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Executive Summary

SPRING is a 5-year accelerator programme funded by the Department for International Development (DFID), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). It supports business ventures to develop products and services which could transform the lives of adolescent girls. As one component of the overall evaluation of SPRING, the Impact Evaluation (IE) gathers information on the economic and social outcomes of girls who benefit from products and services delivered by SPRING businesses.

Fightback is a private company providing training in safety awareness and self-defence. Prior to SPRING, Fightback was largely provided to small groups of up to 50 participants. Primary clients were Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and institutions, and the participants were mostly women. With SPRING support, Fightback launched its prototype of a girl-focused training programme, which aims to raise girls’ awareness and ability to avoid and respond to threats to their safety, including sexual harassment, physical assaults and violent sexual crimes. The girl-focused training is delivered through schools, allowing for the scaling up of the Fightback programme through reaching up to 1,000 adolescent girls in each training session. Fightback training is charged at 1,000 Nepali rupees ($10) per person for a 3-day course. There are three models of payment: schools split the cost with parents; parents pay the entire cost; or, to target lower income households, Fightback partner with Government or other organisations to provide a cross-subsidisation initiative free of charge to the participant.

The Fightback Theory of Change (ToC) states that after receiving the training, girls acquire a physical, vocal and mental skill set, leading them to feel safer and more confident and helping them mitigate potentially harmful situations. By learning with their peers’ adolescent girls also acquire greater self-confidence. Likewise, parents of the trained girls feel more confident allowing their daughter to engage in educational or economic activities outside the home (girls gain mobility) if parents safety concerns for their daughter are reduced.

This evaluation tests the Fightback ToC and whether the impact to all adolescent girls participating in Fightback is attributable to SPRING. A mixed-methods approach was used to collect qualitative and quantitative data girls in four treatment schools at baseline (prior to engaging in the training) and endline (eight months after training), and from girls that did not receive training in three comparison schools. Fightback’s own monitoring & evaluation (M&E) data, collected immediately before (pre) and immediately after (post) the training, provided additional data collection points and was also analysed. The IE tracks girls’ knowledge, attitudes and practices of self-defence and pro-active protection techniques, feelings of safety and general well-being and confidence. A total 590 survey respondents were matched in the treatment group, and 510 in the comparison group across baseline and endline, supplemented by qualitative research in the treatment group.

Key findings include:

Awareness of safety

At baseline we sought to establish girls’ awareness of safety issues to understand the threats to safety they perceived in their daily lives. Our findings reflect that girls were more aware of instances of teasing and bullying through social media or spoken word, than any other threats to personal safety. Girls aged 14 – 16 years were significantly more likely to know of girls that had experienced safety issues than girls 10 – 13 years of age. There was little difference in the experience of safety issues between treatment and comparison groups.

---

1 The Nike Foundation was a funder in the earlier stage of SPRING.
2 At the time of joining SPRING, Fightback was not established as a separate enterprise and was an intervention within the Paritran private company. Paritran has since established Fightback as a separate private enterprise concentrating only on self-defence and safety awareness training. For the sake of consistency in this report we will refer to both the prototype and the business as Fightback.
3 Paritran and Fightback also provide grant-funded self-defence training, most notably: DFID Integrated Programme for Strengthening Security and Justice (IP-SSJ) which was delivered to smaller groups of girls in rural communities during the SPRING programme; and Grand Challenges Canada Grant Fund (GCC) which targets school girls from lower income households. SPRING Investment Support assisted Paritran to secure GCC funding.
4 All schools included in this IE were private schools, which is consistent with Fightback’s initial business targeting and training delivery over the evaluation period. However, the participants in this IE tend to be from a background of privilege and protection relative to girls on average.
Learning how to stay safe - tested recall

At endline\(^5\), trained girls demonstrated a high level of recall of the theory they had been taught during the Fightback programme, achieving an average test score of 90%. This represented a significant improvement on their average baseline test score of 10%. Only a slight decrease in knowledge between Fightback’s post-training test and the evaluation endline test was evident.

Qualitative feedback provided further insight that the loss of recall was a combination of not needing to put self-defence techniques into practice and some feeling that the training programme was too short to allow girls to integrate the new information into their memories.

At endline, girls demonstrated the highest recall of being able to use their voice as a self-defence weapon (99%) and lowest recall of the key characteristic that would make them vulnerable (83%) or how to respond to a physical attack (83%). The efficiency of acquiring skills in verbal self-defence, or voice as self-defence, in the three-day programme was highlighted in the SPRING Business Performance Evaluation (BPE) case study report. Those aged 14-16 years showed a slightly higher recall than those aged 10-13.

Anticipated response to safety risks

Looking at the differences between baseline and endline, trained girls were significantly more likely to state they would respond to a threatening situation by fighting (+25%) or running away (+15%) than at baseline or compared with girls who had not been trained. These are the safety response techniques taught by the Fightback programme and suggest that the training has improved girls’ knowledge of how to respond rapidly to a potential threat.

However, at endline over half of trained girls were worried they would get into trouble for being in a situation where their safety was at risk (57%), which suggests that blame and shame it still an issue. Age had little bearing on how girls perceived they would respond to an incident.

At endline, trained girls were significantly more likely to anticipate speaking to somebody if something happened to them than they were at baseline or compared with girls who had not received training. This suggests that Fightback training has improved girls’ safety through encouraging them to speak out and report threats to their safety.

Perceived ability to stay safe

At endline, trained girls felt significantly more able to recognise and respond to potentially harmful situations than before they received training or than girls who did not receive training. In particular, trained girls felt more able to use their voice as a weapon (99%), manage fear and stress under threat (74%), or identify a dangerous situation (72%) than respond to sexual harassment early (67%) or identify a potential criminal (61%).

Surveys administered to the treatment group immediately after training (post-survey) and endline reflect a slight decline in perceived ability eight months after training. The greatest decline was evident in girls perceived ability to respond early to sexual harassment and their ability to identify a potential criminal. The smallest decline was noted for girls’ ability to use their voice as defence.

Feelings of safety

At endline, trained girls felt safest at home (97%) and at school (92%) and least safe while travelling on public transport (57%). Looking at the differences between baseline and endline, the areas of strongest improvements in feelings of safety amongst trained girls were noted where they participated in extra-curricular activities (+16%); where they spent time by themselves (+13%), were at school (+12%) or travelled on public transport (+11%). This suggests Fightback training has been particularly effective in helping girls feel safer when in public spaces.

At endline, most trained girls were satisfied with their safety (86%), and seven in ten were satisfied with their ability to defend themselves (74%) or avoid dangerous situations (71%). Looking at the differences between baseline and endline, the areas of strongest improvement were in girls’ satisfaction with their ability to defend themselves against (+38%) or avoid (+27%) dangerous situations. This suggests that training has enhanced girls’ ability to stay safe.

\(^5\) Approximately eight months after baseline data collection.
Wellbeing

Looking at differences between baseline and endline, and using the framework of the Paediatric Quality of Life Enjoyment and Satisfaction Questionnaire (PQ-LES-Q)\(^6\), trained girls rated their ability to get things done (+12%); play/free time (+12%); energy (+10%); mood and feelings (+9%); love and affection (+8%); health (+6%); and life overall (+7%), significantly higher at endline than at baseline or than girls who had not been trained. Differences between baseline and endline also reflect that trained girls were more satisfied with their self-confidence (+16%), friendships (+11%), and life overall (+15%). This reflects that girls enjoyed wider psychological benefits and an improved sense of control over their lives after Fightback training.

At endline, 35% of trained girls stated they had taken up a new activity in the last six months\(^7\). This was significantly more than the 27% of girls who had not received training. Taking up a new activity, suggesting training might improve girls' mobility. However, qualitative research reflected that trained girls' daily routines had not changed much between baseline and endline. While research suggests girls felt more confident when going about their daily activities, they largely followed the same schedules, frequented the same places and held the same patterns of travel as before the baseline. Parents cited the brief duration of the training as the main reason they had not re-evaluated their child’s freedom. They reported that they did not feel that three-days was sufficient preparation for their daughters to assume greater risks.

Differences between baseline and endline reflect that trained girls were slightly more satisfied with their freedom (+10%) and what they did in their free time (+3%). This is consistent with qualitative feedback which reflects that while girls may not have been granted additional freedom, they were more confident to enjoy the freedom they had.

Attribution and contribution

SPRING has recorded 5,595 girls reached through the programme during 2016 – 2018 and Fightback report that by May 2019, they had reached 12,751 girls. While this is somewhat behind Fightback’s target to reach 13,000 girls in its second year of launch and 30,000 girls by 2020, it does reflect the business is showing promising and accelerated growth since launch. At endline, when asked if the training had helped them, 98% of girls agreed that it had, spontaneously citing that the training had: made them feel more confident (47%), safer (15%) and able to walk around their community.

When asked the most important thing they had learnt from the training, while most girls cited a learning associated with self-defence training, such as self-defence techniques, safety awareness or response to danger; a significant minority of girls (22%) felt the most important thing they had learnt was to be confident.

At endline, nearly all trained girls felt their confidence (88%), ability to defend themselves (96%), feel safe (92%), and able to stay away from danger (92%) had improved. Nearly six in ten girls felt their self-defence skills and self-confidence had improved a lot.

Unintended consequences

Qualitative feedback suggests a high incidence of girls sharing their training with others in their family. This can be expected to not only raise household awareness of safety issues but shift social taboos on blame and shame.

Similarly, moderate changes in attitudes regarding boys’ safety in their communities were realised indirectly through the Fightback training. At baseline, self-defence training was seen as less necessary for male audiences as boys were deemed less vulnerable. Where respondents did think that boys should attend self-defence training, it was typically so that boys could also learn about girl safety issues and help protect girls. After the training, roughly 30% of interviewed parents and children still thought that boys should receive the training for the benefit of girls, but the majority also believed boys would benefit from protection information. Furthermore, by endline, respondents were more convinced of the dangers that boys faced in their community. While training did not appear to change boy-girl relations it did appear to raise community sensitivity to abuse beyond that of the attendees alone\(^8\).

We thought that self-defence training might lead to an increase of girls fighting with other girls and boys using the self-defence techniques taught or that girls might start behaving in an unsafe way. However, neither of these possible unintended consequences were evident in the research findings.


\(^7\) New activities included: dance, drama classes, basketball or additional studies.

\(^8\) In the last year (2018-2019) Fightback has introduced self-defence training for school boys.
Overall evidence of impact

Fightback has succeeded in delivering the depth of impact as anticipated and gone partway to achieving its targeted girl reach. Table 1 below summarises the key impact pillars and compares the areas the Fightback prototype was expected to impact against where evidence suggests it has succeeded.

Table 1: Overall evidence of impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Earning</th>
<th>Saving</th>
<th>Safety (&amp; Learning)</th>
<th>Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Direct benefit through training to improve safety awareness and self-defence skills; leading to safer behaviour change</td>
<td>Direct benefit through improved confidence, peer network and agency; shift in shame and blame culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Impact</td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Impact</td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to look at impact within each pillar:

- **Safety:** There is clear evidence that girls who participate in Fightback training feel safer as a result of it: they feel safer after training and relative to the comparison group, particularly in public spaces; and they spontaneously cite that training has helped them feel more confident, safer and able to move around their community. Evidence also suggests that training has enhanced girls’ preparedness for rapid response and in particular, the efficiency in learning ‘verbal judo’ within a three-day programme. However, there is mixed evidence that Fightback succeeded in addressing taboos around blame and shame: while girls are more likely to share incidences of risks to safety after training than before, they are also more likely to be worried about getting into trouble for it.

- **Wellbeing:** There is clear evidence that Fightback training improves girls’ perceptions of their psychological and physical wellbeing, but there is less evidence that Fightback has succeeded in improving girls’ mobility and freedom. By and large, while girls adhere to their existing daily routines, they feel more confident and happier going about their daily routines.

Summary of impact

- Improved feeling of situational safety and improved satisfaction with ability to keep themselves safe.
- Improved knowledge of safety and self-defence techniques.
- Improved rating of self-assessed psychological and physical health.
- Improved satisfaction with friendships, self-confidence and satisfaction with life overall.

Implications for Fightback

Reflecting on the findings, the following implications can be drawn for Fightback and their future business:

- Girls and parents alike felt the course was too short to produce long-term change, requiring repeat intervention to properly absorb. However, Fightback do already offer refresher training to schools and have not had much direct demand from girls or their parents for additional self-defence classes. This suggests there may still be an opportunity for Fightback to promote the need and opportunity for additional training classes via another channel.

9 Note: Shade of colour denotes strength or weakness of impact, darker green showing higher impact and lighter green, less impact.
Girls demonstrate the highest recall for scenarios they experience and techniques they apply on a regular basis. They demonstrate lower recall for techniques they do not apply on a regular basis, e.g. application of physical self-defence techniques. This can be addressed through tailored refresher training.

Research findings reflect that younger girls recalled slightly less than older girls and it is to be expected that different ages absorb information differently. This can present a challenge for mass training. Trainers need to be mindful of establishing correct pace of training that suits both young and old alike.

While Fightback has concentrated on the most serious acts of sexual violence against women and girls, findings reflect that teasing, bullying and harassment are a common source of threat to girls’ wellbeing and feelings of safety and could benefit from greater focus in future training content.

Programme implications

Reflecting on the findings, the following implications can be drawn for SPRING and future programming:

- SPRING programme has succeeded in helping Fightback to both identify the adolescent girl market for self-defence training and also to understand the specific needs of adolescent girls. The impact evaluation demonstrates that girls have benefited from improved perceptions of self-confidence and safety as are result and the Fightback business has proved to be a success for the programme.

- The findings reflect that schools provide an effective means of accessing younger adolescent girls in large numbers in a safe environment. Moreover, while younger girls recall slightly less, the findings indicate they derive greater benefit in self-esteem through the training and this could potentially create a different pathway for girls in how they manage their day-to-day lives.

- Findings point to the success of the training programme in improving girls’ feelings of safety and self-confidence. However, at this stage, the training has not produced the depth of impact to change girls’ mobility or their ability to learn and earn, as outlined the ToC. It is likely that a greater frequency of training would be required to produce this type of outcome and impact, reflecting the limitations of the three-day programme in delivering long-term change.

- Targeting private schools and parents has proved an effective mechanism to reach adolescent girls. However, the business model relies on the ability of parents and schools to pay for the training, which suggests that without grant funding, the needs of girls who cannot afford to pay for training go unmet.

- In recognition of this shortfall, SPRING’s provided investment support to assist Fightback to secure additional grant funding to address the needs of the BOP, most notably the Grand Challenge Canada Grant (GCC). In the last year (2018-2019), Fightback has also actively pursued a low-income cross-subsidisation programme to provide Fightback training that is fully subsidised by Government or other organisations, to girls in lower-income schools.

- Despite the success of the training programme, Fightback did not achieve its SPRING targets, though the business is now growing at an accelerated rate. This reflects both that small business growth may take more time than programme assumptions allowed for; but also, that there were either incorrect assumptions in the forecast model or in the business implementation. Understanding why Fightback has not achieved its predicted target is important in identifying how the programme may have achieved better girl reach.

- There is evidence that through sharing the training content and techniques with their families, girls raise awareness of safety issues and challenge social taboos around blame and shame, presenting girls as victims and not instigators of harassment. Evidence also suggest that training helps girls to speak out.
1. Context

1.1 Purpose and structure of this document

This document presents the findings from the impact evaluation (IE) research for Fightback, a business supported during the second SPRING cohort (October 2016 – July 2017). The report is divided into four sections. Section 1 provides an overview of the SPRING impact evaluation, and an introduction to Fightback’s SPRING prototype, Fightback Girls, and IE design and methodology. Section 2 presents the research findings in line with the Fightback’s Theory of Change (ToC), mapping the findings across the impact pillars of: safety and well-being. Section 3 presents the conclusions against the evaluation questions before interpreting these in Section 4 with lessons for the business and, Section 5, lessons for the programme.

Annexes A, B and C provide tabular detailed results from a series of examination tests set for girls to test their recall of training. Annex D provides a detailed description of the evaluation Methodology and Fieldwork. Copies of the data collection tools are provided in the following Annexes:

- Annex E: Endline Survey;
- Annex F: Key Informant Interview (KII) guide; and
- Annex G: Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide.

1.2 Overview of the SPRING Impact Evaluation

SPRING is a five-year accelerator programme that supports business ventures to develop products and services to help girls earn, learn, save, keep safe and experience increased well-being. SPRING envisages that their successful engagement with businesses will lead to a broader shift in markets that enable girls and their communities to contribute to ending the cycle of poverty.

As one of the three components of the SPRING evaluation, the IE provides evidence of the overall effects of SPRING in terms of improvements in economic and social outcomes for girls as a result of using products and services delivered by SPRING businesses. While other components focus on how well the programme works and what works (or does not work) well, the IE contributes evidence to help understand the effect of SPRING-funded business activities on the socio-economic circumstances of the adolescent girls. Over the lifetime of SPRING, the evaluation team will conduct a total of eight IEs, two per cohort.

Following an evaluability assessment of Cohort 2 businesses, and in consultation with the IP, Fightback and iSocial were selected for the IEs for Cohort 2. This report presents the findings from the impact evaluation research for Fightback’s programme.

1.3 Introduction to Fightback

1.3.1 Description of the business and prototype

Fightback is a private company providing self-defence and safety awareness training for women of all age groups, physical conditions and socio-economic backgrounds and aims to address the skills deficit to counter sexual harassment, physical assaults and violent sexual crimes.

The Fightback training programme seeks to empower and enable women to avert, mitigate, confront and/or escape from the perpetrators of violent sexual crimes. It is designed for women who have not had any previous exposure to any forms of martial arts or combative training, to be easy to learn and assimilate. The focus is on simple life saving tools and techniques uniquely designed with a specific purpose – protection of women at their most vulnerable state.

10 Details of the Fightback evaluation, including the evaluation design, data collection methodology, data sources, sampling strategy are provided in Annex C.

11 At the time of joining SPRING, Fightback was not established as a separate enterprise and was an intervention within the Paritran private company. Paritran has since established Fightback as a separate private enterprise concentrating only on self-defence and safety awareness training. For the sake of consistency in this report we will refer to both the prototype and the business as Fightback.
With SPRING funding, Fightback launched their SPRING prototype: en masse training programme delivered to adolescent girls through schools, reaching as many as 1,000 in one training session.

The Fightback Girls mass training is slightly modified on the original Fightback programme to suit a large group of younger participants. Additionally, through their SPRING girl research, Fightback realised that to improve girls’ safety, training itself needed to focus on improving girls’ self-confidence as well as self-defence skills. Fightback girls training thus has a greater focus on activities to build girls self-confidence, such as role play, group exercises and speaking up in trainings12.

The girl mass training model has allowed the business to scale up by targeting adolescent girls in school.

Fightback girls training is charged at 1,000 Nepali rupees ($10) per person for a 3-day course and 300 rupees for a 1-day course. Within the prototype, generally schools split this cost 50:50 with parents or parents cover the entire cost themselves. The only exception to this is where institutions (e.g. NGOs or donors) fund training, as was the case with St Mary’s Ward School, which was funded by an alumni group of the school. Fightback has set a target of reaching 30,000 girls by 2020, which is equivalent to providing training to approximately 30-35 schools13.

Fightback also envisioned providing sensitisation sessions, or workshops, for parents of girls who participated in the Fightback training. Through discussion and presentation of evidence, the workshops aimed to raise parental awareness and recognition of girls as victims of crime rather than instigators, so shifting norms of shame and blame in crimes against girls.

The Fightback Girls prototype has largely remained unchanged through the evaluation. The only notable changes were implementation challenges of a lack of demand for parental sensitisation sessions14, which meant that no parental sensitisation sessions were delivered to parents whose daughters attended the evaluation treatment schools15; and difficulties coordinating schools to achieve en masse training numbers originally envisaged.

1.3.2 Fightback Girls Theory of Change

The ToC of Fightback Girls envisions that by attending an en masse training session, girls gain a physical, vocal, and mental skill set that will lead to their greater safety and confidence and help to mitigate harmful situations. In addition, training in large groups with peers will create a sense of power through the creation of a network of empowered and strong girls, also leading to improved self-confidence. Lastly, through the programme’s engagement and sensitisation with parents, parents will feel more able to allow girls to engage in economic or educational activities outside of the home, and parents will increasingly recognise girls as victims rather than instigators of violence, shifting the norm around ‘shame and blame’ culture of violence against girls, resulting in girls’ greater mobility.

1.4 Fightback Impact Evaluation design

The IE tests if the impact to all adolescent girls participating in the en masse Fightback Girls programme are attributable to SPRING.

To assess the attribution of the impact of Fightback Girls mass training programme, we used a quasi-experimental impact evaluation approach comprised of treatment and comparison group data collected at baseline and endline. The impact evaluation utilises quantitative surveys as well as qualitative KIIs and FGDs. We collected baseline data between May – August 2018 to coincide with Fightback’s training schedule. Baseline data was collected a few days before Fightback Girls training was delivered to each of the treatment schools. Comparison school’s data collected was scheduled between data collection from the treatment schools. Endline data was collected approximately eight months after baseline. Further details of the methodology, including a detailed schedule of baseline and endline data collection for each school and the criterion for selecting comparison schools, is detailed in full in Annex D.

12 See SPRING Cohort 2 Fightback BPE Case Study Report.
13 Outside of the prototype, Fightback training may be fully funded by institutions or as part of specific programmes, e.g. where Paritran delivered training funded by DFID’s IP-SSJ programme.
14 The lack of demand for the sessions is believed to be a combination of a lack of willingness amongst schools to pass on the cost of attending the sessions and a lack of time amongst working parents.
15 While Fightback are still committed to providing the sensitisation sessions, only six parental sensitisation sessions have been taken up by parents in schools in Kathmandu due to a low demand and absence of momentum in schools to promote this opportunity for discourse to parents.
The IE is guided by the overall impact evaluation questions from the SPRING M&E Evaluation Framework. Building on this framework, the evaluability assessment identified the following pathways to impact adolescent girls:

- **Providing learning through teaching skills of awareness and self-defence**: Adolescent girls 10 – 19 years old will participate in 1 to 3-day training on awareness of their surroundings, pro-active protection and self-defence techniques.

- **Improving safety and wellbeing**: Adolescent girls are taught safety techniques, which ensures their wellbeing.

- **Promoting empowerment**: Girls become more empowered through course training through improved confidence and involvement in peer network.

- **Greater mobility**: Girls gain greater mobility when parents are sensitised. If parents’ fears about girls’ safety are reduced, they will feel more able to allow girls to engage in educational or economic activities outside the home. Parental sensitisation will also lead to recognition of girls as victims rather than instigators, shifting norms around violence against girls (“shame and blame”).

The IE assesses the retained knowledge directly attributable to Fightback Girls training and the impact of this knowledge on girls’ overall sense of wellbeing; and their perception of their ability to stay safe and defend themselves using techniques learned during Fightback training. Perception is used as a proxy for girls’ ability to stay safe.

1.4.2 Data sources

The Fightback Girls impact evaluation draws on qualitative and quantitative primary data:

1.4.3 Quantitative data collection

There are two components of quantitative data collection:

1. **The Pre/Post-training survey**: This is a self-complete survey designed by Coffey and Fightback, and part of Fightback’s ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). The survey was administered as a census of the adolescent girls who participated in the training, completed before the training is administered and then again immediately following the training. The survey was administered by Fightback and processed by Foundations for Development Management (FDM), the local research partner. The pre and post surveys were only administered to the treatment group (girls that received training).

2. **The baseline/endline survey**: This was an facilitator-led self-complete survey designed by Coffey. The was the main tool designed to collect data on the outcome and high-level indicators of Fightback’s ToC and girl impact pathways. It was administered to a sample of trained adolescent girls and a comparative sample of girls who did not participate in the training. FDM both administered and processed the survey. The baseline and endline surveys were administered to both treatment and comparison groups.

1.4.4 Qualitative tools

Qualitative tools were designed to supplement the baseline survey and were only administered to the treatment group. All qualitative research was conducted by FDM. There are three components of qualitative data collection:

3. **KII**s conducted with headteachers.

4. **Paired KII**s with adolescent girls who participated in trainings, and separate KIIIs with their guardians.

5. **FGDs** with adolescent girls who participated in trainings, and an additional FGD held with a comparable sample of boys who did not participate in training.

At both baseline and endline, the qualitative tools were administered to girls in the treatment group to gather further information on girls’ knowledge, perception, and experiences of safety issues as well as their overall wellbeing.

Coffey partnered with FDM for data collection purposes. Coffey designed the data collection tools in collaboration with FDM and Fightback.

1.5 Final achieved and matched sample

The sampling frame captures information from a representative sample of girl beneficiaries who benefited from the training as well as a comparison group of girls that have not received training. At the point of design, Fightback
Girls planned to train three schools in the last academic term of 2018 and we used this as a basis for our sample design. Ultimately, changes in the schools training schedule required us to extend our fieldwork period as well as include an additional treatment school. Data collection from the comparison schools was contingent on training (and data collection) from the treatment schools.\textsuperscript{16}

Figure 1 outlines the different stages of data collection. Each stage is detailed below.

**Figure 1: Stages of data collection for Fightback Girls evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment – Girls trained</th>
<th>Comparison – Girls not trained</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASELINE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected a few days prior</td>
<td>Data collected to coincide with treatment group data collection: 500 Test A Surveys across three schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fightback training: 596 Test A Surveys; 9 parent/girl paired KIIs; 3 teacher KIIs; 4 focus groups across four schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAY – AUG 2018: A few days before training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE &amp; POST TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected immediately prior training via self-completion: 530 Test B Surveys matched.</td>
<td></td>
<td>First day of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected immediately after three-day training via self completion: 530 Test B surveys matched.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day of 3-day training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDLINE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected roughly eight months after Fightback training: 590 matched Test A &amp; B Surveys; 9 parent/girl paired KIIs; 3 teacher KIIs; 4 focus groups across four schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEB-MAR 2019: Eight months after baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected roughly eight months after baseline data collection: 501 Test A Surveys across three schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.1 **Completed interviews – Quantitative Surveys**

A total 590 quantitative surveys were matched at baseline and endline across the intervention schools, and 501 surveys were matched across the comparison schools. Table 2 details sample achieved at each school.

**Table 2: Quantitative Survey - Final matched sample achieved, treatment and comparison schools (endline)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Target\textsuperscript{17}</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline / Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apex Life School</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Godavari (SXG)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Jawalakhel (SXJ)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Excelsior School</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16} Further details on the sample design can be found in Annex D: Fieldwork Methodology.  
\textsuperscript{17} Targets are the initial figures provided by schools on the estimated number of participants to participate in the training. At baseline, all girls who were participating in Fightback training and present on the day of data collection were interviewed. At endline, we surveyed all girls interviewed at baseline. The target for Nightingale comparison schools was exceeded because the number of students per class was larger than anticipated.
## 1.5.2 Quantitative data analysis and matching

In addition to the baseline and endline data collected, Fightback Girls’s own pre-and-post survey data was processed, analysed and matched to the endline sample. Only the respondents who could be matched across the pre-survey and post-survey datasets were kept in the pre-and-post survey analysis. 77 students who appeared only in the pre-survey or in the post-survey dataset were subsequently removed (58 students from the pre-survey, 19 from the post-survey). The resulting pre-and-post survey dataset was then matched with the endline dataset. 24 students who could not be found in the endline dataset were removed from analysis. The resulting cohort size for the pre-and-post survey was of 530 students.

Throughout the report, we use difference-in difference (DID) analysis to highlight the additionality of participating in Fightback Girls training on girls’ awareness and knowledge of safety and self-defence, their feelings of safety and their overall wellbeing.

### 1.5.3 Completed Key Informant Interviews

A total 21 KIIs were completed at baseline and endline: three KIIs with headteachers and nine paired girl and parent KIIs. Three girl and parent KIIs were replaced at endline, but the remaining 15 KIIs were completed with the same participants at both baseline and endline. The final achieved sample is detailed in Annex D.

### 1.5.4 Completed Focus Group Discussions

Four focus group discussions were completed at both baseline and endline across the first three intervention schools. The final achieved sample is detailed in Annex D.

### 1.6 Respondent profile

The basic demographics of participants in the endline data collection are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>The average age of girls who received Fightback training was 14 years: 46% were aged 10 - 13, 44% were aged 14 - 15 and 9% were 16 years of age. The average age of girls in that did not receive training was 14 as well. 33% were aged 10 - 13, 55% were aged 14 - 15 and 11% were 16 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>A third (31%) of trained girls sampled were from Excelsior, a third (35%) were from St. Xavier’s Godavari (SXG), 20% were from St. Xavier’s Jawalakhel (SXJ) and 15% were from Apex School. Half (49%) of girls in the that were not trained were from Nightingale school, 23% were from Creative and 28% were from Patshala schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>A third (33%) of girls trained were in grade 5-7, a quarter of girls (24%) were in grade 8. Four in ten (41%) of girls trained were in grades 9 – 10. In the comparison group, a quarter (23%) of girls were in grade 5-7, a quarter of girls (25%) were in grade 8 and 52% of girls were in grades 9-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Half (54%) of girls trained were from the Kathmandu district, compared with a third (32%) of girls not trained; 44% of trained girls and the same 44% of untrained girls were from Lalitpur; the same 2% of trained and of untrained girls were from Bhaktapur; and 23% of girls not trained were from Kirtipur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Probability Index (PPI)(^{18})</td>
<td>PPI scores were calculated using the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool for Nepal and data collected at endline. The PPI score ranges from 0 to 100, its value being a proxy to poverty likelihoods(^{19}). The mean PPI score across in intervention group was 60, and 61 in the comparison group(^{20}). According to the Index, there is a 2.3% chance that a person in Nepal with an index rating of 60 or 61 lives on less than $1.25 a day (2005 PPP); a 17.7% they live on less than $2 a day and a 42.3% chance they live on less than $2.50 a day.(^{21})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>The Washington Group Short Set of Disability Questions was included in the baseline survey. Seven percent of those in the treatment group and 3% of those in the comparison group reported some form of disability. Across all respondents to the surveys, 0.9% reported great difficulty and 0.7% reported inability to see; 0.2% reported great difficulty and 0.2% reported inability to hear; 0.5% reported great difficulty to walk or climb steps; 2.8% reported great difficulty, and 0.3% inability to remember or concentrate on activities; 0.6% reported great difficulty and 0.4% reported inability to provide self-care(^{22}).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) All SPRING impact evaluations use PPI as a proxy for poverty. 
\(^{19}\) More information on PPI score calculations for Nepal as well as poverty likelihood equivalences can be found here: https://www.povertyindex.org/country/nepal. 
\(^{20}\) The PPI uses data collected from ten questions about household characteristics and asset ownership and calculates the likelihood that the household is living below the poverty line. Questions are tailored to each country: http://www.progressoutofpoverty.org/country/nepal. 
\(^{21}\) This low incidence of poverty is consistent with Fightback’s purposeful targeting of private schools in the Kathmandu region, 
\(^{22}\) Note – we anticipate the latter response was a misinterpretation of the question as the Coffey Evaluation team met completed a KII with this respondent during which she did not mention nor display any obvious issues with self-care.
2 Findings

This section details findings from data collected throughout the Fightback Girls IE:

- Section 2.1 reports on awareness of safety and who girls have spoken to about safety concerns
- Section 2.2 reports on girls’ recall of the Fightback training programme and their anticipated response to a potentially harmful situation;
- Section 2.3 reports on girls perceived ability to stay safe both before and after training;
- Section 2.4 details girls’ feelings of safety in different situations, as well as satisfaction with safety overall;
- Section 2.5 details girls’ perception of their quality of life and overall wellbeing;
- Section 2.6 explores attribution & contribution of SPRING to girl impact
- Section 2.7 explores unintended consequences of the Fightback programme

Throughout the report: use of the terms ‘baseline and endline’ refers to data collected by Coffey from both treatment and control groups as part of the evaluation; use of the terms ‘pre and post training’ refers to data that was collected by Fightback immediately before and after training as part of their ongoing M&E.

2.1 Safety awareness

Spring’s landscape study documents that violence against girls is a major concern for girls and their parents in Nepal. Social norms and taboos create an environment where girls are seen instigators instead of victims of violence. Fightback Girls’ ToC recognises the threat to girls’ safety and states that girls are subject to safety risks and that by attending Fightback Girls’ en masse training girls improve their awareness and ability to manage situations where they might feel vulnerable or at risk. It encourages girls to speak out about their safety concerns.

To test Fightback Girls’ assumption that girls were subject to threats to their safety, our first step at baseline was to collect data on girls’ awareness of safety issues, who they had spoken to about safety concerns, and their perceived need for self-defence training to confirm the need for the training programme.

2.1.1 Awareness of Safety Issues

At baseline, to establish girls’ awareness of safety issues we asked them if they were aware of potential risks to their safety.

Their responses are detailed in Box 1 below and reflect that treatment girls were most likely to be aware of instances of verbal bullying/harassment, with 53% aware of unpleasant teasing and 45% of unpleasant comments. A significant minority were also aware of teasing and intimidation through social media or text and phone calls. While the Fightback Girls training programme does place some focus on how girls handle teasing and bullying, it is not the primary emphasis of the training programme.

Over four in ten (42%) were aware of girls feeling harassed on public transport, 36% were aware instances of theft, 32% were aware of girls who had been inappropriately touched and 29% were aware of girls who had been followed by a stranger in a public place. These are all core themes in the Fightback Girls training programme.

Girls aged 14 – 16 years were significantly more likely to know of girls who had experienced safety issues than girls 10 – 13 years of age. The only exception was the experience of having something stolen, where older girls were only slightly more likely to know of girls who had something stolen than younger girls (39% v 33%, respectively). PPI score had little bearing on girls’ experience of safety issues.

With the exception of being followed in a public place, there were no statistically significant differences in the awareness of any of the measured safety issues between the treatment and comparison groups.

---
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Box 1: Awareness of safety issues in the treatment community at BASELINE (heard of girls like them experiencing issues %)

Box 1. Summary of girls’ safety awareness:

- At baseline girls were more aware of instances of verbal teasing and bullying than any other safety issue. Girls aged 14 – 16 years were significantly more likely to know of girls who had experienced risks to their safety than girls 10 – 13 years of age. There was little difference in the awareness of safety issues between treatment and comparison groups.

- Overall, girls at baseline were most likely to have spoken to an adult in their home and their friends about safety issues. Girls in the comparison group were significantly more likely to have spoken to someone about safety issues than those in the treatment group.

- Girls in the treatment group opted to participate in Fightback training to improve their self-defence knowledge; parents supported the training to improve their daughters’ self-defence, safety and confidence.

From qualitative feedback, when describing their awareness of safety issues, most girls were not aware of issues at home or at school.

A few girls mentioned incidents of other girls who had been bullied by boys at school, though none reported a sexual element to this teasing. There was one story of sexual harassment by a member of staff at school, shared by a student informant. This staff member had inappropriately touched a student at the school and had been subsequently fired.

When asked about more specific incidents, girls were more likely to be concerned about cyber bullying and harassment:

“Probably cybercrimes through the sharing of photos and videos, girls hanging out at late night at pub and bars, girls getting friendly with the boys they do not know and trusting someone very fast without knowing their background.” KII Girl 8 Baseline

“I don’t feel unsafe in my locality. Neither do I feel unsafe in my school. But I feel unsafe over social media where people can easily defame you and make you uncomfortable in front of hundreds.” KII Girl 6 Baseline

Parents also voiced similar concerns for their daughters:

“Now I think education in the home has changed a lot but still more education is required since many are not aware of problems that can occur via tab, internet, TV, mobile and computer.” KII Parent 8 Baseline

“I also have various concerns about other negative things that she might have picked up. Although we do not give her much access to mobile phones or laptops, she might have picked up a few things from when she is with her friends or other people, might have watched videos with adult content. She will not share these things with her parents obviously. The children these days are very forward, and I just doubt she might have been exposed to contents like those.” KII Parent 2 Baseline

Public spaces presented girls with risks of sexual harassment and discomfort that home and school did not. A participant in an endline focus group with SXG schoolgirls said that she was scared to go to a grocery store alone, because her friend had had an incident where she was harassed by the owner of the store.

One girl gave a more proximate account:

“Yesterday after my exams, I went out with friends. I was wearing a small skirt because it was really hot. We were walking around Pulchowk and my friend told me that people were staring at my legs. I became uncomfortable and conscious. So, instead of roaming around I went to a restaurant with my friends and sat there where I could sit comfortably. This type of things makes me awkward and conscious about myself.” KII Girl 5 Baseline

While another girl shared the experience of a friend of hers who received unwanted attention on a public bus.

“She feels her bus conductor always stares and looks her in a weird way which always makes her uncomfortable. She is not even sure whether it is just her imagination, or he is actually doing this to make her feel uncomfortable.” KII GIRL 7 Baseline

These examples reinforce the need for self-defence education in the first place.
2.1.2 Who girls had spoken to about their safety concerns

Fightback training also aimed to teach girls to share their safety concerns with people around them who would be able to support and guide them. To assess the impact of this training, at baseline we asked girls who they had spoken to about safety issues and Figure 2 details their responses.

Overall, girls were most likely to have spoken to an adult in their home and their friends about safety issues and girls in the comparison group (98%) were significantly more likely to have spoken to someone about safety issues than those in the treatment group (96%).

With the exception that girls aged 10 – 13 were less likely than those aged 14 – 16 years to have spoken to their siblings (51% v 72%) or friends (62% v 79%), age and PPI score had little bearing on who girls had spoken to.

Figure 2: Who girls have spoken to about safety issues? (baseline)

Qualitative feedback provided further insight into the nature of conversations girls had:

“My parents share news where girls are harassed or abused and tells me that how important it is to be conscious everywhere, we go. Whenever I go out, my mum gives me certain time frame to be back home by and I follow that. I understand she gets worried and I have to be careful when I am on my own.” Girl 6 Baseline

“Both my father and mother give me advice regarding my studies and my safety… They always keep me telling to be safe. My father always tells me not to add unknown people on Facebook.” KII Girl 8 Baseline

“There wasn’t any issues so I have not talked about it. Had there been any issues, I would have definitely talked about it with my parents”. KII Girl 5 Baseline

The majority of parents reported that they spoke to their children about their safety, but the content communicated varied greatly. As a minimum, parents advised their children not to speak to strangers and to be wary of unfamiliar people and places. The most common advice from parents instructed girls to ‘stay aware’ and ‘alert’. In general, the more ubiquitous the advice, the more theoretical it was:

“Yes, both of us, i.e. my wife and me discuss safety with our daughter… Apart from us, her mother’s sister has spoken to her about her safety.” KII Parent 5 Baseline

“I discuss safety with my daughter but more than that she is close with her mother. I keep her telling to be safe and avoid unknown people.” KII Parent 7 Baseline

“Her relatives sometimes give her advice. Her aunts, both maternal and paternal give her advice. It is easier for them to talk to her.” KII Parent 2 Baseline
Parents also reported that they encouraged their children to share with them any instances of abuse or bullying so that they, the parents, could get involved.

Age usually determined the content parents discussed with their children. Understandably, younger participants were spared more mature or fearful information, and thus, older girls tended to have a greater awareness of the dangers present in their communities. Some parents chose to share high profile cases of sexual harassment or assault with their daughters and expound on them for learning opportunities, but this was rare. Owing to this, girls were insulated from exposure to occurrences of bullying, sexual assault, harassment and crime in their wider community.

### 2.1.3 Motivation and take up of self-defence training

The Fightback Girl training assessed as part of the evaluation were three-day training courses. Ninety-three percent of girls surveyed attended all three days. The en masse training was targeted at all girls in a school, and paid for by girls’ parents, implying that parents were supportive of the initiative.

All treatment schools included in the IE made participation in the training compulsory for girls to attend. However, parents, girls and teachers were still able to explain why they supported the initiative:

Parents wanted to equip their children with the tools necessary to defend themselves (most common answer), educate them on such issues as personal safety (second most common answer) and instil confidence in their daughters (third most common answer).

Girls wanted to gain a better understanding of how to stay safe, which for most of them, they only had peripheral experience or understanding of. Many hoped that the improved knowledge and understanding would give them greater confidence moving about day to day.

Teachers did not comment as to whether or not they held private hopes that their female pupils would enrol in Fightback, however they did surmise that parents would want their daughters to be safer by knowing how to react during dangerous situations.

### 2.2 Tested recall and anticipated response to potential harm

The Fightback Girls training programme seeks to teach girls risk awareness and a mental, vocal, and physical skillset to improve girls’ confidence and safety through teaching girls how to recognise and respond to situations of potential harm.

To assess the effectiveness of the training, we designed a series of tests for girls. The tests were aligned with Fightback Girls’ own Monitoring and Evaluation data, enabling the collection of data both immediately before training, immediately after training and then again at endline, eight months later. At baseline and endline, we also tested how girls anticipated they might respond to a situation of potential harm to assess the impact of training on girls’ behaviour.
Box 2. Summary of girls’ tested recall and anticipated response to a potential threat

Tested recall

- Trained girls demonstrated a high level of recall at endline, achieving an average test score of 90%. This represented a significant improvement their average baseline test score of 10%. A slight drop off in knowledge between Fightback’s post-training test and the endline test was evident.
- Qualitative feedback provided further insight that the loss of recall was due to a combination of not needing to put self-defence techniques into practice and some feeling that the training programme was too short to allow girls to integrate the new information into their memories.
- Girls demonstrated highest recall of being able to use their voice as a self-defence weapon (99%) and lowest recall of the key characteristic that would make them vulnerable (83%) or how to respond to a physical attack (83%).

Anticipated response

- At endline, trained girls were more likely to state they would respond to a threatening situation by fighting (82%) or running away (53%) than at baseline or compared with girls who had not been trained. This suggests that trained girls have improved their knowledge of how to respond rapidly to a potential threat.
- Similarly, reflecting on how they would respond after the incident, trained girls were significantly more likely to state they would try not to return to the place it had happened (66%). However, at endline trained girls were also more likely to be worried they would get into trouble (57%). While these girls were still less likely to be worried than girls who had not been trained, it suggests that blame and shame it still an issue. Age had little bearing on how girls thought they would respond to an incident.
- At endline, trained girls were significantly more likely to anticipate speaking to somebody if something happened to them than they were at baseline or compared with girls who had not received training. This suggests that Fightback training has helped girls know how to report threats to their safety.

2.2.1 Tested recall – Overall

Respondents completed a series of multiple-choice questions to assess their recall of the training content of the Fightback Girls programme. The questions were developed in collaboration with Fightback Girls and aligned with the monitoring surveys Fightback Girls themselves administer both immediately before and immediately after training. Detailed responses to the tests are provided in Annex A and B.

At baseline and endline we asked six questions24 of both trained girls and girls not trained. Full responses to the questions are detailed in Annex A. Aggregating all correct responses to the six questions asked, at endline, 88% of statements were answered correctly by trained girls, a marked improvement on baseline where only 16% of statements were answered correctly25. This compared with only 28% for those girls not trained, against 20% at baseline.

At endline, to supplement Fightback Girls’ own M&E data, we asked an additional five questions26 of trained girls and matched these with Fightback’s pre-and-post training data. Full responses to the questions are detailed in Annex B. Aggregating all correct responses to the five questions asked at endline, trained girls were able to provide a correct response to 90% of statements on average, representing a marked improvement from the average 6% of correct responses before the training. However, this a slight decline on the 97% of correct responses immediately after training. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

24 Test A: 6- Test questionnaire: 1) Choose the key characteristic a criminal looks for in a victim.; 2) Which part of an assailant’s grip is the weak point?; 3) What should your FIRST RESPONSE be if an assailant grabs you by the neck?; 4) What should your FIRST RESPONSE be if an assailant [mugger] grabs you by the hair?; 5) What is your FIRST RESPONSE when someone tries to press their body against yours in a public vehicle [to resolve the situation peacefully]; 6) Which of these is NOT a FIRST RESPONSE if someone tries to physically attack you?
25 Repeat testing amongst respondents in the treatment group is also likely to have improved levels of recall.
26 Test B: 5-Test questionnaire: 1) A place can be high risk zone if you ask for help but do not get it within; 2) What colour should you for situational awareness; 3) When you face a threat is flight a good response?; 4) What is the minimum safe distance that one should maintain in a potentially dangerous situation?; 5) Can you use your voice as a weapon?
27 The questions were also part of Fightback’s pre-and-post train surveys and, as they were specific to Fightback training theory which was assessed in the six questions described above, they were not completed by the comparison group.
Girls aged 10—13 years tended to score slightly lower than those aged 14 – 16 years of age across all test questions. PPI score had little bearing on girls’ ability to provide a correct response.

**Figure 3: Girls average Test A and Test B scores (%)**

In qualitative feedback, most girls spoke generally about the lessons learned from the Fightback training, demonstrating that girls remembered more salient lessons from their training. A few girls demonstrated very good recall of the training, providing specific, factual description of what they learned, for example:

“I remember talking about bullying and how to stand up against it. Also, it was important to learn about the weaker body parts of boys. The training made us kick the dummy and it gave us confidence that we can actually hit boys if needed.” KII Girl 9 Endline.

“If someone follows me, I would first change direction and see if the guy is still following. If yes, I would look back and look into his eyes and wait for him to go first. In public transport, if someone tries to come close to me, I’ll create distance by using my hand and placing in my waist. For anything more than that, I’d shout and call the conductor for support.” KII Girl 11 Endline

However, some loss of knowledge between baseline and endline was evident, where girls’ answers were vague and general. Such phrases as ‘staying alert’ that did not contain any further information

“Some of the issues that were talked during the training were how to how to defend when somebody attacks you, how to be aware while travelling and the things to be alert in order to stay safe and protective.” KII Girl 8 Endline

Most participants and parents felt that one three-day training did not provide sufficient time for girls to fully integrate the new information into their memories.

“Fightback training was good…[but]. It’s hard to remember everything in 3 days so it should have been extended for at least 2, 3 weeks by practical test.” FGD Girls 1 Endline

The greatest benefits from training were psychological/emotional rather than practical/tangible.
2.2.2 Tested Recall of strategies to recognise potentially harmful situations (Trained Girls)

Both sets of test questions were grouped into two categories: questions about recognising and questions about responding to potentially harmful situations. As the comparison group had only responded to some of the questions, the analysis focuses on trained girls only, though where available results from the comparison group are provide in a footnote.

Analysis of trained girls’ responses to questions about how to recognise potential safety threats reflects that 90% of could correctly identify a high-risk zone, 84% what colour situational awareness\(^{28}\) was and 83% could correctly identify the key characteristic that a criminal would look for in a victim\(^ {29}\).

Similarly, from qualitative feedback, after participating in the training, girls provided much more concrete knowledge of situational awareness. A few girls identified that unpopulated/deserted areas posed greater threats than places with many people present, while others stated that unfamiliar places are also more dangerous than familiar ones. It is clear that these girls had developed a deeper understanding of the environmental factors of insecurity and were now able to analyse not only a physical environment itself, but the people populating it.

Prior to the Fightback Training, girls offered ambiguous answers as to how to recognise a potentially harmful or dangerous situation. Often, they provided general circumstances but could not provide specific qualities of a dangerous environment. For example, at baseline, two girls identified ‘night-time’ as a potentially problematic environment, and two girls could not even do that.

Conversely, recognising agents of possible harm was a difficult topic for girls to answer adequately both before and after the Fightback training. In both cases, girls felt that the predominant indication of malicious intent was for someone to either stare at or follow them. It should be noted, however, that five more girls identified this as suspicious behaviour after the training than before. Evidently, this lesson was clearly communicated to training participants. More abstract knowledge for detecting and deducing harmful intent remained elusive. Only one interviewee (KII Girl 3 SXG) at endline recounted the counter-intuitive lesson that excessive or unwarranted friendliness can also be a warning sign. Otherwise, girls could only reference ‘intuition’ or a ‘bad sense’ as effective instruments for detection.

Qualitative feedback at endline indicated girls better understood how remaining calm in dangerous situations enabled greater situational awareness and therefore, preparedness.

2.2.3 Tested recall of strategies to respond to potentially harmful situations (Trained girls)

Analysis of trained girls responses across both sets of questions reflects that at endline, 99% of trained girls identified they could use their voice as a weapon, and 95% could recall how to respond to harassment in public transport; slightly fewer girls recalled their first response against physical attack (83%) or their assailant’s weakpoint (85%) or that flight was a good response to danger (88%)\(^{30}\). In general, trained girls demonstrated a higher recall for techniques they might expect to use or be regularly exposed to (e.g. public transport) than techniques of self-defence against an attack. The efficiency of acquiring the skills of ‘verbal judo’ or voice as self-defence, was highlighted in the SPRING BPE case study, and it is encouraging to see high retention in this skill eight months after training.

Qualitative feedback at endline also indicated an improvement in girls’ ability to provide a definitive description of how they would react and describe specific techniques compared to baseline.

The most common response was to shout for help or otherwise use the voice for defence and while girls before and after the training relied on their voice for their defence mechanism, it was clear that girls honed this skill through the training.

“Girls should not be quiet and should be able to shout. The training made us shout to teach us this important skill of shouting when in danger.” KII Girl 9 Endline

Girls also described specific physical techniques they had learned, for example:

\(^{28}\) Fightback teaches girls the colours of situational awareness, which is a common concept in self-defence training, as detailed in: https://www.wideopenspaces.com/color-coding-situational-awareness/

\(^{29}\) This compared with only 35% of girls who had not been trained who could correctly identify the characteristics that a criminal would look for in a victim.

\(^{30}\) Compared with girls that had not been trained, only 15% could correctly identify an assailants weakpoint and who 42% could identify the correct first response to an attack.
“If somebody attacks me, I will either fight back or I will run away to the safe place. I would see if someone is coming and tell the person to help. If I get caught in such situation, I will use my hands and legs. And if I find mud around me, I will throw the mud in the attackers face so that I will find a safe place.” KII Girl 1 Endline

2.2.4 Anticipated response to a threatening situation

Girls were asked how they would respond to a threatening situation and provided a list of potential responses, both at the time of the incident and after the incident. Table 3 details girls’ responses.

At endline, trained girls were more likely to anticipate how they would respond to a threatening situation than they were at baseline. They were significantly more likely to state they would respond by fighting (82%), running away (53%) than at baseline or compared with girls who had not been trained. This suggests that Fightback training has improved girls’ intention to respond to a potential threat.

Similarly, reflecting on how they would respond after the incident, at endline trained girls were significantly more likely to anticipate they would try not to return to the place it had happened (66%) than at baseline (50%) or than girls who had not received training (56%). However, at endline trained girls were also more likely to be worried they would get into trouble than at baseline.

Age had little bearing on how girls anticipated they would respond to an incident. The exception was that older girls 14-16 years were more likely to anticipate they would ignore the incident than girls 10-13 years (42% v 27%). Likewise, PPI score had little bearing on how girls anticipated they would respond, with the exception that girls from poorer households (PPI score of 0-55) were more likely than those from richer households (PPI score of 66-99) to feel worried (66% v 49%) or embarrassed (26% v 16%).

Table 3: How would you respond if someone made you feel uncomfortable or threatened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls Trained (Treatment)</th>
<th>Girls Not Trained (Comparison)</th>
<th>Difference in Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
<td>Endline (%)</td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would fight [with words or actions]</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would run [or move] away</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would ignore [pay no attention to]</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would try not to go to the place where it happened</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be worried that I would get into trouble</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be embarrassed to talk about something that had happened to me</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (all respondents)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At baseline, before Fightback, qualitative data revealed that girls had a vague awareness and understanding of how to respond to signs of danger. They most commonly mentioned avoiding strangers, but were generally unable to explain the psychology and active behaviour to improve their safety.

While all of these are appropriate strategies, they presume a level of control over a situation that is unlikely to be replicated in a reality. Of course, when prompted, girls were willing to fight to protect themselves, however this was usually much later in the order of responses. Fleeing was also a common answer.
In qualitative feedback at endline, girls were much more cognizant of specific pre-emptive tactics for staying safe, such as alertness to one’s surroundings, displaying confidence in oneself, and remaining calm than the generic responses given at baseline. When girls who had attended the training did provide similar answers to baseline—staying aware and calm—they had a better understanding of how and why these are effective strategies. They were able to assign a practical utility to these response strategies. They also emphasised the importance of mental fortitude.

Furthermore, after the training, girls volunteered more proactive ways to assert their safety when tangible danger arises. All but one girl interviewed said they would fight an attacker. Again, this alone is not significantly different to baseline figures, but the specificity of their answers greatly increased, as did their intentionality.

“My first response would be to shout out loud and try to escape from the attack. If I cannot escape, I’d try to strike and hit them hard where it hurts.” KII GIRL 11 Endline

2.2.5 Anticipated response - who girls would speak to about safety issues

In addition to asking girls who they had spoken to about safety issues (Section 2.1.2), we also asked girls who they thought they would speak to if something happened to them. This allowed us to canvas views of girls who had not discussed safety issues with anyone. Their responses are detailed in Table 4.

At baseline, consistent with who girls told us they had spoken to about safety issues, eight in 10 girls would speak to an adult in their house, and seven in 10 their sibling, four in ten a teacher at school.

At endline, trained girls were significantly more likely to know who they would speak to if something happened to them than they were at baseline or compared with girls who had not received training. This suggests that Fightback training encourages girls to speak out where they are victims of crime and discuss concerns with their support network.

At baseline, girls aged 10-13 years were less likely than girls aged 14-16 years to anticipate speaking to their siblings (68% v 78%) or a teacher (35% v 45%). At endline, age had little bearing on who girls would speak to. PPI score had little bearing on who girls would speak to, with the exception that poorer households (those with a PPI score of 0-55) were less likely than richer households (those with a PPI score of 66-99) to speak to a teacher at either baseline or endline.

Table 4: Who girls would speak to about safety issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls Trained (Treatment)</th>
<th>Girls Not Trained (Comparison)</th>
<th>Difference in Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
<td>Endline (%)</td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An adult in my home</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sister or brother</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher at school</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not know who to speak to</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (all respondents)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative feedback confirmed that between baseline and endline, there was an improvement in girls’ awareness of the safety benefits of reporting or sharing safety concerns or any incidents. Girls felt most comfortable speaking to their parents about their concerns for their own safety or that of their friends. Understandably, parents were their children’s closest confidants. Teachers were also frequently identified ‘counsellors’ for girls.

After the training, girls understood reporting/sharing as an effective mitigation strategy, like the deescalating abuse and preventing recurrence—rather than just elementary function of simply ‘telling mom’. Girls had learned that silence can actually facilitate abuse and advantages abusers, and by sharing their experiences, they can potentially...
interrupt these patterns. Furthermore, they put this into practice and had witnessed the how this simple action may resolve a safety violation.

“I have heard only one case of bully in my school of grade 10 sister. The guys were teasing her and thought they could say anything to her, but she informed about it with her teacher, so the action was taken.” KII Girl 1 Endline

Parents, on the other hand, identified their children’s friends as likely recipients of their children’s insecurities. Parents said that they maintain open communication about such things with their children too, but they were much more likely to volunteer ‘friend’ as an answer to the question above.

Open communication between children and parents was not a given though. At baseline, two girls said they had not talked to anyone about dangerous situations or feelings of insecurity, and one explicitly denied the possibility of speaking to their parents about it. However, there was an observable change in these two girls after the Fightback training. At endline, one said that she would speak to a teacher, and one said that she would speak to her sister if such things occurred. In both circumstances, the Fightback training impressed upon them the need for trusted disclosure of feelings and encouraged them to identify people in their community they would feel comfortable confiding in.

A head teacher similarly recounted an improvement in girls sharing safety concerns between baseline and endline:

“I do not know much details of exactly what they learned but I have seen girls being more vocal and confident. I’ll give you an example. Last week, four girls came to me and said some boys were using abusive language to them. They felt very uncomfortable and offended. These were girls who would never come to me and say something. They are shy in nature. But it must be after the training, they got confidence and were able to speak up. Now, we are taking actions against the boys. We are calling their parents and talking with them. This is a huge success of the program I think.” KII Head Teacher 2 Endline

2.3 Perceived ability to stay safe

Fightback’s ToC states that by attending the Fightback en masse training, girls improve their awareness and ability to manage situations of potential harm. To test this and building on girls’ recall of training as detailed in Section 2.2, we collected data on girls’ perceived ability to recognise and respond to potentially harmful situations before and after training.

Box 3. Summary of girls’ perceived ability to stay safe

- At endline, trained girls felt more able to recognise and respond to potential harmful situations than before they received training. In particular, these girls felt more able to use their voice as defence (86%), manage fear and stress under threat (74%), or identify a dangerous situation (72%) than respond to sexual harassment early (67%) or identify a potential criminal (61%).

- At endline, girls who had not received training were significantly less likely to feel able to able to recognise and respond to potentially harmful situations than those trained.

- A dramatic increase in girls perceived abilities to identify and manage threats to their safety was evident immediately after training. However, eight months after training, a slight decline in perceived ability was evident. The most notable decline was in girls’ perceived ability to stop sexual harassment and their ability to identify a potential criminal. The smallest decline was noted for girls’ ability to use their voice as defence.

To assess the effectiveness of the training, trained girls were asked questions on their perceived ability to recognise and respond to potential threats to their safety. Questions were asked as part of Fightback’s own pre-and-post training M&E, and also included in the evaluation endline data collection, six-eight months after training. Girls responses are detailed in Figure 4.

As detailed in Figure 4, at endline, trained girls felt more able to recognise and respond to potentially harmful situations than before they received training. In particular, trained girls felt more able to use their voice as defence (86%), manage fear and stress under threat (74%), or identify a dangerous situation (72%) than respond to sexual harassment early (67%) or identify a potential criminal (61%).
Girls who had not received training were significantly less likely to feel able to recognise and respond to potentially harmful situations than those trained. They felt most able to use their voice as a weapon (67%) and least able to identify a potential criminal (34%), manage fear and stress (41%) or respond to sexual harassment (42%).

Surveys administered to the treatment group just before training (pre-survey) and immediately after training (post-survey) reflect a dramatic increase in girls perceived abilities to identify and manage threats to their safety. However, between post-training and endline, a slight decline in perceived ability was evident. The greatest decline was evident in girls perceived ability to respond early to sexual harassment to stop it and their ability to identify a potential criminal. The smallest decline was noted for girls’ ability to use their voice as defence or defend themselves if pushed to the ground.

Age and PPI score had little bearing on girls perceived ability to respond to a potentially harmful situation.

Figure 4: Perceived ability to recognise and respond to potentially harmful situations (Able+Very Able %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
<th>Endline - Girls Trained</th>
<th>Endline - Girls not trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential dangerous situation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a potential criminal</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use your voice as a weapon</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage your fear and stress in life threatening situation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend yourself if someone pushed you on the ground</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond early to sexual harassment to stop it peacefully</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Feeling safe

Fightback’s ToC states that training will lead to improved feelings of safety. To assess this, we gathered data on girls’ feelings of safety in a variety of situations both before and after training.

31 Pre and post training data is collected by Fightback as part of their M&E; baseline and endline is data collected as part of Coffey’s Evaluation.
Box 4. Summary of girls’ feelings of safety

- At endline, trained girls were significantly more likely to feel safe than girls who had not been trained; whereas at baseline (prior training) girls in the treatment group were less likely to feel safe than those in the comparison group. In particular, trained girls felt safer when doing extra-curricular activities (either at school or away from school), spending time by themselves, at school or travelling on public transport.

- At endline, most trained girls expressed satisfaction with how safe they felt (86%), and their ability to defend themselves (74%) or avoid dangerous situations (71%). In all instances, girls were significantly more satisfied with their safety than at baseline.

- Trained girls were significantly more satisfied with their ability to respond to or avoid dangerous situations than girls who had not been trained. This suggests that training has enhanced girls’ ability to stay safe.

2.4.1 Feelings of safety

At both baseline and endline, we asked girls about their feelings of safety in the preceding six months. Table 5 details girls’ perceptions of their safety at endline and baseline and the difference between comparison and treatment groups at endline and baseline.

At endline, nearly all trained girls felt safe at home (97%) and at school (92%) and most felt safe doing activities either at school (88%), away from school (88%) or outside the home (86%). Girls were least likely to feel safe while travelling on public transport (57%). Girls’ feelings of safety improved between baseline and endline across both groups, although to a larger extent among trained girls.

At endline, trained girls were significantly more likely to feel safe than girls who had not been trained. This compared with baseline, where girls in the treatment group were generally less likely to feel safe than those in the comparison group. In particular, trained girls felt safer when doing extra-curricular activities (either at school or away from school), spending time by themselves, at school or travelling on public transport.

Age had little bearing on girls’ feelings of safety, with the exception that girls 10-13 years felt safer than girls 14-16 years when doing things outside the home (82% v 67%) or travelling on public transport (68% v 48%). PPI score had little bearing on girls’ perceived safety.

Table 5: Feelings of safety in the last 6 months (% Never + Hardly Every felt unsafe) 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls Trained (Treatment)</th>
<th>Girls Not Trained (Comparison)</th>
<th>Difference in Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
<td>Endline (%)</td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While at home</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While at school</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you did organised classes or activities not part of school</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you did sport or exercise away from school and without instruction from a sports coach or tutor</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you did things outside the home with your friends</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you spent time by yourself (either in or outside your home)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 International Children’s Survey in Nepal, pp10: 3.2 (80%) 10 years old and 3.3 (82.5%) 12 year olds satisfied with safety at home; pp21 3.24 (80%) 10 year olds and 3.39 (85%) 12 year olds feel safe at school. http://www.isciweb.org/_Uploads/dbsAttachedFiles/Nepal_NationalReport_Final.pdf
When you travelled on public transport | 46 | 57 | 43 | 49 | +11%
Base (all respondents) | 590 | 501

Qualitative feedback confirmed that school was perceived as a safe space by girls, parents and teachers alike. Only one parent and one Head Teacher even mentioned school as an environment with possible danger. The overwhelming attitude towards school by both parents and their daughters was great confidence. Girls felt safe travelling to and from school, as in most cases, this was chaperoned by either parents or by chartered school bus. Where public bus was used (Endline FGD Girls SXG) girls were accompanied by their mothers which made those in this transportation category feel safe. Typically, younger students were accompanied by a parent on their journeys to and from school. At the same time, focus group discussions with girls elicited a few instances of sexual harassment at school. Furthermore, at baseline one Head Teacher explained that parents expressed concerns over how male teachers might behave around female students. There were no specific incidents of this occurring, so this was not necessarily a substantiated worry. Rather, it was a general concern over the possibility of inappropriate behaviour.

2.4.2 Satisfaction with safety and ability to stay safe

At both baseline and endline, we asked girls how satisfied they were with their safety and their ability to defend themselves or avoid danger. Table 6 details how many girls were either satisfied or very satisfied with their safety at endline and how this has changed since baseline.

At endline, most trained girls expressed satisfaction with how safe they felt (86%), and seven in 10 were satisfied with their ability to defend themselves (74%) or avoid dangerous situations (71%). In all instances, trained girls were significantly more satisfied with their safety than at baseline.

Trained girls’ satisfaction with their ability to respond to or avoid dangerous situations and to defend themselves against physical attack increased significantly between baseline and endline and compared to girls that were not trained. This suggests that the training has improved girls’ knowledge and confidence in how to mitigate potential danger and this should enhance girls’ ability to stay safe.

At both baseline and endline, girls aged 10-13 years were typically more satisfied with their safety than those 14-16 years of age. PPI score had little bearing on girls’ satisfaction with their safety.

Table 6: Satisfaction with safety over last 6 months (Satisfied + Very satisfied%)
“Yes, I feel safer in the last 6-8 months. After the training, I feel safer than before as now I know how to avoid risky situations. I have now become more aware of my surroundings and if anything happens, I can push the person, shout and ask for help.” KII GIRL 11 Endline

“In the past few months I feel safer as I have learned to defend myself to a certain extent. Yes, the fight back training has contributed to a great extent.” KII Girl 10 Endline

However, some respondents felt that their perceived improvements in safety may have been diminished by difficulties recalling the information from the Fightback Training.

“I remember something, but I have not used it yet” FGD Girls 1 Endline

“I remember only some techniques, but I’d like to remember them all as they were very important” FGD Girls Apex 1 Endline

2.5 Wellbeing

Fightback Girls’ ToC states that improving girls’ sense of safety and ability to defend themselves improves their focus of control and self-confidence (and as outlined in Section 1, Fightback girls training also includes activities, such as group exercises, role play and speaking up in training, to improve girls’ self-esteem.) Furthermore, the en masse format of training girls in large groups with their peers improves girl’s friendship networks and girls’ wellbeing.

To evaluate Fightback Girls’ impact on girls’ wellbeing we collected data on girls’ quality of life, their perceptions of their friendship networks, appearance and confidence, their activities and freedom of movement. The questions are aligned with the Paediatric Quality of Life Enjoyment and Satisfaction Questionnaire (PQ-LES-Q)33, the International Children’s Survey34 and the UNICEF Multiple Index Cluster (MICS)35 questions on wellbeing.

**Box 5. Summary of girls’ perceived wellbeing**

- At endline, trained girls rated 14 Quality of Life (QoL) aspects either slightly or significantly higher than at baseline.
- At endline, trained girls rated their ability to get thing done, play/free time, energy, health; mood and feelings, love and affection and life overall, significantly higher than those that had not been trained. At baseline, no significant difference between the two groups was evident.
- At endline, 35% of trained girls stated they had taken up a new activity in the last six months, this was significantly more than the 27% of girls who had not received training taking up a new activity.
- However, qualitative feedback suggests that girls largely followed the same schedules, frequented the same areas and held identical patterns of travel as before the baseline, with few examples of girls gaining increased freedom. Some parents cited that the three-day training was insufficient preparation for their daughters to assume greater risks.
- At endline, trained girls were slightly more satisfied with their freedom and free time than at baseline and compared with girls who had not received training. This is consistent with qualitative feedback which reflected that while girls may not have been granted additional freedom, they were more confident to enjoy the freedom they had.

2.5.1 Quality of life

The PQ-LES-Q is a comprehensive measure of child and adolescent girls’ physical, emotional, and psychological wellbeing, adopted for the purposes of our evaluation. At baseline and endline, girls in both treatment and comparison groups were asked to rate 14 aspects of their life. Their responses are detailed in Table 7.

Overall, girls rated their feelings about their home, relationships with their family and friends and their health most highly at both baseline and endline.

34 http://www.isciweb.org/ – a worldwide research project supported by the Jacobs Foundation on children’s subjective wellbeing aiming to improve children’s lives.
At endline girls' that had received training rated all of the 14 QoL aspects either slightly or significantly higher than at baseline. With the exception of feeling good about their play/free time or their love and affection, an improvement was also noted amongst girls who had not received training.36

Comparing the DID across treatment and comparison groups, trained girls rated their ability to get things done, play/free time, energy, health; mood and feelings, love and affection and life overall, significantly higher than those that had not been trained. This supports Fightback’s ToC that training leads to improved confidence and goes beyond Fightback’s ToC in improving girls’ perceptions of psychological and physical wellbeing.

**Table 7: Thinking of the last week how have you been feeling about… (Good + Very Good %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls Trained (Treatment)</th>
<th>Girls Not Trained (Comparison)</th>
<th>Difference in Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
<td>Endline (%)</td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your health</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play or free time (EMP)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your energy levels</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting things done</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping out at home</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or learning</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The place where you live</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting or buying things</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mood or feelings</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along with your friends</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along with your family</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your feeling of love or affection</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall how has your life been</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to rating their QoL, at both baseline and endline, girls were asked how satisfied they were with their wellbeing over the past six months. The dimensions measured are listed in Table 8.

At endline, trained girls were significantly more satisfied with their friendships, self-confidence and life overall than girls who had not been trained. This finding supports Fightback’s ToC that the en masse (group) delivery format

---

36 This may in part be a social desirability bias compounded by repeat interviewing of baseline and midline within a short succession.
37 International Children’s Survey in Nepal, pp 27 10 – 12 year old satisfaction on a 10point scale. 10 – 12 year olds scoring >5: health (86%); self-confidence (85%); the way you look (79%); life overall (87%; 57% completely satisfied).
38 Base size may vary slightly across the statements due to missing responses, ranging from 584 – 590 for Treatment; 499 – 501 for comparison groups.
improves girls’ friendships network and focus on safety awareness and self-defence improves girls’ self-confidence and overall sense of wellbeing.

At both baseline and endline, girls aged 10-13 years were typically more satisfied with life than those 14-16 years of age. PPI score had little bearing on girls’ satisfaction with life.

Table 8: Satisfaction over last 6 months (Satisfied + Very satisfied%)\textsuperscript{39}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls Trained (Treatment)</th>
<th>Girls Not Trained (Comparison)</th>
<th>Difference in Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
<td>Endline (%)</td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your friendships</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way you look</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your self confidence</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your life overall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (all respondents)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative data revealed that girls felt significantly more confident in their lives. While this was mostly related to issues of safety and ability to defend oneself, there are a few examples of Fightback Girls’ positive implications in other areas of girls’ lives. Some girl respondents said that their confidence made them feel more capable in making decisions and increased their maturity. This was also reported by some of the girls’ parents, who had observed a similar improvement in confidence in their daughters. Most often, these parents thought their daughters demonstrated greater patience or understanding in family dynamics. In both cases, the daughters were on the older end of our sampling demographics.

“\textit{Yes, I have seen some good changes in her after the training. She’s less angry nowadays and is cordial with her brother too. She is much more confident and also voices out her concerns with us. Like, she gives examples of training; if we become protective of her, she says she knows how to handle things by herself.}”

KII Parent \textsuperscript{11} Endline.

2.5.2 Empowerment – mobility

SPRING’s landscape study documents that restrictions on girls’ mobility limits their opportunity to progress in life, with girls prohibited from going places boys go and their movements also restricted to protect their reputation. Protecting girls’ reputation becomes a more a more apparent concern as girls enter adolescence.

The Fightback Girls’ ToC asserts that through girl training and parent sensitisation, parents may feel able to allow their daughters to engage in more education or economic activities outside the home.

To evaluate this, we gathered information on girl’s mobility (or freedom of movement) before and after training. The FGD guides were aligned with SPRING’s landscape study. Fightback Girls has not identified demand for parent sensitisation workshops, so this direct intervention has not materialised\textsuperscript{40}.

Overall, qualitative feedback at baseline reflected that girls had very little mobility, regardless of age. In a few instances where girls did have greater mobility, they were older.

At endline, through survey, 35% of trained girls stated they had taken up a new activity in the last six months, this was significantly more than the 27% of girls who had not received training taking up a new activity. This was mostly comprised of girls doing dance classes, but trained girls had also taken up basketball, drama classes and additional studies.

\textsuperscript{39} UNICEF MICS 2014 pp221 – 224: 15-19 year old girls who are very or somewhat satisfied with: Friendships (84.3%); the way they look (81.5%); life overall (83.7%)

\textsuperscript{40} The lack of demand for the workshops is believed to be a combination of a lack of willingness amongst schools to pass on the cost of attending the sessions and a lack of time amongst working parents.
While survey results suggest that girls gained greater mobility after training, when comparing endline to baseline, the qualitative feedback reflected that girls followed largely the same schedules, frequented the same areas and held identical patterns of travel as before the baseline. However, there was some evidence that girls felt more confident when going about their daily activities, as demonstrated by the following quote:

“I have not changed the way I behave or places I go, it’s still the same. But now I feel more confident, while I travel, I am definitely more aware. I feel safer after attending the training, because I feel more confident and fearless than before.” KII GIRL 8 Endline

Parents’ permission to their daughters did not change significantly from the three-day training. While parents and girls unanimously saw improvements in confidence, and all girls felt safer—as most of their parents also noticed—this did not manifest in a greater allowance of freedom or mobility.

Parents often cited the brief duration of the training as the main reason they had not re-evaluated their child’s freedom. They did not feel that three-days was sufficient preparation for their daughters to assume greater risks. Five parents, out of eight total interviews, made such comments. Also, they often said that while the training was educational and valuable in raising self-esteem, it was simply not enough to address the substantial dangers present in their communities.

“I think most importantly, she learned to be confident and to be aware. Physical training was good, but I think it wasn’t enough for her to learn and use it in future.” KII Parent 8 Endline

While there were few examples of girls gaining increased freedom, some parents felt it was appropriate to grant their daughter more freedoms as she could now handle the increased responsibility. A girl in an FGD chronicled just this:

“I feel like the confidence I developed because of the training had positive impact not only on me but also my parents. I was interested to go to a music class which is little far from our home, but I was not allowed to because my parents didn’t have confidence in me. But, after the fightback program, they have allowed me to take the music class. I am thankful to fightback for building my confidence and giving me this newly found mobility and access to do what I always wanted to.” FGD GIRLS 2 Endline

“My parents trust me a little more than before and feel safer. I don’t know if it was because of the training but they may have noticed the increased confidence in me.” KII GIRL 7 Endline

While girls felt safer, younger girls, who are largely still restricted from going to unsafe places or from leaving the house unchaperoned, qualified that they have not yet had these improvements ‘tested’ in the real world.

At endline there was a slight improvement in how satisfied girls trained were with their free time and a significant improvement in the freedom they have compared with girls who had not received training (although half of this relative improvement rather comes from a decrease in the comparison group level). This again suggests that while girls may not have been granted additional freedom, they were more satisfied with the freedom they had. It is likely that increased confidence has helped girls enjoy their freedom.

### Table 9: Satisfaction over last 6 months (Satisfied + Very satisfied%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls Trained (Treatment)</th>
<th>Girls Not Trained (Comparison)</th>
<th>Difference in Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
<td>Endline (%)</td>
<td>Baseline (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom you have</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you do in your free time</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (all respondents)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.6 Attribution and contribution

In this section we assess Fightback’s attribution and contribution to the SPRING programme, including how many girls Fightback has reached, girls perceived improvement through the training and other sources that may have contributed to the improvement in girls perceived safety and wellbeing.
Box 6. Summary of attribution and contribution

- Fightback Girls has reached fewer girls than they had hoped to reach when setting their girl reach targets during bootcamp 1. However, growth over the past year has been at a faster rate than the first two years following launch and if continued, by 2020, Fightback Girls will be nearer their target of 30,000.

- Nearly all trained girls feel agreed that the training has helped them, spontaneously citing that the training had: made them feel more confident (47%), safer (15%) and able to walk around their community (15%).

- Girls cited the most important thing they had learnt was self-defence techniques (27%); learning to be confident (22%); how to be safe (16%), to be alert/aware (15%), and how to respond to dangerous situations/Fight back (15%).

- Through training, girls felt their confidence (88%), ability to defend themselves (96%), feel safe (92%), and able to stay away from danger (92%) had improved. Nearly six in ten girls felt their self-defence skills and self-confidence had improved a lot.

SPRING has recorded 5,595 girls reached through the programme during 2016 – 201841 and Fightback Girls reported that by May 2019, they had reached over 10,000 girls. While this is somewhat behind Fightback’s target to reach 13,000 girls in its second year of launch and 30,000 girls by 2020, it does reflect the business is showing promising and accelerated growth.

2.6.1 Perceived improvement through training

At endline, when asked if the training had helped them, 98% of girls agreed that it had, spontaneously citing that the training had: made them feel more confident (47%), safer (15%) and able to walk around their community (15%). Only 5% of girls spontaneously mentioned the training helped them through teaching them self-defence techniques or how to defend themselves.

When asked the most important thing they had learnt from the training, while a quarter (27%) of girls spontaneously cited they had learned self-defence techniques, more girls cited the psychological benefits of: learning to be confident (22%); how to be safe (16%), to be alert/aware (15%), and how to respond to dangerous situations/Fight back (15%). This reinforces that girls have derived as much, if not greater, psychological benefit from the training than palpable self-defence techniques.

At endline when asked if Fightback Girls had improved their skills, nearly all trained girls felt their self-defence, ability to defend themselves, safety awareness (alertness), feelings of safety, ability to stay away from danger, and self-confidence had improved. Girls’ responses are detailed in Figure 5.

Age had little bearing on how girls perceived the training had improved their safety. The only notable difference was perceived self-confidence, where 92% of girls 10-13 years compared with 81% of girls 14-18 years of age felt the training had improved their self-confidence. PPI score equally had little bearing on girls’ perceptions of improvement, though girls from less poor households were slightly more likely to perceive an improvement in their ability to stay away from danger, escape from possible threats, or improve self-confidence and alertness of mind, than those from poorer households.

---

41 Logframe Outcome 2_Girl Beneficiaries: 2,028 between Oct 2016 – June 2017 and 3,567 between July 2017 – June 2018
All parents and children interviewed stated that the training adequately addressed their safety needs and concerns, when speaking generally. As stated before, parents noticed that their daughters displayed greater confidence in themselves and recounted specific tactics for self-defence.

The one area of criticism though, for both girls and their parents, was that the training was too short and did not allow for sufficient time to absorb all of the material presented. Parents would have felt more confident in their child’s ability to protect themselves had the training been sustained. They did not specify the precise duration that would satisfy this insecurity, but they would have liked to see greater repetition in the program. Girls, too, felt that they would have liked more time to practice the self-defence techniques, so that their bodies and minds could better assimilate the moves.

Fightback training was minorly successful in instigating personal commitment to self-defence. Two girls from which qualitative data was collected said they were so inspired by the training that they have since taken the initiative to learn more about it.

“*The examples that I have learned are skills to gain physical and mental strength. Like, wrist grabbing we still practise it in our lunch time.*” KII Girl 8 Endline

“*After the training we were so interested we even watch YouTube Tutorials on self-defence.*” FGD Girls 2 Endline

Fightback Girls were planning to run weekly self-defence classes from their offices in Kathmandu and do offer training in Martial Arts. However, there seems little evidence that the girls approached Fightback Girls themselves to take their training further suggesting a lack of committed follow-through.
2.6.2 Source of information on self-defence

Girls received basic safety information from their parents. This was usually restricted to advice about avoiding strangers and staying out of danger in the first place. It did not describe what to do when danger is already present. In baseline interviews and focus groups, parents were the only source of information that girls had on such topics.

By endline data collection, girls appear to have diversified their access to safety and self-defence knowledge. Parents still constituted the primary source, but now eight out of nine interviewed girls said they received information online or through social media. Information-seeking behaviour can only be attributed to two of these cases. Regardless of whether or not the information gathering is passive, it is clear that girls are now more aware of the learning opportunities available to them. Girls did not disclose what specific facts they had learned this way.

“We did not have much idea about it until the Fight Back training. After the training we were so interested we even watch YouTube Tutorials on self-defence.” FGD 2 Endline

2.7 Unintended consequences

In this section we examine the unintended consequences of the Fightback Girls programme.

Box 7. Summary of unintended consequences

- Qualitative feedback suggests a high incidence of girls sharing their training. That girls shared the training with those close to them further corroborates the conclusion that Fightback Girls had a measurable impact on the attitudes of its participants.
- Moderate changes in attitudes regarding boys’ safety in their communities were realised indirectly through the Fightback training. At baseline, self-defence training was seen as less necessary for male audiences. When respondents thought that boys should also attend self-defence training, it was usually for girls’ benefit. After the training, roughly 30% of interviewed parents and children still thought that boys should receive the training for the benefit of girls, but the majority also believed boys would benefit from protection information. Furthermore, by endline, respondents were more convinced of the dangers that boys faced in their community.
- There was no improvement in bullying rates but also no change in boy-girl relations and the training raised the communities’ sensitivities to abuse beyond that of the attendees alone.

Reflecting on the unintended consequences of the Fightback programme, two key aspects emerge: first the positive unintended consequence that girls share the training they have learned, and secondly, as a negative unintended consequence, that the programme fails to address the safety needs of boys.

2.7.1 Sharing training techniques

Qualitative feedback suggests a high incidence of girls sharing their training: All interviewed participants, except for one, shared what they learned from the Fightback Girls training with their siblings and family. Girls were motivated to share their knowledge in order to help make other people safer. They felt empowered by the physical self-defence techniques and they wished to grant that same feeling to those close to them. One mother stated that she found the knowledge so helpful, that even she had benefitted from the techniques.

“My daughter even teaches me how to be safe.” Parent 2 EXC Endline

Another attestation to the impact of Fightback’s training:

“My daughter showed the moves that she was taught during the training. She also shared the skills she learned regarding vocal and mental self-defence. We have a very good impression of the program. It has definitely made my daughter more vocal and confident.” Parent 11 Endline

That girls shared the training with those close to them further corroborates the conclusion that Fightback Girls had a measurable impact on the attitudes of its participants. Had they not felt it was useful, or had they not perceived any lasting benefit to themselves, they would not have distributed the lessons further.

42 Other possible unintended consequence of girls fighting with other girls and boys using the self-defence techniques taught or that girls start behaving in an unsafe way, were not evidenced in the findings.
2.7.2 Boys safety concerns

Moderate changes in attitudes regarding boys' safety in their communities were realised indirectly through the Fightback Girls training. The baseline interviews revealed that, in general, these communities subordinated boys' vulnerability to that of girls. Girls were perceived as much more vulnerable to boys in terms of severity as well the nature of the abuse. Concerns for boys were strictly relegated to fighting, bullying and criminal behaviour. Concern over sexual violence, however, was mostly reserved for girls.

As such, at baseline, self-defence training was seen as less necessary for male audiences. When respondents thought that boys should also attend self-defence training, it was usually for girls' benefit. Both interviewed parents and girls thought that it would be helpful for the boys to use the training to learn respectful ways to treat girls, as they are, statistically, the perpetrators of sexual violence.

While this is inarguably relevant, it ignores the vulnerability of boys to all types of abuse and exacerbates issues of under-reporting amongst male victims. One father did acknowledge that boys can also be abused by those around him.

After the training, this position receded somewhat. Still, roughly 30% of interviewed parents and children thought that boys should receive the training for the benefit of girls, but the majority also believed boys would benefit from protection information. Furthermore, parents were somewhat more convinced of the dangers that boys faced in their community and acknowledge so in the qualitative data. This is not directly attributable to Fightback, but perhaps the training contributed to making the many dimensions of safety more prominent in a parent's thinking.

“Although we do not hear many cases where boys are harassed but I am sure there are a lot of cases where such things happen. Due to the society and their prejudices, such cases do not always come out. However, in terms of numbers, obviously it is girls who are the victims of such harassments.” KII Parent 5 Endline

On the other hand, female student respondents were not made any more aware of the sexual vulnerabilities of adolescent boys, but they were, however, more vocal about the negative effect of bullying for both genders.

There was no improvement in bullying rates but also no change in boy-girl relations.

Lastly, the training raised the communities' sensitivities to abuse beyond that of the attendees alone. A head teacher was made aware of the abuse his pupils may face in their daily lives. While it was not discussed much further than this, the mere fact that adults were made more aware of the emotional circumstances of the children for whom they are responsible is a victory for Fightback, however small.

“I didn't observe or attend the training but …I learned that many of our students live in the fear of harassment or abuse and it is important for us as a school to create a safe environment for all our students.” KII Head Teacher 2 Endline

In a recent update on the progress of the prototype, Fightback have confirmed that in the last year (2018-2019) they introduced self-defence training for school-going boys. While this training does place an emphasis on how boys can improve girls safety, the needs of boys themselves is also catered to.
3 Conclusions

Altogether, the findings of the Fightback Girls IE study allow for an assessment of the prototype’s impact on adolescent girl beneficiaries.

Fightback applied to SPRING to upscale their training programme which they identified sought to address the risk of sexual violence and rape in Nepal through increasing risk awareness and enhancing a mental, vocal, and physical skillsets to increase confidence and safety. SPRING assisted Fightback to develop the Fightback Girls mass training programme to train hundreds of girls in a single session. The training programme only required minor adaptations on that already provided to women and girls. Two key implementation challenges to the prototype were that the parental sensitisation sessions, to address taboos of blame and shame, were not taken up by parents and the large participation numbers originally envisaged for schools were difficult to achieve in practice. However, notable success is evident.

Reflecting on the Fightback Girls training programme and the SPRING evaluation questions, we draw the following conclusions:

To what extent have girls improved their safety as a result of participating in Fightback training?

Girls feel safer

There is clear evidence that girls who participate in Fightback Girls training feel safer as a result of it: they feel safer after training and relative to the comparison group, particularly in public spaces; and they spontaneously cite that training has helped them feel more confident, safer and able to move around their community.

Beyond feelings of safety, after Fightback Girls training, girls feel more able to avoid situations of potential danger and anticipate how they would respond to a threatening situation. This suggests that training has enhanced girls’ preparedness and ability for rapid response.

Girls also show improved likelihood to report risks to their safety suggesting girls feel more comfortable talking about their safety, leading to improved safety and wellbeing.

Girls knowledge and perceived ability in safety awareness and self-defence have improved

There is also clear evidence that Fightback Girls has improved girls’ safety awareness and self-defence knowledge, and that girls retain high levels of knowledge eight months after training. Furthermore, after training, girls were able to volunteer more proactive and specific ways to assert their safety in the face of potential harm.

As might be expected, girls show greatest knowledge retention and perceived ability to keep safe in situations that they frequently encounter, such as travelling on a public bus. It is situations less frequently encountered, such as identifying a criminal or responding to a physical attack, that girls show less knowledge retention and perceived ability to respond. Moreover, while girls felt safer, without being able to test the strategies they have learned, much of the knowledge is still theoretical and more easily forgotten.

However, many self-defence techniques have not yet been tested. Where girls are unable to put strategies and techniques into practice it is difficult to know if their actual safety has improved.

There is mixed evidence that Fightback Girls succeeded in addressing taboos on blame and shame: While girls are more likely to anticipate speaking out about incidences of potential harm they are also more likely to report feeling worried they would get into trouble as a result of a safety incident.

To what extent have girls improved their well-being as a result of participating in Fightback training?

Girls perceive their quality of life has improved

There is evidence that trained girls feel better about their life in general 6-8 months after training than girls who did not receive training. Most notably, girls seem to have benefited psychologically from the training, as they express greater happiness with their feelings, energy, relationships and play than girls who did not receive training. Girls feelings of self-confidence also improve after training, and this is particularly noticeable in younger girls. This goes beyond supporting Fightback Girls’ ToC that through training girls gain confidence and stronger friendship networks and goes partway to suggesting, at a critical developmental stage, the training may provide girls with a greater sense of control over their lives.
There is less evidence that Fightback Girls has succeeded in improving girls’ mobility and freedom. While a significant minority of girls state they have taken up new activities since the training, findings suggest that by and large girls have adhered to their daily routines. Parents, similarly, indicate that they have not allowed their daughters greater freedom as a result of the training or any perceived changes in their daughter’s behaviour following the training. A three-day training is perceived by many parents to be too short to instigate any real change in their attitudes to giving their daughter greater freedom. Parents of younger girls in particular, are also understandably unlikely to give their daughters greater freedom as a result of the self-defence training.

However, there is evidence that the training has improved girls’ satisfaction with the freedom they have girls’ confidence and sense of empowerment going about their daily routines.

How did SPRING contribute to this change, as opposed to other factors?

Prior to SPRING, adolescent girls were not a target market for the Fightback programme and Paritran had not considered marketing the programme directly to schools. All adolescent girls reached through schools are attributable to SPRING.

Moreover, girls who received training attributed an improvement in their confidence, feelings of safety and ability to avoid or mitigate harmful situations to the training. Parents equally attributed an improvement in their daughters’ self-confidence and knowledge of tactics for self-defence to the training.

While parents were girls’ primary source of information on safety both before and after training, the training provided girls with information that they had not received before. Thus, the improvement in self-confidence and feelings of safety amongst girls who received training is attributable to Fightback.

After training, girls were motivated to diversify the sources of information they accessed. Most notably, after training, girls accessed online or social media sources of information showing a greater interest in ensuring their own safety. The greater interest in diverse and new sources of information is attributable to Fightback, but also suggests an opportunity for Fightback to engage with girls online.

What have been the unintended consequences of participating in Fightback Girls training?

Two key unintended consequences emerge from the Fightback Girls training. The first, positive consequence is that girls share the training they have learned with their parents and siblings, and in so doing, subtly challenge taboos of blame and shame through promoting the notion that girls are victims and not instigators of crime.

The second, as a negative unintended consequence, is that the programme failed to address both boys understanding of the safety needs of girls’ and boys’ own safety and protection needs. This has since been recognised by Fightback and in August 2018 they launched a programme targeted at boys’ safety.

Other possible unintended consequence of an increase of girls fighting with other girls and boys using the self-defence techniques taught or that girls behaving in an unsafe way, were not evidenced in the findings.

What have we learned about adolescent girls as beneficiaries?

Findings reflect that schools are an effective forum to reach adolescent girls and teach girls about safety strategies. While much of what has been learned is still theoretical, girls demonstrate high levels of recall and findings suggest that girls have benefited psychologically from participating. Younger girls in particular, while not changing their daily routine as a result of training, demonstrate an improvement in their perceived self-confidence as a result of the training. While it is difficult to anticipate the long-term outcomes, the psychological benefits that girls demonstrate eight months after training are promising and suggest the training has delivered good outcomes.

Overall evidence of impact

Table 1 summarises SPRING’s key impact pillars and compares the areas the Fightback Girls intervention was expected to impact against where evidence suggests it has succeeded in impacting.

---

43 The boys programme seeks to improve both boys ability to be safer with respect to avoiding and responding to threats of sexual violence; and the role boys can play as ally in improving girls safety against sexual violence.
Table 10: Overall evidence of impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Earning</th>
<th>Saving</th>
<th>Safety (&amp; Learning)</th>
<th>Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas</strong></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Direct benefit through training to improve safety awareness and self-defence skills; leading to safer behaviour change</td>
<td>Direct benefit through improved confidence, peer network and agency; shift in shame and blame culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Impact</strong></td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual Impact</strong></td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>Low (0)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 Note: Shade of colour denotes strength or weakness of impact, darker green showing higher impact and lighter green, less impact.
4 Implications for Fightback

This section provides a discussion of why and how the IE findings are of significance for Fightback and what learning points can be identified for their future business.

- **Consistent with the ToC, research findings reflect an improvement in girls’ feelings of safety and confidence eight months after training**

  The research findings validate Fightback Girls’ ToC that training methods lead to improved feelings of safety and self-confidence. Research findings further reflect girls share what they have been taught during training and are less afraid to speak out. Fightback will be able to use this evidence to attract future investments.

- **Girls’ and parents alike feel the course was too short to be properly absorbed**

  In qualitative feedback, girls and parents alike commented the course was too short to produce long-term change. Fightback does provide refresher training for schools, with some take-up. Fightback has also tried to introduce additional classes for girls to take up independently, including Fightback Fitness and martial arts classes. However, girls have not shown an interest to attend extra-curricular self-defence classes. One potential opportunity for Fightback is that girls have gone on to look for more self-defence and safety information online or through social media. Fightback could consider targeting girls for refresher training via an online forum.

- **Girls demonstrate better recall of situational awareness techniques and using voice as a weapon than of recognising a criminal or of techniques against physical attack**

  Eight months after training, girls demonstrate the highest recall for scenarios and techniques that they experience on a regular basis. These patterns of recall are less evident in Fightback Girls’ own post-survey data which is administered immediately after training and when girls recall is still very high. Examining the results of the endline data may give Fightback Girls direction on how to tailor the content of refresher training to focus on the areas of greatest loss of recall.

- **The data suggests the incidence of teasing, cyber bullying and harassment is a key area of concern**

  While Fightback is aware of the prevalence of teasing, bullying and harassment in person or via social media, the course has concentrated on the most serious acts of sexual violence against women and girls. This will be an important area for Fightback to address in future schools training programmes.
5 Programme Implications

This is a section providing a discussion of why and how the impact evaluation findings are of significance for the SPRING programme and what learning points can be identified for future programming. SPRING girl research helped Fightback both identify how to access the adolescent girl market and understand the need for a greater focus on training to improve girls’ self-confidence.

The SPRING programme has succeeded in helping Fightback to both identify the adolescent girl market for self-defence training and also to understand the specific needs of adolescent girls. The IE demonstrates that girls have benefited from improved perceptions of self-confidence and safety as are result and the Fightback business has proved to be a success for the programme.

- Younger girls realised relatively greater improvements in perceptions of self-confidence than older girls and working through schools is effective in reaching younger girls.

The findings reflect that schools provide an effective means of accessing younger adolescent girls in large numbers in a safe environment. Moreover, while younger girls recall slightly less, the findings indicate they derive greater benefit in self-esteem through the training and this could potentially create a different pathway for girls in how they manage their day-to-day lives.

- However, the ToC’s suggested benefits of improved mobility to improve girls’ ability to learn and earn have not been recognised; additionally, many of response tactics have not yet been put to the test.

Findings to point to the success of the training programme in improving girls’ feelings of safety and self-confidence. However, at this stage, the training has not produced the depth of impact to change girls’ mobility or their ability to learn and earn. It is likely that a greater frequency of training would be required to produce this type of outcome and impact, reflecting the limitations of the three-day programme in delivering long-term change.

- The Fightback business model provides insight into the characteristics of successful businesses for the SPRING programme but also the limitations—private company, marketed to (private) schools (B2B) who in turn market to parents.

With SPRING assistance, Fightback has succeeded in switching the intended focus of its SPRING prototype from B2C to B2B and has scaled up its business model. Targeting private schools and parents has proved an effective mechanism to reach adolescent girls, who are receptive to learn. However, the business model relies on the ability of parents and schools to pay for the training, which suggests that without grant funding, the needs of girls who cannot afford to pay for training will go unmet.

- The Fightback business model also provides insight into the role of grant funding and subsidy in helping businesses address the needs of the BOP.

SPRING’s Investment support has assisted Fightback to secure additional grant funding, most notably the GCC Grant; and in the last year, Fightback has also actively pursued a low-income cross-subsidisation programme to provide Fightback training that is fully subsidised by Government or other organisations, to lower-income schools.

- Despite the success of the training programme, Fightback did not achieve its SPRING targets, though is now growing at an accelerated rate.

Fightback Girls’ failure to achieve its SPRING targets reflects both the business growth took more time than programme assumptions allowed for; but also, that there were either incorrect assumptions in the forecast model or in the business implementation. The final programme evaluation will need to consider the implications of slow business growth in overall girls reach, particularly amongst businesses participating in Cohorts 3 and 4. Girls share learnings with their families to raise safety awareness and indirectly challenge social taboos.

---

45 There are difficulties with a business accurately predicting reach for an untested product on a two year horizon. This is an inherent risk of programmes of SPRING’s nature.
There is evidence that through sharing the training content and techniques with their families, girls raise awareness of safety issues and challenge social taboos around blame and shame, presenting girls as victims and not instigators of crime and also helping girls to speak out.
## Annex A – Knowledge Recall (1)

### Choose the key characteristic a criminal looks for most in a victim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone who is wealthy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Someone who is unsure of themselves</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who is not physically strong</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which part of an assailant’s grip is the weakpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrist</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thumb</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Finger</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What should your FIRST RESPONSE be if an assailant [mugger] grabs you by the neck?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hit them in the groin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the grip with your hands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit them in the throat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit them in the nose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Break the grip with your hands and hit them in the groin</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What should your FIRST RESPONSE be if an assailant [mugger] grabs you by the hair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick your leg back against them</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing your arm back against them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlock your fingers and push down against their wrist</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

46 Green font denotes correct response.
### Treatment vs Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flick your head back to relax the grip and run away</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your FIRST RESPONSE when someone tries to press their body against yours in a public vehicle [to resolve the situation peacefully]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a distance with your arms/elbows</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmly push them away</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move somewhere else in the vehicle</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these is not NOT a FIRST RESPONSE if someone tries to physically attack you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulate your breathing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run away</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think about your next move</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total correct response (Average)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base (all respondents)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B – Knowledge Recall (2)

Without help, please read through each question and tick the box that answer the question:

Firstly, thinking about how you might identify and respond to potentially dangerous situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>A place can be high risk zone if you ask for help but do not get it within</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 seconds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 seconds</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>What colour should you be for situational awareness?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>When you face a threat is flight a good response?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>What is the minimum safe distance that one should maintain in a potentially dangerous situation?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 foot</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 feet</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>Can you use your voice as a weapon?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Green font denotes correct response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total correct response (Average)</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>97%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base (respondents matched pre/post/endline)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex C – Perceived ability to apply training

#### 2.1 Identify potentially dangerous situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.2 Identify a potential criminal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.3 Release yourself from a wrist grab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.4 Escape from a neck grab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.5 Release yourself from a hair grab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Use your voice as defence in an attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7 Defend yourself if someone pushed you on the ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.8 Respond early to sexual harassment to stop it peacefully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.9 Manage you fear and stress in life threatening situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average able + very able over 9 measures | 1.5% | 86% | 74%

Base (respondents matched pre/post/endline) | 530 | 530 | 530
Annex D – Fieldwork Methodology

1. Purpose

This Annex provides details on the fieldwork methodology for the Fightback Girls impact evaluation, including fieldwork for data collection and details of completed interviews and quality assurance processes used to assess fieldwork results.

1.1 Fightback Impact Evaluation design

The impact evaluation tests if the impact to all adolescent girls participating in the en masse Fightback Girls programme are attributable to SPRING.

To assess the attribution of the impact of Fightback girls mass training programme, we used a quasi-experimental impact evaluation approach comprised of respondent feedback at baseline and endline. The impact evaluation utilised quantitative surveys as well as qualitative KII and FGDs. Below we provide a summary of the methodology. The methodology is detailed in full in Annex D.

1.1.1 Impact Evaluation questions

The IE is guided by the overall impact evaluation questions from the SPRING M&E Evaluation Framework. For Fightback, the questions are applicable in measuring the impact of Fightback on adolescent girls who participate in the en masse Fightback programme. The evaluation questions are indicated in the table below (on the left column), with the applicable sub-questions in the right column.

### Table 1: Evaluation questions and sub-questions guiding the Fightback Impact Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Sub – Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **E 1.4 To what extent have girls improved their safety as a result of accessing products, services or business opportunities?** | • Safety: Has girls’ awareness of and ability to avoid risk improved as a result the Fightback training? Have girls modified their behaviour following the training? Do girls feel safer as a result of training?  
• % of girl beneficiaries who show improved perceptions of their safety and extent and ways in which girls' perceptions of their safety has changed between baseline and endline  
• Learning: What do girls recall of training? |
| **E 1.5 To what extent have girls improved their well-being as a result of accessing products, services or business opportunities provided by SPRING businesses?** | • Wellbeing: Do girls perceive a higher quality of life? Are they more confident? Are they less afraid to speak out?  
• % of girl beneficiaries who show improved perceptions of their wellbeing and extent and ways in which girls' perceptions of wellbeing has changed between baseline and endline  
• Girl empowerment: Do girls enjoy greater freedom since training? Has anything changed in their perceived locus of control and ability to move around outside the home, and their confidence? |
| **E 1.6 How did SPRING contribute to this change, as opposed to other factors?**      | • Attribution of SPRING’s impact can be determined by the number of adolescent girls trained through the Fightback Girls en masse classes. Attribution of Fightback training on adolescent girls can be evidenced by assessing beneficiary knowledge of and confidence in dealing with/avoiding potentially dangerous situations.  
• Contribution questions: What external factors (e.g. government / NGO initiatives; learning skills from other family members) may have contributed to the set outcomes? Is there a trickle down of training where girls share what they have learnt in the training with other family members and friends? |
**Evaluation Question** | **Sub – Questions**
---|---
E2.2 What have been the unintended consequences of adolescent girls accessing products, services, or engaging with business models provided by SPRING businesses? | • Types of positive unintended consequences from adolescent girls accessing products, services, or engaging with business models provided by SPRING businesses

E2 What have we learned about adolescent girls as end-users or beneficiaries in the value chain? | • What factors helped or hindered adolescent girls from taking up training?

### 1.1.2 Data sources

The Fightback impact evaluation draws on qualitative and quantitative primary data:

#### 1.1.3 Quantitative data collection

There are two components of quantitative data collection:

1. **The Pre/Post-training survey**: This is a self-complete survey designed by Coffey and Fightback. The survey is administered as a census of the adolescent girls who participate in the training, completed before the training is administered and then again immediately following the training. The survey is administered by Fightback and processed by Foundations for Development Management (FDM), the local research partner. The pre and post surveys were only administered to the treatment group (girls that received training).

2. **The baseline/endline survey**: This is an enumerator-led self-complete survey designed by Coffey. This is the main tool designed to collect data on the outcome and high-level indicators of Fightback’s ToC and girl impact pathways. It is administered to a sample of trained adolescent girls and a comparative sample of girls who did not participate in the training. FDM both administered and processed the survey. The baseline and endline surveys were administered to both treatment and comparison groups.

#### 1.1.4 Qualitative tools

Qualitative tools were designed to complement the baseline survey. All qualitative research was conducted by FDM. There are three components of qualitative data collection:

- **KII**s conducted with headteachers,
- **Paired KIIs** with adolescent girls who participated in trainings, and separate KIIs with their guardians,
- **FGDs** with adolescent girls who participated in trainings, and an additional FGD held with a comparable sample of boys who did not participate in training.

The qualitative tools were administered to girls in the treatment group to gather further information on girls’ knowledge, perception, and experiences of safety issues as well as their overall wellbeing. The qualitative tools supplement the survey.

Coffey partnered with FDM for data collection purposes. Coffey designed the data collection tools in collaboration with FDM and Fightback.

### 1.2 Sampling strategy

Separate sampling strategies were used for the quantitative surveys, KII**s**, and FGDs.

#### 1.2.1 Quantitative surveys

Our sampling strategy was designed to capture information from a representative sample of adolescent girls who participated in the Fightback Girls training programme as well as a comparison group of girls who had not received training.

**Treatment schools**
Schools were purposively targeted (and selected) by Fightback on the basis of their location within the Kathmandu Valley (Kathmandu and Lalitpur Districts), and the willingness of the school’s principal or school management committee to participate in (and capacity to pay for) the Fightback Girls training programme. As such, the treatment group is made up of girls who participated in a Fightback Girls training programme during the period of the evaluation period48.

Comparison schools
Sampling was also designed to capture information from non-participants in comparable schools in which training had not (or had not yet) taken place. Comparison schools were purposively selected using a non-probability sampling method to determine relevant schools for comparison with intervention schools. This included the following characteristics:

- **Location (region and district)** - schools were selected to be within the Kathmandu Valley, to be comparable to selected intervention schools
- **School type (private or Government)** - Private schools, where English is the language of instruction, was considered to be comparable to intervention schools.
- **Size of school and teacher-student ratio**: The average teacher-student ratio of 40 was considered to be comparable to selected intervention schools.

FDM was responsible for the identification and selection of comparable schools to form the comparison group. Three schools met the criteria and were willing to participate, and thus were selected as comparison schools.

1.2.2 **Key Informant Interviews**

Sampling for KIIs (including with headteachers and paired adolescent girl / parent) were sampled from within each treatment schools. Headteachers of the first three intervention schools were interviewed.

The sampling for the paired KIIs was designed to include a cross-section of girls across grade groups and schools amongst girls who had participated in the training. KIIs were conducted with girls across the intervention schools, on the basis that they had participated in training, were not participating in the baseline/endline survey (so as to reduce research fatigue), and that they had a guardian who was also available and willing to participate49. The selection was facilitated by school teachers participating in the research on the basis of convenience sampling50.

1.2.3 **Focus Group Discussions**

Similar to the sampling strategy for KIIs with adolescent girls, FGD participants were also selected on the basis of convenience sampling. In addition, within each FGD, girls were stratified according to their grade, ensuring at least one girl from each represented grade who participated in the Fightback training. Unlike KII respondents, adolescent girls participating in FGDs were selected by FDM facilitators on the basis of volunteers amongst those who participated in the surveys and in the FGD at baseline.

2 **Fieldwork**

**Preparation for fieldwork- enumerator training and piloting**

Ahead of baseline and endline data collection, Coffey and FDM jointly delivered enumerator training.

2.1 **Team selection**

Local researchers (facilitators) were selected on the basis of their experience conducting research with adolescence girls. Only female researchers were selected, to ensure that respondents would feel comfortable to talk and discuss their experience with the researchers. At both baseline and endline, FDM selected seven

---

48 This figure is based on the estimate at the time of the design phase of Impact Evaluation that Fightback would reach a further 1,500-2,000 girls in 2018.

49 Availability was assessed on the basis of living nearby, or who worked as teachers in the same school, whose participation would not impede on their work, and who were willing to participate and commit at least one hour for the interview.

50 Convenience sampling, which is also known as grab sampling, accidental sampling, or opportunity sampling, is a form of non-probability sampling that implies sampling from a population that is close to hand.
researchers in total for data collection. Two researchers were assigned for each FGD (including one to take notes), two were assigned to conduct KIIIs with both girls and their parents, while the three remaining enumerators were assigned to facilitate and lead the self-complete survey in classrooms. At endline, three of the original team of seven researchers were replaced.

2.1 Enumerator training

At baseline and endline, in preparation for fieldwork, enumerator training was undertaken at the FDM offices in Kathmandu, Nepal. The FDM local research team of seven enumerators participated in training, delivered both in person and via Skype with the Coffey evaluation team. Enumerators were introduced to the study design and purpose, and the data collection tools. Role playing exercises were used to familiarise enumerators on the study context and the data collection tools (including the survey questionnaires and interview guides). Each tool was reviewed question by question to ensure full comprehension by enumerators, and feedback from enumerators assisted in providing further revisions and clarifications to the data collection tools. Informal translations were discussed to aid with the facilitation of the English-language self-complete survey. In addition, the head of Fightback was asked to provide further clarifications for the enumerators where required.

Enumerators were additionally provided with training and support on best practices for research and on Coffey’s Girl Safety Protocols and Ethical Research Framework. These covered general guidance on how to conduct fieldwork in a rigorous, ethical and appropriate manner, and the established expectations with regards to data write-up and the timing of delivery. Specific training also included discussions on informed consent, appropriate behaviour with girls and data protection with all enumerators.

Piloting

At baseline, Coffey, together with Fightback and our local research partner, undertook a pilot of the data collection tools. The data collection tools were piloted at the DAV school in Kathmandu, where Fightback had conducted training in 2017.

Fifty girls across grades 6 – 11 were selected to participate in the pilot: 43 participated in the survey (43), one in the KII, and six in an FGD. The pilot served to both test the data collection tools and as part of the enumerator training to orientate the team of seven local researchers.

Following the pilot, a debrief session was held to gather feedback on the data collection. While few amendments were made to the survey, the enumerator guidelines were expanded to provide additional support. The amendments included:

- Further simplifying language were possible, particularly in the PPI question set around head of household/wage/long-term employment.
- Adding further clarification explanations for the enumerators around words and terminology of which girls were unsure (e.g. assailant, victim, index finger).
- Providing guidance on how to pace reading out each question to allow each girl sufficient time to complete the survey.
- Introducing a system of putting pens down to stop girls from moving ahead of the enumerator in the survey completion.

At baseline, as there were only minimal changes in the methodology and data tools, a separate pilot of the data tools was not deemed necessary. Instead, we undertook a comprehensive feedback session following the first school data collection.

2.3 Fieldwork process

Baseline

At baseline, the start of fieldwork experienced several delays as Fightback experienced delays in finalising its training schedule with schools.

Fieldwork was originally scheduled to begin in March 2017 but began at the end of May 2017. As data collection was organised on a rolling basis (e.g. as schools signed up for Fightback training), data was collected over a period of four months, concluding in August 2018.
Fieldwork was planned according to each schools’ Fightback training and school work schedule. Fieldwork was conducted ahead of the scheduled Fightback training, but accounting for classes and internal exams, to ensure that participants’ classes were not disturbed. Additionally, enumerators and the Study Coordinator visited schools to observe Fightback training days, to understand the training modality and responses of girls during training.

**Endline**

Endline fieldwork was scheduled to fall six - eight months after baseline, before the end of the academic year.

### 2.4 Fieldwork monitoring and management

Field monitoring was provided by FDM to ensure the quality and reliability of the data, as well as compliance with the Girl Safety Protocols and Ethical Research Framework. Details on FDM’s field monitoring and quality control procedures, and quality assurance mechanisms, can be found in Annex D.

Fieldwork was monitored by FDM’s Study Coordinator, who oversaw each of the enumerator’s work. The Study Coordinator was also responsible for ensuring that survey participants understood each survey question as part of the self-complete format of the survey.

Once interviews were completed, all questionnaires were handed over to the Study Coordinator for scrutiny. All paper questionnaires were safely stored in secure FDM offices. All data was anonymised and personal information (e.g. girls’ personal information) was stored separately from the rest of the questionnaires to ensure anonymity.

### 2.5 Final achieved and matched sample

#### 2.5.1 Quantitative survey sample achieved

Table 2 provides a summary of the total sample achieved for the Baseline survey. A total of 596 adolescent girls from treatment schools (out of a target of 600), and a total of 502 adolescent girls from comparison schools (out of a target of 400), were interviewed.

**Table 2: Fieldwork dates and sample achieved, intervention and comparison schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Baseline Dates</th>
<th>Endline Dates*</th>
<th>Target*</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex Life School</td>
<td>29/05/2018</td>
<td>04/02/2019</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/02/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Godavari</td>
<td>18/06/2018</td>
<td>26/02/2019</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Jawalakhel</td>
<td>14/07/2018</td>
<td>17/02/2019</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19/02/2019</td>
<td>03/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Excelsior School</td>
<td>30/07/2018</td>
<td>19/02/2019</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>603</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale High School</td>
<td>16/07/2018</td>
<td>27/02/2019</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.6 Key Informant Interviews

The sample size achieved for KIIs for girls was nine. Convenience sampling was applied to select girls. The original sample design aimed to interview three girls & parents in each of the three treatment schools included in the evaluation. However, as the number of schools sampled increased from three four, we adjusted the final number of interviews to allow for at least one girl & parent to be interviewed in each school. No headteacher was sampled from Excelsior School as the target of three headteachers had been achieved. At endline, with the exception of three replacements, we returned to the same participants as baseline. Three replacements were undertaken to achieve a wider representation of girls ages. Table 3 provides a summary of the sample achieved for data collection for KIIs.

**Table 3: Total qualitative KIIs sample achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Girls (age) – BASELINE</th>
<th>Girl (age) - ENDLINE</th>
<th>Parents (sex)</th>
<th>Headteacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apex Life School</td>
<td>Girl 1 (13)</td>
<td>Girl 1 (13)</td>
<td>Parent 1 (F)</td>
<td>Headteacher 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier's School, Godavari</td>
<td>Girl 2 (12)</td>
<td>Girl 2* (15)</td>
<td>Parent 2* (M)</td>
<td>Headteacher 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl 3 (11)</td>
<td>Girl 3 (11)</td>
<td>Parent 3 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl 4 (13)</td>
<td>Girl 4* (15)</td>
<td>Parent 4* (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier's School, Jawalakhel</td>
<td>Girl 5 (14)</td>
<td>Girl 5 (14)</td>
<td>Parent 5 (F)</td>
<td>Headteacher 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl 6 (14)</td>
<td>Girl 6 (14)</td>
<td>Parent 6 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl 7 (13)</td>
<td>Girl 7 (13)</td>
<td>Parent 7 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Excelsior School</td>
<td>Girl 8 (12)</td>
<td>Girl 8* (15)</td>
<td>Parent 8* (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl 9 (13)</td>
<td>Girl 9 (13)</td>
<td>Parent 9 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Replacement interviews at endline

### 2.7 Focus Group Discussions

As with KIIs, at both baseline and endline, the target for FGD sample was achieved, with three FGDs with girls and one FGD conducted with boys (see Table 4 below). With the addition of a fourth school, additional FGDs were not conducted as the sample was achieved after the third school.

**Table 4: Total qualitative FGD sample achieved – baseline and endline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Grade/Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apex Life School</td>
<td>FGD 1 with Girls</td>
<td>Grade 5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Godavari</td>
<td>FGD 2 with Girls</td>
<td>Grade 5-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At baseline, for each FGD, six respondents were selected, using convenience sampling. FDM enumerators identified FGD participants by asking for volunteers amongst the self-complete survey participants. The process slightly varied for each school on the process of recruiting participants:

- **FGD 1**: One girl each from each participating class (5-10) was recruited. The School Coordinator selected the girls to participate in the FGD.
- **FGD 2**: One girl each from each participating class (5-10) was recruited. The FGD facilitator asked for volunteers to represent each class to participate in the FGD.
- **FGD 3**: Two girls each from each participating class (8-10) were recruited. The FGD facilitator asked for two volunteers to represent each class to participate in the FGD.
- **FGD 4**: Two boys each from participating class (8-10) were recruited. The School Coordinator selected the boys to participate in the FGD.

This was successful in ensuring that the right number of participants were selected to represent the age distribution of participants from each school. FGDs were then conducted in separate (and empty) classrooms.

The same participants were interviewed at both baseline and endline, with no replacements.

### 2.8 Research authorisation/permission

All of the research conducted complies with our Girl Safety Protocols (GSP) and to Coffey’s Ethical Research Guidelines. The GSP are based on the ethical guidelines set out in DFID’s ethics principles for research and evaluation, ESOMAR’s International Code on social research and data analytics, as well as ESOMAR’s guidelines for working with Children and Young People. The GSPs seek to comprehensively ensure the safety and security of all girl respondents and as such 1) detail processes for obtaining informed consent from the girl and from the parent / guardian for girls under eighteen; 2) outline appropriate standards of behaviour for interviewing girls; 3) set out a clear girl protection policy of ‘do no harm’ including standards for minimising girls’ risk; and 4) detail data protection and management policies in adherence to the UK Data Protection Act 1998.

Prior to fieldwork, the District Education Offices of Kathmandu and Lalitpur were informed of the study (see Annex A).

### 2.9 Consent

The process for obtaining consent for research with adolescent girls involved two stages:

1. **Parental / Guardian opt-out**: In the weeks preceding fieldwork, permissions were sought at the parental level for all girls eligible to participate in the study (e.g. who participated in the Fightback training) through an opt-out process. Permission letters were distributed to all eligible girls and their guardians to inform them of the study and to allow for parents to opt their daughters out of the study. See Annex B of the Baseline Fieldwork report for the opt-out letters distributed to parents.

2. **Consent / assent at the time of research**: At the start of each research activity (Baseline survey, KIs, and FGDs), enumerators once again explained the purpose of the study and verbal consent was sought and acquired for all participating adolescent girls.

### 3 Data quality and reliability

#### 3.1 Data management

The following steps are adhered to for data management to ensure confidentiality and security of data:

---

**Table: School Focus Group Grade/Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Grade/Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Jawalakhel</td>
<td>FGD 3 with Girls</td>
<td>Grade 8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier’s School, Jawalakhel</td>
<td>FGD 4 with Boys</td>
<td>Grade 8-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Completed surveys were filed according to grade;
• Completed surveys were organised in ascending alphabetic order;
• A unique code was given to each student according to their class and the names are entered in the computer;
• Once the unique code is given to each student, the code was also written in the cover page and the first page of the survey form;
• Then after, the cover page was removed in order to keep the confidentiality of the respondents;
• The separated cover pages are kept separately to maintain the anonymity of the students;
• Then the survey questionnaires were given to data entry personnel to enter it in the SPSS;
• Once the data entry was completed, it was submitted to the research coordinator and field coordinator;
• Data cleaning process was carried out by the coordinators; and
• Finally, the files were encrypted with password that was stored in a separate location.

3.2 Data validation
For data validation, enumerators adopted a spot check approach to checking questionnaires to ensure that respondents were completing forms. This process was developed after data collection in the first school to mitigate against respondents either too quickly completing questionnaires or responding ‘don’t know’ incorrectly to questions. FDM enumerators both cross-checked forms and consistently checked for respondent comprehension throughout the survey process.

3.3 Transcription and translation
All the qualitative data (KIs and FGDs) were recorded with the consent of girls and their parents. The recorded KIs and FGDs were translated to English and transcribed by the respective data collection enumerators. Transcripts were back checked by Study Coordinator and Field Coordinator in order to ensure quality, consistency, and reliability. To record the voices of all the girls’ present in the FGD, an FGD field note format was formulated that captured not just the general discussions of the FGD but even the smallest details shared by each girl present in the FGD. KIIs notes were also transcribed as verbatim rather than just a field note.

3.4 Data analysis and matching
The baseline characteristics of the intervention and comparison groups were compared to check for any statistically significant difference which could have influenced the outcomes of interest, among which the average students’ age and Poverty Probability Index (PPI) score. All these variables showed similar levels across the two groups. No weighting was therefore applied. In particular, the Nightingale school, which has a larger sample size than other control schools, was kept ‘as such’: this school having the lowest PPI score of all comparison schools and the oldest students on average, while the average PPI score of intervention schools is slightly higher and the average student slightly younger than in comparison schools, underweighting Nightingale students would have resulted in larger differences between intervention and comparison schools and therefore threatened the comparability of the two groups.

3.5 Data storage
Once the field reports and the data entry files were collected, they were encrypted with password and made accessible to only the Study Coordinator and the Field Coordinator at FDM, before being made available to the Coffey evaluation team. Similarly, all the paper-based questionnaires were anonymised by removing the cover sheet where the student’s details were written. The survey form with unique code will be stored in a locked file cabinet for the next three years. The electronic data will be stored in multiple platforms to avoid data loss, for example on the computers of both Study Coordinator and Field Coordinator, on an external hard drive, and in protected cloud storage.

4 Methodological limitations and fieldwork issues
In the following section we outline the key limitations in the evaluation methodology: design, internal and external validity and sampling and non-sampling errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design - reliance on the business:</strong></td>
<td>Fightback had an active pipeline of 5-6 schools interested in taking up the training, however we were unable to predict or influence which schools did take up the training. Given the low frequency of schools taking up training, we sought to survey the first three schools that took up training during the evaluation period. During the evaluation period, Fightback only delivered 3-day en masse training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design - reliance on the business:</td>
<td>The sample design was limited with respect to: schools taking up the training, or the nature of the training programme provided (1 – 3 days). Additionally, during the evaluation period, Fightback only delivered training to schools that was paid for by schools and/or parents. This is consistent with the target market for its fee-paying model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing and scheduling of fieldwork:</strong></td>
<td>The fieldwork had to be re-scheduled numerous times according to training and school schedules. In two of the intervention schools, the data collection schedule had to be revised to facilitate completion of the baseline survey as well as Fightback’s pre – training survey on the first day of training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selecting suitable comparison schools:</strong></td>
<td>Comparison schools were identified to match Fightback’s defined target schools with respect to location, type of school and size. Comparison schools were approached through e-mail, letters individual referral and appointments. Fightback also offered a free training session to participating schools. Where schools agree, a free training session will be delivered after the evaluation is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spill over and contamination:</strong></td>
<td>During the evaluation we gathered data to identify if any participants had otherwise become involved in Fightback training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling error and attrition:</strong></td>
<td>To minimise attrition, endline data collection was collected within the same academic school year and FDM returned to participating schools on multiple occasions to collect data from all baseline participants. This is detailed in Annex D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response bias:</strong></td>
<td>To minimise error, Coffey and FDM developed scripts for facilitators to monitor classroom behaviour, guide survey responses and ensure sufficient time for respondents to raise any questions and complete the survey. To improve confidentiality, KIIs and FGDs, were undertaken in separate classrooms. Higher levels of recall as a result of repeated testing amongst participants is unavoidable. The use of a comparison group mitigates against this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varying comprehension according age:</strong></td>
<td>Scripts were developed to prompt facilitators to clarify and explain questions throughout the survey. Where necessary, facilitators provided one-on-one support to students for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varying comprehension according age:</strong></td>
<td>Levels of test recall amongst respondents in the treatment group may have been improved through repeat testing – i.e. it is to be expected that testing immediately after training and then again after eight months may have improved participant recall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selecting suitable comparison schools:</strong></td>
<td>Comparison schools were identified to match Fightback’s defined target schools with respect to location, type of school and size. Comparison schools were approached through e-mail, letters individual referral and appointments. Fightback also offered a free training session to participating schools. Where schools agree, a free training session will be delivered after the evaluation is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spill over and contamination:</strong></td>
<td>During the evaluation we gathered data to identify if any participants had otherwise become involved in Fightback training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling error and attrition:</strong></td>
<td>To minimise attrition, endline data collection was collected within the same academic school year and FDM returned to participating schools on multiple occasions to collect data from all baseline participants. This is detailed in Annex D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response bias:</strong></td>
<td>To minimise error, Coffey and FDM developed scripts for facilitators to monitor classroom behaviour, guide survey responses and ensure sufficient time for respondents to raise any questions and complete the survey. To improve confidentiality, KIIs and FGDs, were undertaken in separate classrooms. Higher levels of recall as a result of repeated testing amongst participants is unavoidable. The use of a comparison group mitigates against this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varying comprehension according age:</strong></td>
<td>Scripts were developed to prompt facilitators to clarify and explain questions throughout the survey. Where necessary, facilitators provided one-on-one support to students for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varying comprehension according age:</strong></td>
<td>Levels of test recall amongst respondents in the treatment group may have been improved through repeat testing – i.e. it is to be expected that testing immediately after training and then again after eight months may have improved participant recall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Fightback evaluation limitations and mitigation strategies
qualitative interviews, younger girls evidenced a lack of understanding of terms 'bullying'; 'sexual harassment' or 'security' to provide an assessment.

**Limitations in statistical analysis:** Our statistical analysis is restricted to measurable factors and does not account for 'omitted' or 'hidden' variables. Besides, the quantification of measurable factors may not be straightforward and result in loss of information and/or bias.

Our survey includes direct variables covering a range of knowledge, practices and attitudes. The levels of these variables were assessed using multiple choices which were coded as either binary or categorical ordered variables. Two statistical tests were used on each variable, the Student's t-test and the Mann-Whitney U test, to assess the consistency of statistical significance findings.

**Limitation in results measurement:** In agreement with the Donor, data on girls' direct experiences of risks to their safety was not collected either before or after training as the necessary support required for girls to answer sensitive questions, support to implement the necessary child protection protocol and referral for girls identified as experiencing violence would require a different and far more costly method of data collection.

The Impact Evaluation has focused on assessing the retained knowledge directly attributable to Fightback training and the impact of this knowledge on girls' overall sense of wellbeing; and their perception of their ability to stay safe and defend themselves using techniques learned during Fightback training. Perception is used as a proxy for girls ability to stay safe.
Annex E – Endline Survey

Paritran Fightback Survey – Endline

Enumerator Introduction Page

ENUMERATOR TO READ OUT:

INTERVENTION GROUP INTRODUCTION

Hello. My name is _____ I work for FDM research agency and I am here on behalf of Coffey International Development, an independent Monitoring & Evaluation company. We are not from Fightback, but an independent research group that are doing some research on what young people like yourself think about self-defence. Most of you will remember completing a similar survey 6 to 8 months ago, around when you had the Fightback training.

COMPARISON GROUP INTRODUCTION

Hello. My name is _____ I work for FDM research agency and I am here on behalf of Coffey International Development, an independent Monitoring & Evaluation company. We are doing some research on what young people like yourself think about self-defence. Most of you will remember completing a similar survey 6 to 8 months ago.

READ OUT TO BOTH GROUPS / ALL RESPONDENTS

If you choose to participate in our study, we will ask you a few questions about yourself and your views about self-defense training for girls. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. We might store the answers that you give us, and use them in our research, but your responses will be anonymised. That means that we will not mention your name or any personal details about you, so that nobody will know it was you who gave these answers. It is entirely up to you whether or not you take part in our research. If you decide now, or at a later time, that you do not wish to take part in this study, you are free to stop at any time. Even if you start to take part and then change your mind later that is OK too.

For most of the survey I will read each question out to you and give you time to complete the answer before moving to the next question. I will explain words and descriptions I think you may not understand, but if there is something you still don't understand, please put your hand up and ask me the question. There may be others in your class that are likely to be confused too! It is very important you understand what you are answering. In this survey there is also one page of questions that you will complete on your own without me reading them to you. I will tell you when we reach these questions.

Please remember – this is not a test and we do not look at your individual responses.

Do you have any questions about what you are agreeing to?
After you have finished answering each question, I want you to put your pen down on your desk and wait till I start to read out the next question before continuing.
At the end of the survey, as a thank you for taking part we have [merchandise] to share with you.

Are we ready to start?

ENUMERATOR TO NOTE SECTION G AT THE END OF THE SURVEY WHICH IS NEW TO THE ENDLINE SURVEY – IT INCLUDES QUESTIONS FROM PARITRAN’S OWN POST-TRAINING SURVEY.

GIRLS WILL COMPLETE SECTION G ON THEIR OWN – WITHOUT ASSISTANCE.

FROM SECTION A ONWARDS, THE SURVEY WILL BE ENUMERATOR-LED AS AT BASELINE.
We would like to ask you a few questions about yourself and your views about self-defense training for girls. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. We might store the answers that you give us, and use them in our research, but your responses will be anonymised. That means that we will not mention your name or any personal details about you, so that nobody will know it was you who gave these answers. It is entirely up to you whether or not you take part in our research. If you decide now, or at a later time, that you do not wish to take part in this study, you are free to stop at any time. Even if you start to take part and then change your mind later that is OK too.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1. Are you happy to complete this survey?</th>
<th>TICK ONE ONLY</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop and tell the facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lets get started!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S2. What is your name</th>
<th>Write in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3. How old are you</td>
<td>Write in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4. What grade are you in now?</td>
<td>Write in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section A: All about you

A2. Below are some statements about feelings and thoughts. Thinking of the past week, for each statement, please tick the box that best describes how things have been: very poor (1), poor (2), fair (3), good (4), very good (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Your mood or feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School or learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Helping out at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Getting along with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Getting along with your family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 | Play or free time  
  *CL: free time is when you are allowed to do as you please* |
| 8 | Getting things done |
| 9 | Your feeling of love or affection  
  *CL: In the context of your parents, siblings and friends* |
| 10 | Getting or buying things |
| 11 | The place where you live |
| 12 | Paying attention |
| 13 | Your energy levels |
| 14 | Overall how has your life been |

A3. In the last 6-8 months, have you been doing any new activities outside of school? Eg. playing sport/dance classes/self-defence classes? If yes, what activity are you doing that you weren’t doing 6-8 months ago? Write in below
A4. How do you think you might respond if someone made you feel threatened (TICK YES, NO OR DON’T KNOW FOR EACH QUESTION):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A4.1 First / immediate response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would fight [with words or actions] with the people who were making me feel uncomfortable or threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL: for example if someone made you feel threatened by following you or standing close to you on the bus would your first reaction be to fight with them, ignore them or run/move away?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would ignore [pay no attention to] the people who were making me feel uncomfortable or threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would run [or move] away from the people who were making me feel uncomfortable or threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A4.2 After</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be worried that I would get into trouble (e.g. for being somewhere I am not supposed to be)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be embarrassed to talk about something that had happened to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would try not to go to the place where it happened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A5.2 Who do you think you would speak to if someone said bad things about you, or made you feel threatened or you felt unsafe? (TICK YES OR NO FOR EACH QUESTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would speak to an adult in my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would speak to my sister or brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would speak to a teacher at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would speak to a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would speak to another person (write in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would not know who to speak to

Section B: General Knowledge

Now, thinking about what you know about your safety, please read the following questions and tick the one response for each question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1.</th>
<th>Choose the key characteristic a criminal looks for most in a victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>CL: a victim is someone that is harmed/attacked by a criminal (add Nepali)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tick one only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone who is wealthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone who is unsure of themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone who is not physically strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B2.</th>
<th>Which part of an assailants grip is the weakpoint?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ENUMERATOR TO DEMONSTRATE GRIP AND EACH PART OF BODY</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>An assailant should be defined for the girls as a person who physically attacks another (and add Nepali word)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tick one only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index Finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3.</th>
<th>What should your FIRST RESPONSE be if an assailant [mugger] grabs you by the neck?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ENUMERATOR TO DEMONSTRATE NECK GRAB AND ACTIONS AND RESPONSE OPTIONS LISTED BELOW</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tick one only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hit them in the groin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break the grip with you hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hit them in the throat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hit them in the nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break the grip with your hands and hit them in the groin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C: Life in General

C1. Now thinking over the last 6 months, have you ever felt UNSAFE in any of the following: For each, please tick the box that best describes if you have felt UNSAFE: never, hardly ever; some of the time; often or all of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Often or all of the time</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**B4.** What should your FIRST RESPONSE be if an assailant [mugger] grabs you by the hair?  **Tick one only**

- Kick your leg back against them
- Swing your arm back against them
- Interlock your fingers and push down against their wrist
- Flick your head back to relax the grip and run away
- Don’t know

**B5.** What is your FIRST RESPONSE when someone tries to press their body against your body in a public vehicle [to resolve the situation peacefully]?  **Tick one only**

- Create a distance with your arms/elbows
- Firmly push them away
- Ignore them
- Move somewhere else in the vehicle
- Don’t know

**B6.** Which of these is NOT a FIRST RESPONSE if someone tries to physically attack you?  **Tick one only**

- Regulate your breathing
- Shout
- Run away
- Think about your next move
- Don’t know
1. While at home

2. While at school

3. When you did organised classes or activities not part of school
   *CL: at baseline, high DK so need to explain through examples – eg dance classes at a dance school; private tutoring or sports coaching.*

4. When you did sport or exercise away from school and without instruction from a sports coach or tutor

5. When you did things outside the home with your friends

6. When you spent time by yourself (either in or outside your home)

7. When you travelled on public transport

**C2** If you feel unsafe, what are some of the things you can do? Write in below

**C2.** Still thinking of the last 6 months, on a scale of 1-5, how satisfied are you with each of the following things in your life? Please tick the box to show if you are very dissatisfied (1), dissatisfied (2), neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (3), satisfied (4) and very satisfied (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How satisfied are you with how safe you feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How satisfied are you with the freedom you have (to do what you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How satisfied are you with what you want to do and go where you want to go
   *CL: do whatever you want to do and go wherever you want to go*

2. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

3. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

4. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

5. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

6. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

7. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

8. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

9. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

10. How satisfied are you with what you do in your free time

---

**SECTION D – FIGHTBACK SELF-DEFENCE TRAINING**

Now thinking about the Fightback Self-Defence training that was delivered to you school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>How many days did you attend the Fightback self defence training for?</th>
<th>tick one only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Day</td>
<td><em>Continue to D2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Days</td>
<td><em>Continue to D2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Days</td>
<td><em>Continue to D2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (write in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D2. If you were to describe the Fightback training to a friend, what would you say about it?** Write in below
D3. Since your Fightback training, have you felt differently about yourself in any of the following areas? Please rate as: got a lot worse, got a bit worse, stayed the same, improved a bit, or improved a lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot worse</th>
<th>A bit worse</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Improved a bit</th>
<th>Improved a lot</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How safe you feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to defend yourself against a physical attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to stay away from dangerous situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to escape from possible threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your self confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your alertness/Active Mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your self-defence skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D4 Has the training helped you in any way? For example, are you able to do more activities outside the home? Do you feel more confident walking around your community? Is there no change? Please describe. There is no right or wrong response. Write in below.

D5. What is the most important thing you learnt from your Fightback training? Write in below.
Section E: About you  **THIS SECTION WILL NEED TRANSLATION TO NEPALI**

I would now like to ask a few questions about you and your family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many people, including you, live in your house?</td>
<td>Write number in below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many bedrooms does your house have?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does your house have a kitchen?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What kind of stove is used for cooking?</td>
<td>Open fireplace, mud, kerosene, other, Gas stove or smokeless oven, Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What type of toilet you have in your house?</td>
<td>A flushing toilet, No toilet/non-flush/communal toilet, Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the house built from?</td>
<td>Bricks or stones, Other material (write in), Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What material is the roof made from?</td>
<td>Tiles/slate, Wood/planks, or galvanized iron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Concrete/cement

- Concrete/cement
- Other (write in)
- Don’t know

### 8. How many telephone sets/cordless/mobile does your household own?

- None
- One
- Two or more
- Don’t know

### 9. What work does the head of the family do?

- Self employed farmer
- Self employed office worker
- Employed (ie earning a salary/paid by someone else) in either farming or an office
- Other (Write in)
- Does not work
- There is no head of the family

### 10. Do people in your house own any farmland that is used to grow food/vegetables on?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 11. If yes – do you know if the land has its own supply of water/is irrigated?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

---

**Section F Closing**

F1. Lastly, have you had any difficulty completing this survey? If you didn’t answer or replied don’t know to some of the questions – can you tell us why?

Write in here
THE NEXT AND FINAL SECTION OF THIS SURVEY YOU WILL COMPLETE ON YOUR OWN WITHOUT HELP.
### SECTION G: FIGHTBACK POST-TRAINING QUESTIONS

Without help, please read through each question and tick the box that answers the question:

Firstly, thinking about how you might identify and respond to potentially dangerous situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Tick one only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 A place can be high risk zone if you ask for help but do not get it within</td>
<td>30 seconds, 20 seconds, 10 seconds, None of the above, Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What colour should you be for situational awareness?</td>
<td>Blue, Yellow, White, Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 When you face a threat is flight a good response?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 What is the minimum safe distance that one should maintain in a potential dangerous situation?</td>
<td>1 foot, 3 feet, 5 feet, 20 feet, Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Can you use your voice as a weapon?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Reading each action listed below, can you tell me how able you are: For each please tick the box to indicate if you are: not at all able, somewhat able, able, very able.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Not at all able</th>
<th>Somewhat able</th>
<th>Able</th>
<th>Very able</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify potentially dangerous situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a potential criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release yourself from a wrist grab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from a neck grab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release yourself from a hair grab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use your voice as defence in an attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend yourself if someone pushed you on the ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond early to sexual harassment without harming anyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage your fear and stress in life threatening situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIS IS THE END OF THE SURVEY - THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP IN THIS RESEARCH!
Annex F – Key Informant Interview (KII) Guide

Cover sheet Paritran Fightback KII Topic Guide – Endline

INTERVIEWER TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET FOR GIRL, PARENT AND TEACHER KIIs: Please fill in one sheet per interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the interview recorded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent ID:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of training days completed (one, two or three)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main findings

Please summarise below the main findings per theme. Please use the right column to record any additional observations and rank the quality of the overall interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Additional Notes/Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main safety concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned from Fightback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other observations – for example: how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Paritran Fightback KII Topic Guide for girls – Endline

**Purpose:** This topic guide should be used to guide endline Key Informant Interviews with girls who receive Fightback training and have not participated in the survey for the Impact Evaluation with Paritran.

**Aim:** The aim of this Key Informant Interview is to validate the responses of girls that took part in the enumerator-led surveys and also explore parental attitudes to girl safety. We are particularly interested in any changes in the last 6-8 months back (or since the Fightback self-defence training) — in girls’ safety knowledge, behaviour and perceptions of safety and her ability to stay safe.

**Sampling:** In total 21 KIIs will be conducted – 9 KIIs with parents, in addition to 9 with girls and 3 with head teachers. **Six of the girls will have been interviewed at baseline and three will be new at endline.**

**Resources to have to hand:**
- Topic guide and show cards
- Audio recording equipment.
- Previous transcript for second interviews (i.e. participants interviewed at baseline)

**INTERVIEWER NOTE TEXT HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW IS NEW TO ENDLINE.**

**Section 1. Introduction**

*Enumerator to read to the respondents:*

Thank you very much for giving us some time to speak today. I'm <name> from the research company FDM. I am doing research to learn more about what girls think about safety. You may remember speaking to me 6 – 8 months ago? Today we are interested in finding out more about your life [since we last spoke], how you have been spending your time, how you stay safe day to day.

We will talk for about 1 hour.

I have a form here that explains the research we are doing which I would like to review with you. Once we have reviewed the form, if you are happy to continue with our interview I will ask you to sign the form for me to keep, and I will give you a copy that you can keep.

Are you okay if we record our conversation? (Yes/No).

*Interviewer to reiterate:* If at any time you are uncomfortable, we can stop or you are allowed to leave. At any stage during our discussion you can also ask me to stop recording. If anything is unclear, please let me know and ask any questions you have.

**[4.1 and 4.2: ASK ONLY IF NOT INTERVIEWED AT BASELINE/FIRST INTERVIEW]**

**Section 2. Background / warm up (5 mins)**

*IF FIRST INTERVIEW ASK*

2.1 First, I would like to hear more about you, where you come from and what you do from day to day.

Prompt:
- What is your name?
- How old are you? Who do you live with? How many people are in your household?
- Do any other children or adolescents live in your house, e.g. siblings
• What do you like doing most (e.g. playing with your friends, reading, watching TV)?
• What is your least favourite thing?

**IF SECOND INTERVIEW ASK: Interviewer to refer to baseline transcripts and ask:**
• How have things been since we last spoke?

**ASK ALL [INTERVIEWER NOTE – we start with the same game as baseline so we can see the changes]**

**Section 3. Describing yourself (10 mins)**

*Enumerator to refer to stimulus A*

3.1 I'd like us to start by playing a game, this picture shows lots of people doing different things around a big tree. I want you to look at the picture and tell me which person you think is like you and why.

3.2 Now thinking of the past week, how have you felt:

• About school?
• About your friends and family?
• About the way you look?
• About yourself in general?
• What are the things you have been thinking about the most?
• Is there anything else you have been thinking about?
• What has been worrying you the most? What have you felt happiest about?

**Section 4. Extra-curricular activities and mobility (10 mins)**

**[4.1 AND 4.2 – ASK ONLY IF FIRST INTERVIEW]**

4.1 Thinking about an average week, how do you usually spend your time?

4.2 Let's take a typical day in a school week. During that day:

*Instruction for interviewer: talk through a typical day, from waking up, getting to school, getting back from school, what she does in the afternoon and evening.*

*Probe:*

• What time do you wake up?
• What time do you go to school?
• How do you get there?
ASK ALL

4.3 What do you usually do after school and in your free time / when you are not at school?

Probe:
- What things are you allowed to do away from home? But skip over if mentioned above.
- Has this changed in the last 6-8 months? How? Why?

4.4 Are there some things you are not allowed to do? Why are you not allowed to them?

Probe:
- What are girls’ safety levels in specific locations you mention as places where you go.

4.5 What places are you not allowed to go to? Why are you not allowed to go there?

4.6 Is there anywhere you cannot go to, but your siblings or friends go to?

Probe:
- (If girl has siblings) Are your older siblings allowed to go there? Are your brothers allowed to go there?
- Has any of this changed in the last 6-8 months? How? Why? Has it changed since you had the Fightback self-defence training at school? Why/not?

Section 5. Feelings of safety - victim of sexual harassment or bullying (15 mins)

5.1 Do you feel safe in the area where you live? Why do you say this?

Probe:
- What are the biggest safety issues you know about? How do you know about this?
- Have there been any problems in recent past - the past 6-8 months? And in past 30 days?
- Thinking of the last 6-8 months, do you feel more or less safe? How? Why? Has it changed since you had the Fightback self-defence training at school? better/worse/no different? Why/not?

5.2 Have you heard of any bullying or sexual harassment in the last 6-8 months in your community or at school?

READ OUT

By bullying I mean: When a student or group of students say or do bad and unpleasant things to another student. It is also bullying when a student is teased a lot in an unpleasant way or when a student is left out of things on purpose. It is not bullying when two students of about the same strength or power argue or fight or when teasing is done in a friendly and fun way.

By sexual harassment I mean: When someone (e.g. another student, member of the community or family) makes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

Note for enumerator: If necessary, repeat the question on hearing about bullying or harassment

Probe:
- Who have you spoken to about these worries?

5.3 Do you feel safe in school? And on your way to school? Why?
Probes:

- **What are the biggest safety issues you know about?** How do you know about this? Have there been any problems in the community with regards to safety in past 6 months? And in past 30 days?
- Have you heard of any bullying or sexual harassment in school in the last 6-8 months?
- Who have you spoken to about these worries?
- Thinking of the last 6-8 months, do you feel more or less safe? How? Why? Has it changed since you had the Fightback self-defence training? better/worse/no different? Why?

5.4 What do you think girls can do to stay safe?

Probes:

- Can you think of some skills that could help manage or get out of dangerous situations?
- Can you think of some skills that would help you to recognise a dangerous situation and know good from bad behaviour in others?

5.5 Do your parents ever talk to you about your safety? Have your parents spoken to you about your safety in the last few months?

Probes:

- What are some of the issues you spoke to them about?
- What advice did they give you?
- Did they give any specific advice for some activities?

Probes:

- Did your parents give you advice for when you are home alone or outside the house?

5.6 Would you speak up if you were worried about your own/someone else's safety?

Probes:

- Why/why not? When? Who would you speak to?

**Section 6. Taking up the Fightback self-defence course (10 mins)**

6.1 Do you remember the Fightback self-defence training you received at school 6-8 months ago?

I would now like to ask you a few questions about this training:

6.2 Do you remember why you wanted to do the training?

Probes:

- What did you hope you would learn?
- What changes did you hope it would make to your life?

6.2 What has the Fightback training taught you? And, in particular, what has it taught you about staying safe?

Interviewer instructions: each question is aimed at exploring how the training has changed behaviour/increased knowledge, so the responses should reflect what has been a result of the training.

Probes:
• Can you give some examples of what you have learned?
• What are some of the issues you talked about during the training? (e.g. how to stay safe while travelling)
• Were you given any specific advice for some activities? Can you give examples?
• Have you changed the way you behave or places you go to in order to ensure you stay safe? How?

6.3 Do you feel safer after attending the training? Why/why not? Do you feel more confident?
Probe:
• To what extent do you feel taking up the course has allowed you more freedom? [if not mentioned before]
• Do your parents allow you to go to more places and to engage in more activities than before?
• How is this different from before the training [if not mentioned before]? In what way?

6.4 To what extent did the Fightback training sufficiently address your safety needs/concerns?
Probe:
• What did it not address?
• Prompt if necessary: What about cyber safety – how to stay safe on social media etc.?
• Any other suggestions to improve the training?
• What could it have done better to help you address those needs/concerns?

6.5 Did you ever share what you learned at the Fightback training with others?
Probe:
• Did you share it with your friends?
• Did you share it with your family?
• What do you share with them? Why?

6.6 Have you had information about staying safe from anyone/anywhere other than the Fightback self-defence training?
• Prompt if necessary: What are some other sources that have provided you with information about staying safe?

Probe:
• What did you learn from these sources?
• How does this differ from what you learned at Fightback?
Section 7. Self-defence knowledge (15 mins)

Interviewer instructions: in the following section, probe each response using the survey preselect responses if necessary to get the participant to think of a response.

7.1 What do you think could make a situation dangerous?

7.2 How do you think you could manage your fear and stress in a dangerous situation?

7.3 How do you think you would react to a physical attack?

7.4 What do you think your first response to a physical attack should be?

7.5 What do you think could be some signs that someone may do you harm?

Section 8. Boys (5 mins)

8.1 Do you think boys also experience safety concerns or issues in your community?
- Probe: What are some of the ways that safety is different for boys and girls? What are some of the different dangers, or threats to safety, for girls? Boys?

8.2 Do you think you behave any differently around boys since the self-defence training? If yes, how?
- Probe: Do you think boys behave differently towards you or other girls since the self-defence training?

8.3 Do you think boys should also have self-defence training? What do you think they need to learn?

Section 9. Wrap up and close (5 mins)

9.1 Is there anything else you think we should talk about, especially around safety?

THANK AND CLOSE

Thank you very much for taking the time to speak to us today and for your participation. You provided a lot of great information and insight.
Paritran Fightback KII Topic Guide for (head teachers) – Endline

**Purpose:** This topic guide should be used to guide endline Key Informant Interviews with head teachers at the schools in which girls receive Fightback training, for the Impact Evaluation with Paritran.

**Aim:** The aim of this Key Informant Interview is to triangulate the responses of girls that took part in the enumerator-led surveys and explore head teacher perceptions of girl safety and the benefits and drawbacks of improved self-defence delivered by the Fightback training. It also gathers feedback on the administration of the training itself. As far as possible, we go back to same head teachers as baseline.

**Sampling:** Three KII will be completed with head / teachers – participants to be the same as baseline.

**Resources to have to hand:**
- Topic guide
- Audio recording equipment
- Baseline transcript – reviewed for reference in endline interview

**INTERVIEWER NOTE TEXT HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW IS NEW TO ENDLINE.**

**Section 1. Introduction**

Enumerator to read to the respondents:

Thank you very much for giving us some time to speak today. I’m <name> from the research company FDM. You may recall our interview eight months back when the Fightback delivered their self-defence training to the girls in your school. I am now doing follow-up research to find out whether the training has helped to address some of the concerns about the girl students safety in their day to day life, both in school and out.

We will talk for about 1 hour.

I have a form here that explains the research we are doing which I would like to review with you. Once we have reviewed the form, if you are happy to continue with our interview I will ask you to sign the form for me to keep, and I will give you a copy that you can keep.

Are you okay if we record our conversation? (Yes/No).

Interviewer to reiterate: If at any time you are uncomfortable, we can stop or you are allowed to leave. At any stage during our discussion you can also ask me to stop recording. If anything is unclear, please let me know and ask any questions you have.

**Section 2. Background & warm up (5 mins)**

2.1 Firstly, can you tell us

- How were you involved with the Fightback training?

2.2 Now, thinking back over the past 6- 8 months or since we last spoke, has anything happened in the school or community that has had a bearing on girls’ safety? Has anything changed in girls’ behaviour since the Fightback Training? (moderator to make a note to explore later on in the interview)

**Probe:**

- Are girls involved in or showing interest in any new/additional extra curricula activities? Do you have a sense whether girls have gained greater mobility outside the home? Why?
Section 3. Reflections on the Self Defence Course (10 mins)

Now thinking back to the Fightback self-defence training.

3.1 What was your overall impression of the course?

Prompt, if necessary: good/bad/ok

Probe:
- Why do you say this? What was good/bad; why okay/bad and not good?
- Can you report on anything that other teachers said about the training?
- Would you say it has had lasting effects? What are these?

3.2. [moderator to refer to baseline transcript notes were relevant] In particular, what was your impression of:

- Paritran’s communication with you beforehand /during/ after training
- Coordination of the training during the day(s) it was delivered
- Timekeeping and control of the girls
- The training content – appropriateness and relevance for all trainees
- The training methods used:
  - The en-masse (big single group) method of training all girls at once
  - The mix of talking, demonstration and practice
- Value for money – the cost per girl of the training

Thinking about what the training taught girls.

3.3 What are the key things girls learned from the course?

Probe:
- Did the training teach girls anything about how to safely navigate the journey to and from school? Or how to be safe when moving around outside of school?
- Do you agree with what the course taught the students? Why?
- Did the course allow you to learn new things about safety issues as well? What?
- How does this compare to information from other sources?
  - What are some other sources of information that girls receive information about safety from? (e.g. government, NGOs, social media, friends, etc.) [interviewer note: please provide examples of NGOs where needed].
  - How likely are students to use this information to stay safe.

3.4 How did the girls respond to the training?
IMPACT EVALUATION – FIGHTBACK ENDLINE REPORT

Probe:
- What was the girls’ immediate reaction to the training (ie one or two days after the training)?
- Do girls still talk about or refer to the training now in any way?
- Do you feel girls are speaking up more or feel more confident about their safety?
- Would you say the course sufficiently addressed girls safety needs?
  - If No
    - What did it not address?
    - What could it have done better to help them address those needs/concerns?

3.5 And thinking about girls’ parents:
- Did you receive any direct feedback from the parents after the training?
- Did any of the parents express concerns or have questions about the training before it had been delivered?
- [moderator to refer to baseline KII transcripts] Do you feel parents are less worried about their safety since the training?
- Would you say the course sufficiently addressed parents’ safety concerns? Why do you say that?
  - If not
    - What did it not address?
    - What could it have done better to help them address those needs/concerns?

3.6 Would you say the course sufficiently addressed students’ safety needs and concerns?

Probe:
- What did it not address?
- What could it have done better to help them address those needs/concerns?
  - Did any of the girls mention safety related issues to you before the training? Do any of the girls mention safety related issues to you now, since the training?

Note for interviewer: If not mentioned before:
- Do you think girls are able to stay safe and avoid being victims of sexual harassment or bullying?
- Has the training taught girls how to safely navigate the journey to and from school?

Section 4. Victim of sexual harassment or bullying (15 mins)

4.2 [moderator to refer to baseline KII transcripts] Do you think there is any particular activity or place in the community that makes girls less safe?

4.3 Do you think girls are better able to stay safe and avoid being victims of this type of bullying and harassment as a result of the training?

Section 5. Managing safety/self-defence concerns (5 mins)
ASK ONLY OF St Xavier Schools where there is separate counsellor support [NOT APEX]:
Thinking now about the counselling or support service for girls on how to stay safe.

5.1 Has the support provided changed in any way in the last 6 – 8 months/ since the training?

Probe:
- Are the girls asking for a different type of support as a result of the training? is their less need for the service?

Section 6. Boys (10 mins)

These questions are only applicable if the school is a co-ed school. Skip these questions if the school is an all-girls’ school.

6.1 Are you aware of how boys have responded to the training?

Probe:
- Are you aware of any negative effects of the training on boys? Probe – for example, are girls now bullying boys? Have there been any fights between girls and boys?
- Are you aware of any positive effects of the training on boys or on the relationship between boys and girls? Probe – for example, less fighting, less bullying.
- Are you aware of any negative effects on relationships between girls and boys? Probe – are boys jealous or are they at a disadvantage because they know less about safety than girls?

6.2 Did you discuss or share any of the training course with boys? Why/why not?

6.3 Have you noticed any behavioural changes in boys or girls? Could you give examples?

Section 7. Wrap up and close (5 mins)

7.1 Overall, are you able to provide specific examples of girls whose behaviour has changed either positively or negatively since the training, where you think training might have had a role to play?

7.2 Is there anything else you think we should talk about regarding girls’ safety?

THANK AND CLOSE

Thank you very much for taking the time to speak to us today and for your participation. You provided a lot of great information and insight.
Paritran Fightback KII Topic Guide for parents - Endline

**Purpose:** This topic guide should be used to guide endline Key Informant Interviews with parents of girls who receive Fightback training for the Impact Evaluation with Paritran.

**Aim:** The aim of this Key Informant Interview is to validate the responses of girls that took part in the enumerator-led surveys and also explore parental attitudes to girl safety. We are particularly interested in any changes in the last 6-8 months back (or since the Fightback self-defence training) – in both parents and girls’ safety knowledge, behaviour and perceptions of safety and of the girls’ ability to stay safe.

**Sampling:** In total 21 KIs will be conducted – 9 KIs with parents, in addition to 9 with girls (ideally their daughters) and 3 with headteachers. **Six of the parents will have been interviewed at baseline and three will be new at endline.**

**Resources to have to hand:**
- Topic guide
- Audio recording equipment
- Previous transcript for second interviews (i.e. participants interviewed at baseline)
- **INTERVIEWER NOTE TEXT HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW IS NEW TO ENDLINE.**

### Section 1. Introduction

Enumerator to read to the respondents:

Thank you very much for giving us some time to speak today. I’m <name> from the research company FDM. I am doing research to learn more about what girls think about safety. **You may recall speaking to me or one of my colleagues 6–8 months ago? Today we are interested in finding out more about you and your daughter’s life [since we last spoke]. We would like to find out more about how your daughter spends her time, and in particular, your perceptions of her safety in their day to day life.**

We will talk for about 1 hour.

I have a form here that explains the research we are doing which I would like to review with you. Once we have reviewed the form, if you are happy to continue with our interview I will ask you to sign the form for me to keep, and I will give you a copy that you can keep.

Are you okay if we record our conversation? (Yes/No).

Interviewer to reiterate: If at any time you are uncomfortable, we can stop or you are allowed to leave. At any stage during our discussion you can also ask me to stop recording. If anything is unclear, please let me know and ask any questions you have.

### Section 2. Background & warm-up (5 mins)

**IF FIRST INTERVIEW ASK**

- 2.1 First, I would like to learn more about you: your name, whether you are married, working, who else and how many children and adults are in your household?

**IF SECOND INTERVIEW: Interviewer to refer to baseline transcripts and ask:**

- **How have things been since we last spoke?**

**ASK ALL**

- Have there been any changes in your home life in the last 6-8 months for example people leaving the home?
Section 3. Describing your daughter (10 mins)

**IF FIRST INTERVIEW ASK**

- Can you tell us a little bit about your daughter?
- How old is she?
- What school does she go to? What grade is she in?
- What does she most enjoy doing? What does she like the least?
- Do you have other children in the family? Who? What is your daughter like in comparison with other children in your family?
  - Probe: is she shy, is she talkative, is she studious…

**IF SECOND INTERVIEW: Interviewer to refer to baseline transcripts and ask:**

- Since we last spoke have there been any changes in your daughter’s life, specifically thinking of the following? (refer to above)

Section 4. Extra-curricular activities and feelings of safety (15 mins)

**IF FIRST INTERVIEW ASK:**

4.1 Thinking about a typical day in an average school week, can you please describe what your daughter usually does – as well as your other children, if you have any?

*Instruction for interviewer: work with the respondent to talk through a typical day of their daughter, from waking up, getting to school, getting back from school, what she does in the afternoon and evening.*

- What time does your daughter usually wake up?
- What time does she go to school?
- How does she get there?
- What does your daughter usually do after school and in her free time?

*Instruction for Interviewer: probe for girls’ safety in specific locations mentioned as places where girls go.*

**IF SECOND INTERVIEW: Interviewer to refer to baseline transcripts and ask:**

- Since we last spoke have there been any changes in what your daughter usually does day to day? (refer to above)

**ASK ALL**

4.2 What kind of activities does your daughter do outside the home?

- Note to interviewer – skip over if mentioned in 4.1

- Probe:
  - Is your daughter doing new activities outside of the home now compared with 6-8 months ago? What are these activities?
  - Have her activities or behaviour changed in any other way? How?
  - Do you think she is more aware of her own safety? And issues related to her own safety?
  - Do you feel she is speaking up more or feels more confident about her safety?
  - Is she allowed to go places now that she was not allowed to go to 6-8 months ago? Why/not?
4.3 Do you worry about her safety? What makes you worry about her safety?

- **Probe:**
  - Do you worry most about her safety in any specific place?
    - In the last 6-8 months have your concerns for her safety changed in any way?
      - Has the Fightback self-defence training played a role in these changes?

4.4 What do you usually do when you are worried about her safety?

- **Probe:**
  - Is there anywhere she is not allowed to go? Why is she not allowed there? Are there certain times she is not allowed to be outside the house?

4.5 In what way do you worry about your daughter’s safety, compared to other children in your family, e.g. your sons?

- **Probe:**
  - Are there specific risks that girls face? What are the main ones?
    - In the last 6-8 months has this changed in any way?
      - Do you worry more/less? And compared to your other children? Has the Fightback training played a role?

Section 5. Victim of sexual harassment or bullying (15 mins)

5.1 What are your main safety concerns in your community?

- **Probe:**
  - What are your main safety concerns for your daughter specifically?
  - What do you think your daughter can do to stay safe?
    - Have there been any safety-related incidents within the community in the past 6-8 months? Since the Fightback self-defence training? Who did they involve, and how were they resolved? 
    - Do you feel any differently now about your daughters’ safety than 6-8 months ago? Before the Fightback self-defence training? Why/not?

5.2 Do you discuss safety with your daughter? [moderator to refer to transcript if interviewed at baseline]

- **Probe:**
  - What advice did you give to her for when she leaves the house, or for when she is home alone?
  - Have you discussed safety with your daughter in the last 6-8 months?
    - If yes, who initiated this conversation, what was the nature of the conversation? 
    - If no, why not?
• 5.3 [In the last 6–8 months] Do you know if anyone else has spoken to your daughter about her safety?
  
  **Probe:**
  
  * Do you know who spoke to her about it?
  * If she has spoken to someone else, do you know what they spoke to her about or what she learned?

**Section 6. Taking up the Fightback self-defence training (10 mins)**

6.1 What were your expectations of the Fightback self-defence training?

  **Probe:**
  
  * What did you hope your daughter would learn?
  * What changes did you hope it would make to her life?
  * Has it met your expectations? Why/not?

6.2 What was your impression of the Fightback self-defence training? Why do you say that?

  
  6.3 What are some of the things she has learned from the Fightback self-defence training?
  
  **Probe:**
  
  * Did she talk to you about it? What are some of the issues you talked about?
  * Did the training allow you to learn about safety issues as well?
  * Do you agree with what she learned from the training?

6.4 Would you say the course sufficiently addressed her safety needs? Why do you say that?

  **Probe:**
  
  * Would you say it addressed all your safety concerns? What did it address? And what not?
  * Do you feel your daughter is safer since the training? Do you worry about her less since the training?
  * Have you let your daughter do more activities outside the home since the training (or felt she is more able to)?
  * What could the training have done better?

  6.5 Have you noticed any good (positive) or bad (negative) changes in your daughter’s behaviour as a result of the Fightback self-defence training?

  6.6 Have you noticed any good (positive) or bad (negative) changes in your daughters’ behaviour towards her siblings/other children in the household? Can you give us an example?

  **Probe:**
  
  * Has she taught them her skills? Does she bully them? Is she more confident around them? Do they behave differently towards her?

  6.7 [and beyond sources mentioned in 5.2 above] Does your daughter get information about staying safe from anyone/anywhere other than the Fightback self-defence training?
If yes:
• Can you name some of the other [key] sources of information?
• How does the information/message/teaching differ from Fightback’s message/ teaching?

Section 7. Boys (5 mins)

These questions are only applicable if the parents also have sons.

7.1 Do you have different safety concerns between the girls and the boys in your community?
• Probe:
  • What are some of the ways that safety is different for boys and girls?
  • What are some of the different dangers, or threats to safety, for girls? Boys?

7.2 Do you discuss safety differently between boys and girls?

8.3 Now that your daughter has had the Fightback self-defence training, would you like your son to receive either awareness or self-defence training? Can you tell me more about what you think his needs are and what you would like training to address?

Section 8. Wrap-up and close (5 mins)

• 8.1 Is there anything else you think we should talk about regarding girls’ safety?

THANK AND CLOSE

Thank you very much for taking the time to speak to us today and for your participation. You provided a lot of great information and insight.
Annex G – Focus Group Discussion Guide

Paritran Fightback FGD Topic Guide for girls - Endline

**Purpose:** This topic guide should be used to lead Focus Group Discussions at the Endline Impact Evaluation of Paritran.

**Aim:** The aim of this focus group discussion is to find out more about where in their communities / neighbourhoods girls (and boys) feel safe and where they do not and how this has changed since the Fightback self-defence training, in particular if girls feel safer and more confident; and if there are any unintended consequences in particular of training only girls and not boys, e.g. if this alters the relationship between boys and girls.

**Sampling:** In total, four FGDs will be conducted – 3 with girls of different age groups, and one with boys (of a comparable age group to one of the girls’ FGD groups). **As far as possible we will look to speak to the same participants as at baseline.**

One FGD will also be conducted with boys who have not participated in training. **In the case of the ‘boy’ FGD, the same guide should be used, but whenever the guide says ‘girls’, this should be replaced with ‘boys’.**

**Resources to have on hand:**
- Flip chart paper and markers
- Audio recording equipment
- Coloured sticky dots
- A camera (to photograph the maps). This can be a phone camera, but the photos should be of high resolution.
- **Baseline notes – reviewed for reference in endline interview**

**Section 1. Introduction**

**Enumerator to read to the respondents:**

Thank you very much for giving us some time to speak today. I’m [name] from the research company FDM, and this is [name] (introduce the note taker). We are doing research to learn more about what girls think about safety. We would like to find out more about you and your day-to-day lives. For example, where you spend your time, what kind of things you do every day, and where you feel most safe.

We will talk for about 1 hour and 30 minutes.

I have a form here that explains the research we are doing which I would like to review with you. Once we have reviewed the form, if you are happy to continue with our discussion I will ask you to sign the form for me to keep, and I will give you a copy that you can keep.

Are you okay if we record this discussion? (Yes/No).

**Interviewer to reiterate:** If at any time you are uncomfortable, we can stop or you are allowed to leave. At any stage during our discussion you can also ask me to stop recording. If anything is unclear, please let me know and ask any questions you have.

**Section 2. Background & warm up (5 mins)**

First, to start, we would like to get to know each other. I would first like us to play a short game in which each of you will introduce yourself by stating two truths and one lie. The statements don’t have to be intimate, life-revealing things, just simple hobbies, interests, or past experiences that make you unique.
Each person goes one at a time, and the group has to guess which statements are true, and which statement is a lie. For example, "Hi, I'm Mary. My hair was almost to my waist in high school, I talked to Oprah Winfrey in an airport coffee shop, and I speak four languages."

Enumerator who is facilitating should start first.

Section 3. Mobility mapping: day to day life (30 mins)

Now, I would like to do an activity to find out a bit more about what girls like you do each day, where girls like you go in your community and what girls like you do. To do this, I would like us to make a map of your community. By community, I mean the places you usually go and the people that you know.

Instructions for moderator and note taker:

How does it work?
The girls will be split up into groups of 3/4 to create a map each, discussing and putting on it all the places they generally go, before you start asking questions.

What should it include?
- It is often easiest for girls to start with a place that they go often (daily), or know very well, e.g. school and extra-curricular activities such as sports or faith-based clubs. Then, they will extend the map to places they might go less often, such as the cinema, or shops, by drawing an outer boundary. The map should also include places that are within the boundaries of their community, but they do not go to.
- The kinds of places that girls can exclude from the map might be places outside the community boundary, such as places that are far away and that they might visit once a year, or places that would require an overnight trip.

Tips for enumerators
- The enumerator should encourage all girls to participate, and particularly if there are girls who do not speak up.
- During the exercise, and as girls add things to the map, the enumerators should record observations the kinds of discussions the girls have about what to put on the map.
- Once it appears as if they are finished, ask the girls if they are confident that the map captures all of the places where girls like them generally go to.
- Once that is completed, the enumerator will ask the girls some questions about what they have recorded on the map and to discuss the maps in more detail.
- The discussion questions (below) are used to understand what the girls have included in the map and what they have not included. This discussion should help clarify the scale of the map and the boundaries of what the girls consider to be their community. Instruct the girls that if there is anywhere they realise they have missed, that they can still add them to their map, and allow them to add any more places or make further changes.
- When girls have finished drawing their maps, bring the group together and discuss the following questions with them as one group.

Now that we have all drawn our maps, we would like you ask you some questions about what you have drawn. If there is anything you realise you might have missed on your map, feel free to make changes to the map as we discuss.

3.1 How long would it take to walk from one end of the map to the other?
- For instance, how long does it take to walk from your home to school?
3.2 What are some of the places in the community where girls like you would LIKE to go to, but do not go?

3.3 Thinking of the last 6 – 8 months

- Are there any places you are allowed to go to now that you were not allowed before? What are these places? And why are you able to go there now?

- Are there any places you USED to go to but can no longer go? What are these places? And why are you not able to go there now?

3.5 Are there any areas outside of your community where girls like you would like to go but are not allowed? Why are you not allowed to go there? Have there been any changes in the last 6 – 8 months? What? Why?

Section 4. Extra-curricular activities and mobility (15 mins)

In this section, the discussion will seek to learn more about specific locations included in the map. This section seeks to understand what kinds of places girls go to and what they do. We also want to confirm places where girls actually go to, to ensure they are not just places in the community that they know about.

Pick 4-5 different places identified on the girls’ maps. You should include within this at least 2 places that are on all, or most, of the girls’ maps. This should include the school. Pick a few places that only some of the girls have. Please probe on any differences of opinion.

Now I want to find out more about the places you have put on the map and the places that girls like you go. It is OK to have different views from each other. There are no right or wrong answers.

4.1 Do girls like you usually go to [this place]?

4.2 When do girls like you go to this place (e.g. after school, before school, weekends etc). What hours of the day? How often do girls like you go to this place?

- Instruct girls to draw blue dots on the map to represent places that they go to daily and yellow dots to represent places that they go to once or twice a week.

4.3 What are the things that girls normally do when they go here? Do girls like going here and why or why not? How do girls get here? Do girls need permission to go here?

- Probe example: Apart from learning and going to class, what else do you do at school?

- Probe example: Is this a place you are allowed to go to on your own, or with friends? Do you need permission to go to this place? From whom? Do you need to be accompanied by an older relative (e.g. a parent or a sibling)?

4.4 Have there been any changes in your [extra-curricular] activity in the last 6 – 8 months? What? Why has it changed?

Section 5. Feelings of safety - victim of sexual harassment or bullying (15 mins)

This next set of questions asks girls about what places they consider safe and unsafe. As the discussion progresses, instruct girls to draw green dots on places that they consider to be safe and red dots on places that they consider unsafe.

5.1 Looking at your maps and the places you have marked, what are some of the places where girls like you feel safe going to? Why do you feel safe going there? Is it safe at all times? Are there certain days/hours/ times of the year where you think it is unsafe?

5.2 What are some of the places that girls like you are not allowed to go (and why)? Who tells you that you are not allowed to go? To what extent do you agree?
5.3 Have there been any changes in the last 6–8 months? Are there places you can go to now that you couldn’t before? What are these places? And why has it changed?

5.4 What are some of the places where girls like you do not feel safe to go?

Places that girls may feel unsafe are places where they think there might be bullying or sexual harassment.

- Why do you feel these places are unsafe? Why do you/other girls go to these places that make you feel unsafe?
- What makes you feel most unsafe?
- Have there been any changes in the last 6-8 months?

**Moderator to clarify, if needed:**

By bullying we mean: when a student or group of students say or do bad and unpleasant things to another student. It is also bullying when a student is teased a lot in an unpleasant way or when a student is left out of things on purpose. It is not bullying when two students of about the same strength or power argue or fight or when teasing is done in a friendly and fun way.

By sexual harassment we mean: When someone (e.g. another student, member of the community or family) makes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

5.6 How would you respond if you felt unsafe at one of these places?

**Enumerator to probe around:**

- How would you respond if you were bullied? And if you were sexually harassed?
- Who would you go and speak to?

---

**Section 6. Self-defence knowledge/recall of Fightback self-defence training (10-15 mins)**

6.1 Does anyone know of some things that you can try to do to keep safe when going to these unsafe places?

**Probe:** What are these things?

6.2 How do you know how to do this? Did anyone tell you how to do this? **Where did you get that information from?** What sources? [probe all sources]

6.3 And what are some of the other sources that you get information from on how to stay safe?

**ASK GIRLS ONLY [BOYS WILL NOT HAVE ATTENDED THE TRAINING]**

6.4 Which of you remembers the Fightback self-defence training received at school about 6-8 months ago?

What do you remember about the training?

What did the training teach you about staying safe? - What advice were you given? How is this different from other sources of information (interviewer to refer to 6.2)

6.5 Thinking of the places you go [RETURNING TO THE MOBILITY MAP AND PLACES IDENTIFIED]

- Have you changed the way you behave or places you go to ensure you stay safe? How?
- Do you feel safer since attending the training? Why/why not? Has this affected the places you go to now?
- Do your parents allow you to go to more places and to engage in more activities than before? How is this different from before the training? In what way?

6.6 To what extent did the training sufficiently address your safety needs/concerns?
• What did it not address? (e.g. cyber safety – how to stay safe on social media etc.)
• What could it have done better to help you address those needs/concerns?

6.7 Do you ever share what you learned at the training with others?
  • Did you share learnings with your Friends?
  • Did you share learnings with your family? Who in your family?
  • What do you share with them? Why?

**ASK BOYS ONLY**

6.8 Do you remember the Fightback self-defence training that some girls in your school participated in? [prompt – it was about 6-8 months ago]

*If yes, what do you remember about it?*

6.9 Did you learn anything from girls that participated in the Fightback self-defence training? What?

6.10 Have you noticed any difference in the girls that participated in the training?

**Section 7. Wrap up and close**

*[ASK ALL]*

7.1 Do you think boys should also be trained in safety awareness?

7.2 Do you think boys also have a role to play in girls’ safety? What is this role?

7.3 Does anyone have final comments or questions, or think something important has not been said?

**THANK AND CLOSE**

Enumerators to be sure to thank everyone for their time and for their participation.

The enumerators should capture photographs of the map(s) when all the activities are completed.
Annex H – Theory of Change

PROBLEM
ADOLESCENT GIRLS FACE THE REAL AND PERCEIVED RISK OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT, PHYSICAL ABUSE, AND RAPE, LEADING FAMILIES TO RESTRICT THEIR MOBILITY AND GIRLS TO BE VICTIMIZED, HARMING THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH/CONFIDENCE

ACTIVITIES
TO SCALE OFFERING OF PHYSICAL, MENTAL, AND VOCAL TRAINING TO GIRLS AND THEIR PARENTS ‘EN MASSE’ THROUGH SCHOOLS AND PARTNERSHIPS TO REACH 30,000 ADOLESCENT GIRLS & AND THEIR FAMILIES BY 2020

FIGHTBACK

OUTCOMES
• GIRLS ARE TRAINED ON TO PREVENT, MITIGATE, AND MANAGE RISK OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE
• GIRLS ARE MORE RISK AWARE
• PARENTS ARE SENSITIZED TO ISSUES
• GIRLS JOIN A GROUP WITH THEIR PEERS
• GIRLS GAIN A PSYCHOLOGICAL, VOCAL, PHYSICAL SKILLS TO PREVENT
• GIRLS APPLY SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE TO MITIGATE HARMFUL SITUATIONS
• PARENTS FEEL SAFE AND SECURE ABOUT GIRLS
• PARENTS SEE GIRLS AS VICTIMS, NOT INSTIGATORS OF HARASSMENT
• GIRLS MAKE FRIENDS & CONNECTIONS

OUTCOMES
• POSITIVE CHANGE IN NORMS, VALUES, BEHAVIORS AMONG PARENTS REGARDING VIOLENCE AGAINST GIRLS (SHAM/BLAME)
• GIRLS GAIN MOBILITY, ENABLING THEM TO LEARN AND EARN
• GREATER SAFETY OF GIRLS
• GIRLS FEEL GREATER CONFIDENCE

SOCIAL IMPACT INDICATORS
• # FEMALES TRAINED THRU INSTITUTIONS
• # GIRLS TRAINED THRU INSTITUTIONS
• # FEMALES TRAINED THRU RETAIL
• # GIRLS TRAINED THRU RETAIL

INPUTS
• RESEARCH
• BRAND SUPPORT
• PARTNERSHIPS
• MANAGEMENT
• RECRUITMENT & TRAINING
• STANDARDIZATION

ASSUMPTIONS
• THAT THERE IS DEMAND FROM PARENTS AND GIRLS
• PRICE OF TRAINING IS AFFORDABLE AND Locations WHERE TRAINING IS OFFERED ARE CONVENIENT FOR GIRLS TO ATTEND

• THAT GIRLS ARE ABLE TO USE SKILLS THEY LEARN
• TRAINERS AND TRAINING METHODS ARE EFFECTIVE
• GIRLS ARE COMFORTABLE AND ABLE TO TALK TO PARENTS ABOUT TRAINING

• ONCE PARENTS FEEL GIRLS ARE EQUIPPED THEY WILL REDUCE MOBILITY RESTRICTION
• GIRLS ARE NOT AFRAID OF CONSEQUENCES OF SPEAKING OUT

BUSINESS INDICATORS
• REVENUE FROM INSTITUTIONS
• REVENUE FROM RETAIL MODEL

LAST UPDATE BOOTCAMP 2
BECCA, EMILY, VIKRANT, ARMAN

PRE/POST TESTS DEMONSTRATING IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE
• GIRLS EXPRESSING INCREASED CONFIDENCE

INVESTMENT ACHIEVED

SPRING MONITORING AND EVALUATION – JULY 2019 86