a href="#">5.6 Local knowledge and engagement</a>	43
<a href="#">5.7 Summary of findings</a>	44
<a href="#">6.0 Key findings and recommendations</a>	45
<a href="#">6.1 Summary of key findings</a>	45

<a href="#">6.2 Recommendations</a> .....	45
<a href="#">7.0 References</a> .....	48
<a href="#">Appendix I Big Lottery Indicators and Findings</a> .....	52
<a href="#">Appendix II SEN Case Study</a> .....	55

## **1. Introduction**

This is the final report on the findings from the evaluation of the Tender Healthy Relationships Project, which was commissioned by Tender in 2012 as part of the national delivery of the project across five different geographic regions in England. The Tender Healthy Relationships Project is a prevention programme with an element of peer-education. Tender Education & Arts was funded by the Big Lottery Reaching Communities Fund, the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, the John Ellerman Foundation, and the Lankelly Chase Foundation to roll out a unique drama-based model of healthy relationship education that engages whole schools in teacher training, practical workshops for pupils and peer-to-peer education. In four of the five regions delivery is through formal partnerships with a range of different organizations, and in the fifth region, Tender themselves deliver the workshops. The other partners are: Peer Productions (Surrey); Soft Touch (Leicester); Relate North Essex and East Herts/ Essex Change (Essex); and Liverpool John Moores University (Liverpool).

The drama-based workshops are carried out with pupils from year 9, year 10, or year 11, and focus on issues related to violence in relationships, drawing on a gender-based model that views relationship abuse in the context of gender inequality. Workshops are carried out in a wide range of schools and engage with a wide range of students (including all-girls groups, all-boy groups, and mixed-gender groups). Workshops explore issues over 10 hours of contact time. Some workshops delivered over two consecutive days, while others are delivered over a 10-week period. The key issues explored in the workshops relate to identifying early warning signs of violence and abusive behaviours, exploring statistics related to violence against women, exploring a range of power dynamics related to abusive behaviours, and signposting young people to appropriate resources for further support. In Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation, the workshops were often, although not always, delivered over two consecutive days. Students who participate in the workshops deliver a drama presentation to a group of their peers in school, to further communicate key messages about healthy relationships to wider cohort of students. Teaching staff are also involved with the workshops in a variety of ways; some teachers/teaching staff attend a staff training (INSET) that links to the messages explored with students in the workshops, some liaise with the partners in terms setting up the workshops in the schools and may participate to a greater or lesser extent while the workshops are being carried out.

## 2. Literature review

Violence against women - including intimate partner and sexual violence - affects a large proportion of the population leading to major public health problems and violations of women's human rights (United Nations, 1999; World Health Organisation, 2013). In England and Wales, the Government's definition of Domestic Violence (DV) now includes 16 and 17 year olds, encompassing incidents or patterns of 'controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour' alongside physical assaults, reflecting the growing recognition that DV is relevant to this population (Home Office, 2013). The levels of violence between young people has become increasingly concerning amongst practitioners and policymakers (Home Office 2011a; Home Office 2011b, Beckett, Firmin, Hynes & Pearce, 2014). The STIR (Safeguarding Teenage Intimate Relationships) research project explored young people's intimate relationships in five countries including England, Italy, Norway, Cyprus and Bulgaria (STIR, 2015a). In this study more than four in ten teenage schoolgirls in England reported to have experienced sexual coercion and most described being pressured to have sex or other sexual activity, including rape. This is consistent with a previous study suggesting that intimate partner violence and abuse (IPVA) affects a substantial proportion of the youth population in the United Kingdom (UK) (Barter, McCarry, Berridge & Evans, 2009). Another study found that 66% of contact sexual abuse experienced by young people under the age of eighteen was perpetrated by other young people highlighting the need for effective prevention, public education and support for young people to enable them to negotiate respectful non-abusive relationships (Radford Corral, Bradley, Fisher, Bassett & Howat, 2011).

The STIR project also highlights that interpersonal violence in young people's relationships are not only face-to-face forms of violence and abuse by partners; controlling, online behaviour often occurs through constant checking of their social network activity, posting sexual images and sending threatening messages or dictating who they can be 'friends' with was associated with young people experiencing violence or abuse from their partner offline. With a high proportion of boys reporting regular use of pornography and the influence it has on sexual behaviour, it is significant that one in five harboured extremely negative attitudes towards women (STIR, 2015b). A number of other reports further highlights concerns about sexual exploitation of children and young people and called for clear and effective responses which raise awareness through prevention and early identification (e.g. Barnado's, 2012; Berelowitz, Clifton, Firmin, Gulyurtlu & Edwards, 2013).

Adolescence has long been regarded as a particularly crucial time to intervene because it is seen as a key transition point in life (Thurston, Meadows, Tutty, & Bradshaw 1999); 'a crucial time when young women and men are developing their sexual identities' (Mahony & Shaugnessy, 2007; p.1) and gender abuse emerges

(STIR, 2015a). Research has found that during adolescence many young women are already in abusive heterosexual relationships with young men and/or experiencing violence and harassment on a daily basis (Maxwell, Chase, Warwick, Aggleton, & Wharf, 2010). With thirty per cent of adult women experiencing some form of domestic abuse post 16 (Povey, Coleman, Kaiza, & Roe, 2009), public health approaches to preventing violence against women suggest that in order to achieve successful primary prevention, early intervention must begin prior to adolescence (WHO, 2010). School based domestic violence prevention interventions to under-12s have in the majority been in the US, whereas UK primary school interventions tend to focus on children's safety and friendship, with domestic abuse only being introduced to older primary school children. A report by the House of Commons Education Committee (2015) recommends that all primary schools should have a sex and relationship education programme tailored to the age and the physical and emotional maturity of the children, however, this is not mandatory.

General consensus is that prevention programmes should target both boys and girls, in mixed gender groupings, although it is acknowledged that single gender delivery may occur as a result of the natural grouping of the organisation, e.g. a boy's school (Stanley, Ellis, Farrelly, Hollinghurst, Bailey & Downe, 2015). There are very few programmes in the UK that takes into account specific issues faced by BAMER<sup>1</sup>, children and young people with learning difficulties or disabilities or transgender young people, with only limited evidence on young people with sexualities other than heterosexual (LGBT Youth Scotland, 2010; Roch Morton, & Ritchie, 2010). An evaluation study concluded that none of the seven programmes evaluated in Kent and Medway addressed LGBT or male victims and they also lacked cultural sensitivity for BAMER students (Manship & Perry, 2012).

The evidence underpinning the effectiveness of the approaches taken by most school-based programmes to prevent relationship violence among young people (or dating violence) comes predominantly from Canadian evaluation studies (e.g. Wolfe, Wekerle, Scott, Straatman, Grasley, & Reitzel-Jaffe, 2003; Wolfe, Crooks, Jaffe, Chiodo, Hughes, Ellis, Stitt, & Donner, 2009). An evaluation study of an 18-session community-based intervention to help at-risk teens develop healthy, non-abusive relationships randomly assigned half of 158 14-16 year olds with histories of child maltreatment who had current dating partners to receive the intervention and the other half not. Over the 2 years of the study outcome measures were administered at regular intervals. Those receiving the intervention were less physically abusive toward their dating partners and reported less

---

<sup>1</sup> Tender are currently receiving funding from London Councils to deliver a programme that focuses on issues for vulnerable groups, including BAMER children.



physical, emotional and threatening forms of abuse by their partners toward themselves (Wolfe et al, 2003). A subsequent study with 1722 students aged 14-15 from 20 public schools half of whom participated in a 21-lesson dating violence prevention programme, found that learning about healthy relationships as part of their required health curriculum reduced boys' perpetration of physical dating violence (Wolfe et al, 2009). Both of these studies used a randomised control group, considered the gold-standard research design which is why the findings are considered strong evidence for the effectiveness of domestic violence prevention interventions. However, these findings are considered an exception, as a systematic review of published literature conducted by Stanley and colleagues (2015) found a lack of evidence of significant programme efficacy consistent with prior reviews.

The theoretical basis used to inform domestic abuse prevention programmes is not always explicit. For example, in some programmes a feminist understanding of domestic abuse shaped programme content and informed the rationale given for the work either explicitly or implicitly. Other programme theories incorporated some version of behaviour change or theory of change around social (and often gender) norms (AVA, 2013; Wafni & Deni, 2011). Most of the programmes dealing with domestic abuse topics will cover topics relating to gender e.g. gender stereotypes and roles, gender (in)equality and address power in relationships, with some programmes openly stating that changing attitudes to gender violence was an objective (DMSS Research, 2012; CRG Research, 2007). The NICE review (2013), however, found limited evidence that school-based universal primary prevention programmes achieved behavioural as opposed to attitudinal change. Research suggests that there has been a general reluctance in the UK to programmes that directly address the gendered nature of domestic abuse (Ellis, 2006; Thiara & Ellis, 2005). Tutty and Bradshaw suggest that this may be because "gender-neutral programs are more easily marketed to the school system and are more comfortable for teachers and students to accept" (2004, p.48). A gendered approach was sometimes opposed by staff (women and men) and young men who described the work as 'anti-men' (CRG Research, 2009; Hester & Westmarland, 2005). This could be counterbalanced by ensuring the work is co-facilitated by a man and a woman, so that staff can 'practice the message' of gender equity (Respect, 2012).

Within feminist framings exists the notion that there is an absence of female pleasure from dominant discourses of (hetero) sexuality when in discussion about young people's sexual risk taking and sexual violence (McGeeney, 2013). Fine (1988) introduces the concepts of *sex as violence*, *sex as victimisation*, *sex as individual morality* and *discourse of desire*, of which the latter is missing from sex education and discussions in the classroom. Fine suggest that by providing the context of sexuality for women in terms of reproduction and the risks of male violence and disease, results in women being educated as victims of 'potential sexual (male)

desire' (1988:42), with options only to say 'no' and protect themselves from possible harmful consequences rather than exploring and understanding their sexual desires. Fine argues that women would benefit from accessing 'safe spaces' to explore their desires and have the opportunity to negotiate the pleasures and dangers that they encounter (Vance 1984), without this women have a greater vulnerability to unwanted or unsafe sexual activity and sexual violence (Fine 1988; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998). There is an acknowledgement that the school classroom and sex education may not provide the right environment for young women to articulate their sexual desires, but that there are benefits in having conversations in which pleasure/sex and relationships are positively explored within domestic abuse interventions.

Evaluations of school based domestic/sexual violence prevention interventions have suggested they enable children and young people to change their attitudes and perceptions of equality, respect and consent (WHO, 2009). In the UK, the primary aim of many prevention programmes is to impart knowledge about domestic violence and abuse: what it is, its prevalence, and how it impacts on women and children. Information on the services available to help survivors is usually included, with the intention of enabling children and young people to seek help for themselves and for peers, and to learn how to offer appropriate support (Fox, Hale and Gadd, 2013). In the main, findings from the review support that interventions based on information can increase knowledge in the short-term (Barter, 2015). This should however be treated with caution, as the retention of this knowledge in the longer term is less apparent. A wide variety of skills training such as conflict resolution, anger management, communication, problem-solving, assertiveness, and prosocial skills were often included in prevention (Hale, Fox, & Gadd, 2012; DMSS, 2012; Walton, 2007; Manship & Perry, 2012; AVA, 2013). Values education, concerning equality, acceptance of difference, respect for self and others, caring, justice, responsibility are included in many programmes to challenge the undesirable attitudes some children and young people hold (Stanley et al, 2015).

As a result of the many competing issues that are covered within Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE), schools can often struggle to assign adequate time to domestic abuse prevention education (Maxwell et al., 2010). Therefore the gap is filled by domestic abuse prevention programmes which are largely facilitated by external staff from specialist domestic abuse/violence against women organisations as opposed to school staff and teachers (Ellis, 2004; Hale, Fox & Gadd, 2012; DMSS, 2012; Ellis, 2006; Manship and Perry, 2012; CRG, 2007). However, this poses a number of potential issues and barriers; firstly organisations may not be explicit about the gendered nature of the programme to gain entry to the school (Tutty, 2009). Secondly, it is often unsustainable because they are highly reliant on short-term funding (AFRCV, 1999; Ellis, 2004). Another drawback is that external staff are less likely to impact on school culture, or provide continuity and progression

to young people, making long-term change more difficult. Taking a whole school approach is likely to have broader benefits for the school community in which the prevention programme is embedded in and aims to promote the understanding of gender and gender equality (Skelton & Francis, 2009; Maxwell et al, 2010).

Prevention programmes considered to be effective employ a breadth of methods to engage children/young people and meet a range of learning styles (Strategic Partners Ltd, 2000). Participative and active approaches such as theatre/role play are valued by children as well as using video/ DVD, small and whole group discussions (Bell & Stanley, 2006; Debbonaire, 2002; Ellis, 2006; Hester & Westmarland, 2005; Mullender, Hague, Imam, Kelly, Malos, & Regan, 2002). Stanley et al. (2015) in their evidence synthesis on prevention programmes in the UK argue that drama-based interventions are highly valued by young people and experts, who argue that using dramatic approaches can create emotional intensity and contribute to what can be understood as ‘authenticity’, which makes interventions and key messages more ‘real’ for young people. Drama can be a powerful and effective tool for encouraging individuals to analyse their own behaviour and act as a catalyst for supporting personal development and change. Highly skilled and well trained staff (Flood, Fergus & Heenan, 2009) who receive supervision (De Grace & Clark, 2012) are able to manage group dynamics in ways which create safe learning spaces where young people feel high levels of trust and can feel confident discussing emotive topics, as well as examining their own beliefs and attitudes (CRG Research 2009; Ellis, 2006; Strategic Partners Pty Ltd, 2000).

Using the arts and drama as part of prevention or educational programmes has established merit. While creative teaching methods used to engage young people vary from project to project, there is evidence that a wide range of creative approaches have positive impacts on students. The Health Education in the Arts, Refining Talented Students (HEARTS) programme, for example, included drama and used whole brain approaches. The usual, heavily standardised educational approach used in US schools can leave some children (with particular learning styles) at risk of boredom, underachievement and disruptive behaviour. Reflecting on an entirely different approach, Hobbs (2002) set out the advantage of using puppetry in Sex and Relationships education. This liberated pupils to express issues that they would otherwise have found difficult and embarrassing. One UK-based evaluation found that Year 8 pupils involved in a drama-based Healthy Relationships programme on domestic violence had developed their understanding of what a healthy relationship means. They had considered inequality, power and control in abusive relationships, and the emotional impact of domestic violence on those experiencing it. Some demonstrated the positive ideas they had developed about ‘healthy relationships’, encompassing values of equality, negotiation and respect (Bell & Stanley, 2006: 247).

It is generally accepted that the arts enable young people to explore concepts such as respect, trust, sexual consent and communication as well as practice strategies and reflect ideas in a safe space. These areas are amongst those being investigated under the Arts Council England's current research funding: one particular project is testing how effectively the arts can influence pro-social motivations such as cooperation, helping, kindness, generosity and solidarity. Martin et al (2013) found that arts participation not only increased academic, but non-academic performance (measured by enhanced self-esteem, life satisfaction motivation and engagement). Others researching the impacts of using theatre and drama, found that youth theatre created a protected space for young people to develop important personal and social skills and resources, whilst also confronting uncertainty and risk (Hughes & Wilson (2004). Some work is said to improve the social skills of 'at-risk' youth, who enjoyed (and benefited from) working in teams (including negotiation, decision-making, and compromise) - reportedly became happier, more sociable and better behaved (Wright et al., 2006). Another experiment used drama to increase participants' ability to work in groups, solve problems and develop stronger self-efficacy - the sense that they could "make things happen and overcome obstacles" (Catterall, 2007).

The arts enables young people to explore concepts such as respect, trust, sexual consent and communication as well as practice strategies and reflect ideas in a safe space. Drama also has a distancing effect, whereby young people can explore the emotions and decisions of characters rather than focusing on their own personal experiences. Holland reflects on "process drama" whose theorists stress the importance of:

...placing empathic imagination and creativity at the centre of learning if we are to build a 'pro-human society'. Some assert that 'a sense of social justice and equity' should take empathy beyond catharsis – it should inspire people into action. The careful and subtle sequencing of conventions enables participants to move between spectator and actor, and towards transformative social action and a strengthened empathic imagination (2009: 531).

### **3. Methodology**

The Tender Healthy Relationship project is drama based and encourages young people to think deeply about what a healthy relationship means. The project is designed to engage young people by utilising creative teaching methods. There is a particular focus on the early warning signs of abuse e.g. controlling and isolating behaviour. Drama is able to encourage groups to work together as teams, increase individual confidence and raise self-esteem, with the purpose of challenging attitudes. Tender also provides training to staff members as part of INSET days or twilight INSET sessions. The Tender Healthy Relationship project is expanding to be delivered in five different locations across England.

Previous evaluations of prevention programmes in England have been small scale, methodologically limited and lacked the capacity to assess attitudinal or behavioural change in comparison to the Canadian studies (e.g. Bell & Stanley, 2006). This evaluation will employ qualitative methods to obtain the young people's views of the education they have received (e.g. Bell & Stanley, 2006; CRG Research 2009; Hester & Westmarland, 2005; Stanley, Ellis & Bell, 2011). In addition, pre and post-intervention analysis will seek to improve the effectiveness of efforts to reduce the prevalence of domestic abuse and ensure that young people's concerns are fully addressed in domestic abuse prevention education programmes. Post-measures will be taken with young people who watched the drama performances to assess their knowledge and understanding of the key issues. Finally, we also sought to understand the experiences of teaching staff and how they felt students' attitudes and/or behaviours may have shifted as a result of their engagement with the project.

#### **3.1. Objectives**

The evaluation has two objectives focused on the Healthy Relationships Project implementation:

**1) Does the Healthy Relationship project make a difference in terms of young people's knowledge about violence in relationships?**

We explore this issue in relation to young people who are active participants in the workshop, as well as young people in schools who attend and watch a sharing/presentation put on by their peers. We also ask teachers and staff in the schools about the impact of the workshops on the students who engage with the programme.

**2) Have the workshops been implemented effectively by all the partners?**

We explore this issue by gathering information from the partners about the first and second year of delivery, but also by speaking to teachers and professionals in schools about the process of working with partners around the project.

In order to ascertain the impact of the Tender Healthy Relationships Project, and the delivery process, a mixed methods approach was undertaken.

## **3.2. Method and Analyses**

### *3.2.1. Quantitative Elements*

The Tender Healthy Relationship Project reached a wide range of young people and educators across the country. In total, the project was delivered in 90 schools, 2050 students who engaged with the participated in the workshop element, 15,404 students who watched the drama performances, and 1,843 educational staff were trained during INSET sessions.

The quantitative element of the evaluation consisted of four different strands:

- Pre and Post questionnaires were carried out with young people who were involved in the drama-based workshops (referred to from this point forward as Workshop Questionnaires) (Year 1 n=315; Year 2 n=524; Year 3=539<sup>2</sup>).
- Post-performance questionnaires were immediately administered to the young people who had been in the audience (referred to from this point forward as Audience Questionnaires) (Year 1 n=975; Year 2 n=3607; Year 3=3435).
- Pre and Post intervention questionnaires with relevant teaching staff (including, but not limited to assistant heads, PSHE teachers, drama teachers, and a range of learning support staff) were carried out in order to understand teaching professionals' experiences with students' behaviours and attitudes (referred to from this point forward as Teacher Questionnaires) (Year 1 n=38; Year 2 n=29; Year 3 n=20<sup>3</sup>).

---

<sup>2</sup> This number refers to matched sets of pre and post measures. Unmatched questionnaires were excluded from analysis.

<sup>3</sup> This number refers to matched sets of pre and post measures. Unmatched questionnaires were excluded from analysis.

- INSET training questionnaires were administered to all staff taking part in an INSET training day led by Tender (referred to from this point forward as INSET Questionnaires) (Year 1 n= 76; Year 2 n=501; Year 3 n=503).

The partners administered the questionnaires and sent completed questionnaires to the evaluators for data entry and analysis. Data were analyzed in SPSS using descriptive statistics.

### *3.2.2. Qualitative Elements*

Focus groups were conducted with young people during Year 1 and Year 2 of the project. In Year 1, and again in Year 2, ten focus groups with young people from two schools in each of the five areas who had taken part in the workshops (Year 1 n=117; Year 2= 77) The focus groups were conducted after the workshops were delivered, and the performance had taken place. The focus groups for Year 1 were carried out between April and July of 2013, and between October 2013 and July 2014 for Year 2.

Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with teachers and teaching professionals (Year 1 n=18; year 2 n=15; Year n=6) who were involved in the delivery of the project. Different schools had a range of different professionals involved depending on their particular circumstances - as such, participants varied depending on who was involved in the delivery and management of the workshop within the school. The interviews for Year 1 were carried out between April 2013- July 2013; Year 2: October 2013 - July 2014; Year 3: December 2014- June 2015.

For Year 3 we introduced a new framework for the qualitative data collection. At the end of Year 2, focus group and interview data with young people and teachers was saturated, with no new thematic areas emerging. As such, we felt that conducting follow up interviews with young people who had taken part in the workshops at the start of the Project (from September 2012-December 2013) might provide insights into the longer term impacts of the project. In order to recruit students, we contacted teachers initially via telephone or email and asked them to pass details of the study on to students who took part. We then followed up with teachers to see if any students were interested in taking part, and arrange a time to meet with them in the school setting.

We had hoped to interview between 15-20 students across the partner areas, although ultimately only two focus groups (n=7) were achieved. This is largely due to two factors:

1) Many of the students who had taken part during 2012-2013 were sitting their GCSEs by 2015, and schools were restricted by which lessons students could be released from to attend focus groups. Whilst we offered to run interviews or focus groups during lunch breaks and after school, this was not feasible due to the school time tabling or the students not wanting to give up their free time.

2) Many of the staff members who coordinated the project in 2012-2013 were no longer in post, so it was difficult to get buy-in from staff who were unaware of the project to arrange the focus groups.

Due to the low numbers of participants, the data from the qualitative elements for young people in year 3 have not been included in the final report.

As the qualitative data from teacher interviews and focus groups were also saturated by the end of Year 2, we took a similar approach in trying to conduct follow up interviews with teachers – we conducted 6 interviews with members of staff from a range of schools across the intervention areas, where workshops ran in either 2012-2013 or the first term of the 2013 school year. We contacted teachers via telephone or email, asking if they would like to take part in an interview. Teachers were asked to reflect on their students' experiences of taking part in the workshops – thinking about how they reacted to the workshops at the time, and the extent to which they thought attitudes or behaviours might have shifted.

We also conducted semi-structured telephone interviews with partners in the five areas (Year 1 n=5; Year 2 n=5; Year 3 n=5), in order to elicit as much information about the process of delivery as possible. For Year 1, interviews were conducted between June and November of 2013; for Year 2, between March and August 2014; for Year 3 between May and June 2015.

Focus group discussions and interviews were analyzed thematically, in order to gain insight into experiences and the impact of the Tender Healthy Relationships Project. In line with feminist qualitative traditions of research that seek to represent the voices of research participants in an authentic way (Stanley and Wise, 1990; Letherby, 2003), this report uses verbatim quotations from focus groups with young people. This approach is consistent with other reports produced for organizations that work with young people (c.f. Nolas, Neville, and Sanders, 2011), and allows the voices of young people to be heard in their own words.



### **3.3. Ethics**

Guidelines on research ethics as set out by the British Psychological Society and the British Sociological Association were adhered to. The Department of Psychology Ethics Committee at Middlesex University reviewed the research proposal and all documentation for the project. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and all schools and partners have been anonymized to protect their right to confidentiality. We have anonymized all the names of participants, and excluded identifying details.

### **3.4. Challenges to the Evaluation**

There was a delay in setting up evaluation materials at the start of the project – while Tender and the partners began delivering the workshops at the start of the school term in September 2012, developing the evaluation tools and obtaining ethical approval for the project from the Psychology Ethics Committee took a number of weeks, and as such some of the evaluation material from Year 1 was excluded from analysis due to this lag. As such, a far greater number of participants were included in Year 2 and Year 3. It is important to note that ethical obligations mean that students are only invited to take part in the evaluation – they are not obliged to participate in focus groups or answer any questions of the questionnaire if they did not want to. As such, a greater number of students may have participated in the Tender Healthy Relationships Project in some way, but their experiences are not captured in the evaluation.

In terms of evaluating the programme delivery, partners were able to develop different delivery tools (although keeping with core key messages set out by Tender), depending on the type of school and the nature of the student cohort. There were also some small differences in terms of the mode of delivery – for example workshops can be delivered in a two-full days format, or a ten-one hour a week format; cohorts can be drawn from year 9, year 10, or year 11 students; religious schools and secular schools are invited to participate; SEN schools have been included in some areas and workshops can be run with mixed-gender groups or same-sex groups. From an evaluation perspective this means we are not presented with a ‘uniform’ sample of schools that have had the same experiences. For the purposes of this evaluation, all variations were considered, except for SEN schools, because the content of the workshop had to be considerably adapted to meet the needs of students. However, we have included a case study of one particular session run at an SEN school that highlights the value that these workshops may offer students with additional learning needs.

The reporting for End of Year reports focused very specifically on outcome measures set out by the Big Lottery – these figures can be seen in Appendix 1 of this document.

#### **4. Impact of the Tender Healthy Relationships Project**

This section will explore the key themes that emerged from both qualitative and quantitative elements – some of which relate to the outcomes set out by the Big Lottery, but many of which go beyond these indicators. Each school has been randomly assigned as an ‘Area’ for the purposes of anonymization; partners have also been anonymized, and anonymous numbers have been used for their responses.

The major themes in students’ accounts of the impact of the programme were their understanding of what constitutes abuse in relationships, early warning signs, related statistics in relation to the issue, and where to seek help and increase in skills and confidence by participating in peer performances.

Major themes in teacher and educator accounts centred around the impact on students (those who were involved in the workshops and those who watched the performance), issues related to the time and resources required to set up the project, and concerns about student engagement.

Partners’ interview data focused around issues working with schools, dealing with difficult students, and working through a range of difficult situations that arose during the delivery. We probed all interview and focus group participants on aspects of delivery that could be improved.

##### **4.1. Impact on Students: Students’ Knowledge and Understanding of Domestic Violence and Abuse**

The Tender Healthy Relationship project engages young people around a number of key areas related to violence and abuse, the data collected from young people evidences a number of key statistical changes in attitudes of young people, which are the key focus for the next sections. It is important to mention here the salience of the project to young people was evidenced firstly on their experiences of abuse – we asked young people from across the country whether they, or someone they knew, had experienced abuse or violence of some kind. The results from each of the five areas clearly demonstrate that young people had overwhelmingly experienced, or witnessed, a range of violence in different contexts, with similar experiences being reported across the UK:

##### **Young People’s Experiences of Abuse and Violence across the Five Areas**

	<b>Area A</b>	<b>Area B</b>	<b>Area C</b>	<b>Area D</b>	<b>Area E</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
	1376	1792	2453	1394	2302
YP who have been <b>yelled at</b>	20%	14%	16%	15%	18%
YP who knows someone who has been <b>yelled at</b>	41%	38%	39%	39%	37%
YP who have been <b>put down or humiliated</b>	12%	10%	10%	10%	12%
YP who knows someone who's been <b>put down or humiliated</b>	34%	26%	31%	30%	31%
YP who have been <b>hit, kicked, pushed or slapped</b>	9%	7%	7%	8%	7%
YP who knows someone who has been <b>hit, kicked, pushed or slapped</b>	32%	20%	25%	27%	21%
YP who have been <b>pressured into having sex</b>	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%
YP who knows someone who has been <b>pressured into having sex</b>	16%	11%	18%	15%	14%
YP who have been <b>pressured into getting married</b>	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%
YP who knows someone who has been <b>pressured into getting married</b>	14%	7%	14%	11%	10%
YP who have been <b>threatened</b> if didn't do something their partner wanted	3%	2%	4%	3%	4%
YP who know someone who has been <b>threatened</b> if didn't do something their partner wanted	20%	13%	18%	18%	16%
YP who were <b>constantly controlled</b>	4%	3%	6%	4%	4%
YP who knows someone that was <b>constantly controlled</b>	24%	16%	25%	25%	21%
YP who know at least <b>one or more girls who have been hit by their partner</b>	32%	41%	39%	41%	30%
YP who know at least <b>one or more girls who have been sexually assaulted or raped</b>	22%	26%	30%	29%	25%
YP who know at least <b>one or more girls who have been sexually bullied</b>	20%	17%	19%	16%	21%
YP who know at least <b>one or more boys who have been hit by their partner</b>	13%	15%	20%	20%	20%
YP who know at least <b>one or more boys who have been sexually assaulted or raped</b>	6%	3%	6%	5%	4%
YP who know at least <b>one or more boys who have been sexually bullied</b>	4%	7%	6%	5%	6%

Findings from across the different partner areas reveal similar experiences of young people, highlighting the salience of prevention programmes for all young people in the UK.

The next sections will outline key areas where young people demonstrated an increase in knowledge or understanding as a result of their participation in the workshops.

#### *4.1.1. Prevalence of domestic violence*

As the tables below shows, in total 920 participants answered this question related to prevalence in the pre and post intervention. The percentage of participants who agreed with this statement before the workshop

intervention 132 (14.3%) went down to 99 (10.8%) after the workshop. Conversely participants who disagreed with this statement before the workshop 788 (87.5%) went up to 821 (89.2%). These results were statistically significant with  $p=.000$ , which indicate that the intervention had an overall positive effect on participants knowledge on this issue. Moreover, a statistically significant phi value of .28 suggests, the workshop had a moderately strong effect.

### **Violence and abuse in relationships only affects a small number of people**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Agree (PRE)	132	14.3
Agree (POST)	99	10.8
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>-3.5%</b>

N=920/920

Gender differences for this survey question were also tested. As the table below shows, the percentage of males who agreed with this statement before the workshop intervention 68 (19.7%) went down to 37 (10.7%) after the workshop. Conversely male participants who disagreed with this statement before the workshop 277 (80.3%) went up to 308 (89.3%). These results were statistically significant with  $p=.000$ , which indicate that the intervention had an overall positive effect on male participants knowledge on this issue. Moreover, a statistically significant phi value of .29 suggests, the workshop had a moderately strong effect. The results for female participants are as follows: 59 (10.8%) agreed with the above statement before the workshop intervention, and 57 (10.4%) agreed with it after the intervention. Conversely, 489 (89.2%) disagreed with this statement before the intervention, and 491 (89.65) disagreed with it after. While very small, the changes were statistically significant, and a phi value of .30 suggests that the workshop had a moderately strong effect size.

**1. Violence and abuse in relationships only affects a small number of people \* Violence and abuse in relationships only affects a small number of people \* gender Crosstabulation**

gender				Violence and abuse in relationships only affects a small number of people		Total
				Agree	Disagree	
Male	1. Violence and abuse in relationships only affects a small number of people	Agree	Count	20	48	68
			% of Total	5.8%	13.9%	19.7%
	Total	Disagree	Count	17	260	277
			% of Total	4.9%	75.4%	80.3%
Female	1. Violence and abuse in relationships only affects a small number of people	Agree	Count	22	37	59
			% of Total	4.0%	6.8%	10.8%
	Total	Disagree	Count	35	454	489
			% of Total	6.4%	82.8%	89.2%
Total			Count	57	491	548
			% of Total	10.4%	89.6%	100.0%

Focus groups with students suggest that these key messages were understood, and that students had a much greater awareness of important issues related to violence in relationships. Equally, students acknowledged that abuse “isn’t just hitting someone” and that although most people think about physical abuse, “there’s a lot more to it than that”. Psychological was the second most common type of abuse talked about by students and was described in terms of “pressure” to do something or taking the form of “jealousy and isolation”. They were also able to recall prevalence of domestic violence, which had a profound impact on many of the participants.

**Excerpts from Student Focus Groups**

‘I learned a lot of facts about relationships and stuff... lots of things were really new – that like, it affects people our age as well, and um, it can happen to men to, not just women. And like, 1 out of 4 women experiences domestic abuse.’ Student, Area 8

‘It helped me realise what actually abuse is. So for example if you are in a relationship with somebody and really liked that person, if they shoved or pushed you, you might think that’s fine but that’s really abuse.’ Student, Area 2

‘I told my mum that two women are killed each week by partners or ex-partners in the UK. She was quite shocked when I said it and she didn’t think it was that many. Even before I knew about it, I didn’t think it would be that many, it shocked me a lot.’ Student, Area 2

#### 4.1.2. Understanding Control and Coercion

Students taking part in the workshops gained a more nuanced understanding of the complexity of violence in relationships, and they consistently demonstrated knowledge about control and coercion in the context of a relationship. Analysis of Workshop Questionnaire data illustrates the significance of these changes in relation to this message, as well as findings from focus groups.

##### Question 8: People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence

In total, 661 participants answered this survey item pre and post intervention. 400 (60.5%) participants agreed with this sentiment before the intervention, which went up to 536 (81.1%) after the intervention. These results were statistically significant ( $p=.000$ ), and the phi value of .32 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

##### **People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Agree (PRE)	400	60.5
Agree (POST)	536	81.1
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+20.6%</b>

*N = 661/661*

The gender differences are as follows: 149 (56.7%) of males agreed with this sentiment before the intervention, which went up to 193 (73.4%), after the intervention. These results were statistically significant ( $p=.000$ ), and a phi values of .36 indicates a moderately strong effect size. Of the female participants, 236 (62.6%) agreed with this sentiment before the intervention, which went up to 323 (85.7%), after the intervention. These results were statistically significant ( $p=.000$ ), and a phi values of .28 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

**8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to \* People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to \* gender Crosstabulation**

gender				People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to		Total
				Agree	Disagree	
Male	8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	Agree	Count	130	19	149
			% within 8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
			% of Total	49.4%	7.2%	56.7%
	Disagree	Count	63	51	114	
		% within 8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	55.3%	44.7%	100.0%	
		% of Total	24.0%	19.4%	43.3%	
Total			Count	193	70	263
			% within 8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
			% of Total	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Female	8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	Agree	Count	220	16	236
			% within 8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	93.2%	6.8%	100.0%
			% of Total	58.4%	4.2%	62.6%
	Disagree	Count	103	38	141	
		% within 8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	73.0%	27.0%	100.0%	
		% of Total	27.3%	10.1%	37.4%	
Total			Count	323	54	377
			% within 8. People who abuse their partners are able to control their violence if they want to	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
			% of Total	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%

Focus group responses revealed an increased awareness about domestic violence as an issue of control, and findings suggest that the workshops had an important impact on helping them challenge misconceptions surrounding domestic violence and abuse within relationships, and developing empathetic responses to victims of violence.

**Excerpts from Student Focus Groups**

‘It’s not about anger. It’s about power and control.’ Student, Area 1

‘It is always your choice if you choose to hit someone else.’ Student, Area 2

‘It is not always their choice to stay in it, sometimes it is the pressure of the partner saying “I’ll kill you if you leave”... so it makes me feel that it’s not always their fault. I used to think they should just leave the relationship, but now I understand why they feel they can’t.’ Student, Area 2

‘In the beginning, we all kinda had the attitude that if you are in an abusive relationship, you just get out of it straight away, but then we realised as it progressed that it wasn’t that it easy.’ Student, Area 2

#### 4.1.3. *Women as Victims of Violence*

There was also an increased awareness about the gendered nature of domestic violence. Analysis of Workshop Questionnaire data illustrate the significance of this, with a clear understanding that women are more likely to be victims of violence.

#### Question 4: Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?

The most relevant change in table below concerns the distribution of participants who answered that women are the most likely to become victims of violent relationships (as opposed to Men or Men/Women Equally). Of these, 595 (53.8%) or participants gave this answer pre intervention, which went up to 855 (77.4%). This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .32 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

#### **Who are most likely to be victims of domestic violence?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Women (PRE)	595	53.8
Women (POST)	855	77.4
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+23.6%</b>

*N = 1105/1105*



**4. Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships? \* Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?**  
**Crosstabulation**

			Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?			Total
			Men	Women	Men and Women both equally likely	
4. Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?	Men	Count	4	11	5	20
		% within 4. Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?	20.0%	55.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.4%	1.0%	0.5%	1.8%
	Women	Count	16	521	58	595
		% within 4. Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?	2.7%	87.6%	9.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.4%	47.1%	5.2%	53.8%
	Men and Women both equally likely	Count	8	323	159	490
		% within 4. Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?	1.6%	65.9%	32.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.7%	29.2%	14.4%	44.3%
Total	Count	28	855	222	1105	
	% within 4. Who are most likely to become victims of violent relationships?	2.5%	77.4%	20.1%	100.0%	
	% of Total	2.5%	77.4%	20.1%	100.0%	

Gender differences for this survey question were also tested. As the table below shows, the percentage of males who listed women before the intervention 241 (57.5%) went up to 336 (60.2%) after the workshop. These results were statistically significant with  $p=.000$ , which indicate that the intervention had an overall positive effect on male participants knowledge on this issue. Moreover, a statistically significant phi value of .28 suggests, the workshop had a moderately strong effect. The results for female participants are as follows. 328 (50.5%) listed females before the workshop which went up to 488 (75.1%) after the intervention. These changes were statistically significant ( $p=.001$ ), and a phi value of .34 suggests that the workshop had a moderately strong effect size.

*4.1.4. Seeking support*

Students reported having knowledge of what action to take if needing support around violence and abuse in terms of what to do and who could support. The results for this suggest that there was a statistically significant increase from 86% (699) of participants who reported being able to help a friend in an abusive relationship prior to the intervention to 94% (744) afterwards. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .34 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

**If a friend of yours were in an abusive or unhealthy relationship would you feel able to help?**

Response	N	%
Yes (PRE)	699	86
Yes (POST)	744	94

<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>+18%</b>
-----------------------	-------------

*N* = 789/789

Students reported having knowledge of what action to take if needing support around violence and abuse in terms of what to do and who could support.

**Excerpts from Student Focus Groups**

‘I learnt where to go if I got raped or abused.’ Student, Area 5

‘Where you could go for help, they gave us a piece of paper that had Tender and numbers of where you could call for help – ChildLine – if you know anyone that is being abused.’ Student, Area 7

‘It would help to know how to spot domestic abuse if it is going on and where to report it to and you know what to do if it happened to you.’ Student, Area 7

*4.1.5. Early warning signs and prevention*

The number of participants that reported ‘They make you feel guilty for your actions’ as an early warning sign rose from 868 (75.6%) prior to the intervention to 1065 (92.6%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .27 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

**They make you feel guilty for your actions**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes (PRE)	868	75.6%
Yes (POST)	1065	92.6%
<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>+17</b>	

*N* = 1130

The number of participants that reported ‘They ignore your feelings’ as an early warning sign rose from 815 (70.5%) prior to the intervention to 1042 (90.0%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .18 indicates a weak to moderately strong effect size.

### They ignore your feelings

Response	N	%
Yes (PRE)	815	70.5%
Yes (POST)	1042	90.0%
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+20.5%</b>

N= 1156

The number of participants that reported ‘They pressure you to drink alcohol’ as an early warning sign rose from 741 (64.2%) prior to the intervention to 1014 (87.8%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .23 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

### They pressure you to drink alcohol

Response	N	%
Yes (PRE)	741	64.2
Yes (POST)	1014	87.8
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+23.6</b>

N= 1155

The number of participants that reported ‘They control what you wear’ as an early warning sign rose from 865 (74.8%) prior to the intervention to 1081 (93.5%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .20 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

### They control what you wear

Response	N	%
Yes (PRE)	865	74.8
Yes (POST)	1081	93.5
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+18.7</b>

N= 1156

The number of participants that reported ‘They disrespect and humiliate you’ as an early warning sign rose from 944 (81.7%) prior to the intervention to 1048 (90.7%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .27 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

### **They are disrespectful and humiliate you**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes (PRE)	944	81.7
Yes (POST)	1048	90.7
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+9.0</b>

N= 1155

The number of participants that reported ‘They push, shove, slap or hit you’ as an early warning sign fell from 1055 (91.0%) prior to the intervention to 1022 (88.6%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .32 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

### **They push, shove, slap or hit you**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes (PRE)	1055	91
Yes (POST)	1022	88.6
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>-2.4</b>

N= 1154

The number of participants that reported ‘They keep you away from your friends’ as an early warning sign rose from 973 (84.2%) prior to the intervention to 1071 (92.6%) after the intervention. This is a significant change with  $p=.000$ . Moreover, a phi value of .27 indicates a moderately strong effect size.

### **They keep you away from your friends**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes (PRE)	973	84.2
Yes (POST)	1071	92.6
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>+8.4</b>

N= 1156

Many students referred to acquiring knowledge around early warning signs and how useful it was as a preventative element. Students reported gaining examples of early warning signs and what they were about.

### **Excerpts from Student Focus Groups**

‘I liked learning the early warning signs because you never know what might happen – that might actually happen.’ Student, Area 7

‘If you see this happening to yourself or other people, like the warning signs, you can try to do something about it.’ Student, Area 2

#### *4.1.6. Summary of Student Findings*

Overall, findings from across the three years suggest that the project has a clear impact on young people, and meets the key aims of the Healthy Relationships project. Students in workshops demonstrated their increased knowledge of the issues involved in understanding abuse in the context of relationships by naming the different types, providing practical examples of what types of abuse might occur, distinguishing between healthy and unhealthy relationships and who is primarily affected by violence. These findings were consistent across Year 1 and Year 2 in focus groups, and were evidenced by students recalling facts regarding their knowledge of domestic violence, which help to dispel myths surrounding and elicit a change in their attitudes. It is clear that the Tender Healthy Relationships Project is delivering on a number of its key aims around increasing knowledge and understanding. Students overwhelmingly engage positively with the workshops – many key messages seem to be taken on board by the workshop participants, and their experience of the project is overwhelmingly positive. Students’ knowledge about issues such as domestic violence and sexual bullying was developed. The gendered breakdown also suggests that many of the issues were equally impactful for young men and women in relation to knowledge and understanding.

Young people who engage directly with the workshops benefit in terms of understanding key messages, demonstrating confidence and skills, and correctly identifying early warning signs. The only anomalous response is to understanding ‘push, shove, slap or hit’ as an ‘early warning sign. This trend was evidenced across all three years, and we would suggest, based on their clear understanding of other ‘early warning signs’, that students may in fact see this as an indication of an abusive relationship, rather than an early warning sign, *per se*.

The Tender Healthy Relationships project, and the partnership model as evaluated here, has had a clear impact on the students participating in the workshops across the five areas, particularly in relation to improving

knowledge and understanding of violence and abuse for young people, and ensuring that educational staff are trained and able to engage students around the key issues delivered in the intervention. In line with current research on prevention programmes (c.f. Stanley et al. 2015), the drama approach used in the Healthy Relationships Project was seen as valuable by young people who were overwhelmingly positive about the workshops.

## 4.2. Wider Impacts: Teachers' Experience of the Project

Measuring the impact of the project means understanding the change in students' knowledge and understanding of key issues, but also assessing the extent to which the Project may have impact on teachers and their ability to engage students after the project has finished. The next section sets out findings from the INSET questionnaires and from interview data to understand how teachers and educational staff experienced the Healthy Relationship Project.

### 4.2.1. Findings from INSET Questionnaires

INSET training sessions were valued by schools, and areas where INSET and delivery of projects was taken seriously at a school-wide level, the messages from the workshops were applied in a holistic manner. Teaching staff across different schools felt that the inset gave them an insight into the issues that young people might face in relationships.

Analysis of INSET questionnaire findings from across all three years (n=1080) suggest that teaching staff that took part in the INSET training felt that they had increased their knowledge of issues related to violence against women and girls, felt more confident in dealing with key issues related to violence and sexual bullying, and many felt that they could introduce these topics into future schemes of work.

### Have you learned anything new about issues of violence against women and girls?

Response	N	%
Yes – to a great extent	177	16.3
Yes – to some extent	475	43.7
To a limited extent	181	16.6
Not at all	51	4.7

Did not respond	121	11.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1005/1088*

Overwhelmingly, teachers who took part in the INSET training learnt new information about violence against women and girls – with over 75% of participants learning new details about this issue.

**Has this training been useful for your professional practice?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes – to a great extent	351	32.3
Yes – to some extent	585	53.8
To a limited extent	114	10.5
Not at all	14	1.3
Did not respond	16	1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1080/1088*

Over 96% of teachers who took part in the training felt that the INSET sessions were useful for their professional practice – clearly demonstrating the value of the sessions to teachers on an individual level.

**Do you feel your school could benefit from more support to address issues of sexual bullying or abuse in young people’s relationships?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes – to a great extent	319	29.3
Yes – to some extent	582	53.5
To a limited extent	185	12.4
Not at all	7	0.6
Did not respond	37	3.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1080/1080*

After the INSET training sessions, it was clear that many teachers felt they could use more support on key issues, with 96% suggesting they would like more help in addressing sexual bullying and abuse in young people's relationships.

**Do you feel more confident about teaching domestic violence issues after having completed this training?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes – to a great extent	181	16.6
Yes – to some extent	541	49.7
To a limited extent	246	22.6
Not at all	4.3	4.3
Did not respond	65	6.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1088/1088*

Nearly 90% of staff suggested that the training gave them increased confidence in teaching issues related to DV as a result of the INSET training.

**Do you feel more confident about teaching sexual bullying issues after having completed this training?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes – to a great extent	154	14.2
Yes – to some extent	494	45.4
To a limited extent	246	26.6
Not at all	4.3	6.3
Did not respond	65	6.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1080/1088*

Over 85% of staff suggest that the training gave them increased confidence in teaching issues related to sexual bullying as a result of the INSET training.



**Do you feel more confident about teaching violence in teenage relationship issues after having completed this training?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes – to a great extent	181	16.6
Yes – to some extent	528	48.5
To a limited extent	250	23.0
Not at all	54	5.0
Did not respond	67	6.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1080/1088*

Over 85% of staff suggest that the training gave them increased confidence in teaching issues related to violence in young people’s relationships as a result of the INSET training.

**Do you think you would include some of these issues in future schemes of work/lesson plans?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes – to a great extent	140	12.9
Yes – to some extent	375	34.5
To a limited extent	281	25.8
Not at all	103	9.5
Did not respond	163	15.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1062</b>	<b>100</b>

*N = 1062/1088*

Many teachers (over 75%) felt they would be able to include some of the issues raised in the INSET training in their lesson plans.

It’s clear that the INSET training sessions were well-delivered and highly valued by teaching staff – with many staff who took part suggesting they felt more confident about addressing issues related to young people and violence, and that future lesson plans for many staff members may also include elements from the INSET sessions. INSET sessions clearly work to create a more holistic approach to dealing with violence, and the positive feedback from teaching staff suggests that their understanding of key issues has been significantly enhanced as a result of the training.

#### 4.2.2. *Changes to the Students*

Feedback from teachers who had observed the workshop sessions was collected both in a pre and post survey (n=88), as well as in interviews and focus groups across the areas during the course of the evaluation. Data from the pre and post measures are not robust enough to reveal statistically significant changes, but there was a clear sense from both these measures and the qualitative elements that teachers were positive about the workshops, and many had noticed changes in the young people taking part. In particular, educators noticed an increased confidence and empathy from young people, as well as increase in knowledge related to healthy relationships and domestic violence.

#### **Excerpts from Teacher Interviews**

‘The students have gained confidence in themselves and in doing this have become more confident students’.  
Teacher, Area 2

‘They have become very sensitive and thoughtful with the subject opinions with their choice of characters’.  
Teacher, Area 1

‘I have watched them grow significantly; they appear more confident in themselves and proud to be able to help others’. Teacher, Area 2

‘They now know exactly where to go if they need to talk to somebody. They recognise signs for unhealthy relationships’. Teacher, Area 5

‘They developed a deep awareness of what constitutes a healthy relationship, confidence to know when something is not right and where to go for support’. Teacher, Area 4

#### 4.2.3. *Summary of Findings*

The INSET training sessions provide valuable knowledge for educators, and most felt more aware of key issues, and had a better awareness of the complex situations young people have to navigate in establishing and maintaining healthy relationships. Equally, teaching and support staff who were present during the workshop

sessions suggested not only that students had developed their knowledge of the area, but that they could see positive changes in many of the young people in the workshop sessions.

## **5. Effective Implementation of the Partnership Project**

The Tender Healthy Relationships Project is a prevention programme with an element of peer-education. Tender Education & Arts worked with four partner organizations to roll out a unique drama-based model of healthy relationship education that engages whole schools in teacher training, practical workshops for pupils and peer-to-peer education. In four of the five regions delivery is through formal partnerships with a range of different organizations, and in the fifth region, Tender themselves deliver the workshops. The other partners are: Peer Productions (Surrey); Soft Touch (Leicester); Relate North Essex and East Herts/ Essex Change (Essex); and Liverpool John Moores University (Liverpool).

Each of the partner areas received the following support/resources from Tender:

- 3 days training
- A facilitator pack and framework for delivery
- Ongoing central support provided throughout
- Resources for each project; facilitator pack, helpline cards, badges
- Supporting films for delivery
- Practical training on both issue and delivery for new organisation staff
- Quality assurance visits
- Annual general meetings

The next section will explore a range of thematic issues that were brought up during the focus groups with students, interviews with teachers/teaching staff, and partner interviews. Key areas that emerged from the data included questions relating to selection processes, the delivery and organization of workshops, and fidelity to the facilitators pack.

### **5.1. Selecting Students for the Workshops**

Schools seemed to have a variety of approaches for selecting students, and by and large partners did not give schools particular guidance on which students to choose. As such, some schools chose drama students, some schools chose students they felt would be good peer mentors, and some schools chose vulnerable students who they felt would benefit from the workshop. One school discussed their selection strategy – they decided to focus on ‘free school meal’ students (pupil premium), and include some recommended students: ‘people who would benefit from the project’. However, there was an awareness that students would, at some point, become aware they were chosen for a particular reason. He says:

*'We didn't want to them to think 'you are people that we feel need a specific focus on relationships', but the moment they saw who was in the room, I suspect they worked that out for themselves.'* Assistant Head, Area 5

Asking vulnerable students to engage with the workshop raises some ethical questions about the impact this might have on students who feel singled out, or who may feel even more targeted because of the selection process. It also has an effect on how schools engage with parents. A number of schools sent letters home to parents letting them know about the workshop, and that their child had been chosen to take part. For students who were selected because of their drama experience, attending a drama workshop did not flag any issues, and in general, drama students reported that they were more likely to discuss these issues with their parents, and with their peers. However, when students are selected because they are understood to be vulnerable, this impacted schools' decision to notify parents.

*Interviewer: Did you let parents know about the workshops in advance?*

*Assistant Head Area 5: No. I informed the students two weeks before, and said to them this is what's going to happen, any problems, anyone who is not comfortable with this idea, come and let me know. I felt that to talk to the parents specifically, could cause problems from the parents, in as much as they might start asking questions 'why is my particular child selected for this project?' and I didn't want that to be a hindrance to our selection of those students.... The line I would have given if there was a concern raised is we talked at a pastoral level about students who would benefit from work on relationships, and that's why we've selected your child, but I think to formally put that into a letter could have raised some problems...*

Schools where students were chosen based on their vulnerability to these issues almost invariably expressed concern about notifying parents in advance, and most of them did not inform parents about the workshops.

*Teacher Area 8: We hand-picked the majority of [students], which we probably wouldn't do again where we knew there was either a concern in the home environment, or a concern with a relationship. Some of the children where there's been a concern with the parents' relationships and what they've been witnessing and it is impacting them at school. Students have been able to express this concern and take that message home, and we did have a phone call from one mum, it's even helped her, the messages from her own daughter, and it's ok to talk about it, it's ok to get help...*

Schools where drama students or 'confident' students were selected were more likely to inform parents about the workshops, and to gain explicit consent from them in order to have their child take part. As previously highlighted, this does raise important questions about the ethicality of including students on a workshop and

purposely not informing parents about this. It also raises questions about the nature of the programme. This is not a counselling or therapeutic programme, and is not designed to address specific issues that young people might be encountering. One partner noted that dealing with disclosures was a problem, finding a way to deal with problems that young people disclosed meant that she drew on counseling skills to try to help with these situations:

*'I'm using counselling skills for my work, but I'm using them because they're self-taught. I've learned from people around me, and a natural instinct to listen effectively... ' Partner 3*

Facilitators for the project are not, on the whole, trained as counsellors, and are not equipped to deal with these kinds of disclosures within a therapeutic framework. While the partners explained to schools that disclosure policies must be in place before the commencement of the workshops, some schools specifically provide counselling or make pastoral staff aware that particular issues might be flagged, adopting a holistic approach to addressing these issues, while other schools were less able to deal with issues that may have been raised as a result of the programme. It is important that schools are aware that disclosure issues will need to be dealt with by appropriately trained staff, and to ensure that provision for counselling is available for all students who may be experiencing violence or abuse on some way.

There was a sense, to some extent, that there was a trade-off between choosing drama students who would be confident performers and would be best placed to get the message across to their peers, versus students who might be experiencing some of these issues themselves, and benefitted personally from the workshop, but perhaps weren't able to communicate the key messages as well. This raises important questions about the ultimate aim of the workshop – the intention seems to be focused on peer education and empowering young people to educate other students about the issues that are raised. As such, students who are able to meet this mandate may be best placed to effectively communicate the insights they've learned to their peers.

This was a question raised by a number of schools as well. One school that had chosen students based on their vulnerability raised a query about the quality of the performance. This particular school suggested that they wanted an excellent performance – and while they recognized that there was some good content and audience engagement, they felt the outcome from the drama element was a bit disappointing. To some extent this may be about managing expectations – but it raises an important question about the ways in which students are selected, and what the ultimate aim of the workshops are. For some schools, students were selected on the basis of confidence and ability to communicate messages, which fits with the criteria for a successful peer-to-peer education programme.

*'...initially I thought we might want to choose students who, perhaps, you could see those issues developing, but actually what we decided was that we wanted to have a group of students who could then do something for other students, and be leaders within that – we wanted people who would be good drama students but also students who contributed positively in form time. We didn't want students who said nothing – but also students who could work in a group effectively, so that those ten hours, those sessions we use really effectively.'*

*Assistant Head, Area 4*

The nature of the drama workshops means that the performance element is critical – and in terms of meeting project outcomes, students who participate in the workshops need to perform to a relatively large audience in order to fulfil the Big Lottery criteria for success. As such, this also raises questions about the ability of students to successfully perform in order to meet these standards. Performing to a large audience can be intimidating for the best of drama students, and for young people who are not engaged with drama, this may be an overwhelming process.

One partner experienced particular difficulties in working with students who were considered vulnerable, and they suggest that given the level of the performance, and the numbers that are required, they try to engage with drama students where possible, to ensure that there is a strong group who can deliver the messages to their peers.

Filming and presenting the performance on DVD has also proved effective, and indeed this strategy may reach a larger number of students than a single performance might. In one school that created a DVD, the performance had been shown to a wider range of students, and they were planning on using the performance DVD again the following year in PSHE classes.

## **5.2. Delivery Support**

All of the partners indicated that while there had been some challenges in getting the workshops delivered in the first year, the experience had been overwhelmingly positive, with good levels of positive communication with Tender and the Evaluation Team to help with any issues that arose. Most schools found the workshops were delivered well, and students responded positively to the drama elements and the team building.

*'[The facilitator] did some team building games, because the group didn't know each other at all, hardly at all, and she quickly established their link and their friendships started to get together, and they did that by a lot of team building activities. They responded quickly and they responded quickly to her as well.'* Teacher, Area 6

*'[The facilitator] did a session with staff, which was really good. Staff really enjoyed that – to all the year 10 tutors. We said we wanted them to give us at least 2 names of students for the project, who would be positive, that were going to work well together, that wouldn't take that long to get going. The funny thing was when we got them together... there were 450 in the year group – we realized they didn't know each other at all, but they got working really well together.'* Teaching Assistant, Area 6

### **5.3. Organizing Workshops: Challenges of Working with Schools**

Most of the partners expressed a range of problems when trying to engage with schools. Time and resource pressures were frequently highlighted as the biggest problem in working with schools and effectively organizing the workshops.

*'The problem is, because they're under so much pressure themselves, it's difficult. All we found is that it's time consuming – you know you can't contact a school and get a phone call back the same day, and when you're chasing information you always have to wait, and some schools can be difficult at first, and I think that's more challenging than anything else.'* Partner 4

The partners felt, overwhelmingly that establishing good communication with schools was fundamental to the success of the project – some felt that ensuring schools were very clear about what was required from them upfront would help with this issue. As the project progressed partners developed a range of strategies to engage schools more effectively, and to ensure the process of communicating the details of the project to schools were streamlined. Ensuring that schools are aware of the time involved in the project, and that they can effectively manage the process alongside the partner seems critical for the success of the delivery. Indeed, even when the message was clearly received and students were very positive about the workshops in situations where there was a lack of teacher engagement because of the strain on time and resources there was a strong sense from professional teaching staff that the workshop was unsuccessful. Schools that did not fully understand the workshop aims, or those that were disorganized often had a negative impact, in the view of the partners, on the delivery.

*Interviewer: How did the other teachers and professionals in the school feel about the project?*



*Teacher Area 8: They didn't like it – mostly because of how much time it took, and how much it took away from – so, I know initially they wanted one staff member to take part all the way through, which was me. I just don't have that much time, and I needed to rely on colleagues to give support, and it's taking away from the everyday work load as well so it put a lot of pressure on staff, um, so they weren't very happy about it and there were a few complaints, but we were just told to get on with it.*

This particular professional felt that the workshop was very good in terms of raising key issues and addressing 'healthy relationships', but that she would not host the workshop again because of the time implications, the issues that it raised in terms of demands on staff, the work that was required to get the project set up, and deliver the project. This was partly because the workshop was delivered outside of the normal curriculum, requiring teachers to stay after school hours. These particular teaching staff were refused 'time off in lieu' by their manager, and it became a burden for them, not only in devoting their personal time to the project, but also managing student behaviour, which was a particular problem for this group.

However, other schools adopted a holistic approach to the workshops, incorporating it within the curriculum and seeing the sessions as a small part of a wider discussion the entire student population should have around healthy relationships. One teacher noted:

*'Because I'm on the PTA, and they wanted to get other people, um, I got a group of governors and parents, and staff who were free to have some training as well. So, the net has been widened, and there's a clear message at the school that domestic violence isn't acceptable.'* Teacher Area 3.

This particular model seems to reflect best practice, although of course not every school will have the funding or the will to incorporate such a holistic approach. However, in terms of creating an ongoing impact, this is by far the best strategy for carrying key messages across a wider range of students, and over a longer period of time.

#### **5.4. Tender Materials**

While Tender do not currently have a specific programme manual per se, they do have a facilitators pack that all partners are expected to use. Facilitators are expected to adhere to 'key messages', but have some flexibility to how they deliver the workshops. There is an ongoing debate about fidelity to programme manuals in the delivery of intervention programmes. Little (2010) argues that a lack of adherence to programme manuals can be detrimental to achieving proposed outcomes, while others (Mitchell, 2011; Nolas *et al.*, 2012) question the

extent to which flexible approaches can be made without losing core messages. These questions are particularly relevant for the Tender Healthy Relationships project, as partners have been given a great deal of flexibility when delivering the workshops. While there was a strong sense from partners that the core principles Tender highlights were being adhered to, the ways in which different organizations approached the delivery varied considerably.

*'We basically have the same journey but we might deliver it slightly differently... The content in terms of the learning points remains the same, but we might approach it slightly differently.'* Partner 3

*'Using the framework of Tender's project, it's been good that we've been able to um, put our own stamp on that and have our own input into the exercises and the way that the workshops are run... I've always worked with the skeleton of the structure of the areas they wanted to cover, I guess in terms of delivery it's not so much changes but just creating exercises that you think are appropriate to the group that you're working with, which obviously sometimes you have to do that on the spot.'* Partner 1

As each organization has a different background in terms of the organizational aims, it is, perhaps, not surprising that different strategies were used to carry out workshops.

*'We use our own work to deliver the outcomes. We do use some of it, we use parts of the folder, but the other parts of it come from working with [the facilitator's] experience and drama background – so we do use different scripts and bits and pieces, um, so I don't know how close our delivery is to what's specified in the manual, in that sense.'* Partner 4

Engaging different organizations with different backgrounds in the project inevitably means that there will be differences in terms of delivery. While there was a strong sense from partners that the core principles Tender highlights were being adhered to, there is a concern that partners may not have the expertise in some cases to deal with issues raised by students or schools. One partner commented:

*'As long as it [the topic] is in the subject remit of healthy relationships and looking at early warning signs we would tackle it during the session'* (Partner 4).

In one particular area, a partner was asked to deliver a session on male date rape. It may well be that some partners have sufficient expert knowledge to handle these questions adeptly, but this may not necessarily be the case. It is essential that there are clear indications in either the manual or in the training that the Tender Healthy

Relationships Project about the focus of the workshops, and that as much as possible issues outside of the core themes are not directly introduced or encouraged by the facilitators.

### **5.5. Framing ‘Healthy Relationships’**

There is some suggestion from both teachers and facilitators that the Project, while clearly delivering in its aim of increasing knowledge around domestic abuse, perhaps lacks a more positive approach to helping people build a healthy relationship. There were also concerns about the framing of relationships as both heterosexual, and the ways in which young men were included in the workshops. One partner, talking about the importance of delivering a project to a mixed group said:

*‘Setting it up to empower young men and having young men within the project and engaging their views in the discussion but also having them perform to their peers and looking at the fact that men are abused as well and same sex relationships are an important message to be tackling’ (Partner 3).*

Issues that affect young men specifically, or the ways that violence manifests itself in same-sex relationships is not something that is covered in-depth in the Tender material. Another partner suggests that there is a short period of time to cover a good deal of material, but that often the messages put forward are ‘negative’ in the sense that they focus on violent relationships, but less on how to create or develop ‘healthy’ relationships.

This was a concern echoed by a number of schools, who felt that the project did an excellent job at focusing on violence against women which was clearly taken up by all participants, but suggested that finding a way to include young men in a more positive way, and providing more positive reinforcement/information about how to create a healthy relationship would be beneficial. One partner commented:

*‘[Some schools]’ feedback found that many felt that the workshops were to be about healthy relationships but once they had started they saw that it was more towards violence in relationships not really healthy relationships’ (Partner 2).*

A systematic review produced by Stanley et al. (2015) reinforces this idea, and emphasizes the importance of avoiding blaming approaches, and engaging young men in positive ways.

### **5.6. Local Knowledge and Engagement**

For the partners, there was clear evidence that all four areas delivered successful programmes. Partners that had previous experience of working with domestic violence were able to introduce the drama elements with ease, and drama-oriented partners increased their knowledge and understanding of issues related to domestic violence. A few of the partners were able to engage with relevant groups and organizations in the local area. One partner invited in a local DV agency to talk about DV support in that location with the young people- while another group joined the DV forum within the local council and was making contacts and links across that particular geographic area. This can have a positive benefit in terms of spreading the message beyond the school, and in some cases can add weight to the messages being delivered by partners. One partner who did not have a particular background in DV expert to help reinforce the messages, and she felt that this helped strengthen the key messages she was trying to deliver.

*Interviewer: How did students respond to having the [DV worker] in the school?*

*Partner 1: Some students used that person as an outlet for the young people to talk – we have a discussion and ask them if they want to ask any questions about what happens and their experiences really, because they deal first hand with young people that have experienced abuse, and also families that have experienced it, so you know, the participants are free to ask questions to the workers, and also it backs up what I'm saying, because obviously I don't work in that area, but they do so, you know, it's almost like a trust thing for the kids to know that what I've been saying is true. It's good support.*

For partners who are not DV experts, including expert knowledge helps reinforce the authenticity of the messages, which is vital for ensuring the success of prevention programmes (Stanley et al., 2015). While different areas will have to deal with different issues locally, involving DV organizations that can help elucidate issues that are going on in particular communities may be worth considering, particularly for partner organizations that do not have specific experience of working in domestic violence.

## **5.7. Summary of Findings**

The Tender Healthy Relationships Project employed a range of organizations with different backgrounds to implement the Project in five different geographical areas. Each of the partners developed and shared strategies for addressing key issues as they arose, and effective communication between Tender and the partners ensured that the delivery was as robust and consistent, despite variations in geography.

## **6. Key Findings and Recommendations**

### **6.1. Summary of Key Findings**

The findings from across the three years suggest that the Tender Healthy Relationships Project has met the two key objectives that were originally set out:

- 1) The Healthy Relationships Project does make a difference in terms of young people's knowledge about violence in relationships
- 2) The Healthy Relationships Project was implemented effectively by all partners

It is clear from the data that young people who took part in the workshops were able to recall relevant statistics about domestic violence, had a better understanding of what constitutes an unhealthy relationship including early warning signs, recognized the gendered nature of domestic violence, and knew where to go for help and support. Additionally, the INSET training provided a useful mechanism for supporting teachers to continue conversations about domestic violence after the workshops had concluded – which is an important factor in ensuring that the gains made during the workshops are continued.

The Project was implemented well across all five of the areas - issues related to selection criteria, delivery and organizations of workshops, fidelity to the core aims of the Project, and linking into local knowledge were all key areas that came up over the course of the evaluation. Each of the partner areas worked to deliver the workshops effectively, and key targets for the Big Lottery were consistently met.

### **6.2. Recommendations**

The evaluation process has highlighted a number of recommendations that we would encourage Tender to incorporate

- 1) While building and developing relationships with new schools is essential to expanding the Healthy Relationships Project, growing and sustaining existing relationships provides a more holistic and long-term way of integrating key messages across different cohorts of students. As such, we would recommend that schools commit to the delivery of the project across a number of years, and consider the Healthy Relationships Project as a long-term collaboration.

- 2) Schools that take a holistic approach to engaging with the project seem to have a more positive experience of the project, with both students and teachers able to discuss these issues within the school setting. While it may not be possible in every school, it might be useful suggesting to schools that a more integrated approach may help deliver messages more effectively. School-wide approaches to addressing bullying, problematic student behaviour have been successful in the North America and the UK, and may have a positive impact on student learning and creating safe environments (Chapman & Hofweber, 2000; Colvin & Fernandez, 2000; Horner & Sugai, 2000). Holistic approaches to education also have greater impacts in relation to changes in attitude and behaviour (Ballantyne and Packer, 2005) – as such this provides further incentive for schools to adopt the project over a number of years, and to recognize the value of incorporating key elements from the model into learning and teaching practices. We would argue that a holistic and sustained introduction of the Healthy Relationship Project may have positive impacts on students’ understandings of the key messages, and allow for the continuation of safe spaces for students to talk and discuss related issues.
- 3) It may be worth considering how to include issues that focus more on ‘healthy relationships’ – developing positive messages and specific guidance for young people on how to manage this. While young people demonstrated increase in knowledge around violence, a focus on healthy aspects of relationships and how better to develop these are equally important, and should be a focus of the project. While there is a clear need to discuss domestic abuse and how this impacts young women, finding ways to help young men and women think critically about their own experiences, and how to *build* a healthy relationship may be useful.
- 4) While the material and delivery of the Tender project goes some way to addressing issues of violence within same-sex relationships and there was an indication from some young people that same-sex relationships and same-sex relationship violence had been discussed, we would suggest that the way that relationships are framed in much of the material adopts a heteronormative approach – in line with other suggestions that prevention programmes need to recognize the experiences of LGBTQI young people (Manship & Perry, 2012). While it can be difficult for young people to discuss their sexuality openly, we suggest that Tender develop materials that specifically and purposefully address same-sex relationship violence, possibly working with a LGBTQI third sector organization that may be able to assist in making the focus more inclusive.
- 5) Research from Stanley et al. (2015) makes clear that students with personal experience of domestic violence are less likely to engage fully with prevention programmes. In line with this, and based on the findings from the evaluation, we recommend that the selection of student performers should be based on their ability to perform confidently, and to be able to act as peer educators following the conclusion of the project. Partners should be given specific details about how to develop students into these roles, and

schools should be given guidance about how to support these people. Tender may want to consider developing a specific training programme in conjunction with specialists in schools around this issue – to help schools meet the needs to young men or women who are experiencing or are vulnerable to these issues.

- 6) While there are ethical questions about the absence of parental decision-making in relation to the inclusion of young people in the Project that need to be considered, there is also a strong argument for including parents in discussions about these issues (c.f. Stanley et al. 2015), and including them in discussions about how to help young people develop healthy relationships. We would strongly encourage Tender to require that all schools seek permission from parents before allowing young people to take part, and further, to develop specific material for parents so that discussions about healthy relationship choices can continue at home.
- 7) While the findings from the evaluation demonstrate that the Project has significant impact on young people's knowledge of key issues about violence against women and girls, it is hard to determine how well young people retain this knowledge, and the extent to which it might impact on behaviour. While we were not able to capture long-term impacts in this evaluation, we would encourage Tender to continue to develop their evaluation framework to try to assess this, perhaps working alongside schools where there is an established relationship with teachers/educational staff to understand longer term impacts.
- 8) Finally, we suggest that a specific training programme for partners be developed, alongside a more detailed manual that focuses on both the drama and content delivery. Going forward, Tender should develop tools to ensure that facilitators are trained to deliver the Healthy Relationships Project, and that they adhere as closely as possible to the material in the manual to ensure that key messages are delivered in line with Tender's ethos.

## 7. References

Against Violence and Abuse (AVA), Institute of Education (IOE). Practical Prevention Summary Report. London: Comic Relief; 2013.

Alliance of Five Research Centres on Violence (AFRCV) (1999). Violence Prevention and the Girl Child. Phase One Report. Canada: AFRCV. Available from <http://fredacentre.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Jiwani-et-al-1999-Violence-Prevention-and-the-Girl-Child-.pdf>

Ballantyne, R. and Packer, J. 2005. 'Promoting environmentally sustainable attitudes and behaviour through free-choice learning experiences: what is the state of the game?' In Environmental Education Research Vol. 11 Iss. 3 Pp 281-295

Barnardo's (2012). Cutting them free: How is the UK progressing in protecting its children from sexual exploitation? Barkingside; Barnardo's.

Barter, C., McCarry, M., Berridge, D. & Evans, K. (2009). Partner exploitation and violence in teenage intimate relationships. London: NSPCC. Available from [http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/research/findings/partner\\_exploitation\\_and\\_violence\\_report\\_wdf70129.pdf](http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/research/findings/partner_exploitation_and_violence_report_wdf70129.pdf)

Beckett, H., Firmin, C., Hynes, P., & Pearce, J. (2014). Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation: A Study of Current Practice in London Full Report. London: London Councils

Bell, J. & Stanley, N. (2006). Learning About Domestic Violence: Young People's Responses to a Healthy Relationships Programme, Sex Education, 6, 237-250.

Berelowitz, S., Clifton, J., Firmin, C., Gulyurtlu, S. & Edwards, G. (2013). If only someone had listened: Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Gangs and Groups. Final Report. London: Office of the Children's Commissioner. Available from [http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/content/publications/content\\_743](http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/content/publications/content_743)

CRG Research Ltd. (2007). An Independent Evaluation of the TRUST Education Project: Summary Findings. Cardiff: CRG Research.

Debonnaire, T. (2002). Building Healthy Relationships and Safer Communities: Report of Westminster Domestic Violence Forum Schools Domestic Violence Prevention Project. Bristol: DVT.

De Grace, A. and Clarke, A (2012), 'Promising practices in the prevention of intimate partner violence amongst adolescents', Violence and Victims, 27(6), 849-859.

DMSS Research & Consultancy. (2012). Tender's Healthy Relationship Education in Schools funded by Comic Relief. North Dalton: DMSS.

Ellis, J. (2004). Preventing Violence Against Women and Girls. A Study of Educational Programmes for Children and Young People. London: WOMANKIND Worldwide.

Ellis, J. (2006). Children and the Prevention of Domestic Violence Through School-based Work. Unpublished PhD thesis. Coventry: University of Warwick.



- Fine, M. (1988) 'Sexuality, Schooling, and Adolescent Females: The Missing Discourse of Desire', *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(1), 29 – 52.
- Flood, M., Fergus, L. & Heenan, M. (2009). *Respectful Relationships Education. Violence Prevention and Respectful Relationships Education in Victorian Secondary Schools*. Melbourne, VIC: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development;
- Fox, C., Hale, R. & Gadd, D. (2013). Domestic abuse prevention education: listening to the views of young people, sex education: sexuality, society and learning. *Sex Education: Sexuality, Society and Learning*;14:28–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2013.816949>
- Hale, B., Fox, C. & Gadd, D. (2012). *Evaluation of 3 European Schools-Based DV Prevention Education Programmes and Follow Up Data Analysis*. Keele: Keele University
- Hester, M. & Westmarland, N. (2005). *Tackling Domestic Violence: Effective Interventions and Approaches*, Home Office Research Study 290. London: Home Office.
- Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. & Thomson, R. (1998). *The male in the head: young people, heterosexuality and power*, London, Tufnell Press.
- Home Office. (2011a). *Cross-Government Definition of Domestic Violence: A Consultation*. London: Home Office
- Home Office. (2011b). *Ending Gang and Youth Violence: a cross government report including further evidence and good practice cases*. London: The Stationary Office
- House of Commons Education Committee. (2015). *Life lessons: PSHE and SRE in schools*. London: The Stationary Office
- LGBT Youth Scotland (2010). *Challenging Homophobia Together: Research Report*. Edinburgh: LGBT Youth Scotland. Available from [https://www.lgbtyouth.org.uk/files/documents/LGBT\\_Research.pdf](https://www.lgbtyouth.org.uk/files/documents/LGBT_Research.pdf)
- Manship, S & Perry, R. (2012). *An Evaluation of Domestic Abuse Programmes for Adolescents in Kent and Medway*. Kent: Canterbury Christchurch University
- Maxwell, C., Chase, C., Warwick, I., Aggleton, P. & Wharf, H. (2010). *Freedom to Achieve: Preventing Violence, Promoting Equality: A Whole School Approach*. London: Womankind Worldwide.
- McGeeney, E. (2013) *What is good sex? Young people, sexual pleasure and sexual health services*. Available from <https://goodsexproject.files.wordpress.com/2014/03/ester-mcgeeney-theses-with-amendments.pdf>
- Mullender, A., Hague, G., Imam, U., Kelly, L., Malos, E. & Regan, L. (2002). *Children's Perspectives on Domestic Violence*. London: Sage.
- NICE (2013). *Domestic violence and abuse – identification and prevention: draft guidance*. London: NICE.
- Povey, D. (ed.), Coleman, K., Kaiza, P. & Roe, S. (2009). *Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence 2007/08 (Supplementary Volume 2 to Crime in England and Wales 2007/08)*. Third Edition. London: Home Office. Available from <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs09/hosb0209.pdf>

- Radford, L., Corral, S., Bradley, C., Fisher, H., Bassett, C. & Howat, N., with Collishaw, S. (2011). *Child Abuse and Neglect in the UK*. London: NSPCC.
- Roch, A., Morton, J. & Ritchie, G. (2010). *Out of Sight, Out of Mind?: Transgender People's Experiences of Domestic Abuse*. LGBT Youth Scotland & Equality Network. Available from [www.scottishtrans.org/Uploads/Resources/trans\\_domestic\\_abuse.pdf](http://www.scottishtrans.org/Uploads/Resources/trans_domestic_abuse.pdf)
- Respect (2012). *The Respect Accreditation Standard*, London: Respect.
- Skelton, C. & Francis, B. (2009). Feminism and 'the schooling scandal'. *Gender and Education*, 21(5) 625-626
- Stanley, N., Ellis, J. & Bell J. (2011) *Delivering Preventative Programmes in Schools: Identifying Gender Issues*. In Barter C, Berridge D, editors. *Children Behaving Badly? Peer Violence Between Children and Young People*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell;. pp. 217–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470976586.ch15>
- Stanley, N., Ellis, J., Farrelly, N., Hollinghurst, S., Bailey, S. and Downe, S. (2015). Preventing domestic abuse for children and young people (PEACH): a mixed knowledge scoping review. *Public Health Research*, 3(7)
- STIR. (2015a). *Briefing Paper 2: Incidence Rates and Impact of Experiencing Interpersonal Violence and Abuse in Young People's Relationships*. DAPHNE III European Commission. Available at: <http://stiritup.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/STIR-Briefing-Paper-21.pdf>
- STIR. (2015b) *Briefing paper 4: young people's views on intervention and prevention for interpersonal violence and abuse in young people's relationships (PDF)*. Preston: STIR.
- Strategic Partners Pty Ltd. (2000). *Domestic violence prevention: Strategies and resources for working with young people*. Commonwealth of Australia: Partnerships Against Domestic Violence.
- Thiara, R.K. & Ellis, J. (2005). *WDVF London-wide Schools' Domestic Violence Prevention Project: An Evaluation. Final Report*. London: Westminster Domestic Violence Forum.
- Thurston, W., Meadows, L., Tutty, L. & Bradshaw, C. (1999) *A Violence Reduction Health Promotion Model. Executive Summary*, Calgary: Prairie Partners. Available from <http://www.peace.ca/CBEViolenceReductionModel.pdf>
- Tutty, L. & Bradshaw, C. (2004). *Violence Against Children and Youth: do School-Based Prevention Programs Work?* In C. Ateah & J. Mirwaldt (Eds) *Within Our Reach: Preventing Abuse Across the Lifespan*. Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing and RESOLVE.
- Tutty, L. M. (2009). *Do dating violence and healthy relationship programs make a difference? Final Report for the Canadian Women's Foundation*
- United Nations (1999). *Remarks of Secretary-General Kofi Annan to the Inter-Agency Videoconference for a World Free of Violence against Women, SG/SM/6919 WOM/1113*, Available from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1999/19990308.sgsm6919.html>
- Vance, C.S. (1984) 'Pleasure and danger: toward a politics of sexuality ', in Vance, C.S. (ed), *Pleasure and danger: Exploring female sexuality* Boston and London Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Walton, K. (2007). Domestic Violence Prevention in London Schools. Peer Educator Pilot Project Evaluation Report. London: Domestic Violence Responses.

Wolfe, D.A., Wekerle, C. Scott, K., Straatman, A-L., Grasley, C. & Reitzel-Jaffe, D. (2003). Dating violence prevention with at-risk youth: a controlled outcome evaluation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 279–291.

Wolfe, D.A., Crooks, C., Jaffe, P., Chiodo, D., Hughes, R., Ellis, W., Stitt, L. & Donner, A. (2009). A school-based program to prevent adolescent dating violence: a cluster randomized trial. *Archives of Paediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 163, 692– 699.

Women's Aid Federation Northern Ireland and Department for Education Northern Ireland (DENI). (2011). *Evaluation Helping Hands Pilot*. Belfast: WAFNI and DENI;

World Health Organisation (2013). *Violence against women: Intimate partner and sexual violence against women*. Fact sheet N°239. Geneva: WHO. Available from <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>

World Health Organisation (2009). *Promoting gender equality to prevent violence against women*. Geneva: WHO. Available from [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2009/9789241597883\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2009/9789241597883_eng.pdf)

## Appendix I

### Big Lottery Indicators

#### *Project Outcome 1*

**Indicator 1: 70 per cent of the young participants (3,780 per year) demonstrate knowledge about abuse by recalling statistics/prevalence rates**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of participants disagreed that 'Abuse in relationships affects only a small number of people'.	58%	62%	66%
% of participants that answered women were the 'most likely to become victims of violent relationships'.	66%	67%	71%
% of participants that knew 1 in 4 'women in Britain who experience abuse in relationships in their lifetime'.	65%	75%	82%
% of participants that knew 2 women in England and Wales were 'killed per week by partner or ex-partners'.	51%	60%	67%

Year 1 n= 975/975; Year 2 n= 4131/4131; Year 3 n=3974/3974

**Indicator 2: 70 per cent of audience participants (3,780 per year) report they have increased their understanding of where to seek support for violence in relationships, demonstrating their increased capacity to keep safe.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of participants who knew where to go to seek support for violence in a relationship	69%	66%	70%

Year 1 n= 975/975; Year 2 n=4131/4131; Year 3 n=3974/3974

**Indicator 3: 70 per cent of audience participants (3,780 per year) report increased understanding of healthy and unhealthy relationships.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
--	--------	--------	--------

% of participants report that they have an increased understanding of healthy relationships after the project	77%	75%	80%
---	-----	-----	-----

Year 1 n= 975/975; Year 2 n= 4131/4131; Year 3 n=3974/3974

**Project Outcome 2**

**Indicator 1: 2,250 young people in workshops (750 per year) demonstrate their increased confidence and skills by delivering peer-education performances/workshops on healthy relationships.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of participants demonstrated their increased confidence and skills	77%	88%	89%

Year 1 n= 315/506; Year 2 n=523/690; Year 3 n=539/539

**Indicator two - 25 per cent of young people in workshops (187 per year) demonstrate increased knowledge of early warning signs in questionnaires.**

**Table 6.**

	Year 1 Pre	Year 2 Pre	Year 3 Pre	Year 1 Post	Year 2 Post	Year 3 Post
Make you feel guilty	71%	76%	77%	86%	94%	91%
Ignore your feelings	70%	70%	72%	87%	91%	90%
Pressure you to drink alcohol	59%	67%	65%	80%	89%	89%
Control what you wear	64%	78%	76%	87%	95%	93%
Disrespect/humiliate	75%	84%	80%	83%	92%	91%
Push, shove, slap, hit	86%	94%	89%	83%	91%	87%
Keep you away from friends	80%	86%	84%	90%	92%	93%

Year 1 n= 396/506; Year 2 n=640/693 for pre; n=524/693 post; Year 3 n=570/593 for pre; n=593/593 post

**Indicator three - 70 per cent of young participants in workshops (525 per year) report feeling more confident about dealing with sexual bullying.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of participants that feel more confident about sexually bullying	86%	86%	88%

Year 1 n= 315/506; Year 2 n=524/690; Year 3 n=539/593

***Project Outcome 3***

**Indicator one- 25 per cent of young people in workshops (187 per year) notice a positive change in the attitudes or behaviour of their peers at school around the issues of violence and abuse.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of young people noticed a positive change in attitude/behavior of peers	52%	47%	52%

Year 1 n= 315/506; Year 2 n= 524/690; Year 3 n=539/593

**Indicator two - 80 per cent of teachers (24 per year) report positive change in the attitudes or behaviour of their students as a result of the project.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of teachers noticed positive behaviour	84%	81%	76%

Year 1 n= 19/39; Year 2 n= 27/35; Year 3 n=17/20

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
% of teachers noticed positive attitudes	87%	95%	94%

Year 1 n= 15/39; Year 2 n=24/35; Year 3 n=16/20

## Appendix II

### SEN Case Study

A number of successful projects were run in SEN schools across the partner areas. While these were not included in the evaluation, this case study provides an interesting account of the impact that the Tender Project might have on SEN students. We have anonymized the school name to ensure that confidentiality of students is ensured.

**Overview of school:** School Alpha caters for a wide variety of physical and emotional needs. The head teacher was fully supportive of the Tender project being delivered in their school and therefore all staff were involved. The facilitator met with the school nurse, psychologist TA's catering staff and teaching staff during the course of her work at school, in addition to the INSET. Two meetings with School Alpha were set up in advance of the project, and the facilitator spent two half days observing of some students who would be involved allowing for a plan of specific programme activities to be created in line with student ability. The activity programme was subsequently reviewed in school by staff members and amendment suggestion were emailed in advance to ensure that pupils abilities and specific needs of the School Alpha were met

**Overview of workshop and student engagement:** Material from Ariel Trust ([www.arieltrust.com](http://www.arieltrust.com)) was used to help develop materials, and all materials was developed in large print and braille. The workshops were delivered over two consecutive days with two TA's each day, and there was regular communication with staff about delivery and pupil response. All students successfully engaged, irrespective of differing abilities/needs. The pupils delivered a 1 hour performance to 45 of their peers from years 9-13 with outstanding confidence.

Year Group	Gender Split
Year 9	2 male 1 female
Year 10	0 male 2 female
Year 11	1 male 1 female
Year 12	0 male 3 female

**Outcomes:** While the workshop was not fully evaluated, it was clear that students gained in confidence from the experience, and were able to discuss a range of issues related to healthy relationships. Many pupils were able to successfully recall statistics, and some students suggested that taking part had given them time to meet new friends from other years, as usually pupils do no mix from other years

**Conclusions:** Given the lack of programmes designed specifically for young people with disabilities, there is scope for developing a specific SEN programme for tackling Healthy Relationships. This case study provides a good example of a whole school approach where there were good levels of communication and engagement, and it seems to have had a positive impact on your people. As such, one of the recommendations of this report is for Tender to work with a partner organization that has specific experience of working with SEN students to develop a more specific programme that can be rolled out and used in a variety of SEN settings.