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The violence prevention field is moving beyond its infancy

First decade yielded new strategies able to reduce levels of VAW/C in years, not lifetimes

Widespread calls to adapt and scale models shown “to work”

But second-generation studies have not always reproduced the same positive findings
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*Operational foundations entails:
- Organisational Capacity
- Management Commitment
- Budget and Timeframe
- Trust and Community Linkages
Indashykirwa: Object lesson for the field

4-part IPV prevention programme implemented in rural Rwanda

- 21 Session couple’s curriculum recruited from VSLAs
- Opinion Leader Training
- Women’s Safe Spaces
- Community activism patterned after SASA program (community mobilization)
CASE 1: Indashyikirwa Couples Curriculum

**INDASHYIKIRWA 1.0**
- 21 session couple’s curriculum saw **significant reduction** in all types of IPV as reported by both men and women
- Consistent impact on other intervening variables

**MIGEPROF REPLICATION**
- Slightly modified couple’s program **increased risk** of IPV among couples who participate
- **Even greater increase** among VSLA members who were not selected to participate
- Hypothesis is that program increased backlash among men—especially partners who did not participate in training
CASE 1: Fact finding mission

Field staff encountered resistance from male participants, who were especially resistant to program content on women’s ability to initiate and refuse sex, the importance of shared economic decision-making, and the unfair division of household labor.

Qualitative research from Indashyikirwa 1.0 documented similar resistance early on, but this was aptly managed by facilitators. In the end, content on women’s ability to initiate and refuse sex was cited by couples as one of the most liked aspects of course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indashyikirwa</th>
<th>MIGEPROF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group size</strong></td>
<td>15 couples (30 individuals)</td>
<td>20 couples with maximum of 25 couples (50 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator experience and recruitment</strong></td>
<td>90% had prior experience in gender transformative work (many had implemented JOT)</td>
<td>33% had prior experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator training</strong></td>
<td>10-day training by master trainer at off-site retreat center</td>
<td>More Ad Hoc; Multiple senior staff from Indash 1.0 called in to teach sessions with little prep time or continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator practice</strong></td>
<td>Opportunity to give and receive feedback during month long pretest</td>
<td>No practice prior to implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator support</strong></td>
<td>1:7 ratio of supervisors to facilitators; monthly debriefs and trouble shooting</td>
<td>1:16 ratio of supervisors to facilitators; 2nd supervisor quit early on and was not replaced; No debriefs; no supervision in one sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management oversight</strong></td>
<td>CARE had lead responsibility for coordinating project; 3 FTE at CARE</td>
<td>No overall coordinator; MIGEPROF contracted 3 orgs independently; MIGEPROF lead was director of Great Lakes Project; District Coordinator resigned early on and was never replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psycho-social training</strong></td>
<td>Supplementary training in psycho-social &amp; trauma support and managing disclosures</td>
<td>No training in psycho-social support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indashyikirwa Journeys of Transformation SASA!
CASE 2: SASA! Community Component of Indashyikirwa

Original – in Kampala, Uganda

- Trained and supported community activists to reduce levels of IPV at a community level over 4 years
- SASA! showed **significant community-level reductions** on women’s risk of physical IPV and on the social acceptability of violence.

In Rwanda

- Trained and supported community activists to reduce levels of IPV at a community level over 3 years
- Indashyikirwa saw **no reduction** in IPV using ”adapted” SASA! program in rural Rwanda
SASA! Comparisons
(Kampala versus Indashyikirwa in Rwanda)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTION DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original SASA!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 community phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIT TO CONTEXT

• SASA’s community activism approach is highly informal
• Activists go to where people gather – tea stalls, moto repair shops, waiting rooms
FIT TO CONTEXT

• More “formal” highly controlled environment. Discomfort with “informal activism.”

• Needed permission to access existing spaces (DV committees; parents clubs)

• Therefore, limited diffusion & opportunities for interpersonal communication
“The CAs do not do informal activism. We push them to go to markets, churches, bus stations but they are shy. They don’t dare go there... I think this is related to the new approach because Rwandans are not familiar with this type of thing”

(RWAMREC Field Supervisor, Eastern Province)

“Rwandans are not used to discuss their issues in public. You need to choose a safer place to help people gain their trust. On the side of the road or a market is hard”

(RWAMREC Field Supervisor, Western Province)
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Take Home Message

- Must move beyond sweeping claims that a particular programme model “works” or “doesn’t work”!
- Need more emphasis on quality of implementation and fit for context
- More nuanced interpretation of research-based evidence
- Quantitative evaluations must be accompanied by qualitative studies and process evaluations
- Recognition that each evaluation is only one “piece of evidence”
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