

## **WEBINAR: ADVANCING RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: PARTNERING FOR IMPACT AND SCALE**

**7 APRIL 2020**

### **Questions and Answers**

Question for Susana: One of the study finding was "facilitators need support and training". What exactly the support means, how does it look like, and how should it be delivered (e.g. opportunity to meet with other facilitators to discuss implementation opportunities, challenges, etc. logistical support, technical support from implementation manager, etc.). Would be great to know details. From Peter....

One use of the findings of this study was that Mexfam - with support of SVRI - is in process of finalizing the development of a toolkit to support facilitators with conflict resolution skills and improvements in the ongoing training materials on gender and sexual diversity as well as GBV. The experience in Mexico suggests the importance of building ongoing exchange between facilitators themselves to trouble-shoot and discuss facilitation challenges. And also, it's important to highlight the technical support from the project manager, such as observation of facilitation sessions and providing feedback. More information, you can contact me [smedina@ippfwhr.org](mailto:smedina@ippfwhr.org)

Question for Susana: If we could speak about the challenges to work with the Mexican Ministry of Education to adapt and scale up a CSE program like the one of Mexfam to the national level. From Manuel...

When Mexfam presented the preliminary findings locally there was interest from ministry staff. Actually, Mexfam was preparing to host a launch event to share the findings of this study and disseminate the policy briefs in March, but this was cancelled due to COVID-19. Scale up will be an important challenge to translate these findings into policy use, and we have not yet been able to take this on.

Question for Shalini: Thanks, Shalini. Did you also assess the BCC alone as one arm (without CCT)? From Maria Beatrice...

**SR: We were not able to assess the impact of BCC alone (without food or cash). The reason is that the "main evaluation" on which we built the post-program IPV study was focused on understanding the impacts of food or cash transfers, with**

or without BCC, on household food security and child nutrition. A large randomized controlled trial (RCT) focusing solely on the impacts of BCC on child and maternal nutrition (“Alive and Thrive”; see [Menon et al. \(2016\)](#)) was concurrently underway in Bangladesh, and logistics limited the number of arms we could include in our RCT, so we did not include a BCC-only arm.

Although we cannot say conclusively what the post-program impacts on IPV would have been from BCC only, we hypothesize that BCC would not have had comparable effects absent the transfers. First, conditioning transfers on BCC likely led to the high rates of BCC participation; women’s restrictions on mobility and opportunity costs in terms of time would have plausibly limited BCC involvement without the incentive of transfers. Second, the importance of transfers is signaled by our suggestive evidence that women’s increased control over economic resources increased their threat points and that households’ increased well-being reduced conflict. More details are in the paper on our case study ([Roy et al. \(2019\)](#)).

Question for Shalini: Thanks, Shalini. I am wondering if social support may have played a role in reduced IPV (among BCC group) From Sarah Shuman

SR: Yes, we hypothesize that social support played an important role in reducing IPV among the BCC group. This is part of what we refer to as “social capital.” By nature of its design, the BCC led to weekly interaction with community members for women who were previously socially isolated, which likely increased their social ties and social capital. The BCC community meetings also made the importance of nutrition knowledge more salient in communities, and our evidence suggests that women’s increased knowledge of nutrition led them to experience greater interaction and respect in the community.

We believe the increased social support may have led to reduced IPV in several ways. First, it may have increased women’s bargaining power (or “threat points”) within their relationships. Second, it may have increased the social cost to men of perpetrating violence, consistent with the concept of “social control.” Prior evidence from Bangladesh shows that greater visibility of women in the public domain due to participation in program activities made it more difficult for husbands to perpetrate violence without incurring social scorn and that women’s group members put social pressure on men to stop beating their wives. More details are in the paper on our case study ([Roy et al. \(2019\)](#)).

Vandana - How are the podcasters selected, and what does the training include?  
From Jocelyn Lehrer

**VS: The podcasters were recruited from the refugee camp. Initial recruitment criteria included experience working in the community (for example with an NGO), and some experience with technology or journalism. In the end, we selected individuals who had previous experience on gender programming, including some who had worked as facilitators for the Unite for a Better Life in-person program.**

Vandana- were the podcasters paid? From Sarah Shuman

**VS: Yes, the podcasters were employed by the project and paid a monthly salary.**

Vandana - Question regarding finding that 'listeners shared with average 14 people'. Was there social diffusion approach incorporated in the intervention (e.g. were listeners specifically asked to share learnings/messages from podcasts with individuals in their reference group: family members, neighbors, etc.). If not, what was the incentive for them to share? From Peter.

**VS: Listeners were not specifically asked to share information with their family and friends. My sense is that they shared the information because they found it useful and relevant and believed their friends and family members would as well.**

Vandana - apart from the ability to listen to podcasts privately, were there any other characteristics of podcasts identified that make them more suitable/effective than traditional radio programming at addressing social norms and IPV? From Lara

**VS: The privacy component (being able to listen on their own on their own devices or in private at a Listening Center) was an important element. The podcast approach may also be more suitable compared to radio specifically for displaced populations who may be mobile and not able to access radio regularly. This approach also allows for peer-to-peer sharing so not dependent on radio broadcasts.**

Thank you to all our panelist, presenters and participants.