WORKING PAPER

GENEVA DECLARATION

TACKLING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: FROM KNOWLEDGE TO PRACTICAL INITIATIVES

By **Jennifer Milliken**
with **Elisabeth Gilgen**
and **Jasna Lazarevic**

www.genevadeclaration.org

Photo ▶ A victim of domestic violence with her daughter in Managua, Nicaragua, February 2009. © Riccardo Venturi/Contrasto/Dukas in collaboration with Intervita

small arms survey

Geneva Declaration Secretariat
c/o Small Arms Survey
47 Avenue Blanc
1202 Geneva
Switzerland

WORKING PAPER

GENEVA DECLARATION

TACKLING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: FROM KNOWLEDGE TO PRACTICAL INITIATIVES

By **Jennifer Milliken**
with **Elisabeth Gilgen**
and **Jasna Lazarevic**

Copyright

Published in Switzerland by the Geneva Declaration Secretariat

Geneva Declaration Secretariat
c/o Small Arms Survey
47 Avenue Blanc
1202 Geneva
Switzerland

Copy-edited by Alex Potter
Proofread by John Linnegar
Typeset in Meta by Richard Jones (rick@studioexile.com)
Printed by nbmedia, Geneva

ISBN: 978-2-940415-75-5

The Geneva Declaration

The Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development, endorsed by more than 100 countries, commits signatories to supporting initiatives intended to measure the human, social, and economic costs of armed violence, to assess risks and vulnerabilities, to evaluate the effectiveness of armed violence reduction programmes, and to disseminate knowledge of best practices. The Declaration calls upon states to achieve measurable reductions in the global burden of armed violence and tangible improvements in human security by 2015. Core group members include Brazil, Colombia, Finland, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. Affiliated organizations include the Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the Quaker United Nations Office (QUNO).

For more information about the Geneva Declaration, related activities, and publications, please visit www.genevadeclaration.org.

Contents

Boxes and tables

List of abbreviations

AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BCPR	Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery
DALY	disability-adjusted life years
FC	Friends of the Chair of the UN Statistical Office
GD	Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development
ICRW	International Center for Research on Women
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NSO	national statistical office
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PSA	participatory situation analysis
QUNO	Quaker United Nations Office
RRA	rapid rural appraisal
RSG	'Ready, Steady, Go'
SNA	System of National Account
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNSC	UN Statistical Commission
USAID	United States Agency of International Development
VAW	violence against women
WHO	World Health Organization

About the authors

Jennifer Milliken is the Founder and Principal of Milliken Strategy & Communications, an event content and design consultancy, and the Program Director for the Women's Forum Global Meeting. Previously, she was Principal at Smadja & Associates Strategic Advisory, and Assistant Professor of International Relations at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies. Jennifer holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Minnesota, an MA in International Relations from Syracuse University, and a BA (cum laude) in Communications from Concordia University.

Elisabeth Gilgen is a researcher at the Small Arms Survey. Her research concentrates on the measuring and monitoring of different forms of armed violence at a global, regional, and local level, including the characteristics of weapons, perpetrators, and victims. She is the coordinator of the *Global Burden of Armed Violence* report. From 2007 to 2009, she was an employee of the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs. She holds a Master's degree in Political Science and International Law from the University of Berne, Switzerland. As part of her degree programme, she was a visiting student at Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi, India.

Jasna Lazarevic is an associate researcher at the Small Arms Survey. Her primary research interests include arms transfers to armed groups and transparency in the small arms trade, as well as stockpile management and surplus destruction. Her work also includes projects on armed violence and gender issues, focusing in particular on female roles in armed groups and gangs, as well as females as agents and victims of political violence. She co-authored the chapter entitled 'The Other Half: Girls in Gangs' for the *Small Arms Survey 2010: Gangs, Groups, and Guns* and contributed substantially to a chapter on armed violence against women for the *Global Burden of Armed Violence* report (GD Secretariat, 2008b).

Acknowledgements

The authors express their thanks to the researchers and experts who participated in the Expert Workshop on Violence against Women—Disabling Development held on 25–26 March 2010 in Geneva, Switzerland. They include (in alphabetical order): Naeema Abrahams (Medical Research Council, South Africa); Carla Afonso (Observatory on Gender and Armed Violence, Portugal); Anna Alvazzi del Frate (UN Office on Drugs and Crime, Austria); Diana Arango (Gender Action, USA); Shelah S. Bloom (MEASURE Evaluation, USA); Jacquelyn C. Campbell (Johns Hopkins University, USA); Larry Cohen (Prevention Institute, USA); Menbere Dawit (Gender-Based Violence Information Management System); Tanis Day (University of Western Ontario, Canada); Mirjana Dokmanovic (Consultant); Claudia Garcia-Moreno (World Health Organization, Switzerland); Gillian Holmes (UN Action against Sexual Violence in Conflict, Switzerland); Henriette Jansen (Consultant); Holly Johnson (University of Ottawa, Canada); Michael P. Johnson (University of Pennsylvania, USA); Ursula Keller (Swisspeace, Switzerland); Keith Krause (Small Arms Survey, Switzerland); Tiina Luige (UN Economic Commission for Europe, Switzerland); Sarah Masters (International Action Network on Small Arms, UK); Rashida Manjoo (UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, its Causes and Consequences, South Africa); Sami Nevala (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Austria); Lucie Ogrodnik (Centre for Justice Statistics, Canada); Mónica Orozco Corona (Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, Mexico); Christina Catherine Pallitto (World Health Organization, Switzerland); Margarita Quintanilla (PATH, Nicaragua); Linda Laura Sabbadini (National Institute of Statistics, Italy); Nika Saeedi (United Nations Development Programme, Switzerland); Matt Stearmer (WomenStats, USA); Zachary Taylor (United Nations Development Programme, Switzerland); Ravi Verma (International Centre for Research on Women, India); Charlotte Watts (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK); Monique Widyono (PATH, USA); Kathryn Yount (Emory University, USA).

The Geneva Declaration Secretariat expresses its gratitude to the Norwegian government for generously supporting the workshop and this report.

Introduction

Although the number of women who are violently injured and killed each year worldwide is not known with any precision, available evidence, while unsystematic and incomplete, already indicates that violence against women (VAW) is 'a universal problem of epidemic proportions' (UNIFEM, 2007). VAW occurs in both conflict and non-conflict situations. It is often less evident in its occurrence and effects than the deaths and injuries of men as combatants in armed conflicts or as gang members in violence related to drug wars. Yet women and girls are often victimized or adversely affected in other ways in these and all other armed violence settings. Women and girls are also common targets of sexual violence in armed conflict and fragmented societies, and they suffer disproportionately from its indirect consequences. In non-conflict situations, women are the victims of intimate-partner (or 'domestic') and sexual violence, honour killings, and dowry-related violence (GD Secretariat, 2008b).

The economic costs associated with armed violence are tremendous. It is estimated that the annual economic cost of armed violence in terms of lost productivity due to violent homicides is between USD 95 billion and USD 163 billion alone (GD Secretariat, 2008b, p. 89). Additional costs include medical costs associated with treating the injured or indirect costs such as loss of income from the victim's inability to work. However, a focus on costs ignores the wider relationship among armed violence, livelihood perspectives, development, and the (indirect) impact on women and men. The gendered dynamic of these relationships is complex. As the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) states:

> When husbands are killed, women frequently lose their access to farmlands and the right to live in their marital homes. The resulting survival choice for many affected women and children is prostitution, commercial labour or domestic servitude. This has consequences for ongoing exposure to violence and ill health from communicable diseases and poor working conditions, as well as future community exclusion (OECD, 2009, p. 32).

The Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development (GD) is a diplomatic initiative built around the recognition that armed violence and

Armed violence is defined as 'the intentional use of illegitimate force (actual or threatened) with arms or explosives, against a person, group, community, or state, that undermines people-centred security and/or sustainable development' (GD Secretariat, 2008b, p. 2).

development are closely linked.[1] From its inception, the GD initiative has recognized the importance of the gendered aspect of armed violence. It promotes

> a comprehensive approach to armed violence reduction issues, recognizing the different situations, needs and resources of men and women, boys and girls, as reflected in the provisions of UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1612 (GD Secretariat, 2006).

However, (armed) violence against women and its impact on development, while acknowledged since the inception of the GD, has so far been only partially addressed by the GD Secretariat.[2]

This *Working Paper* represents one of the actions by the GD Secretariat to support work on the elimination of (armed) VAW with a view to enhancing development. It is divided into two sections. The first section illustrates the context of the GD, (armed) VAW, and development. The second section sets out five possible initiatives to fill research gaps on VAW:

1. support international initiatives to track VAW globally;
2. promote field-based research on mapping VAW;
3. develop improved costing tools for estimating the effects of VAW on development;
4. extend the work on a contextual appraisal toolkit for implementing VAW interventions; and
5. support a comprehensive evaluation toolkit for VAW prevention and reduction programmes.

The first three initiatives focus on filling gaps in mapping VAW; the last two present ways to support VAW reduction and prevention programming.

The *Working Paper* concludes with the observation that further innovative research is needed to understand the scope and scale of VAW, such as its negative impact on development. Research initiatives need to acknowledge the complexity, and the sometimes-apparent paradox, of the phenomenon of VAW, as well as support the development and evaluation of programming efforts to prevent and reduce VAW.

Geneva Declaration, (armed) violence against women, and development

The 2008 *Global Burden of Armed Violence* report—the flagship publication of the GD—emphasizes that armed violence is highly gendered in both its causes and its consequences. Across all affected societies, men—and in particular young men between the ages of 15 and 29—are the most common perpetrators, as well as immediate victims, of armed attacks (GD Secretariat, 2008b). Yet the focus on lethal violence conceals the myriad ways in which women and girls are negatively affected by violence perpetrated against them. Women are less often killed, but more often maimed, mutilated, or otherwise physically harmed through rape or other assaults, such as acid attacks and female genital mutilation. Specific impacts of armed violence on women in particular shift our focus from the nature of the act (lethal violence) to the nature of the victim (women and girls). As a result, the picture of both conflict and non-conflict violence changes somewhat (Krause, 2009).

While women's rights have concerned the UN since its founding, it was only in the 1990s that the international community acknowledged the alarming global dimensions of VAW. Since the UN General Assembly's 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, international advocacy efforts have grown markedly.[3] Significant work among the international community to combat VAW has been completed or is under way. A recent initiative is the creation of UN Women in July 2010. It provides an opportunity to accelerate the efforts of the UN system to drive progress in meeting the needs of women and girls worldwide, including in areas such as the eradication of violence against women (see Box 1).

According to the UN General Assembly's Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, VAW can take many forms, including:

- Physical, sexual and psychological violence *occurring in the family*, including battering, sexual abuse of female children in the household, dowry-related violence, marital rape, female genital mutilation and other traditional practices harmful to women, non-spousal violence and violence related to exploitation;
- Physical, sexual and psychological violence occurring *within the general community,* including rape, sexual abuse, sexual harassment and intimida-

tion at work, in educational institutions and elsewhere, trafficking in women and forced prostitution;

- Physical, sexual and psychological violence *perpetrated or condoned by the State*, wherever it occurs (UNGA, 1993, para. 2(b); emphasis added).

Box 1 Selected international initiatives to eliminate violence against women

Advocacy/programming

- The UN Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women has distributed more than USD 60 million to 317 initiatives in 124 countries and territories since it began operations in 1997 (UNIFEM, n.d.).
- The UN Secretary-General's UNiTE to End Violence against Women campaign, launched in 2008, 'brings together a host of UN agencies and offices to galvanize action across the UN system to prevent and punish violence against women' (UN, n.d.).
- In July 2010 the UN General Assembly created UN Women, the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. It merges and builds on the work of four previously distinct parts of the UN system: 1) the Division for the Advancement of Women; 2) the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women; 3) the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women; and 4) the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).

Measuring/monitoring

The following measuring/monitoring projects are in place:

- the UN Population Fund's *A Practical Approach to Gender-based Violence: A Programme Guide for Health Care Providers and Managers* (UNFPA, 2001);
- the International Violence against Women Survey, undertaken by the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, the UN Interregional Crime and Justice Institute, and Statistics Canada (2001–08);[4]
- the World Health Organization's (WHO) 2005 *Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women* (WHO, 2005a);[5]
- the UN Secretary-General's 2006 *In-depth Study on All Forms of Violence against Women* (UNGA, 2006a);
- the UN Statistical Office's 'Friends of the Chair' initiative to develop statistical indicators on violence against women (UNSC, 2009); and
- the Global Health Forum's Sexual Violence Research Initiative (launched in 2000) (SVRI, n.d.).

Violence against women is 'any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life' (UNGA, 1993, art. 1).

While following the UN definition (see box), this report concentrates on physical and sexual violence in its consideration of supportive activities to address VAW. Often, violence imposed on women and girls does not involve 'arms' as conventionally defined (meaning firearms or bladed weapons, such as knives), but rather physical acts, such as striking and hitting, or verbal threats. However, in countries such as the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, the majority of women who die from intimate partner violence are shot or knifed. Canadian statistics, for example, indicate that between 1998 and 2007 women were three to five times more likely than men to be killed by their intimate partners. Approximately 30 per cent of the solved homicides against women involved stabbing and 28 per cent involved shooting (Ogrodnik, 2009). Another study from the Dominican Republic found that 70 per cent of female homicides in 2000 were intimate partner homicides, and of these, 50 per cent were killed using bladed weapons and 39 per cent using firearms (Pola, 2008, p. 53).

The use or threat of armed violence is also involved in incidents of sexual violence directed against women and girls. This is evidently the case in conflict situations, in which rape has been shown to be

> systematically employed for a variety of purposes, including intimidation, humiliation, political terror, extracting information, rewarding soldiers, and 'ethnic cleansing' (Amnesty International, 2007).[6]

Less recognized is that weapons are also regularly involved in sexual assaults in non-conflict situations. For example, in a recent study of sexual assault in South Korea, 30 per cent of the attacks examined involved weapons (Soo et al., 2007). A Canadian study found that weapons were used in 24.1 per cent of the sexual assaults against women committed by strangers and 13.3 per cent of the assaults committed by perpetrators who are known to the female victims (Stermac et al., 1995).

The GD was developed around the recognition that the human toll of armed violence in both conflict and non-conflict settings constitutes a serious obstacle to social and economic development. Hence, eliminating all forms of VAW is incremental for development. Women are 'half the sky'—a phrase

A woman who was raped by two soldiers awaits treatment in Kitchanga, DRC, February 2008.

used by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl Wu-Dunn in the title of their best-seller on 'gendercide' in the 20th century. For these authors, poor countries will be able to climb out of poverty only if they halt VAW and empower women and girls socially and economically (Kristof and Wu-Dunn, 2009).

Official backing for a women's empowerment approach to development is set out in the Millennium Declaration and Millennium Development Goal 3 (MDG 3), which specifically calls for the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment. But the elimination of VAW is also relevant to other MDGs (see Box 2).[7] The relationship between sustainable development and VAW was again confirmed in September 2010 when VAW was the only form of violence that made it into the MDG review document (UNGA, 2010).

On 25–26 March 2010 the GD Secretariat organized the Expert Workshop on Violence against Women—Disabling Development[8] that brought together 36 experts

> to discuss how to develop a research agenda that contributes to systematically measuring and monitoring VAW cross-nationally and that supports programming efforts that prevent and reduce VAW (GD Secretariat, 2010a, pp. 2–3).

The expectation of the workshop was to listen to and learn from experts and researchers from international organizations, civil society, academia, and independent research institutions about the state of the art of research and programming to eliminate VAW.

Box 2 Relevance of violence against women in achieving the MDGs

- MDG 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger: VAW creates significant economic costs for households (in one study in Uganda, where the average annual per capita income is USD 340, each incident of violence incurred an average cost of USD 5) and survivors of violence also earn far less than other women (ICRW, 2009).
- MDG 2: Achieve universal primary education: A lack of security and violence are factors that prevent girls and young women from entering and completing school (WHO, 2005a).
- MDGs 4 and 5: Reduce child mortality and improve maternal health: VAW is associated with elevated mortality rates among infants and young children and with severe health consequences for mothers, including increased risk of high blood pressure, antepartum haemorrhage and miscarriage, depression, and suicide (Colombini, Mayhew, and Watts, 2008).

Five possible initiatives to fill research gaps

In the spirit of listening and learning, and building on the work by the international community to combat VAW—and with great thanks to the group of researchers who participated—five initiatives were identified to fill research gaps on VAW. This report presents those initiatives. Three focus on filling gaps in mapping VAW, and two look at ways to support reduction and prevention programming. Table 1 provides an overview of the possible initiatives in the order in which they are discussed below.

Table 1 Possible initiatives to support international efforts on VAW research and programming

Area	Primary potential users	Possible initiative
Mapping	UN agencies and international organizations such as the Friends of the Chair (FC) of the UN Statistical Office process and national statistical offices (NSOs)	Support the recommendations of the FC for basic statistical measures to track VAW on a global basis
Mapping	Academic institutes or independent research organizations	Promote field-based research on mapping VAW, including comparable surveys
Mapping	International agencies, national governments, and civil society groups involved in VAW reduction	Develop improved costing tools for estimating the effects of VAW on development
Programming	International agencies, national governments, and civil society groups involved in VAW reduction and prevention programming	Extend the work on a contextual appraisal toolkit for implementing VAW interventions
Programming	International agencies, national governments, and civil society groups involved in VAW reduction and prevention programming	Undertake a comprehensive review of VAW programmes and create an evaluation toolkit for programming VAW prevention and reduction programmes

1. Support international initiatives to track VAW globally

Our current understanding of VAW is like a half-completed patchwork quilt. Some countries, such as the United States and Canada, have been carrying out comprehensive national surveys for more than a decade. Recently, other countries, such as Italy, have also started to carry out national surveys on VAW (Muratore and Sabbadini, 2005). Some countries have surveyed intimate partner violence, but not other forms of VAW, such as sexual violence by strangers. Our knowledge of the latter may be reinforced by studies undertaken in the UN system and by university and non-governmental researchers, but presents comparability difficulties due to different research foci and indicator definitions.

The first step towards defining global and comparable statistical indicators to measure VAW was undertaken by the UN Statistical Commission (UNSC). The origin of the UNSC's initiative is General Assembly Resolution 61/143 of 2006, which requested that the UNSC develop possible indicators for measuring VAW in consultation with the Commission on the Status of Women and building on the work of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, Its Causes and Consequences (UNGA, 2006b). In February 2008 UNSC established the FC to facilitate the mission. The FC includes representatives of Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Ghana, Italy, Mexico (the chair), and Thailand. Observers come from the various UN economic commissions; WHO; the UN Division for the Advancement of Women; the UN Office on Drugs and Crime; and the Special Rapporteur.

In 2008 the FC identified a set of core indicators for NSOs to track VAW (Box 3). Three criteria have guided the group when defining the indicators: 1) whether the indicator is easy to measure and interpret; 2) whether it is relevant and accurate; and 3) whether it is universally applicable. The UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Statistical Division (in collaboration with all regional commissions, the UN Statistical Division, and the UN Division for the Advancement of Women) was assigned in 2009 to develop and test a module questionnaire and training materials in order to collect data on the indicators approved by the UNSC.[9] During the meeting of the FC held in December 2009 in Aguascalientes, Mexico, the FC added an additional set of indicators for further elaboration (UNSC, 2010).

Data to measure and monitor those key indicators can come from a range of data sources. Criminal justice statistics are a major source of data on crimes, such as rapes and other forms of VAW, that are considered illegal. Hospital data are another important source of data on severe, but non-fatal, injuries

resulting from VAW. However, these administrative sources are biased in favour of settings with functioning governmental registration systems. Also, they consider only those incidents that were reported to the police or treated at hospitals. As a result, they often do not capture the more subtle impacts of violence, such as domestic, sexual, and intimate-partner violence (see Holder et al., 2001).

Compared to the two other sources of statistics—censuses and administrative records—statistical sample surveys have the advantage of being less costly;

Box 3 The core international indicators recommended by the FC for measuring VAW

Total and age-specific rate of women subject to:

1. physical violence in the last 12 months by severity of violence, relationship to perpetrator(s), and frequency;
2. physical violence during lifetime by severity of violence, relationship to perpetrator(s), and frequency;
3. sexual violence in the last 12 months by severity of violence, relationship to perpetrator(s), and frequency;
4. sexual violence during lifetime by relationship to perpetrator(s), and frequency;
5. sexual and/or physical violence by current or former intimate partner in the last 12 months by frequency;
6. sexual and/or physical violence by current or former intimate partner during lifetime by frequency;
7. psychological violence in the past 12 months by the intimate partner;
8. economic violence in the past 12 months by the intimate partner; and
9. female genital mutilation.

Other indicators (to be further elaborated on):

10. femicide in general and spousal homicide, in particular;[10]
11. stalking;[11]
12. physical and sexual violence in childhood;
13. discrimination and violence at work;
14. trafficking of women;
15. the impact of sexual violence on sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS;
16. the extent to which women recognize that they suffered violence as a crime; and
17. hidden violence unreported to authorities.[12]

Source: UN ECOSOC (2008); UNSC (2010)

Activists stand next to the shoes of femicide victims during a rally for International Women's Day in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, March 2011. © Edgard Garrido/Reuters

> [being] more flexible in terms of the depth of investigation of certain topics—survey instruments can accommodate larger number of more detailed questions; producing statistics of better quality as a consequence of the fact that interviewers can be better trained and prepared compared to census enumerators. The major disadvantage is the lack of the capacity of a sample survey to generate small area statistics (UNSC, 2009, p. 3).

The FC therefore advocate that every national government undertake dedicated national surveys regularly (UNSC, 2009). In this way, VAW would be mapped across its different forms and over time, permitting changes in patterns, prevalence, and frequency evaluations. The national and international consensus being built up in the FC (including the development and testing by UNECE of a new VAW module) is a new and important advancement for VAW research. It is the first plan to measure VAW systematically and globally on a regular basis. The decision taken by the FC to seek to work through NSOs makes good sense from a confidence-building perspective. The reputation of NSOs for impartiality is generally higher than that of NGOs, making NSO-based surveys more likely to be accepted by potential respondents. NSOs are also the first source of professional statistics and of continuity in statistical research in most countries. This makes the results of NSO studies less likely to be questioned, increasing their credibility.[13] This report therefore advocates supporting the recommendations of the FC.

2. Promote field-based research on mapping VAW

The introduction of VAW indicators into NSO operations will bring some notable challenges. There could be resistance to tracking VAW from those governments that view it as a private affair or a minor issue relative to other problems of violence and development. In conflict and post-conflict settings, for example, in which the government is weak or non-existent, it will be challenging to work through NSOs. Furthermore, many NSOs, especially in poorer countries, already lack the funding and staff to collect the statistics they are officially required to produce. Expanding their mandate to include VAW surveys (or a survey module) might be perceived as an additional burden by some NSOs, as they will probably need to revise national statistics and administrative records. VAW research is also unfamiliar territory for most statisticians, as is the notion that collecting data on sensitive issues requires different measures, such as providing support (services) for interviewees and interviewers.

Owing to these and other challenges and as an intermediate measure until systematic national surveys can be carried out by NSOs (see previous section),

Box 4 Examples of stand-alone surveys on VAW

Several research institutes and NGOs conducted stand-alone surveys on (some) aspects of VAW. For example, the surveys developed within the framework of women's safety audits carried out by Women in Cities International and UN-HABITAT is one such example (UN-HABITAT, WICI, and SIDA, 2009). Likewise, the Global Safe Cities Free of Violence against Women and Girls Programme launched by UNIFEM (part of UN Women) conducted a survey and data collection in order to capture the nature and magnitude of sexual harassment and violence in public spaces. The programme will focus on slum areas and the poorest urban dwellers. Five cities are participating: Cairo, Kigali, New Delhi, Port Moresby, and Quito (UNIFEM, 2010).

In December 2010 a Gender, Conflict and Research Seminar was held in Oslo while a research programme launched by the World Bank was presented. The programme aims:

> to study the gender-differentiated impacts of violent conflict using both demographic and gender lenses. With a view to inform policy in conflict and post-conflict states, the research program aims to identify gender-aware interventions that strengthen post-conflict recovery and development efforts in the areas of labor markets, education and health (PRIO, CSCW, and World Bank, 2010).

Six country case studies (Burundi, Timor-Leste, Rwanda, Nepal, rural Colombia, and Tajikistan) were presented that addressed the same set of questions and used similar methods.

smaller and more localized household surveys conducted by independent academic institutes and research partners are recommended to measure VAW.[14] These surveys can be stand-alone studies or they can be included in larger country-based violence mappings (see Box 4).

Surveys on VAW—whether conducted through NSOs or by research institutes, NGOs, or international organizations—have to put a special emphasis on particular components. The questionnaire and training materials need to have a strong focus on ensuring the safety of respondents. Women and children can be put at further risk if the survey process is not handled in a confidential manner that is genuinely sensitive to the prospects of retribution against respondents. And if those answering the survey do not feel secure, they will be less likely to disclose information, reducing the accuracy of prevalence rates that a study eventually yields (WHO, 2001).

Regular interviewers used for other surveys, especially men (and men known to the women asked to participate), may not be appropriate for VAW surveying. To protect respondents, careful thought has to be given to what to name and

label a survey, what the appropriate conditions for interviewing are, and how to maintain the absolute confidentiality of the data afterwards. Interviewers will need rigorous training to manage the surveying appropriately and enable them to cope with other ethical issues they are likely to face (WHO, 2001; Ellsberg and Heise, 2005).

Many of these issues also concern researchers on armed violence in a way that others do not. Armed violence assessments must carefully address specific ethical issues in interviewer selection and training as part of their design and implementation. Absolute confidentiality also applies when asking about gang violence in a particular neighbourhood or the weapons that households possess. When researching armed violence, guaranteeing the respondents' and researchers' safety is crucial. So, while a VAW module will require special preparation and training, researchers who work on sensitive issues such as armed violence, gang membership, or gun ownership often already have the orientation necessary for ethical and safe research conduct in this domain.

The Small Arms Survey regularly conducts country-based household surveys to measure the scale and distribution of armed violence and its negative impact on development. The surveys also include assessments of VAW.[15] Efforts to develop a methodological guide to conduct surveys on armed violence in an ethical manner are under way (Small Arms Survey, forthcoming).

A VAW dimension in both general household surveys and stand-alone surveys represents a real gain for advancing knowledge on VAW. However, focused VAW research often lacks comparability in study design, limiting researchers' ability to accumulate knowledge across studies and to evaluate possible changes in VAW forms and frequency. A well-designed module for national armed violence assessments needs to be developed that would yield baseline measures that could be re-evaluated consistently at a later date. It would also provide the means to make informed cross-national comparisons among the countries studied.

3. Develop improved costing tools for estimating the effects of VAW on development

Researchers have long been concerned with estimating the negative consequences of collective armed violence. In the early 20th century, economists

> sought to demonstrate whether investment and destruction arising from armed conflict had the potential to generate new efficiencies and release productive energies (GD Secretariat, 2008b, p. 91).

Over the decades, approaches to estimating the costs of interpersonal violence have been developed (see Box 5). This also includes estimates of the cost of VAW. In fact, one of the great achievements of the research on VAW is the measuring of the direct and indirect economic costs of VAW to victims, their families, their communities, and their national societies and economies. The 'costing' of VAW, ongoing now for approximately 20 years, started as small sample surveys or case studies, and then moved into the rough mapping of national costs and the development of high-quality, small data sets to measure specific costs.[16]

Most estimates to determine the costs of VAW use an accounting approach, in which costs are divided into direct tangibles (hospital bills), indirect tangibles (loss of income from the inability to work), and direct intangibles (pain and suffering of the victim). Indirect intangible costs (the psychological harm to children who witness violence) would also fit the model and are discussed in the literature, but have rarely been included in an actual study (Day, McKenna, and Bowlus, 2005). The 'state of the art' today constitutes the use of increasingly sophisticated data sources combined with experimentation with new estimation techniques.[17]

Box 5 Approaches to estimating the costs of violence[18]

The *accounting approach* is essentially a balance sheet of the accumulated costs of specific factors to the economy. Whether determined from a macro or micro perspective, it requires reliable data and the ability to identify appropriate cost factors associated with fatal and non-fatal injury rates. This is the principal methodology applied by public health economists associated with the World Health Organisation (WHO) and other agencies (GD Secretariat, 2008b, pp. 91–92).

Economists studying war commonly adopt a *modelling approach* to measuring the economic costs of collective armed violence. They estimate the costs of armed conflict by undertaking growth simulations in countries affected by civil wars. Such estimates should take account of the social and geographic concentration of the effects of war (particularly among the poor); the opportunity costs of development; the persistence of the economic costs of war over time; and spillover effects, such as crime, disease, and terrorism.

The *contingent valuation approach,* or 'willingness-to-pay' approach, is also commonly employed to estimate the costs of armed violence. This technique measures what individuals and households are prepared to pay in order to improve their safety from, or live free of the threat of, violence.

Source: GD Secretariat (2008b, pp. 91–92)

Based on the work that has been undertaken to date, it is clear that VAW is highly costly, running in the billions on annually. To illustrate, in 1994 VAW and sexual assaults on children in Canada were estimated to cost CAD 4.2 billion (approximately USD 3.2 billion) (Greaves, Hankivsky, and Kingston-Reichers, 1995). In the United States in 1995 intimate partner violence alone was estimated to cost USD 5.8 billion (NCIPC, 2003). A 2001 estimate for this type of violence for England and Wales arrived at a total estimate of GBP 23 billion (approximately USD 34.5 billion) (Walby, 2004). A 1999 study of domestic violence in Nicaragua and Chile calculated the economic multiplier effects of VAW at 1.6 per cent and 2 per cent of gross domestic product, respectively (ICRW, 2007). These estimates are conservative, since even the most comprehensive estimates are based on a limited subset of those costs that can be measured adequately for research purposes.

Estimating the various costs of violence is extremely difficult. There is a need for vast quantities of different types of data. To quote a UN expert brief on the subject:

> Each consequence needs to be estimated numerically and more often than not, specific data do not exist. For this reason, data used in costing estimates are often recombined from data collected for other purposes. To create usable data for the whole costing exercise, many assumptions must be made. Assumptions allow data from differing sources to be combined and recombined. However, all assumptions must be based in fact, stated explicitly and supported by evidence. In the end, however, there may not be any relevant data collected by any agency, and even though it is clear the costs exist, it may not be possible to estimate them numerically (Day, McKenna, and Bowlus, 2005, p. 30).

Despite these challenges, the authors of this report present two possible costing tools that are worth exploring further. The first tool helps to enhance the understanding of the impact of VAW on development through bottom-up estimates. This means taking on the data issue as part of the tool itself and developing improved methods for household- and community-based estimates. The second tool contributes to establishing the potential benefits of violence reduction and prevention programming, which can potentially help to increase the acceptance of violence reduction and prevention programming in a given community.

Bottom-up estimates

The bottom-up methods gap has been partly addressed through a recent initiative of the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) and its partners. The ICRW-led initiative includes refining and field testing a method-

Box 6 Valuing women's labour

Women's work is greatly undervalued in economic terms, because so much of it is unpaid and not given a market value in System of National Account (SNA) measures. This is especially the case in developing countries, where time allocation studies show that women work more than men (53 per cent of women's time versus 47 per cent of men's), but men dominate SNA work (76 per cent of men's work versus only 34 per cent of women's). The implication for cost estimates is that conventional data sources generally fail miserably to capture the value of women's work. Only research adapted to studying when, where, and how women actually work can create viable estimates for the costs to individuals, families, and societies when women are violently hurt or killed.

Source: UNDP (1995)

ology for costing intimate partner violence in developing countries (ICRW, 2007). Notably, the approach includes detailed activity and time-use survey and valuation methods for capturing women's informal and household labour (see Box 6).

The ICRW initiative also takes into account women's use of both formal and informal services (e.g. community-level dispute-resolution mechanisms instead of state social services). These are major features of female labour and service use, and it is an advance to be able to incorporate them into a costing estimate. As the ICRW remarks, its approach is a first look at the impact of VAW on households as an economic unit. There is room to improve on the methodology for addressing other forms of VAW and to check for modifications for specific settings, such as post-conflict contexts.

Good cost estimates

The second proposed research initiative focuses on good cost estimates that can help establish the potential benefits of violence reduction and prevention programming. They can potentially help to increase the acceptance of violence reduction and prevention programming in a given community. By putting a price on violence that can be communicated to communities and households, the need for investment in prevention and reduction programming can be better illustrated.

An interesting illustration comes from the recent Australian report on *The Cost of Violence against Women and Their Children* (NCRV, 2009). This study not only estimates the costs of such violence to the Australian economy at AUD 13.6 billion (approximately USD 13.7 billion) in 2008–09, but it also uses

different parts of the estimate to generate an action plan with estimated returns for each proposed priority. The estimate of second-generation costs,[19] for instance, is linked to proposals to give parents and primary caregivers additional help in providing positive parenting. This includes supporting their children to develop respectful relationships. If this initiative were implemented, 'AUD 725 (approximately USD 638) could be saved in second generation costs for every woman whose experience of violence was prevented' (NCRV, 2009, p. 58).

Another project illustrating the positive effects of communicating the impacts and costs of violence against women comes from a project being undertaken in Costa Rica. When costs at the household level were integrated into village outreach, men understood the price their families were paying for VAW and many changed their behaviour, to the extent that the level of violence fell.[20]

4. Extend the work on a contextual appraisal toolkit for implementing VAW interventions

Experience in many fields, including small arms control and disarmament, security sector reform, VAW, rural development, public health, humanitarian relief, state and peace building, and others demonstrates that programming implementation should be 'contextual', i.e. planned in the light of the local context and the understandings and perspectives of the people involved.[21] Human relations have common characteristics, as well as group-specific dynamics and potential break points. One-size-fits-all intervention implementation strategies regularly fail because they are blind to the local context and people's understandings of their situation. What is needed is a helpful analytical framework that captures key features of armed violence. The 'Armed Violence Lens' developed by the OECD, for example, has the ability to be applied in conflict and non-conflict settings and to be used by conflict prevention experts, criminologists, and public health specialists alike. This approach helps to identify hotspots where incidents of armed violence occur in a given community and to understand the 'who . . . where, when, how, and why' of incidents of armed violence (OECD, 2009, p. 51).

Contextual appraisals first emerged in development work in the 1980s due to the dissatisfaction of agricultural experts with traditional research methods and the biases of typical field trips. Rapid rural appraisal (RRA), the first contextual methodology to be developed, emphasized the relevance of situational local knowledge and the importance of listening research. Seeking to get a few big things broadly correct, it drew on interviews and other

Women attend a Change Makers meeting in the village of Dinaipur, Bangladesh, as part of a campaign to end violence against women. © G. M. B. Akash/Panos

Box 7 Rapid appraisal techniques[22]

- interview design techniques for individuals and households;
- group interview techniques (focus groups);
- sampling techniques that can be adapted to particular goals;
- methods for obtaining quantitative data in limited time;
- methods for direct observation; and
- schemes to triangulate sources of information to cross-check conclusions.

then- innovative qualitative and quantitative research methods (Chambers, 1994). (For examples of rapid appraisal techniques, see Box 7.) RRA soon gave way to participatory rural appraisal, which transformed the researcher into a 'facilitator' of participants' understandings and group definitions of aims and outcomes.

Subsequently, contextual techniques and approaches avoided the emphasis on 'rural' and could be applied more broadly. Researchers developed an array of participatory approaches that varied according to the goals for participants (learning, empowering, or creating partnerships). Participatory situation analysis (PSA)[23] emerged as a designation for an appraisal process whereby the expectations, needs, and problems of the community are analysed and described as a preliminary step in programming (Chambers, 1994; Conroy, 2001; Cornwall, 2000 and 2003; Bartle, 2007).

Participatory tools cross over with rapid appraisal techniques, while down-playing quantitative data collection and foregrounding role playing, open storytelling, and visual methods in semi-structured interviews (see Box 8).

Participatory techniques are considered necessary in order to ensure that programmes are properly grounded in local experiences and understandings.[24]

Box 8 Visual techniques frequently used in participatory appraisal analysis

- matrices;
- diagrams (seasonal calendars, genograms);
- timelines and historical profiles;
- mapping and modelling; and
- ranking and scoring (to show proportions).[25]

Furthermore, they are considered useful as they have also been developed for use in places where there is a paucity of baseline data and poor facilities for survey research. For example, the NGO CARE used community mapping in Dadaab camp on the border between Kenya and Somalia to enable refugee women to identify areas of heightened danger for them. The most insecure areas turned out to include the camp hospital, a finding that another approach might have missed (Ellsberg and Heise, 2005, p. 149).[26]

A small number of high-quality assessments exist that illustrate how to ground programming in order to prevent and reduce VAW in contextual appraisals.[27] The most ambitious of these to date is the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)-funded assessment of promising practices to address VAW in Vanuatu, Fiji, the Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, and Timor-Leste. The AusAID appraisal involves a local advisory group in each country and a team of international and national researchers carrying out interviews and focus group discussions with more than 700 individuals. From this study, indicative questions for a contextual appraisal of VAW include the following:

- What are the basic patterns of violence, and how do victims, perpetrators, and the larger community (including institutional actors) understand these?
- What has been done to address VAW and why has it worked or not?
- What gaps exist, according to local understandings and the situational mapping of violence, and what can be done to fill these gaps?
- Who is working on violence prevention, who needs to be engaged, and how can this be best organized?[28]

An interesting new initiative could be to extend this work and create a rapid, participatory, and multi-method toolkit for programming that aims to prevent and reduce VAW. Like the original RRA approach, any usable contextual appraisal tools have to be reasonably easy and efficient to apply, or they will not be taken up. Besides being rapid and participatory, a contextual appraisal toolkit for VAW should be multi-method and include a guide on when and how to use different tools and approaches in an appraisal. Rapid and participatory research approaches already incorporate the use of different techniques. The issue is how the techniques should be selected and whether they should be supplemented by other methods drawn from (for example) survey research, epidemiology, or political analysis.

Participatory appraisal techniques have strong advocates, but they have equally strong critics. Some participatory research advocates would argue against a broader multi-method approach, as it undermines the potential empowerment of participatory approaches.[29]

Yet the authors of this report would argue that appraisals of the kind being discussed can only benefit from triangulation using different methods to confirm findings. Programming interventions planned on a larger scale to address violence cross-sectorally also require a greater array of assessment tools. A multi-method toolkit is needed to facilitate an understanding of complex interacting violence dynamics and to enable decision-makers to plan engagements that integrate different levels of analysis (OECD, 2009).

5. Support a comprehensive evaluation toolkit for VAW prevention and reduction programming

Programming to reduce or prevent VAW follows three distinct, yet interrelated, tracks: law and justice, the provision of services, and violence reduction and prevention interventions. All three tracks have grown substantially in the last decade, while remaining uneven in geographic and programming scope terms.[30] A few countries have even gone further to adopt multi-sector national strategies to combat VAW (Travers et al., 2008).

Solid interventions that have proved to be effective in preventing and reducing VAW are increasing. Three are mentioned here:

- The Safe Dates programme is a school and community initiative for 13–15-year-old boys and girls. A ten-session programme targets attitudes and behaviours associated with dating abuse and violence among peers (WHO, 2009, p. 5). The sessions cover subjects such as defining caring relationships and dating abuse, means of helping friends, equalizing power through communication, and preventing sexual assault. Participants in the programme produce a play and posters for community communication, and there is also a parental component. The programme was originally funded by the University of North Carolina and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In randomized controlled trials, the programme has been shown to have lasting effects on dating partner violence. Originating in the United States, the Safe Dates programme is now being implemented in an adapted form in South Africa (Ashley and Foshee, 2007; MRC, 2009).
- Stepping Stones is another promising example. It is a community-based life skills training intervention, carried out in parallel for single-sex groups of women and men, that was first used in Uganda in 1995. It has subsequently been implemented in more than 40 countries, mostly in Africa and Asia. The project is delivered through a series of small group, participatory learning activities based on critical education theory and the use of assertiveness training techniques, and theatre and drawing exercises.

The aim is to draw out and build on participants' knowledge in order to encourage them to reflect critically on

> *why* we behave in the ways we do—and to work out, assess the potential consequences and *rehearse together* ways in which we can change (Salamander Trust, n.d.).

Most versions involve at least 50 hours of intervention over 10–12 weeks, delivered in at least 15 sessions. Stepping Stones now has an impact track record (Wallace, 2006).

- Last but not least, the IMAGE programme has been proven to reduce intimate-partner violence. Conducted in rural South Africa, it combines a microfinance programme that focuses on the poorest women in a given community with 'Sisters for Life', which is a series of participatory education sessions on gender awareness and HIV/AIDS. It thus combines microfinance with training for loan recipients to enable them to confront their husbands about sexual and intimate partner violence. The Sisters for Life sessions are made obligatory for receiving a loan; they are accompanied by activities to encourage wider community participation to engage men and boys. A rare and important feature of the programme is that it integrates prospective, randomized community intervention trials to evaluate and document the impact of the programme at the individual, household, and community levels. IMAGE has been shown to lead to a reduction of more than 50 per cent in intimate-partner violence and a reduction in HIV risk behaviours among young intervention participants (Kim et al., 2007; SEEP Network, 2008).

The expansion of promising VAW programming creates a need for a guide, or 'evaluation toolkit', for programme managers and policy-makers to help them make informed choices about VAW initiatives. Is it better to adopt a programme design of X or Y? Decision-makers will answer this question on a variety of grounds. However, they can make programme effectiveness a priority only if they have access to an evidence-based guide to what works and what does not.

Recognizing this issue, researchers have generated a number of programming reviews. These are concentrated in the area of violence prevention in public health.[31] A comprehensive review would enable a more systematic and interdisciplinary understanding of programming effectiveness than what is currently available. It would also complement other policy research initiatives that are under way; for example, a United States Agency of International Development (USAID) project to establish a well-grounded set of indicators for VAW monitoring and evaluation, and the innovative studies of programme outcomes being undertaken by the Gender Violence and Health Centre at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (Bloom, 2008; IGWG, 2008; SAME, n.d.).

A good model for a VAW programming toolkit comes from the WHO's 'Ready, Steady, Go' (RSG) review of interventions to prevent HIV/AIDS among young people in developing countries (Ross, Dick, and Ferguson, 2006). The RSG categories (described in Box 9) constitute an evidence-based guide to programming that policy-makers can easily understand and integrate into their deliberations. The translation of research findings into policy-friendly language is an essential step in creating a viable programming toolkit.

Box 9 The Ready, Steady, Go categories and review approach

- **Ready:** The evidence threshold is partially met. The evidence suggests that interventions are effective, but large-scale implementation must be accompanied by further evaluation and operations research to clarify the impact and mechanisms of action.
- **Steady:** The evidence threshold is not met. Some of the evidence is promising, but further development, pilot testing, and evaluation are needed before it can be determined whether these interventions should move into the 'Ready' category or 'Do Not Go'.
- **Go:** The evidence threshold is met. There is sufficient evidence to recommend widespread implementation on a large scale, as long as there is careful monitoring of coverage, quality, and cost, and operations research is implemented to better understand the mechanisms of action.
- **Do Not Go:** There is strong enough evidence of a lack of effectiveness or of potential harm. Do not go.

The first step in an RSG-type review is to divide the field of interventions to be studied according to intervention settings (schools, the mass media, and communities). Then, for each setting, the reviewers should:

- define the key types of intervention that policy-makers need to choose from in the setting under consideration;
- define the strength of evidence that would be needed to justify widespread implementation of the intervention;
- develop explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria for the studies to be reviewed;
- critically review all eligible studies and their findings, by intervention type;
- summarize the strength of the evidence on the effectiveness of each type of intervention;
- compare the strength of the evidence provided by the studies against the threshold of evidence needed to recommend widespread implementation; and
- from this comparison, derive evidence-based recommendations related to the implementation of each type of intervention in the setting or population group.

Source: Ross, Dick, and Ferguson (2006, pp. 9, 321)

Also of interest in the RSG approach is that it is able to integrate programming variability and observational research designs into a review. Variability is necessary in that VAW interventions (such as those to prevent HIV/AIDS) have different complexities and scales, and are staged among different population groups, settings, and contexts. Observational research designs are not ideal from a scientific standpoint, because they lack the controls on possible sources of bias that can be achieved through the 'gold standard' of randomized controlled trials or other experimental research designs. But observational research designs are used in the vast majority of VAW programming (just as for HIV/AIDS programming or, in fact, most policy research). So it is practically necessary to be able to include observational research designs in any VAW programming review.

A general finding of a WHO RSG review was that there is often a paucity of adequate evidence of the effectiveness of different types of intervention. Although there are notable exceptions (see the examples above), this can be expected in the case of VAW interventions too. As the introduction of the USAID and evaluation compendium notes, 'the dearth of rigorous evaluations' for VAW programmes 'has resulted in a lack of data to support recommendations for best practices in the field' (Bloom, 2008, p. 9).

A comprehensive evaluation would highlight interventions that have been shown to be effective on the ground. Going further, it would compare interventions to establish the key success factors in programme design. Comparison of this kind is important in order to build upon and refine lessons that have emerged from VAW programming.

Conclusion

In order to achieve a measurable reduction in the global burden of armed violence, the gender dimensions of armed violence must be taken into account. VAW is less dramatically evident in its occurrence and effects than the deaths and injuries of men as combatants in conflicts or gang wars. Yet women and girls are still victims and affected parties in these and all other armed violence settings.

This *Working Paper* has highlighted five initiatives that researchers can undertake to fill knowledge gaps on VAW. The first two initiatives have been developed to enhance data on the scope and scale of VAW at a local, regional, or national level. They are complementary. While the first initiative ensures an (armed) VAW mapping in different forms over time (changes in patterns, prevalence, and frequency can be observed), the second demonstrates an advanced knowledge of VAW in the form of household and/or stand-alone surveys undertaken by independent research institutes, NGOs, and international organizations. The challenge of the latter is to make the surveys alike in order to make cross-national comparisons possible. The third initiative aims to enhance costing tools to estimate the financial and negative impacts of VAW on development and to undertake a cost–benefit evaluation of chosen programmes to prevent and reduce VAW. The fourth initiative supports the development of contextually adequate policy-making and programming. Programming should aim to reduce and prevent VAW. It should be easy and effective to apply rapid, participatory, and multi-method programming in order to confirm findings. Finally, the fifth initiative illustrates the need for an evidence-based guide demonstrating what works and what does not work. Evaluation efforts for these projects should be comprehensive programme reviews, including a more systematic and interdisciplinary understanding of programming.

What this *Working Paper* did not specifically examine is the relationship of VAW to other forms of violence. For example, many researchers consider that armed violence against men and boys is causally intertwined with VAW. Medrado demonstrates that in Brazil comparatively high levels of VAW correlate with comparatively elevated levels of male-on-male violence. As he observes:

> these data show that men are put in contact with violence in various settings, often as deliberately by way of hierarchical power relations in society that define male domination over women. To put it another way, the same power system that authorizes men to behave in an aggressive fashion and to 'uphold their rights in the name of honor' is the same system of power that places them in a situation of vulnerability (Medrado, 2003, p. 4; Bourgois, 1996).

Barker's (2005) comparative study of young men in low-income urban settings reaches a similar conclusion. Many young men, in trying to live up to rigid standards of what it means to be a man, become locked into spirals of violence in which they hurt others or are hurt or killed themselves. Not surprisingly, programmes sometimes also target men and boys, and deal with questions of masculinity (Barker, Ricardo, and Nascimento, 2007). Different forms of violence—including armed violence and VAW—are linked to each other. This results in an apparent paradox that promising efforts to prevent and reduce VAW often depend not only on improving resiliencies and protective factors for women, but also on diminishing their risk of experiencing violence by working with males.

Further innovative research is needed to understand the scope and scale of VAW, enhance costing tools to estimate the negative impact of VAW on development, and support the development and evaluation of programming efforts to prevent and reduce VAW. As this *Working Paper* points out, research initiatives need to acknowledge the complexity and sometimes the apparent paradox of the VAW phenomenon.

Endnotes

1 Launched in 2006 by a group of ministers and representatives from 42 countries, the GD now (as at May 2011) includes 108 signatory states. The initiative is designed to support states and civil society actors in achieving measurable reductions in the global burden of armed violence in conflict and non-conflict settings by 2015 (and beyond). The Secretariat of the initiative is run out of the Small Arms Survey and seeks to meet this goal through action based on three pillars: 1) advocacy, dissemination, and coordination to raise global awareness about the negative impact of armed violence on development and the obstacle it constitutes to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals; 2) measurability and monitoring to improve our understanding of the scope, scale, and distribution of armed violence and its negative impact on development; and 3) programming to develop and carry out commitments enshrined in the GD so as to make a measurable difference in the lives of individuals in affected countries and regions through concrete programmes targeting risks and symptoms of armed violence.

2 See chapter on armed violence against women in GD Secretariat (2008b); see also LeBrun, Muggah, and Paoloni (2009).

3 Emblematic of the arrival of VAW on the international scene is the difference between the 1985 Nairobi and 1995 Beijing World Conferences on Women. Although participants in Nairobi were vocal on the subject of VAW, the word 'violence' does not even appear in the General Assembly resolution on the conference (UNGA, 1985). By the time of Beijing, in contrast, the UN had signed the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women. The Beijing Declaration specifically refers to this declaration as committing signatory governments to 'prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls' (Beijing Declaration, 1995).

4 For an overview, see Johnson, Ollus, and Nevela (2007).

5 The study involved interviews with 24,000 women in ten countries and was implemented by WHO (2005a) in collaboration with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, PATH USA, research institutions, and women's organizations in the participating countries.

6 Men and boys are also victims of sexual violence in conflict and non-conflict settings, sometimes at rates approaching those of women and girls (see the study by Johnson et al. (2010) on sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which indicates rates of 40 per cent for women and 23 per cent for men). Men are also victims of intimate-partner violence (based on the study by Tjaden and Thoennes (2000); while 1.5 million women are raped or physically assaulted each year by their intimate partners in the United States, so are 834,732 men. The larger implication, which this report can only point towards, is the need to work on halting these forms of violence for both sexes.

7 For an in-depth discussion of the MDG–VAW issue, see WHO (2005b).

8 For more information on the workshop, see: ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/measurability/monitoring-armed-violence/indicators-of-violence-against-women.html›.

9 For recent advances, see the papers collected for the UNECE-hosted meeting on how to measure VAW (UNECE, 2010).

10 Literature is controversial about the definition of 'femicide'. Some will argue that femicide statistics refer to gender-disaggregated data on the murder of women (see UNGA, 2008). Others argue that some women are killed specifically because they are women, and only this particular form of murder should be called 'femicide', which can be defined as 'the proportion of female deaths that occurred due to gender-based causes' (see Bloom, 2008).

11 Stalking generally refers to 'harassing or threatening behavior that an individual engages in repeatedly, such as following a person, appearing at a person's home or place of business, making harassing phone calls, leaving written messages or objects, or vandalizing a person's property' (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998, p. 1).

12 The FC considers 'violence unreported to authorities' as an issue that should be addressed, treating it as an additional variable. Consequently, the meeting introduced it as a dimension, at the same level as frequency, severity, and so forth, to be collected for the four indicators on physical and sexual violence (UNSC, 2010).

13 For a list of national surveys on VAW, see UNECE, ‹http://www.unece.org/stats/gender/vaw/surveys.html›.

14 A household survey is 'a population-based epidemiological study in which a cross-section of a reference population is surveyed by means of a standard instrument for information collection, such as a questionnaire' (Sethi et al., 2004, p. 8).

15 The GD study on Burundi, for example, included questions in its survey on domestic and sexual violence committed under the threat of a weapon. When the researchers put the survey results in the context of other studies and their own analysis of administrative records, they concluded that 'gender-based violence has reached worrying levels in Burundi' (GD Secretariat, 2008c, p. 31).

16 For an overview of the evolution of research on the economic costs of VAW over the past 20 years, see Day, McKenna, and Bowlus (2005, p. 17).

17 See previous endnote.

18 Researchers have recently been experimenting with an econometric approach to calculating indirect costs of VAW, whereas health impacts have been calculated through DALY (disability-adjusted life years) measures, naïve comparison of mean outcomes, and propensity score matching. See Morrison and Orlando (2004) for examples and further discussion.

19 'This category includes short-term costs of providing protection and other services (such as child protection services, childcare and remedial/special education) to children of relationships where there is domestic violence, and longer-term costs imposed on society by these children as they grow older (such as increased crime and future use of government services)' (NCRV, 2009, p. 57).

20 Verbal report on ongoing research made during the expert meeting by Charlotte Watts, director of the Gender, Violence and Health Centre, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. For more information, see also ‹http://oraweb.aucc.ca/pls/cupid/show_project_e?project_no_in=37/S61268-275B/E›.

21 See: for small arms and disarmament, Morel (2006); OECD (2009); for security sector reform, OECD (2007); for VAW, Ellsberg and Heise (2005); for rural development, US Department of Agriculture (2010); for public health, Hawe et al. (2004); for humanitarian relief, Relief Web (n.d.); and for state and peace building, OECD (2006; 2010). It would also be useful for this toolkit to integrate the findings of Slotin, Wyeth, and Romita's (2010) study of how international actors grapple with local context and power dynamics in partner countries.

22 Several training manuals for RRA are available online. See, for example, Wageningen International (n.d.); Schoonmaker Freudenberger (1999); Bartle (2007).

23 The equivalent of PSA in humanitarian work is often referred to as participatory vulnerability analysis.

24 For examples of participatory approaches in the context of mapping out violence, see Banerjee and Muggah (2002); Baeanisia et al. (2005).

25 Relevant manuals are also numerous; some good places to start include World Bank (1996), Mayoux (2001), and IDS (n.d.).

26 Another example comes from the implementation manual for the Stepping Stones programme, which includes a discussion of why the programme will have to be adapted to different national and local cultures and situations, and suggestions on how to make adaptations (ACORD, 2007).

27 See Ellsberg and Heise (2005); Ellsberg et al. (2009); AusAID (2007; 2008).

28 See AusAID (2007; 2008).

29 See Dullea (2006) and, for a more nuanced position, largely supportive of the argument here, Chambers and Mayoux (2003); Kwan (2002).

30 In UN work on the area, it was recently noted that one of the reasons why it was so difficult to identify best practices is due to 'the lack of sustained resources committed to this work, and especially to evaluating different initiatives' (UN, 2007, p. 101).

31 Evaluations from a justice or services perspective have mostly focused on individual projects and programmes in specific countries, e.g. Ford et al. (2002); Hester and Westmarland (2005); European Commission (2005). For health perspective reviews, see Bott, Morrison, and Ellsberg (2004); UNGA (2006a); AusAID (2007); Colombini, Mayhew, and Watts (2008); WHO (2009); GSDRC (2009); Violence Prevention (n.d.).

Bibliography

ACORD (Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development). 2007. *Implementing Stepping Stones: A Practical and Strategic Guide for Implementers, Planners and Policy Makers*. Nairobi: ACORD. ‹http://www.steppingstonesfeedback.org/resources/5/SS_ACORD_Implementing_Stepping_Stones_2007.pdf›

Amnesty International. 2007. 'Stop Violence against Women: Rape as a Tool of War: A Fact Sheet.' Washington, DC: Amnesty International. ‹http://www.amnestyusa.org/women/rapeinwartime.html›

Ashley, Olivia Silber and Vangie Foshee. 2007. 'Evaluation of the Safe Dates Program to Prevent Adolescent Violence.' Paper presented at the Abstinence Education Evaluation Conference, Baltimore, 19–20 March. ‹http://www.ent-s-t.com/ESTOPA/presentations/Ashley_FINAL.pdf›

AusAID (Australian Agency for International Development). 2007. *Violence against Women in Melanesia and East Timor: A Review of International Lessons*. Canberra: AusAID Office of Development Effectiveness. ‹http://www.ode.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/VAW_review.pdf›

—. 2008. *Violence against Women in Melanesia and East Timor: Building on Global and Regional Promising Approaches*. Canberra: AusAID Office of Development Effectiveness. ‹http://www.ode.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/vaw_cs_full_report.pdf›

Baeanisia, Audrey, et al. 2005. *Silencing Guns: Local Perspectives on Small Arms and Armed Violence in Rural Pacific Island Communities*. Occasional Paper No. 15. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.

Banerjee, Dipankar and Robert Muggah. 2002. *Small Arms and Human Insecurity: Reviewing Participatory Research in South Asia*. Colombo: Regional Centre for Strategic Studies.

Barker, Gary. 2005. *Dying to be Men: Youth, Masculinity and Social Exclusion*. Oxford: Routledge.

—, Christine Ricardo, and Marcos Nascimento. 2007. *Engaging Men and Boys in Changing Gender-based Inequity in Health: Evidence from Programme Interventions*. Geneva: WHO. ‹http://www.who.int/gender/documents/Engaging_men_boys.pdf›

Bartle, Phil. 2007. *Methods of Participatory Appraisal: A Review of PAR/PRA Methods and Techniques*. ‹http://www.scn.org/cmp/modules/par-tech.htm›

Beijing Declaration. 1995. Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action of the Fourth World Conference on Women: Action for Equality, Development and Peace, Beijing, 15 September. ‹http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/e5dplw.htm›

BJS (Bureau of Justice Statistics). n.d. *Special Topics: US National Crime Victimization Survey*. Washington, DC: BJS, Office of Justice Programs. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=97›

Bloom, Shelah S. 2008. *Violence against Women and Girls: A Compendium of Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators*. Washington, DC: USAID. ‹http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/tools/gender/violence-against-women-and-girls-compendium-of-indicators›

Bott, Sarah, Andrew Morrison, and Mary Ellsberg. 2004. *Preventing and Responding to Gender-based Violence in Middle and Low-income Countries: A Multi-sectoral Literature Review and Analysis*. Washington, DC: World Bank. ‹http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/BottVAWpaperfinal.pdf›

Bourgois, Philippe. 1996. 'In Search of Masculinity: Violence, Respect and Sexuality among Puerto Rican Crack Dealers in East Harlem.' *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 412–27.

Chambers, Robert. 1994. 'The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal.' *World Development*, Vol. 22, No. 7, pp. 953–69.

— and Linda Mayoux. 2003. 'Reversing the Paradigm: Quantification and Participatory Methods.' Paper presented at the conference on New Directions in Impact Assessment for Development: Methods and Practice, University of Manchester, 24–25 November.

Colombini, Manuela, Susannah Mayhew, and Charlotte Watts. 2008. 'Health-sector Responses to Intimate Partner Violence in Low- and Middle-income Settings: A Review of Current Models, Challenges and Opportunities.' *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation*, Vol. 86, No. 8, pp. 635–42. ‹http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/86/8/07-045906/en/index.html#R40›

Conroy, Czech. 2001. *Participatory Situation Analysis with Livestock Keepers: A Guide*. Greenwich: University of Greenwich Natural Resources Institute. ‹http://www.smallstock.info/research/reports/R6953/R6953-05.pdf›

Cornwall, Andrea. 2000. *Making a Difference? Gender and Participatory Development*. IDS Discussion Paper No. 378. Sussex: Institute for Development Studies.

—. 2003. 'Whose Voices? Whose Choices? Reflections on Gender and Participatory Development.' *World Development*, Vol. 31, No. 8. August, pp. 1325–42.

Day, Tanis, Katherine McKenna, and Audra Bowlus. 2005. 'The Economic Costs of Violence against Women: An Evaluation of the Literature: Expert Brief Compiled in Preparation for the Secretary-General's In-depth Study on all Forms of Violence against Women.' United Nations. ‹http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/expert%20brief%20costs.pdf›

Dullea, Karen. 2006. 'Women Shaping Participatory Research to their Own Needs.' *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 65–74.

Ellsberg, Mary and Lori Heise. 2005. *Researching Violence against Women: A Practical Guide for Researchers and Activists*. Geneva: WHO and PATH. ‹http://www.path.org/files/GBV_rvaw_complete.pdf›

Ellsberg, Mary, et al. 2009. 'Using Participatory Methods for Researching Violence against Women: An Experience from Melanesia and East Timor.' Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australasian Evaluation Society, Canberra, 2–4 September. ‹http://www.aes.asn.au/conferences/2009/Papers/Ellsberg,%20Mary.pdf›

European Commission. 2005. *The Daphne Experience 1997–2003*. Luxembourg: European Commission. ‹http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/2004_2007/daphne/doc/daphne_experience/daphne_experience_en.pdf›

Ford, David A., et al. 2002. *Controlling Violence against Women: A Research Perspective on the 1994 VAWA's Criminal Justice Impact*. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. ‹http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/197137.pdf›

GD (Geneva Declaration) Secretariat. 2006. Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development. Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/Geneva-Declaration-Armed-Violence-Development-091020-EN.pdf›

—. 2008a. *Armed Violence Prevention and Reduction: A Challenge for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals*. Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/Geneva-Declaration-Millennium-Development-Goals.pdf›

—. 2008b. *The Global Burden of Armed Violence*. Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/measurability/global-burden-of-armed-violence.html›

—. 2008c. *Insecurity Is Also a War: An Assessment of Armed Violence in Burundi*. Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/measurability/country-level-assessments/burundi-armed-violence-assessment.html›

—. 2008d. 'Review Summit Statement.' Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/Geneva-Declaration-Review-Summit-Statement-final-12092008-ENGLISH.pdf›

—. 2010a. *How to Systematically Measure and Monitor Violence against Women*. Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/Expert_Workshops_VAW/Expert_Workshop_on_VAW_-_Background_Paper.pdf›

—. 2010b. *Indicators of Violence against Women*. Geneva: GD Secretariat. ‹http://www.genevadeclaration.org/measurability/monitoring-armed-violence/indicators-of-violence-against-women.html›

Greaves, Lorraine, Olena Hankivsky, and Joanne Kingston-Reichers. 1995. *Selected Estimates of the Costs of Violence against Women*. London, Ontario: Centre for Research on Violence against Women and Children. ‹http://www.crvawc.ca/docs/pub_greaves1995.pdf›

GSDRC (Governance and Social Development Resource Centre). 2009. *Helpdesk Research Report: Violence against Women Interventions*. Birmingham: GSDRC. ‹http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/HD623.pdf›

Harvard Humanitarian Initiative and Oxfam International. 2008. *Now, the World Is without Me: An Investigation of Sexual Violence in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo*. Boston: Harvard Humanitarian Initiative. ‹http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/DRC-sexual-violence-2010-04.pdf›

Hawe, Penelope, et al. 2004. 'Methods for Exploring Implementation Variation and Local Context within a Cluster Randomised Community Intervention Trial.' *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, Vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 788–93. ‹http://jech.bmj.com/content/58/9/788.abstract›

Hester, Marianne and Nicole Westmarland. 2005. *Tackling Domestic Violence: Effective Approaches and Interventions*. Home Office Research Study No. 290. London: UK Home Office. ‹http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/hors290.pdf›

Holder, Yvette, et al. 2001. *Injury Surveillance Guidelines*. Geneva: WHO.

ICRW (International Center for Research on Women). 2007. *Estimating the Costs and Impacts of Intimate Partner Violence in Developing Countries: A Methodological Resource Guide*. Washington, DC: ICRW. ‹http://www.icrw.org/files/publications/Estimating-the-Costs-and-Impacts-of-Intimate-Partner-Violence-in-Developing-Countries-A-Methodological-Resource-Guide.pdf›

—. 2009. *Intimate Partner Violence: High Costs to Households and Communities*. Washington, DC: ICRW. ‹http://www.icrw.org/docs/2009/Intimate-Partner-Violence-High-Cost-to-Households-and-Communities.pdf›

IDS (Institute of Development Studies). n.d. 'Participation, Power and Social Change Team.' Home page and links to articles. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/›

IGWG (Interagency Gender Working Group). 2008. *Monitoring and Evaluating Gender Based Violence*. A collection of papers submitted for the Technical Seminar Recognizing the 2008 '16 Days of Activism'. ‹http://www.igwg.org/Events/MonitorEvalGBV.aspx›

Jansen, Henrica A. F. M. 2010. 'Core Set of VAW Indicators; Short Module Questionnaire to Measure These.' Paper presented at the Workshop on Measuring Violence against Women, UNECE, Geneva, 29–30 April. ‹http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2010.04.vaw.htm›

Johnson, Holly. 1996. *Dangerous Domains: Violence against Women in Canada*. Toronto: Nelson.

—, Natalia Ollus, and Sami Nevela. 2007. *Violence against Women: An International Perspective*. New York: Springer.

Johnson, Kirsten, et al. 2010. 'Association of Sexual Violence and Human Rights Violations with Physical and Mental Health in Territories of the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo.' *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 304, No. 5. August, pp. 553–62.

Kim, Julia C., et al. 2007. 'Understanding the Impact of a Microfinance-based Intervention on Women's Empowerment and the Reduction of Intimate Partner Violence in South Africa.' *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 97, No. 10, pp. 1794–802.

Krause, Keith. 2009. 'Beyond Definition: Violence in a Global Perspective.' *Global Crime*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 337–55.

Kristof, Nicholas and Sheryl Wu-Dunn. 2009. *Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide*. New York: Knopf.

Kwan, Mei-Po. 2002. 'Is GIS for Women? Reflections on the Critical Discourse in the 1990s.' *Gender, Place and Culture*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 271–79.

LeBrun, Emile, Robert Muggah, and Celia Paoloni. 2009. *After the Guns Fall Silent: Sexual and Gender-based Violence in Timor-Leste*. Issue Brief No. 5. Geneva: Small Arms Survey. November.

Mayoux, Linda. 2001. *Participatory Methods*. Swindon: Enterprise Development Impact Assessment Information Service.

Medrado, Benedito. 2003. 'Men, Masculinities and Gender Violence.' Paper prepared for the UN Expert Group Meeting on the Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality, Brasilia, 21–23 October. ‹http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/men-boys2003/OP3-Medrado.pdf›

Morel, Marc-Antoine. 2006. 'Integrating Small Arms Measures into National Development Planning Strategies: Lessons Learned from UNDP Small Arms Programming.' Paper presented at the International Workshop on Integrating Small Arms Measures into Development Programmes, Oslo, 30 November–1 December. ‹http://www.prio.no/projects/a25cost/files/Panel%205%20-20Marc%20Antoine%20Morel.pdf›

Morrison, Andrew R. and Maria Beatriz Orlando. 2004. *The Costs and Impacts of Gender-based Violence in Developing Countries: Methodological Considerations and New Evidence*. Washington, DC: World Bank. ‹http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/costsandimpactsofgbv.pdf›

MRC (Medical Research Council). 2009. 'Gender and Health Research Unit.' Cape Town: MRC of South Africa. ‹http://www.mrc.ac.za/gender/projects.htm›

Muratore, Maria Giuseppina and Linda Laura Sabbadini. 2005. 'Italian Survey on Violence against Women.' *Statistical Journal of the United Nations*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 265–78. ‹http://www.unimi.it/cataloghi/cpo/MGMuratoreViolDonneStatistica.pdf›

NCIPC (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control). 2003. *Costs of Intimate Partner Violence against Women in the United States*. Atlanta, Georgia: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. ‹http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/IPVBook-a.pdf›

NCRV (National Council to Reduce Violence). 2009. *The Cost of Violence against Women and Their Children*. Canberra: Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Government of Australia. ‹http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/women/pubs/violence/np_time_for_action/economic_costs/Documents/VAWC_Economic_Report.pdf›

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2006. *Whole of Government Approaches to Fragile States*. Paris: OCED. ‹http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/24/37826256.pdf›

—. 2007. *The OECD Handbook on Security System Reform (SSR): Supporting Security and Justice*. Paris: OCED. ‹http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/21/58/38304398.pdf›

—. 2009. *Armed Violence Reduction: Enabling Development*. Paris: OCED. ‹http://www.oecd.org/document/34/0,3343,en_2649_33693550_42281877_1_1_1_1,00.html›

—. 2010. *Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Priorities and Challenges: A Synthesis of Findings from Seven Multi-stakeholder Consultations*. Paris: OCED. ‹http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/34/45454619.pdf›

Ogrodnik, Lucie. 2009. 'Fact Sheet—Family Homicides.' ‹http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-224-x/2009000/part-partie5-eng.htm›

Pola Z., María Jesús. 2008. 'Femicide in the Dominican Republic.' In *Strengthening Understanding of Femicide: Using Research to Galvanize Action and Accountability*. Washington, DC: PATH, pp. 49–55. ‹http://www.path.org/files/GVR_femicide_rpt.pdf›

Prevention Institute. 2006. 'Sexual Violence and the Spectrum of Prevention: Towards a Community Solution.' Oakland, California: Prevention Institute. ‹http://www.preventioninstitute.org/component/jlibrary/article/id-97/127.html›

PRIO (Peace Research Institute Oslo), CSCW (Center for the Study of Civil War), and World Bank. 2010. 'Gender and Conflict Research Seminar.' ‹http://www.prio.no/sptrans/-1122709684/Gender%20and%20Conflict%20Research%20Seminar%20Programme.pdf›

Promising Practices Network. n.d. 'Programs that Work: Safe Dates.' Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.promisingpractices.net/about_ppn.asp›

Relief Web. n.d. 'Participatory Approaches in Community Based Development and Disaster Risk Management.' Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwt.nsf/5c0b2abb250bb3a5c1256ecf00372cf0/8788c681520e713505257412003f6cc8?OpenDocument›

Ross, David A., Bruce Dick, and Jane Ferguson. 2006. *Preventing HIV/AIDS in Young People: A Systematic Review of the Evidence from Developing Countries*. Geneva: WHO.

Salamander Trust. n.d. 'Stepping Stones.' London: Salamander Trust. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.steppingstonesfeedback.org/›

SAME (Social and Mathematical Epidemiology). n.d. 'Gender Violence and Health Center.' London: SAME, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://genderviolence.lshtm.ac.uk/›

Schoonmaker Freudenberger, Karen. 1999. *Rapid Rural Appraisal and Participatory Rural Appraisal: A Manual for CRS Field Workers and Partners*. Washington, DC: Catholic Relief Services.

SEEP (Small Enterprise Education and Promotion) Network. 2008. 'Case Study: Intervention with Microfinance for AIDS and Gender Equity, South Africa Microfinance Plus Gender and HIV Education Program.' Washington, DC: SEEP Network. ‹http://communities.seepnetwork.org/hamed/system/files/ImageSA_new.pdf›

Sethi, D., et al. 2004. *Guidelines for Conducting Community Surveys on Injuries and Violence*. Geneva: WHO.

Slotin, Jenna, Vanessa Wyeth, and Paul Romita. 2010. *Power, Politics, and Change: How International Actors Assess Local Context.* New York: International Peace Institute.

Small Arms Survey. 2010. *Small Arms Survey 2010: Gangs, Groups, and Guns.* Cambridge: University Press.

—. Forthcoming. *Ethical Guide.* Geneva: Small Arms Survey.

Soo, Ho Chung, et al. 2007. 'Sexual Assault in the District of Bucheon: A Review of 70 Cases.' *Journal of Women's Medicine*, Vol. 2, No. 1. March, pp. 34–38.

Statistics Canada. 2010. 'Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile.' Ottawa: Statistics Canada. ‹http://www.statcan.gc.ca/bsolc/olc-cel/olc-cel?catno=85-224-X&lang=eng›

Stermac, Lorna, et al. 1995. 'Comparison of Sexual Assaults by Strangers and Known Assailants in an Urban Population of Women.' *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, Vol. 153, No. 8, pp. 1089–94. ‹http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1487328/pdf/cmaj000080-0039.pdf›

SVRI (Sexual Violence Research Initiative). n.d. 'SVRI Publications.' Geneva: SVRI. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.svri.org/index.htm›

Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 1998. *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

—. 2000. 'The Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey.' Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Travers, Kathryn, et al. 2008. *Women's Safety: A Shared Global Concern: Compendium of Practices and Policies*. Montreal: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. ‹http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/uploads/media/pub_206_1.pdf›

UN (United Nations). 2006. *The World's Women 2005: Progress in Statistics*. New York: UN Publications.

—. 2007. *Ending Violence against Women: From Words to Action*. New York: UN.

—. n.d. 'UNiTE to End Violence against Women Campaign.' Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/›

UNDAW and UNODC (United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). 2005. *Final Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Good Practices on Combating and Eliminating Violence against Women*. New York: UNDAW. ‹http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/vaw-gp-2005/docs/FINALREPORT.goodpractices.pdf›

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 1995. *Human Development Report 1995: Gender and Human Development*. New York: UNDP. ‹http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1995/chapters/›

UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe). 2010. *Workshop on Measuring Violence against Women*. A collection of papers presented at the Workshop on Measuring Violence against Women, UNECE, Geneva, 29–30 April. ‹http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2010.04.vaw.htm›

— and World Bank. 2010. *Developing Gender Statistics: A Practical Tool.* Geneva: UN.

UN ECOSOC (United Nations Economic and Social Council). 2008. 'Friends of the Chair of the United Nations Statistical Commission on the Indicators on Violence against Women.' E/CN.3/2009/13. ‹http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/doc09/2009-13-GenderStats-E.pdf›

UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund). 2001. *A Practical Approach to Gender-based Violence: A Programme for Health Care Providers and Managers*. New York: UN. ‹http://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/global/shared/documents/publications/2001/genderbased_eng.pdf›

UNGA (United Nations General Assembly). 1985. 'Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women'. A/RES/40/108 of 13 December. New York: UN. ‹http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/40/a40r108.htm›

—. 1993. Resolution 48/104, adopted 20 December. A/RES/48/104 of 23 February 1994. ‹http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/huridoca.nsf/(symbol)/a.res.48.104.en›

—. 2006a. *In-depth Study on All Forms of Violence against Women*. A/61/122/Add.1. New York: UN. July. ‹http://daccess-dds-my.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/503/01/PDF/N0650301.pdf?OpenElement›

—. 2006b. Resolution 61/143, adopted 19 Dec. A/RES/61/143 of 30 January 2007. ‹http://www.unescap.org/esid/GAD/Events/EGM-VAW2007/Background%20Papers/GA%20resolution%20on%20VAW.pdf›

—. 2008. *Special Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, Its Causes and Consequences, Yakin Ertürk, on Indicators on Violence against Women and State Response*. Seventh session of the Human Rights Council, Geneva.

—. 2010. 'Draft Resolution Referred to the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly by the General Assembly at Its Sixty-fourth Session.' A/65/L.1.17. September.

UN-HABITAT, WICI, and SIDA (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Women in Cities International, and Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency). 2009. *Women's Safety Audits: What Works and Where?* ‹http://womenincities.org/english/sets_en/set_downloads_en.htm›

UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women). 2007. 'The Issue: Violence against Women and the International Response.' Front page for the Internet presentation of the 10th anniversary of the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women. ‹http://www.unifem.org/campaigns/trust_fund_10th_anniversary/the_issue.php›

—. 2010. 'About Global Safe Cities Programme Free of Violence against Women and Girls.' Press Release. New Delhi, 22 November. ‹http://www.unifem.org.in/PDF/SAFE%20CITIES%20PR%20FINAL.pdf›

—. n.d. 'UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women.' Front page for the Internet presentation of the UN Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women. ‹http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/violence_against_women/trust_fund.php›

UNSC (United Nations Statistics Commission). 2009. *Proposed Draft Outline for the Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence against Women, Part I: Statistical Survey*. ESA/STAT/AC.193/Item13. Geneva: UN. December. ‹http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/meetings/vaw/docs/Item13.pdf›

—. 2010. *Report on the Meeting of the Friends of the Chair of the United Nations Statistical Commission on Statistical Indicators on Violence against Women*. ESA/STAT/AC.193/L.3. Geneva: UN. February. ‹http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/meetings/vaw/docs/FinalReport.pdf›

UNSD (United Nations Statistics Division). 2009. 'Methodological Overview of Surveys on Violence against Women.' ESA/STAT/AC.193/1. Background paper for the Meeting of the Friends of the Chair of the United Nations Statistical Commission on Statistical Indicators on Violence against Women, Aguascalientes, Mexico, 9–11 December.

US (United States) Department of Agriculture. 2010. 'The Rural Community Empowerment Program's Guiding Principles.' ‹http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/BCP-EZEC-Principles.html›

Violence Prevention. n.d. 'Violence Prevention Evidence Base and Resources.' Liverpool: Centre for Public Health, John Moores University. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://www.preventviolence.info/default.aspx›

Wageningen International. n.d. 'Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA).' Wageningen: Wageningen UR. Accessed January 2011. ‹http://portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme/?Participatory_Rural_Appraisal_(PRA)›

Walby, Sylvia. 2004. *The Cost of Domestic Violence*. London: Women and Equality Unit, UK Government Equalities Office. ‹http://www.equalities.gov.uk/pdf/Summ%20cost%20of%20domestic%20violence%20Sep%2004.pdf›

Wallace, Tina. 2006. 'Evaluating Stepping Stones: A Review of Existing Evaluations and Ideas for future M & E Work.' Nairobi: ActionAid. ‹http://comminit.com/en/node/265544/347›

WHO (World Health Organization). 2001. *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence against Women*. Geneva: WHO.

—. 2005a. *WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women: Initial Results on Prevalence, Health Outcomes and Women's Responses*. Geneva: WHO. ‹http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/en/›

—. 2005b. *Addressing Violence against Women and Achieving the Millennium Development Goals*. Geneva: WHO. ‹http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2005/WHO_FCH_GWH_05.1.pdf›

—. 2009. *Promoting Gender Equality to Prevent Violence against Women*. Geneva: WHO. ‹http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2009/9789241597883_eng.pdf›

Willman, Ayls. 2009. *The Cost of Violence: Valuing the Impacts of Domestic Violence: A Review by Sector.* Social Development Department. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. ‹http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-1239390842422/6012763-1239905793229/costs_of_violence.pdf›

World Bank. 1996. *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Zimmerman, Cathy. 1994. *Plates in a Basket Will Rattle: Domestic Violence in Cambodia: A Summary*. Phnom Penh: Asia Foundation.