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## Executive Summary

## Purpose and scope of the study

The main objective of the endline survey was to assess the impact of the in-service teacher training on Positive Discipline and Effective Classroom Management (PDECM) on primary school teachers' Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) pertaining to violent disciplinary methods as well as the impact on improvement in child protection in Cambodian primary schools.

The PDECM training package was piloted in 12 selected primary schools in 3 provinces in Cambodia in August and September 2015, 50\% of the total 24 school that were surveyed in the baseline study in 2015. Thus, this study was designed to compare the differing impact from external intervention (PDECM) over 12 schools with the other 12 schools which did not participate in the PDECM training. Data collection for the endline survey was conducted in June and July 2016.

In the study, a total of 24 items in 5 categories regarding the violent disciplinary methods were investigated:

TABLE 1 Five categories examined in this study

|  | Type/Method | Examples of each method |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Moderate verbal discipline | Shouting, yelling or screaming at students, <br> threatening to spank students, or humiliating <br> students |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Harsh verbal discipline | Calling students stupid, lazy or some other <br> names like that, not allowing students to join <br> the class, or swearing or cursing at students |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Moderate physical discipline | Hitting students on the bottom, twisting or <br> pulling student's hairs or ears, or slapping <br> students on hands, arms or legs |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Harsh physical discipline | Hitting students with a stick or ruler on some <br> part of the body, throwing or knocking <br> students down, or slapping students in the face |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Severe physical discipline | Beating students, burning or scalding students, <br> or grabbing students around their necks and <br> choking them |

## Overview of endline survey

The endline survey obtained information from 1,224 students (grades 5 and 6), 148 teachers and 24 school directors from 24 primary schools in three provinces: Battambang, Kampot, and Prey Veng. Standardized questionnaires were used for all three categories which was also used in the baseline survey. In total 24 items in regard to disciplinary measures, categorized into five areas, were assessed: 1) Moderate verbal discipline; 2) Harsh verbal discipline; 3) Moderate physical discipline; 4) Harsh physical discipline; and 5) Severe physical discipline. In addition, teachers' perceptions towards disciplinary methods, teaching style, and anger management were investigated, and student-teacher relationships at school were also inquired into. The last part of the survey assessed child protection mechanisms in primary schools by asking school directors some specific questions.

## The results from the endline survey

Despite the significant reduction of violent disciplinary measures in schools in the experimental group thanks to the PDECM's package, the prevalence of such disciplinary methods was still identified as high. According to the data collected from teachers, the most common form of violent discipline was moderate verbal discipline ( $53.4 \%$ ), followed by moderate physical discipline (41.2\%), harsh physical discipline (24.3\%), harsh verbal discipline ( $16.9 \%$ ) and severe physical discipline (0\%).

## Impact analysis in general (male and female combined)

As a TABLE 2 below shows, against the baseline, positive impacts of the PDECM training were observed from both teachers and students in the experimental group.

TABLE 2 Summary results of five categories

| Disciplinary Method | Reported by teachers |  |  |  | Reported by students |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Baseline $2015$ | Endline Control $2016$ | Endline <br> Experiment <br> 2016 | Endline Total | Baseline | Endline Control | Endline Experiment | Endline Total |
| Moderate verbal | 64.1\% | 70.2\% | 42.9\% | 53.4\% | 52.9\% | 49.6\% | 32.2\% | 42.0\% |
| Harsh verbal | 23.1\% | 29.8\% | 8.8\% | 16.9\% | 30.9\% | 27.2\% | 20.4\% | 24.2\% |
| Moderate physical | 63.2\% | 61.4\% | 28.6\% | 41.2\% | 73.4\% | 64.0\% | 46.5\% | 56.3\% |
| Harsh physical | 34.3\% | 45.6\% | 11.0\% | 24.3\% | 42.6\% | 47.9\% | 27.0\% | 38.7\% |
| Severe physical | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3.0\% | 5.4\% | 1.9\% | 3.8\% |

Evidently, the improvement in the experimental group was much larger than that of the control group; all 4 items in the endilne (both male and female, total 8 items) in the experimental group showed the improvement whilst the control did not.

## Impact analysis: Violent disciplinary methods (five categories)

## Moderate verbal discipline (4 items)

Notably the results demonstrated that the PDECM training has been successful in reducing moderate verbal discipline as less teachers and students in the experimental group reported moderate verbal discipline, except for one item ("Refused to talk to a student"). This negative result was found amongst both male and female teachers in the experimental group. Continuous efforts are needed to address a high prevalence of moderate verbal discipline in general (In total, 42. 9\% of teachers in the experimental group reported moderate verbal discipline, reducing from the baseline results: 64.1\%).

TABLE 3 Comparison between control and experiment: Moderate verbal discipline

| Disciplinary Method | Male Teachers |  | Female Teachers |  | Male Students |  | Female Students |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment |
| Threatened to <br> spank or hit <br> students | $33.3 \%$ | $31.0 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $25.5 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $20.3 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| Shouted, yelled or <br> screamed at <br> student | $50.0 \%$ | $37.9 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $32.3 \%$ | $40.1 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Refused to speak <br> with students | $0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Embarrassed or <br> humiliated a <br> student | $11.1 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $28.6 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ |  |  |

## Harsh verbal discipline (5 items)

The prevalence of harsh verbal discipline has reduced significantly thanks to PDECM training: less than $9 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group reported harsh verbal discipline, reducing from $23.1 \%$ in the baseline.

TABLE 4 Comparison between control and experiment: Harsh verbal discipline

| Disciplinary Method | Male Teachers |  | Female Teachers |  | Male Student |  | Female Students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment |


| Swore or cursed at students | 2.8\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 11.0\% | 8.7\% | 7.4\% | 2.1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Called students stupid or lazy or some other name like that | 19.4\% | 6.9\% | 33.3\% | 6.5\% | 17.9\% | 11.0\% | 14.9\% | 7.0\% |
| Didn't allow student to join the class | 2.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 8.9\% | 10.2\% | 8.0\% | 4.2\% |
| Shaved or cut your hair or the hair of one of students | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 4.8\% | 1.6\% | 6.5\% | 9.8\% | 5.2\% | 3.5\% |
| Economic penalty, fined students | 5.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 8.6\% | 3.5\% | 6.0\% | 2.1\% |

Although occurrence of three types of disciplinary methods were rather uncommon, "Shaving or cut your hair" needs further investigation, because this can be moderate/harsh discipline or even severe physical discipline depending on the circumstances.

## Moderate physical discipline (10 items)

The results showed the prevalence of moderate physical discipline has decreased dramatically amongst teachers in the experimental group (baseline 63.2\% to 23.6\%), especially for female teachers. It can be concluded, therefore, the PDECM training did bring a positive impact on female teachers more than males.

Among ten items, "Hit a student on the bottom with an object like a stick or ruler" was most common amongst female teachers in the experimental group (16.1\%) and other methods were all under $10 \%$. On the other hand, the most common method amongst male teachers in the experimental group was "Slapped a student on the hand, arm or leg" and "Twisted or pulled the ears/hair/joints" (both 20.7\%). These results indicate that female teachers may be more likely to use an object whilst male teachers are actually perpetrating direct violence.

TABLE 5 Comparison between control and experiment: Moderate physical discipline

| Disciplinary Method | Male Teachers |  | Female Teachers | Male Student | Female Students |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment |
| Slapped a student on <br> the hand, arm or leg | $19.4 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $23.8 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ |
| Hit a student on the <br> bottom with an object <br> like a stick or ruler | $44.4 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $39.5 \%$ | $24.8 \%$ | $29.1 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ |


| Threw a pencil or another item at a student | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 22.8\% | 15.7\% | 13.1\% | 9.9\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Twisted or pulled the ears/hair/joints | 33.3\% | 20.7\% | 9.5\% | 4.8\% | 32.6\% | 22.0\% | 19.4\% | 10.2\% |
| Hit a student on the head with the knuckles | 2.8\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 13.9\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 4.2\% |
| Asked a student to hit his/her knuckles against the table or the wall | 8.3\% | 6.9\% | 33.3\% | 8.1\% | 15.7\% | 13.8\% | 14.3\% | 16.5\% |
| Grabbed a student by the collar or by the neck | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 4.5\% | 2.4\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% |
| Forced a student to kneel down or stand in the same position for at least 15 minutes in the classroom | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 33.3\% | 1.6\% | 14.2\% | 7.1\% | 12.3\% | 4.9\% |
| Forced a student to stand in the sun for more than 15 min | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.5\% | 2.8\% | 3.1\% | 0.7\% |
| Forced a student to fetch water for the toilets | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 27.0\% | 9.4\% | 15.4\% | 11.6\% |

## Harsh physical discipline (4 items)

Notably, both male and female teachers in the experimental group dramatically reduced the usage of "Hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body" (male 17.2\% and female 8.1\%), demonstrating a strong impact from the PDECM training. In total the experimental group reduced the perpetration of this methods from baseline $34.3 \%$ to $11 \%$ in the endline.

TABLE 6 Comparison between control and experiment: Harsh physical discipline

| Disciplinary Method | Male Teachers |  | Female Teachers | Male Student | Female Students |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment |
| Slapped a student in <br> the face | $0.0 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Hit a student with a <br> stick or ruler on some <br> part of the body | $47.2 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $48.1 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ |
| Threw or knocked a <br> student down | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Hit a student with a <br> fist or kicked hard | $0 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Severe physical discipline (3 items)

Overall, the results show that PDECM training contributed to the reduction in severe physical discipline as less students in the experimental group reported severe physical discipline. Amongst the experimental group, it was reduced from $0.7 \%$ (baseline) to $0 \%$ (endline).

Like the baseline survey, almost all teachers reported that they have never used this type of method. In contrast, students reported some forms of severe physical discipline. Further investigation is essential for data validation, especially amongst students who reported this.

TABLE 7 Comparison between control and experiment: Severe physical discipline

| Disciplinary Method | Male Teachers |  | Female Teachers | Male Student |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment |
| Beat you or one of you <br> classmates up | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Grabbed you or one of your <br> classmates around the neck <br> and choked them | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Burned or scalded you or <br> your classmates | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |

Impact analysis: teacher's attitudes towards violent discipline (9 items)
Teacher's attitudes towards violent discipline were assessed by asking some questions to teachers. The results showed that the PDECM training promoted teachers' understanding about corporal punishment: less than $20 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group agreed to the statement, "There is a big difference between serious violence and corporal punishment". .

TABLE 8 Teachers' agreement with corporal punishment

| Teachers' agreement | Male teachers |  |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| about violence discipline |  | O ¢ ¢ 0 |  |  |  |  | $\overline{0}$ |  |  |  |
| Corporal punishment is part of the Cambodian culture and tradition. | 25.00\% | 2.80\% |  | 10.30\% |  | 20.00\% |  | 9.50\% |  | 11.30\% |

```
There is a big difference 
between serious violence
and corporal
punishment. Corporal
punishment is not
dangerous, causes little
pain and cannot be
called child abuse.
\begin{tabular}{lllllll} 
My generation was & \(32.40 \%\) & \(50.00 \%\) & \(41.40 \%\) & \(26.70 \%\) & \(61.90 \%\) & \(47.50 \%\)
\end{tabular}
beaten at school, it
taught us how to behave
better.
```

TABLE 9 Teachers' agreement with non-violent discipline

|  | Male teachers |  |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| non-violent discipline | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{\underline{1}}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | O $\stackrel{y}{5}$ 0 |  |  | ¢ ¢ ¢ ¢ |  | O $\substack{\text { c } \\ 0 \\ 0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{む} \\ & \stackrel{\text { E }}{\frac{1}{\partial}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Corporal punishment is child abuse. | 80.6\% | 75.0\% |  | 89.7\% |  | 64.0\% | 90.5\% |  | 74.2\% |
| Explaining why something is wrong is a better way of teaching a child than using corporal punishment. | 94.1\% | 97.2\% |  | 93.1\% |  | 92.1\% | 95.2\% |  | 91.9\% |
| Children have the right not to be punished psychically and psychologically in school. | 94.0\% | 91.7\% |  | 96.6\% |  | 85.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 100.0 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |  | 91.9\% |

## Impact analysis: Teaching styles (4 items)

Through the endline survey, teachers were also asked about teaching methods that they used in their classes. The result showed that most teachers in the experimental group continued to use traditional methods in teaching (more than $95 \%$ ) such as asking students repeat what they read or make them to copy from the blackboard. At the same time, more male teachers in the experimental group paid attention to slow learners (male 55.2\%; female $46.8 \%$ ). More male teachers also reported to have a suggestion box in their class, which needs to be more promoted to ensure there is a mechanism for students to share their opinions about teaching styles and other personal issues with teachers. Beyond the reduction of violent discipline, there is opportunity for further promoting participatory teaching methods among teachers through the PDECM training.

TABLE 10 Teachers agreeing with traditional and participatory teaching style

| Item | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\underline{E}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | 융 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\bar{\omega}} \\ & \stackrel{\text { E. }}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x} \end{aligned}$ |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\text { है }}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x} \end{aligned}$ |


| Teachers agreeing with traditional teaching style |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In my class I ask my students to copy what I write on the blackboard | 100.0\% | 97.2\% | 100.0\% | 92.1\% | 95.2\% | 95.2\% |
| In my class I ask my students to repeat after me for most of the class | 91.2\% | 88.9\% | 96.6\% | 94.7\% | 95.2\% | 95.2\% |
| Teachers agreeing with participatory teaching style |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| My class has a suggestion box so my students can share their ideas about the lessons | 52.2\% | 50.0\% | 55.2\% | 36.0\% | 47.6\% | 30.6\% |
| I regularly take the slow learners in my class separately to explain the lesson to them in more detail | 39.7\% | 44.4\% | 55.2\% | 48.0\% | 38.1\% | 46.8\% |

## Impact analysis: Anger management by teachers (3 items)

The endline survey investigated how teachers managed anger during classes by asking teachers some queries. The results demonstrated that more teachers in the experimental group were able to manage their anger more effectively thanks to the PDECM training. Notably, female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a larger change in a positive way (more than $10 \%$ improvements in all the three items), therefore, it can be concluded that the training package brought positive changes to females rather than males..

TABLE 11 Teachers agreeing with anger management statements

| Teacher agreeing with anger management statements | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 늗 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { ㄴ } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| It makes me furious when I do a good job and students do not value to it. | 77.9\% | 69.4\% | 72.4\% | 80.3\% | 61.9\% | 58.1\% |
| I get angry when students do not respect me. | 80.9\% | 69.4\% | 75.9\% | 77.6\% | 76.2\% | 62.9\% |
| It makes me furious when I explain something to a student again and again and they simply do not get it. | 73.5\% | 75.0\% | 69.0\% | 69.7\% | 66.7\% | 59.7\% |

Despite such positive changes, overall, more than $50 \%$ of both male and female teachers reported that they became angry towards the students in some situations. Therefore,
more support is essential for teachers to enable them to manage anger during classes in a professional manner. This will lead to further reduction of violent methods in school.

## Impact analysis: Relationship in school

Relationship among students and teachers, student and student, and teacher and teacher were also enquired in this study. Notably, more than $95 \%$ of both male and female students agreed with all four statements about their relationship to teachers. Because the result from the baseline was also very positive, only slight increase was observed.

Findings about the relationship amongst students themselves demonstrated that the results in the experimental group was very promising, with more than $95 \%$ agreeing with the positive statement.

Results from the teacher and teacher relationship was also good, and almost all the teachers i agreed with all four statements about their relationship with other teachers.

## Impact analysis: Child Protection in School (3 items)

Existing child protection mechanisms in school were also inquired into by asking different sets of questions to teachers and school directors. Students were also asked some queries to assess their perception about child protection in schools.

School directors: Analysis from the results from school directors showed the clear difference between the control and the experimental group: $41.7 \%$ of the experimental group have made a written "Child protection policy" while only $8.3 \%$ in the control group did so. Most probably when the Policy is made, the school also develops the "Procedure" to implement the policy because exactly the same result was obtained from the next question about "procedure. Notable progress seen in the experimental group demonstrated a strong impact from the PDECM training.

TABLE 12 School directors' assessment of child protection issues in school

| School directors' assessment of child protection issues in school | No, not in place |  |  | Partially done |  |  | Yes in place |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 은 0 0 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\vdots} \\ & \stackrel{W}{0} \\ & \widetilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| You have a written child protection policy in your school to make sure that the children are kept safe from harm. This policy prohibits all forms of violence against children. | 95.8\% | 83.3\% | 58.3\% | 0\% | 8.3\% | 0\% | 4.2\% | 8.3\% | 41.7\% |
| Your school has clear written child protection procedures in place that provide step-by-step guidance for all members of the school on what action to take if there are concerns about a child's safety or welfare | 95.8\% | 83.3\% | 58.3\% | 0\% | 8.3\% | 0\% | 4.2\% | 8.3\% | 41.7\% |

Students: Approximately more than 95\% of students agreed that "School is a safe place" and "There is a teacher that I can trust" and this high percentage remained the same as the baseline. In addition, students' response to "there is a teacher that I can share personal problems with" went up in the experimental group (male 85.4\%, female 84.5\%) thanks to the PDECM training whilst the control group showed lower results (male 80.1\%, female 79.1\%).

TABLE 13 Students' assessment of child protection in school

| Students' assessment of child protection in school | Male Students |  |  |  | Female Students |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{』}{\underline{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oे } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 믇 } \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| I feel safe and protected at my school | 98.9\% | 96.4\% |  | 96.5\% |  | 98.7\% | 97.7\% |  | 98.9\% |
| There is a teacher in the school I can trust | 98.3\% | 94.4\% |  | 96.5\% |  | 98.2\% | 95.1\% |  | 98.2\% |
| There is a teacher in the school I would share personal problems with | 70.1\% | 80.1\% |  | 85.4\% |  | 75.8\% | 79.1\% |  | 84.5\% |

Teachers: The PDECM training enabled teachers together with school directors to prepare teacher's code of ethics and procedures to ensure safe learning environment for Cambodian primary school students. Approximately $90 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group reported that schools have a code of ethics while more than $80 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group that schools have clear written child protection procedures in place.

TABLE 14 Teachers' assessment of child protection in school

| Teachers' assessment of child protection in school | Male teachers |  |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{I}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | O 0 0 0 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\underline{\leftrightarrows}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\tilde{\infty}} \end{aligned}$ | O 능 0 |  |  |
| Does the school have a code of ethics...? | 82.4\% | 97.2\% |  | 89.7\% | 93.3\% | 85.7\% |  | 95.2\% |
| Are the consequences of breaking the guidelines on behavior clearly written in the code of ethics..? | 83.6\% | 77.8\% |  | 62.1\% | 85.3\% | 71.4\% |  | 80.6\% |


| Does your school have clear | $70.6 \%$ | $69.4 \%$ | $82.8 \%$ | $68.0 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $85.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| written child protection <br> procedures in place...? |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Impact analysis: School rules and students' participation (7 items)

Data regarding school rules and student's participation in developing these rules were collected from school directors. With regard to "Classroom rules", the results demonstrated the positive impact of the PDECM training: more schools in the experimental group have classroom rules (Baseline was $12.5 \%$ and this increased to $33.3 \%$ in the experimental group), all of which reported that both students and teachers developed these rules together. In regard to establishing a "Code of Conduct for students", progress is rather slow; $16.7 \%$ of schools in the experimental group have a code of conduct for students (the baseline was 20.8\%). At the same time, a great achievement was made: a code of conduct was developed in a participatory manner together with students in all schools in the experimental group who have a code of conduct.

TABLE 15 Directors' assessment of school rules and participation in writing them

| Directors' |  | not in p | ce |  | Partially |  |  | Yes in pla |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\underline{E}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 응 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\underline{E}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 하 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| You have a code of conduct for students ... | 70.8\% | 58.3\% | 75.0\% | 8.3\% | 25.0\% | 8.3\% | 20.8\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% |
| Students have participated in the development of the student code of conduct | 100 \% | 100\% | 83.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 16.7\% |
| At your school there are classroom rules for each class. | 83.3\% | 41.7\% | 50.0\% | 4.2\% | 33.3\% | 16.7\% | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 33.3\% |
| Students and teachers establish these classroom rules together. | 87.5\% | 83.3\% | 66.7\% | 4.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 8.3\% | 16.7\% | 33.3\% |

The participation of students as well as teachers, parents and community people is a key to ensure a supportive and safe environment for students to learn. $91.7 \%$ of both control and experimental groups have established a "School support committee", and this remained as same as the baseline. Another positive aspect was that more schools in the experimental group established "student councils" and "Parent teacher associations".

Directors assessment of participation of school support committee, parents, teachers, and students

| Directors assessment | No, not in place |  |  |  |  |  | Partially done |  |  |  |  | Yes in place |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\underline{\Xi}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{0}$ 0 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{む} \\ & \stackrel{\text { ch }}{\frac{1}{\partial}} \\ & \frac{\grave{x}}{x} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{\underline{I}}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\otimes} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { O} \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 믇 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| The school has a school support committee | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ \% \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ \% \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ \% \end{array}$ | 91.7\% | 91.7\% | 91.7\% |
| The school has a student council. | 33.3\% |  | 16.7\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ \% \end{array}$ |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 66.7\% | 83.3\% | 91.7\% |
| The school has parent teacher association. | 83.3\% |  | 66.7\% |  | $\begin{aligned} & 66 . \\ & 7 \% \end{aligned}$ |  | 0\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ \% \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \\ \% \end{array}$ | 16.7\% | 25.0\% | 33.3\% |

## Recommendations

## Policy/Legislative recommendations:

Notify all teachers about prohibition of violence discipline and disseminate key findings and recommendations of the endline survey widely: Almost half the teachers in the endline survey still use violent methods at school to discipline students (e.g. Moderate verbal discipline 53.4\%). Therefore, urgent measures should be taken by the MOEYS to notify all school directors across the nation in a written form to inform them that no teachers should use any type of violent discipline in school and their perpetrating such an act may be subject to punishment such as suspension from their teaching role.

Include PDECM training in to Action Plan to effectively implement the Child Protection Policy in Schools in 2016: Provided the strong impact that PDECM training can impose over the perception and attitudes of teachers, it is essential to consider inserting this training into an action plan.

Ensure every school has a child protection policy: Although a dramatic increase was observed in the experimental group, less than half of them have been equipped with a child protection policy. Therefore, the MOEYS need immediate and rigorous policy measure to ensure that all primary schools develop such a policy and implement it with a clear procedure.

Set up a monitoring and reporting mechanism in school: Less than $70 \%$ of the control group had a child protection procedure. Such a mechanism should be established in each school and be equipped with: a uniformed monitoring system with a set of indicators to report cases and track the progress; referral system and response systems in order to prevent any type of violence in school.

Develop, implement and monitor teacher's code of conduct: Almost one-fourth of teachers do not know the consequences of breaking code of conduct. Therefore, all teachers must be regularly informed about the contents of the code of ethics with a focus on disciplinary measures and compliance to this can be systematically followed up on a regular basis by District Training and Monitoring Team (DTMT).

Raise awareness among students and teachers about child protection and corporal punishment: Strategic and targeted Information Education Communication (IEC) materials can be used to build awareness of positive discipline approaches, and to stimulate and reinforce changes in behavior. It can be in the form of posters, school materials such as notebooks, pencils, etc.

Identify champions to be role models: The MOEYS would select champions from the PDECM training, who have changed their perception and attitude in a positive manner and share his/her experience at an annual education congress or national teachers' day event, here in its website or social media.

Encourage students to participate in school management: Many teachers have not set up a suggestion, therefore, all teachers need to urgently be instructed on how to set up a suggestion box.

Encourage students to participate in school management: Notably, most school have already established school support committees and students' councils, however, teacherparents' association has not been set up in many schools. Thus, more support is essential for school management to initiate the formulation of the association.

## Operational/Programme recommendations:

Ensure PDECM training packages will reach all primary schools in Cambodia: The occurrence of violent discipline still remained high. Therefore, it is suggested that the MOEYS formulate a costed plan to scale up the training across schools nationwide (inservice training). Also, teachers to be should be trained with this package while they are trained at teacher colleges in provinces or at national institutes of education.

Make the PDECM training package more gender sensitive: The results showed that more male teachers used both verbal and physical violent methods than females while more male students experienced or witnessed both verbal and physical violence at schools. Therefore, PDECM training package needs to ensure gender sensitivity in delivery of the training to influence more male teachers, and to reduce violence against male students.

Align the PDECM training with other efforts to reduce violence against children in homes and communities as well as schools: The PDECM training needs to be aligned with other training aiming at promoting positive discipline at homes and communities such as the training on positive parenting conducted by the Ministry of Women's Affairs (MOWA).

Articulate key messages more clearly in the PDECM training package to promote teacher's attitudes towards positive discipline: Even after the training, teachers still held the wrong perception that corporal punishment is not child, therefore, the training needs to deliver a clear message that they can no hit a student such as "zero tolerance to violence (corporal punishment)".

Strengthen teachers' Anger management: The result from anger management related questions were not very promising, therefore, formulating a more in-depth manual to assist teachers in learning anger management will contribute to improve it.

Promote participatory teaching methods through the PDECM training: Most teachers still continued to use traditional teaching methods, therefore, beyond the prohibition of disciplinary measures, the PDECM training can have more emphasis on participatory teaching methods that can increase student's motivation to learn, and could prevent more teachers from using violent methods to encourage students to learn.

Increase community awareness about violence against children: Engage parents/guardians and the broader community in the positive discipline programme (such as School Support Committees). Ensure that parents and people in community are informed about the code of conduct for teachers and the complaint/protection mechanism so that they can seek for help on behalf of their children.

Further research needsConduct a survey on a regular basis to assess the impacts of the PDECM training with qualitative data collection methods: To ensure its effectiveness in a sustainable manner, a survey can be carried out regularly to measure the impacts of the PDECM training.

Parallel research with positive parenting training: A robust and credible research needs to be undertaken to strengthen performance with respect to the PDCEM training and positive parenting training carried out by MOWA. Research can be undertaken in various forms and at various levels of the education system.

Engage students in development of data collection methods: In formulating the further study/survey, it is highly recommended to engage students with a questionnaire formulation to ensuring that more accurate data can be collected for analysis.

Increase research coverage to a wider range of children: Vulnerability of younger students (grade 1-4) or early childhood education level is yet unknown, therefore, an investigation of the feasibility of introducing positive discipline training at those levels is advisable.

Furthermore, marginalized students in primary school such as students with disabilities need to be included for further research.

## 1. Introduction and Background

The Cambodia Violence against Children Survey (CVACS) conducted in 2013 highlighted an urgent need to address Violence Against Children (VAC) in Cambodia across sectors and in settings where children spend most of their time, particularly their homes, communities and schools.

To ensure that all children are kept healthy and safe and be protected from violence at school, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Spots (MoEYS) has been implementing the Cambodia's Child-Friendly Schools (CFS) policy (2007). In order to strengthen its implementation, the CFS Manual on Preventing Violence against Children (2008) was produced to increase awareness amongst frontline educators about the causes and consequences of different types of violence in schools. The manual lists responsibilities of school directors, teachers, students, parents or guardians as well as local authorities in preventing VAC.

Despite the existence of policy framework and the prohibition of corporal punishment in Cambodian schools as stipulated in the Education Policy (Art. 37), teachers remained the commonly reported perpetrators of physical violence in Cambodia, as evidenced in the CVACS (2013). This was partly because no training materials or tools had been in place to assist teachers in building healthy relationships, model nonviolent attitudes and behaviours and contribute to a broader positive school environment, which in turn lowers the risk of school violence.

To fill this knowledge gap, the MoEYS, with technical support from UNICEF, developed an in-service teacher training package on Positive Discipline and Effective Classroom Management (PDECM) in 2015. The main aim of the PDECM was to foster secure, childfriendly and non-violent relationships between teachers and their students, drawing on national and international experiences and best practices. The package and tools focus on effective ways to manage classrooms, resolve conflicts non-violently and create positive student-teacher relationships so that students feel comfortable talking with teachers about violence-related issues. The package includes: a revised and updated CFS manual on preventing violence against children as well as three accompanying tool books on positive discipline and effective classroom management: 1) A Guide for Facilitators;' 2) A Tool Book for Senior School Leaders, ${ }^{2}$ and; 3) A Tool Book for Primary School Teachers.

In July 2015, District Training Management Team (DTMT) members from three targeted provinces were introduced to the Guide for Facilitators via a one-week training in Phnom

[^0]Penh, provided by the MoEYS and UNICEF. These DTMT members subsequently provided training on Positive Discipline and Effective Classroom Management to school directors and teachers in their respective provinces. The in-service teacher training package on positive discipline has been developed and piloted in 12 primary schools across the three target provinces: Battambang, Kampot and Prey Veng.

On a parallel basis, the MoEYS and UNICEF cooperated with the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP) to conduct a Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) survey on "Disciplinary Methods in Cambodian Schools: Towards Violence Free Schools" in 2015. This study helped to establish a baseline to measure the impact of the training package. In the study, 24 primary schools in the three target provinces (Battambang, Kampot, and Prey Veng) were selecteds. Data were collected from 1,081 students, 145 primary school teachers, and 24 school principles.

The result of the baseline survey shows a substantial use of moderate and harsh verbal and physical disciplinary methods by teachers. Among all student interviewees, 73.3\% ( $68.2 \%$ of girls and $78.5 \%$ of boys) experienced or witnessed moderate physical punishment by a teacher which was inflicted upon them or one of their classmates. These figures were found to be $42.6 \%$ ( $40.3 \%$ of girls and $32.3 \%$ of boys) for harsh physical discipline, $52.9 \%$ for moderate verbal discipline ( $50.6 \%$ of girls and $55.2 \%$ of boys), and $30.9 \%$ for harsh verbal discipline ( $29.6 \%$ of girls and $32.3 \%$ of boys). Incidents, although rare, of severe physical violence were also found.

The study also found that teachers' use of violence to discipline students were common practice amongst many teachers. For example, approximately two thirds of female and of male teachers ( $61.3 \%$ and $67.2 \%$ respectively) reported to have perpetrated at least one incident of moderate verbal discipline in the past 30 days. These figures were $18.7 \%$ amongst female teachers and $27.9 \%$ amongst male teachers for harsh verbal punishment, about $63 \%$ amongst either male or female teachers for moderate physical violence, and about one third for harsh physical violence.

Strikingly, one third of male teachers and one fifth of female teachers agreed that teachers needed corporal punishment as a last resort and two fifths of female teachers and a fourth of male teachers believed that corporal punishment was not dangerous. In addition, an overwhelming number of teachers still used traditional methods of teaching where students were instructed to copy learning materials and repeat teachers' statements/readings. Furthermore, teachers were also found to get angry when students did not show respect to them (male 60.3\%, female 59.2). Importantly, in regard to child protection mechanisms in school, none of the investigated schools were equipped with clear written child protection procedures that could provide step-by-step guidance for all members of the school as to what action to take if there were concerns about a child's safety or welfare.

With the above referred to baseline study completed, a second KAP survey was conducted in 2016, approximately one year after the PDECM' training in order to determine its impact. ${ }^{3}$

This report details the findings of this second KAP survey or "endline" survey to help determine the impact of the trainings one year on.
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## 2. Methodology of the survey

### 2.1. Objectives

The main objective of the endline survey was to assess the impact of the in-service teacher training on Positive Discipline and Effective Classroom Management (PDECM) on primary school teachers' Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) pertaining to violent disciplinary methods as well as the impact on improvement in child protection in Cambodian primary schools.

The PDECM training package was piloted in 12 selected primary schools in 3 provinces in Cambodia in August and September 2015, 50\% of the total 24 school that were surveyed in the baseline study in 2015. Thus, this study was designed to compare the differing impact from external intervention (PDECM) over 12 schools with the other 12 schools which did not participate in the PDECM training. Data collection for the endline survey was conducted in June and July 2016.

With the above-mentioned intervention, this study was designed to compare the differing impact from external intervention (PDECM) over 12 schools by comparing them with 12 schools which did not participate in the PDECM training. This end-line survey was conducted in June 2016- November 2017.

## Process of the survey



# Follow-up Assessment 6 to 8 months after the Training <br> (school directors, school support committee, teachers, students) 

### 2.2. Selected schools

The study adopted the same sampling design and the selection method of the respondents that was used in the baseline survey. In total, the survey obtained information from 1,227 students (grades 5 and 6), 148 teachers, and 24 school directors from 24 primary schools in three provinces: Battambang, Kampot, and Prey Veng province.

Table 1 Selected provinces, number of schools and selection criteria of schools

| Province | Number of <br> schools | Inclusion criteria: Level of Child-Friendly <br> School approach advance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Battambang | 8 | 2 advanced, 2 medium, 4 basic |
| Kampot | 8 | 2 advanced, 2 medium, 4 basic |
| Prey Veng | 8 | 2 advanced, 2 medium, 4 basic |

Table 2 Respondent groups and methods

| Respondent group for each school | Methods |
| :--- | :--- |
| School director or deputy school director | Standardized <br> interview/checklist |
| All available teachers teaching grade 1 to 6 (female and male Standardized <br> in equal proportion) questionnaire |  |
| Students (female and male in equal proportion) of <br> randomly selected classes enrolled in grade 5 and 6. | Standardized <br> questionnaire |

### 2.3. Instruments for the survey

The following instruments were used in the survey:
Standardized questionnaire for students. This questionnaire included basic sociodemographic information, a disciplinary Inventory ( 35 items with a Likert scale ranging from 1=not at all to 4=often, five times or more) addressing disciplinary methods in the classroom in the past 30 days. Due to a lack of adequate instruments that can be applied with students and teachers in schools in Cambodia, the Disciplinary Inventory was adapted
from the Conflict Tactics Scale ${ }^{4}$, the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire ${ }^{5}$ and the Child Discipline Module ${ }^{6}$. Furthermore, the questionnaire included questions about the studentteacher relationship (12 items with a Likert scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to $4=$ strongly agree), student-student relationship ( 5 items with a Likert scale ranging from $1=$ strongly disagree to $4=$ strongly agree), and the implementation of positive discipline in the school ( 9 items with a dichotomized scale 1=yes and 0=no). Students from grade 4 and 5 used the questionnaire as a self-assessment questionnaire but researchers closely supervised and monitored the self-assessment and supported students where needed. ${ }^{7}$

Standardized questionnaire for primary school teachers. This questionnaire comprised basic socio-demographic information and a Disciplinary Inventory (the same as for students). Furthermore, an Attitude and Practice Inventory that was developed using manuals and tool kits for teachers and education professionals on positive discipline in schools ${ }^{8}$ ( 46 items with a Likert scale ranging from $1=$ not true about me to 4=mostly true about me and 17 items with a Likert scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree). Teachers used the questionnaire as a self-assessment questionnaire. Questions on participation in the baseline survey and PDECM training are added to the questionnaires as controlled questions to capture any variation of responses between those participating and those not participating in the baseline survey.

Standardized questionnaire for school directors. This questionnaire was adapted from the Child Protection Self-Audit Tool ${ }^{9}$ and addressed the following topics: Children's rights, participation of children, parents and community in the school, discipline methods, child protection policies and guidelines on the teachers' behaviour (45 items with a scale 1=not in place, 2=partially in place, $3=$ in place). This questionnaire was used as a structured and standardized interview.
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### 2.4. Procedures of Data Collection and Ethical Issues

## Procedure of data collection

The MoEYS issued an approval letter to inform District Offices of Education, Youth and Sport (DOE) and school directors about the survey. Parents received the Assent Form prior to the data collection, so that the school management could inform researchers about students whose parents did not allow them to participate in the survey.

After the researchers arrived at the school, the field supervisor met the school director. He introduced the researchers and the study. Together with the school director, he selected randomly two classes in grade 4 and 5, asked to have quiet classrooms for the student survey and the focus group discussion and set the time for conducting the interview with the school director. While the field supervisor met the school director, researchers prepared the questionnaires for students and teachers. For details on the consent forms, the ways to guarantee privacy and confidentiality as well for the response procedures please see the following paragraphs.

In each selected class, researchers randomly selected 10 male and 10 female students in the following way excluding those students who didn't have the permission from their parents: They asked all students to write their first names on a small piece of paper and ask them to fold it. They explained to them that they are going to create their own lottery and that 10 girls and 10 boys would participate in the survey. They told them that no one should be sad not to be selected. Researchers were advised to create an open and warm relationship with the students in the classroom. They asked all girls to put their lots in one bowl and the boys to put their lots in another bowl. Then, the researcher selected randomly 10 lots from the one and 10 from the other bowl with closed eyes and read the names of the selected children and ask them to come to the researcher.

At least two researchers took care of one class with 20 students. One researcher conducted the survey while the other was walking around and helped students. They gave the questionnaires to the students and started with the consent procedure. They read the consent form for the students. Researchers were advised to let students go, if they did not want to participate in the survey and to make sure they find their way back to classroom and teacher. Before they started with the questionnaire, they asked the students: "Are you still comfortable to continue?" Considering the fact that students in grade 5 and 6 may have difficulties in reading the items by themselves, the researcher read each item and the scale to the students. They wrote the scale on the blackboard, explained and illustrated them with smiley icons.

Researchers gave a package to all primary school teachers who were available on the day of data collection consisting of the consent form with a small envelope and the questionnaire with a big envelope and asked them to fill in both and to put them in a prepared locked voting box. At least one researcher overseeing the teacher survey and
answered questions. The field supervisor conducted the standardized interview with the school director or his/her deputy starting with the consent form.

## Informed Consent

Parents were provided with the "Assent Form for Parents and Caregivers of Boys and Girls Participating in the Survey" prior to data collection in close collaboration with selected schools (Annex 2). The assent form informed parents about the aim and schedule of the survey. Parents were informed that they don't have to agree that their child would participate in the study, that they could choose to say no and that nothing bad would happen if they said no. It was stated that if they did not agree that their child would not be considered for the selection procedure. Further, they were informed that if they did agree, their child would be considered for the selection procedure, but, as 80 students would be selected by chance, their child may or may not be selected.

Parents were informed that if they agreed with the participation of their child, they would not need to take further action and that in case they did not want their child to participate in this survey, they were kindly asked to fill in the form and to submit it to the school management. The "Certificate of dissent" which stated:
"I have been asked to give assent for a child in my care to participate in this study which will involve completing one questionnaire. I have read the information, or it has been read to me. I have had the opportunity to ask questions to the head of the research team. Hereby, I confirm that my child ... (please write the name of your child) is NOT allowed to participate in this study".

In this survey, no parent refused permission for their child to participate in the survey.
Selected students were informed about the aim and the procedure and informed consent was read to the students (Annex 2). If students agreed, they signed the "statement of the respondent" and the consent form. Students interested in taking part in the focus group discussions were read a separate adapted consent form and if they agreed they signed it.

Teachers and senior school leaders were informed about the survey and asked for their written consent, which was adapted from the student consent form.

## Privacy and confidentiality

Special care was taken to ensure students' and teachers' privacy and confidentiality. The field supervisor of the research team asked the school director to arrange quiet classrooms for conducting the student survey and the focus group discussions with students. He also asked the director to support the research team to create a trustful and confidential atmosphere in the classrooms and to make sure that during the survey no teacher in the classroom and no teachers or other school staff were hanging around near the classroom. It was explained that if a teacher would be in or near the classroom, students would not be free to speak out.

For ethical reasons, questions about disciplinary methods were formulated indirectly asking whether the student or one of his/her classmates had experienced the particular disciplinary method. For example: Instead of "Slapped you on the hand, arm or leg" students were asked, "Slapped you or one of your classmates on the hand, arm or leg". This was done to protect students and to take potential pressure from them as they might have gotten into a moral conflict with their teacher if questions had been asked directly.

Researchers were advised to never show or give the student questionnaire to a teacher or school director. When a teacher or someone else was asking the researchers what they were doing or what the questionnaire was about, they were instructed to say: "I am a researcher from the Royal University of Phnom Penh. We are conducting the survey on Positive Discipline and Classroom Management. We are interested in the relationship between the students and the teachers. We ask teachers and students how they feel at school, what it is like to study and to teach at this school." They were advised not to use the phrase 'corporal punishment'. Researchers were also asked not to try to convince or to bribe students and teachers who didn't want to participate in the survey.

The teacher survey was also self-administered at a private place in school chosen by the teachers. To further guarantee teachers' privacy and confidentiality, they were asked to put their signed written consent form into a small envelope and the completed questionnaire into a big separate envelope, to seal both envelopes and to put both envelopes into a locked voting box without colleagues being able to see answers and relate answers back to particular teachers and students.

## Response procedures

At the end of the student survey, researchers conducted a debriefing. Students were informed about their rights and services of the Child Helpline Cambodia. ${ }^{10}$ All students were provided a UNICEF Cambodia Children's Rights Book. The number of Child Helpline Cambodia was discreetly stamped on the last page of this book. Researchers did debriefing when the survey was completed (Annex 2). Researchers were further advised to have a careful look at the questions on severe physical violence. If they see that a student shared any experience of this kind of violence in the questionnaire, they should ask the student to wait for a moment and ask the student about it after all students have left the classroom. They should then inform the field supervisor about it immediately. The supervisor should inform the principal investigators, so the issue could be shared confidentially with a colleague from the Child Protection section UNICEF.

[^3]
### 2.5. Data Collection

Data collection was carried out by the team from the Department of Psychology, RUPP, from June 10th to July 15th, 2016. For this study, the baseline survey questionnaires were used. Table 3 below depicts the number of collected data.

Table 3 Respondent groups and collected data

| Respondent group | Number of collected Data |
| :--- | :--- |
| School director or deputy director | 24 interviews with school directors or the deputy <br> in 24 schools |
| Teachers Survey | 148 teacher questionnaires from 24 schools |
| Students Survey | 1,227 student questionnaires from 24 schools |

### 2.6. Data analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to generate data and verify the impact from statistical views. The impact assessment by comparing three groups were done;
(1) the result from the baseline survey,
(2) the control group in the endline survey, and
(3) the experimental group in the endline survey

All the analysis was done by segregating the results by gender (male/female).

## 3. Assessment between baseline and endline

The main purpose of this endline survey was to assess the impact from PDECM training package. Therefore, this survey was targeted to reach to the same group of people who participated in the baseline survey to obtain reliable results of the impact. However, the participants to the baseline survey and endline survey were slightly different; $81.1 \%$ of teachers participated in both survey while $73 \%$ of students participated in both surveys. The SPSS analysis demonstrated that this difference had no affect at all in regard to the students' results while it slightly affected the results of the teachers, but the affect was minor.

### 3.1. Limitations

- Number of participants not the same; only $73 \%$ of students and $81.1 \%$ of teachers participated in both baseline and endline surveys. Although SPSS analysis confirmed that there is no impact from such difference in the result of students, however, there is a slight impact in the result in teachers, for example, some unexpected negative results were obtained from the control group (Detailed statistical analysis is in Annex 3).
- Although not all the teachers in the experimental group attended the PDECM training
(attendance rate: $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ ), the overall results demonstrated the reduction in the use of violent disciplinary methods in the experimental group. This indicates that the result could have been more positive if all the teachers who took this survey actually participated in training.
- The result of the total prevalence of each category (5) might have some errors because of the wrong categorization of a disciplinary measure. For example, "Shaved or cut your hair" was categorized into Harsh Verbal Discipline, however, this should be under the Moderate or Harsh Verbal discipline because this act is beyond verbal.
- There was no Focus Group Discussion (FGD) conducted in this endline survey. Therefore, an assessment through qualitative analysis was impossible to verify some unexpected results.
- The survey was not inclusive to all types of students to collect their voices. For example, the marginalized students, such as students with disabilities who were attending schools, students from sexual minority, or students from extremely poor families whose attendance were not regular (thereby they did not come to school on the survey date) were not inquired about their experience. Their experience of violence might have been different from other students provided their high vulnerabilities, or their views toward safety in school might have been very different.

Important note to the readers:
(1) In the following chapters, the terms "control group" and "experimental group" are frequently used. The control group are those people who were not targeted for the PDECM training, while the experimental group were those people whose schools were selected to patriciate in the PDECM training. Therefore, the simple assumption is that the result from those who were in the experimental group would demonstrate some positive outcome in comparison to the baseline study (such as positive behavior changes) while the control group may well sustain the result from their baseline.
(2) There are some unexpected results found in the analysis of the endline survey: such as unexpected higher level of increase of some types of disciplinary methods as reported by students. This was most probably due to the way that investigated questions were asked. As in baseline study, in order to protect students' safety, indirect questions were asked. For example, instead of "The teacher shouted, yelled or screamed at you", this question was formulated as "The teacher shouted, yelled or screamed at you or one of your classmates". It is important to note that this has consequences for the data analysis and this needs to be taken into consideration when interpreting the findings.

## 3. Findings

### 3.1. Demographic Characteristics

This section shows demographic characteristics of the respondents to the questionnaires, including students, teachers and school directors.

### 3.1.1. Students

### 3.1.1.1. Age and grade of students

In total, 1,227 questionnaires were filled out and collected from students. However, not all questionnaires were valid and a total of 1,224 questionnaires were used for data analysis. ${ }^{11}$

Among the valid questionnaires obtained from 1,224 students, 590 are boys ( $48.2 \%$ ) and 634 are girls (51.8\%). All these students are in grades 5 and 6 and $92 \%$ of them are 11-14 years old. Judging by their age and grade that children in grade 5 should be 10-11 years old and those in Grade 6 should be 11-12 years old, many children ( $8 \%$ ) are not in the grades corresponding to the ages designated by the educational system.

Table 4 Age distribution of students.

| Age | Total <br> $(\mathrm{N}=1,224)$ | Boys <br> $(\mathrm{n}=590)$ |  | Girls <br> $(\mathrm{n}=634)$ | Grade 5 <br> $(\mathrm{n}=636)$ | Grade 6 <br> $(\mathrm{n}=587)^{12}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  |
| 10 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 1.2 |  |
| 11 | 15.2 | 12.4 | 17.8 | 23.1 | 6.6 |  |
| 12 | 34.3 | 33.6 | 35.0 | 37.1 | 31.3 |  |
| 13 | 28.1 | 27.8 | 28.4 | 20.9 | 35.9 |  |
| 14 | 14.4 | 16.8 | 12.1 | 9.4 | 19.6 |  |
| 15 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 4.8 |  |
| 16 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |

### 3.1.1.2. Performance of students

Information on students' school attendance and performance were also collected from official class books during the survey: number of days absent during the current academic year and the average score from the first semester. The number of days absent was counted from the date of starting school (November $1^{\text {st }}, 2015$ ) up to the date of the

[^4]interview (June $10^{\text {th }}$ - July $15^{\text {th }}$ ) with the school days being from 160 days to 185 days. The average score from the first semester was based on 10-points scoring system: from 0 to 10 , with the passing score being 5 .

Based on their attendance records (Table 5), the maximum days of absence during the 160185 school days was 34 days ( 34 days for boys and 25 days for girls). Compared with the baseline survey result, the absence days were reduced by about $50 \%$ (it was 70 days of maximum absence during the first semester in 2014-15 school year). Further, only 47.3\% had never been absent, $27.5 \%$ were absent one or two times, $13.9 \%$ were absent $3-4$ times, and about $11 \%$ were absent 5 or more times. Examining gender difference reveals that male students were absent more than female students and the percentage of absences 5 or more times is also higher amongst males.

Table 5 School attendance and performance of students

| Days of absence | Male | Female | Total |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 0 days | 44.6 | 49.8 | 47.3 |
| 1-2 days | 26.9 | 28.1 | 27.5 |  |
| 3-4 days | 13.7 | 14.0 | 13.9 |  |
| 5-6 days | 5.3 | 3.9 | 4.6 |  |
| 7-8 days | 3.2 | 1.4 | 2.3 |  |
| 9 days or more | 6.3 | 2.7 | 4.4 |  |
| Maximum days of absence | 34 | 25 | 34 |  |
| Average days of absence |  | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 |
| Average scores from first semester |  |  |  |  |
|  | Below 5 | 4.4 | 2.1 | 3.2 |
| 5-6.99 | 46.9 | 58.5 | 53.0 |  |
| 7-8.99 | 3.5 | 10.0 | 6.9 |  |
| 9 and above |  |  | 40.1 |  |

School performance data in Table 5 above also shows that male students also performed lower on tests according to official class books, in addition to having more absences than female students. The percentage of students who failed the first semester was $4.4 \%$ amongst males and $2.1 \%$ amongst females; and the percentage of having at least the score of 7 points was $50.4 \%$ amongst males and $68.5 \%$ amongst females.

### 3.1.1.3. Student's family situation

The school record books show who are supported through scholarship. The majority of students did not receive scholarships (65.8\%). The percentage slightly varied by gender
(male 66.8\%, female 64.9\%). On the other hand, the percentage of students who were scholarship recipients (from poor families) was $34.2 \%$ (male 33.25\%, female 35.1\%)).

Table 6 Percentage of students from poor and non-poor families

| Types of students | Boys | Girls | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scholarship | $33.2 \%$ | $35.1 \%$ | $34.2 \%$ |
| Non-Scholarship | $66.8 \%$ | $64.9 \%$ | $65.8 \%$ |

### 3.1.1.4. Participation to the baseline survey

This survey was designed to target to collect information from those students who participated in the baseline survey in 2015 in order to allow a reliable comparison between control group and experimental group. However, the study faced difficulty due to students' movement either to different classes or to different schools or being absent on the interview days. Given this difficulty, replacements were allowed in order to complete the survey's targeted quorum in each selected school.

Table 7 below shows that nearly three fourth of the students interviewed (73\%) did participate in the baseline study, and the percentage is higher among girls (75.8\%) than among boys (69.9\%).

Table 7 Percentage of students participating in the previous survey

| Answer | Boys | Girls | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | $69.9 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| No | $29.9 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $27 \%$ |

### 3.1.2. Teachers

### 3.1.2.1. Background of teacher

In the teacher sample, $43.9 \%$ were male and $56.1 \%$ were female. The majority of the teachers interviewed were $40-49$ years old (male 55.4\%, female 42.25\%), followed by those aged $30-39$ years old (male 21.5\%, female 30.1\%). About one fourth of them are under 30 years old or were 50 years old and above.

The interviewed teachers possessed extensive teaching experience; $81 \%$ of them had taught for at least 10 years. The percentage for this was slightly higher amongst male teachers (83.1\%) than among female teachers (79.3\%).

Table 16: Background characteristics of teachers

|  | Male <br> $(\mathbf{n}=65)$ | Female <br> $(\mathbf{n}=83)$ | Total <br> $(\mathbf{n}=148)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Item/gender | $43.9 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |


| Age | Under 30 years old | 13.8\% | 14.5\% | 14.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 30-39 years old | 21.5\% | 30.1\% | 26.4\% |
|  | 40-49 years old | 55.4\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
|  | 50 years old or above | 9.2\% | 13.3\% | 11.5\% |
| Teaching experience | Less than 10 years | 16.9\% | 20.7\% | 19.0\% |
|  | 10-19 years | 33.8\% | 28.0\% | 30.6\% |
|  | 20-29 years | 33.8\% | 36.6\% | 35.4\% |
|  | 30 years or more | 15.4\% | 14.6\% | 15.0\% |
| Participation in similar survey last year | Yes | 78.5\% | 83.1\% | 81.1\% |
|  | No | 21.5\% | 16.9\% | 18.9\% |
| Participation in PDECM training in Phnom Penh |  | Male | Female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=90) \end{aligned}$ |
| Experimental group only ( $\mathrm{n}=90$ ) | Yes I attended ( $\mathrm{n}=67$ ) | 72.4\% | 75\% | 74\% |
|  | No, I did not ( $\mathrm{n}=23$ ) | 27.6\% | 25\% | 26\% |

### 3.1.2.2. Participation in the PDECM training

No teachers in the control group participated in the PDECM training, whilst 74\% of teachers in the experimental group ( $\mathrm{n}=90$ ) attended it (male $72.4 \%$, female $75 \%$ ). ${ }^{13}$ Although not all the teachers in the experimental group participated in the training, teachers who participated in the training must have disseminated knowledge about positive discipline to other teachers in their schools, and school directors who participated in the training took many initiatives to promote positive discipline in schools, therefore, it is assumed the fact that $16 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group did not participate in the training did not bring about a major challenge in data analysis..

### 3.1.3. School Directors

### 3.1.3.1. Background of school directors

In this study, 24 school directors were interviewed. Amongst them, $91.7 \%$ were male directors, $45.5 \%$ were under 45 years old, and $50 \%$ had been the school directors less than 5 years. Nearly all school directors were once teachers (91.7\%).

### 3.1.3.2. Participation to the PDECM training

Regarding the PDECM training, all the directors in the experimental group had participated.

[^5]Table 17: Background characteristics of school principles

| Gender | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Male | 22 | 91.7 |
| Female | 2 | 8.3 |
| Under 45 years old | 10 | 41.7 |
| 45 years old and above | 14 | 58.3 |
| Ever been a teacher | 22 | 91.7 |
| Yes | 2 | 8.3 |
| No | 11 | 45.8 |
| Year of experience as school director | 5 | 20.8 |
| Less than 5 years | 8 | 33.3 |
| $5-9$ years | 12 | 50.0 |
| 10 years or more | 12 | 50.0 |
| Participation in PDECM training |  |  |
| Yes | 12 | 50.0 |
| No | 12 | 50.0 |
| All staff participated in PDECM training |  |  |
| Yes |  |  |
| No |  |  |

### 3.2. Summary: Disciplinary Methods in Schools

In this section, the disciplinary methods used in schools are described, following the format of the baseline survey report. ${ }^{14}$

### 3.2.1. Types of methods analyzed in the study

Five violent disciplinary methods divided into two types (verbal and physical) were analyzed. The examples of each type of violent disciplinary methods were as below Table 8:

Table 8 Types of violent disciplinary methods
Type/Method Details of each method

[^6]| Moderate verbal discipline | shouting, yelling or screaming at students, threatening to <br> spank students, or humiliating students |
| :--- | :--- |
| Harsh verbal discipline | calling students stupid, lazy or some other names like that, <br> not allowing students to join the class, or swearing or <br> cursing at students |
| Moderate <br> discipline$\quad$ physical | hitting students on the bottom, twisting or pulling <br> student's hairs or ears, or slapping students on hands, <br> arms or legs |
| Harsh physical discipline | hitting students with a stick or ruler on some part of the <br> body, throwing or knocking students down, or slapping <br> students in the face |
| Severe physical discipline | Beating students, burning and scalding students, grabbing <br> students around their necks and choking them |

Each of these five types was measured by a composite index based on relevant multiple questions for both students and teachers (Annex 1). Responses from these questions were collapsed into dichotomies with 1 indicating at least one incident in the past 30 days and 0 indicating no incident at all. Then, each composite index was created as a dichotomous variable, with 1 if there is at least one incident among all relevant questions and 0 if none.

### 3.2.2. Summary findings from the endline survey

The result from teachers, which were reporting the actual perpetration of disciplinary measure demonstrated that the most common form of violent discipline was moderate verbal violent discipline (53.4\%), followed by moderate physical violent discipline (41.2\%).

On the other hand, the most common form of violent disciplinary methods reported by students is moderate physical violent discipline ( $56.3 \%$ ), followed by moderate verbal violent discipline (42.0\%), harsh physical violent discipline (38.7\%), harsh verbal violent discipline ( $24.2 \%$ ), and severe physical violent discipline ( $3.8 \%$ ). Therefore, students were experiencing or witnessing physical violence more than verbal violence at school.

It should be noted that the incident reported by teachers is much lower than reported by students ( $16.9 \%$ versus $24.2 \%$ for harsh verbal violence, $24.3 \%$ versus $38.5 \%$ for harsh physical violence, and $0 \%$ versus $3.8 \%$ for severe physical violence). This was because teachers were reporting their own direct perpetration of disciplinary measure whilst students were reporting their own experience or experience of witnessing someone who was disciplined in the classroom. Although the psychological impact from students' witnessing violence in the classroom should not be underestimated, it is impossible to simply compare the prevalence between teachers and students, because the indicators used to collect data against the same question was different between the two. Despite such technical challenge, the result from students demonstrated how much percentage of students were imposed to violence at school.

Table 9 Incident of violent disciplinary methods: students versus teachers

| Disciplinary Method | Reported by teachers |  |  |  | Reported by students |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { O} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\overline{3}$ i 0 0 |  |  |
| Moderate verbal | 64.1\% | 70.2\% | 42.9\% | 53.4\% | 52.9\% | 49.6\% | 32.2\% | 42.0\% |
| Harsh verbal | 23.1\% | 29.8\% | 8.8\% | 16.9\% | 30.9\% | 27.2\% | 20.4\% | 24.2\% |
| Moderate physical | 63.2\% | 61.4\% | 28.6\% | 41.2\% | 73.4\% | 64.0\% | 46.5\% | 56.3\% |
| Harsh physical | 34.3\% | 45.6\% | 11.0\% | 24.3\% | 42.6\% | 47.9\% | 27.0\% | 38.7\% |
| Severe physical | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3.0\% | 5.4\% | 1.9\% | 3.8\% |

Note: Percentage in red was the higher occurrence of discipline against baseline, all those five percentage was reported by the control group. The blue shows decrease in the endline against the baseline, thereby blue shows the positive change whilst red shows negative change.

Sections 3.3-3.7 below describe each item under five categories in details by gender for both teachers and students. The presentation is organized by type and severity of violent discipline as shown in Table 11 above.

### 3.3. Moderate Verbal Discipline

### 3.3.1. Overview of result: moderate verbal discipline

Four methods were investigated under moderate violent physical discipline. The overall incident of this discipline was still alarmingly high amongst the control group (teacher total=70.2\%) whilst the experimental group demonstrated the significant reduction of this discipline (teacher total=42.9\%), demonstrating the strong impact from PDECM training. The same changes were observed in the students in two groups.

Figure 1: Incident of moderate verbal discipline by gender


### 3.3.2. Details of result: Moderate verbal discipline

All the four methods under moderate verbal discipline were analysed for students and for teachers by gender and below Table 10 is a summary (Details in ANNEX 4). The most common action of moderate verbal discipline was teachers' "Shouting, yelling, or screaming at students", as reported by teachers in the experimental group (male 37.9\%, female 32.3\%).

Table 10 At least one incident of all types of Moderate verbal discipline

| Moderate | Male Teachers |  |  | Female Teachers |  |  | Male Student |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| verbal discipline | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\bar{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{0}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{2}$ 0 0 0 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{\leftrightharpoons}} \\ & \underline{\bar{\omega}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\underline{\leftrightharpoons}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Threatened to spank or hit | 38.2\% | 33.3\% | 31.0\% | 39.5\% | 57.1\% | 24.2\% | 26.7\% | 25.5\% | 19.3\% | 23.9\% | 20.3\% | 9.9\% |
| Shouted, yelled or screamed at student | 48.5\% | 50.0\% | 37.9\% | 53.9\% | 66.7\% | 32.3\% | 40.1\% | 40.1\% | 20.5\% | 36.1\% | 28.6\% | 15.5\% |
| Refused to speak with students | 3.0\% | 0\% | 10.3\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 3.2\% | 10.1\% | 15.7\% | 11.8\% | 8.6\% | 11.7\% | 5.3\% |
| Embarrassed or humiliated a student | 13.2\% | 11.1\% | 6.9\% | 9.2\% | 9.5\% | 8.1\% | 17.4\% | 25.8\% | 13.0\% | 17.6\% | 14.6\% | 8.8\% |

$1^{\text {st }}$ method, "Threatened to spank or hit students but did not actually do so": Both male
and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease of this discipline (male from $38.2 \%$ to $31 \%$, female from $39.5 \%$ to $24.2 \%$ ). Likewise, both male and female students in the experimental group reported a dramatic decrease in this disciplinary method (male from $26.7 \%$ to $19.3 \%$, female from $23.9 \%$ to $9.9 \%$ ). Therefore, from both teachers' view and students' view, the experimental group showed a notable decrease while the control group did not.
$2^{\text {nd }}$ method, "shouted yelled or screamed at students", Both male and female teachers in the experimental group showed positive change and a decrease in such methods (male from $48.5 \%$ to $37.9 \%$, female $53.9 \%$ to $32.3 \%$ ). The positive result was similar amongst the students; both male and female students in the experimental groups reported a decrease in this method (male from $40.1 \%$ to $20.5 \%$ and female from $36.1 \%$ to $15.5 \%$ ).
$3^{\text {rd }}$ method, "refused to speak with students", only the result from female students in the experimental group showed a positive change (from $8.6 \%$ to $5.3 \%$ ). Problematically, the teachers using this disciplinary measure as reported by male students remained as a similar level between the baseline and endline study.

The last method investigated under this category, "embarrassed or humiliated a student for not knowing the answer to a question or making mistake in the class", both male and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in the endline survey (male from $13.2 \%$ to $6.9 \%$, female from $9.2 \%$ to $8.1 \%$. A similar trend was observed amongst students; both male and female students in the experimental group reported the decrease of such methods in the classroom. This is the only discipline in this category that female teachers reported more occurrence than male teachers in the experimental group.

Overall, the above results showed that the perpetration of 3 items out of 4 items in moderate verbal discipline reduced, thereby demonstrating some positive changes, and this was backed up with the result from the students. However, despite such improvement, in total, more than $40 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group reported perpetrating this method (male 44.8\%, female 41.9\%), therefore, more efforts and supports are essential to reduce this to zero.

### 3.4. Harsh Verbal Discipline

### 3.4.1. Overview findings from the End line survey

Harsh verbal discipline consisted of five methods and the total prevalence was decreased from $23.1 \%$ in the baseline to $16.9 \%$ in the endline. The strong impact from PDECM training was observed as the endline result showed a much higher perpetration among the teachers in the control group (29.8\%) against their counterparts in the experimental group (8.8\%).

Despite a large reduction of usage of this method in the experimental group, when disaggregated by gender, male teachers perpetrated this more than twice in comparison to their female counterparts (male 13.8\%, female 6.5\%).

Figure $\mathbf{2}$ Incidents of harsh verbal discipline by gender


The students in the experimental group also reported a similar pattern of reduction of this discipline (male students from $32.3 \%$ to $28 \%$, female from $29.6 \%$ to $13.7 \%$ ).

Overall, the results from PDECM training package brought positive impacts, as the results from female teachers and both male and female students were all positive and demonstrated the reduction of all the investigated moderate physical disciplinary methods; however, notable challenges remain amongst male teachers because $40 \%$ of the results were negative ( 2 out of 5 items showed increase in their usage).

### 3.4.2. Details of result: harsh verbal discipline

All the five items under harsh verbal discipline was analysed for students and for teachers by gender and below table 11 is a summary (Details in Annex 4).

The prevalence of harsh verbal discipline has decreased dramatically thanks to the PDECM training. Some items showed mixed results such as "Swore or cursed at students" and "Shaved or cut a student's hair or a students' hair was shaved or cut hair by a teacher".

Table 11 At least one incident of all types of harsh verbal discipline

| Harsh verbal discipline | Male Teachers |  |  | Female Teachers |  |  | Male Student |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \cong \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathscr{U}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | 인 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\underline{\omega}} \\ & \text { W } \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | 윤 0 0 |  |  | 인 웅 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\underline{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\otimes} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 0 |  |
| Swore or cursed at students | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 3.4\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 9.1\% | 11.0\% | 8.7\% | 7.9\% | 7.4\% | 2.1\% |


| Called students <br> stupid or lazy or <br> some other name | $20.6 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $14.9 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| like that |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 3.5. Moderate Physical Discipline

### 3.5.1. Overview of Moderate Physical Discipline

Moderate violent physical discipline methods consisted of 10 methods. In total, both male and female teachers' perpetration decreased in the experimental group (male from 63.2\% to $41.2 \%$, female from $63.2 \%$ to $22.6 \%$ ).

Figure 3 Incident of moderate physical discipline by gender


Overall, the results from PDECM training package brought positive impacts, as the results from female teachers and students were all positive and demonstrated the reduction of all the investigated moderate physical disciplinary methods; however, notable challenges remain amongst male teachers because $33 \%$ of the results were negative ( 3 out of 10 items showed increase in their usage).

### 3.5.2. Details of Moderate Physical Discipline

All ten items under moderate physical discipline were analyzed for students and for teachers by gender and below is a summary table (Details in Annex 4). The most common method reported under this category by teachers in the experimental group was male teachers; "Slapped a student on the hand, arm or leg" and "Twisted or pulled the ears,
hair or joints of a student" (both 20.7\%). Thus, female teachers were more likely using the object whilst male teachers are actually perpetrating direct violence.

Table 12 At least one incident of all types of moderate physical discipline

| Moderate physical discipline | Male Teachers |  |  | Female Teachers |  |  | Male Student |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{』}{\bar{E}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\square} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{\underset{\sim}{c}} \\ & \stackrel{E}{\frac{1}{U}} \\ & \stackrel{D}{x} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\overline{=}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 믐 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\bar{E}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{N}} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 믄 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\bar{U}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Slapped a student on the hand, arm or leg | 20.6\% | 19.4\% | 20.7\% | 27.6\% | 23.8\% | 9.7\% | 30.8\% | 19.9\% | 13.4\% | 27.5\% | 8.9\% | 10.6\% |
| Hit a student on the bottom with an object like a stick or ruler | 39.7\% | 44.4\% | 17.2\% | 43.4\% | 42.9\% | 16.1\% | 40.7\% | 39.5\% | 24.8\% | 32.5\% | 29.1\% | 15.5\% |
| Threw a pencil or another item at a student | 1.5\% | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 7.9\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 22.2\% | 22.8\% | 15.7\% | 80.9\% | 13.1\% | 9.9\% |
| Twisted or pulled the ears, hair or joints of a student | 23.5\% | 33.3\% | 20.7\% | 23.7\% | 9.5\% | 4.8\% | 34.9\% | 32.6\% | 22.0\% | 27.2\% | 19.4\% | 10.2\% |
| Hit a student on the head with the knuckles | 2.9\% | 2.8\% | 6.9\% | 3.9\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 10.8\% | 13.9\% | 6.7\% | 10.1\% | 7.1\% | 4.2\% |
| Asked a student to hit his/her knuckles against the table or the wall | 19.1\% | 8.3\% | 6.9\% | 22.4\% | 33.3\% | 8.1\% | 25.4\% | 15.7\% | 13.8\% | 21.5\% | 14.3\% | 16.5\% |
| Grabbed a student by the collar or by the neck | 2.9\% | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 2.4\% | 4.2\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% |
| Forced a student to kneel down or stand in the same position for at least 15 minutes in the classroom | 7.4\% | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 17.1\% | 33.3\% | 1.6\% | 11.2\% | 14.2\% | 7.1\% | 10.1\% | 12.3\% | 4.9\% |
| Forced a student to stand in the sun for more than $\mathbf{1 5} \mathbf{~ m i n}$ | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 6.5\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.1\% | 0.7\% |
| Forced a student to fetch water for the toilets | 13.2\% | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 3.9\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 23.9\% | 27.0\% | 9.4\% | 18.0\% | 15.4\% | 11.6\% |

Notably, all the methods were decreased amongst female teachers in the experimental group, thereby showing the strong impact form the PDECM package over them in regard to stopping the perpetration of moderate physical disciplines. Harsh Physical Discipline

### 3.6. Harsh physical violent discipline

### 3.6.1. Overview findings from the End line survey

Harsh physical violent discipline methods consisted of 4 items. The overall result was that the reduction in the number of teachers perpetrating this method was observed (from
$34.3 \%$ to $24.3 \%$ ) and this was backed up with the findings from the students (from 42.6\% to $38.7 \%$ ). Notably, all the categories in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in using this discipline.

Figure 4 Incidents of overall harsh physical discipline index


Positive result was that both male and female teachers in the experimental groups showed a large decrease in this method (male from $36.8 \%$ to $17.2 \%$, female from $32 \%$ to $8.1 \%$ ). This positive impact was backed up by the result from the students (male from $45 \%$ to $33.1 \%$, female from $40.4 \%$ to $21.5 \%$ ). On the contrary, findings demonstrate that in all the schools in the control groups, harsh physical discipline had increased from baseline to endline study. Overall, teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a large positive attitude change, therefore, there was a strong impact from the PDECM training.

### 3.6.2. Details of findings: Harsh physical discipline

All the four items under harsh physical discipline were analyzed for students and for teachers by gender and below is a summary table (Details in Annex 4). Different from other three categories that were analysed above, all the methods in this discipline were perpetrated by more male teachers than their female counterparts in the experimental group (other categories showed mixed results; some methods were perpetrated by female teachers more than males).

The occurrence of three acts in severe physical discipline ("Slapped a student", "Threw or knocked a student down" and "Hit a student") were small (less than 10\%) but "Hit a student with a stick" was more than $40 \%$ (as reported by teachers). Therefore, this method ("Hit a student with a stick") could have been wrongly categorized. ${ }^{15}$

[^7]Table 13 At least one incident of all types harsh physical discipline

| Harsh physical discipline | Male Teachers |  |  | Female Teachers |  |  | Male Student |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{\leftrightarrows}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\ddot{N}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{U}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\leftrightarrows} \\ & \underset{\bar{U}}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{0}$ 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\Xi} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{む} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oㅎ } \\ & \text { 두 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Slapped a student in the face | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.8\% | 7.7\% | 5.1\% | 4.2\% | 5.1\% | 1.4\% |
| Hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body | 33.8\% | 47.2\% | 17.2\% | 30.7\% | 42.9\% | 8.1\% | 39.7\% | 48.1\% | 28.3\% | 36.7\% | 38.0\% | 19.0\% |
| Threw or knocked a student down | 2.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 9.9\% | 6.2\% | 3.1\% | 7.7\% | 2.9\% | 1.1\% |
| Hit a student with a fist or kicked hard | 0\% | 0\% | 3.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5.6\% | 4.7\% | 2.4\% | 3.9\% | 3.4\% | 1.1\% |

The $1^{\text {st }}$ method in this category was "slapped a student in the face", and conversely, only male teachers in the experimental group reported to have perpetrated this act ( $6.9 \%$ ) and all other categories amongst teachers reported to have never done so. On the contrary, although the positive reduction was observed amongst the students in the experimental group (male from $5.8 \%$ to $5.1 \%$, female from $4.2 \%$ to $1.4 \%$ ), however, they still reported occurrence of this method.

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ method was "hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body", and both male and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in this method (male from $33.8 \%$ to $17.2 \%$, female from $30.7 \%$ to $8.1 \%$ ). The students' responses in the experimental group showed a similar result (male from $39.7 \%$ to $28.3 \%$, female from $36.7 \%$ to $19 \%$ ). On the contrary, the students in the control group reported the increase of this method.

The $3^{\text {rd }}$ method was "threw or knocked a student down", and both male and female showed a decrease in this method to $0 \%$ (male from $2.9 \%$, female from 1.3\%). On the contrary, the students' responses in the experimental group showed different result and despite the reduction of this method, prevalence of this method was reported (male from $9.9 \%$ to $3.1 \%$, female from $7.7 \%$ to $1.1 \%$ ).

The last method investigated in this category was "hit a student with a fist or kicked hard", and conversely, only the male teachers in the experimental group increased the perpetration of this method (from 0\% to 3.4\%), while all others decreased it. Students in the experimental group showed a decrease in this method, however, still reported the prevalence (male from $5.6 \%$ to $2.4 \%$, female from $3.9 \%$ to $1.1 \%$ ).

### 3.7. Severe Physical Discipline

### 3.7.1. Overview of Severe Physical Discipline

The overall result of severe physical discipline was measured by the reporting by students only, as no teachers reported to have perpetrated this type of discipline. Nevertheless, even in the experimental group, students reported to have experienced such punishment from their teachers (male 2\%, female 1.8\%). The discrepancy in the report between teachers and students suggests caution in use of this finding. Further investigation is needed for data validation, especially among students who reported so.

Figure 5 Incident of severe physical discipline index


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $1.5 \%$ and females was $0 \%$, and this decreased to $0 \%$ in both the control group and in the experimental group.

In regard to students' responses, reporting of occurrence of severe physical discipline is higher than that of teachers but the experimental group showed the reduction of this (male from $3.5 \%$ to $2 \%$, female students from $2.4 \%$ to $1.8 \%$ ). All the methods in this category should be strongly condemned and stopped, therefore, more in-depth investigation is essential with the enforcement of code of ethics amongst teachers.

### 3.7.2. Details of findings: Harsh physical discipline

All the three items under severe physical discipline were analyzed for students and for teachers by gender and below is a summary table (Details in Annex 4). Because teachers' response was $0 \%$ in endline survey in both experimental and control groups, the below are only students' results.

Table 14 At least one incident of any type of severe physical discipline

| Severe physical discipline | Male Teachers | Female Teachers | Male Student | Female Students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\underline{I}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & +\frac{\pi}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 능 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\underline{I}} \\ & \overline{\mathbb{N}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\square} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beat you or one of you classmates up | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.7\% | 4.7\% | 1.6\% | 1.8\% | 3.4\% | 1.1\% |
| Grabbed you or one of your classmates around the neck and choked you or your classmate | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | 1.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0\% |
| Burned or scaled you or one of your classmates on purpose | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2.2\% | 2.1\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.9\% | 0.7\% |

The $1^{\text {st }}$ method investigated in this category; severe physical discipline was "beat you or one of your classmate up", both male and female students in the control group showed a higher occurrence of this than in comparison to the experimental group that showed a positive decrease (male from $1.7 \%$ to $1.6 \%$, female from $1.8 \%$ to $1.1 \%$ ).

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ method was "grabbed you or one of your classmates around the neck and choked you or your classmate", only the male students in the control group showed an increase while others decreased whilst the experimental group showed a positive change (male from $0.9 \%$ to $0.8 \%$, female from $0.7 \%$ to $0 \%$ ).

The final question was "burned or scaled you or one of your classmates on purpose" and both male and female students reported a decrease but the decrease was larger in the experimental group (male from $2.2 \%$ to $0.8 \%$, female from $1.1 \%$ to $0.7 \%$ ).

### 3.8. Attitudes towards Violent and Non-violent Discipline Methods in Schools

This section describes teachers' perceptions towards discipline methods in school and there were nine questions, divided into three categories (discipline, corporal punishment, and nonviolent discipline). All questions related are scaled from strongly disagree (code 1) to strongly agree (code 4). These scales are dichotomized (disagree versus agree) and the percentage of agreement is computed and presented in this section.

### 3.8.1. Teachers' view about discipline

Three questions presented below (Table 15) investigated teachers' view about disciplinary methods that may lead to use of violent discipline method in school. Detailed analysis is in Annex 4.

Table 15 Teachers' agreement with discipline

| Teachers' agreement with attitude questions about violence discipline | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\bar{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{\sim}} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { C } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\bar{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{\sim}} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{3}$ 0 0 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students will disrespect teachers if they don't fear them. | 52.90\% | 63.90\% | 31.00\% | 47.40\% | 76.20\% | 48.40\% |
| If you give children too much freedom and space you will spoil them | 58.80\% | 61.10\% | 44.80\% | 52.00\% | 61.90\% | 50.00\% |
| Sometimes nothing else works. Schools/teachers need corporal punishment as a last resort. | 30.90\% | 11.10\% | 13.80\% | 19.70\% | 33.30\% | 16.10\% |

Notably, both male and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a positive change in regard to two statements: "If you give children too much freedom and space you will spoil them" and "Sometimes nothing else works. Schools/teachers need corporal punishment as a last resort". Male teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a positive change in all the items, and female teachers in the same group were positive in 2 out of 3 items (except "Students will disrespect teachers if they don't fear them").

The most important statement in this category was "Sometimes nothing else works. Schools/teachers need corporal punishment as a last resort" because agreeing to this statement may mean the actual perpetration of punishment. In comparison to other two questions above, this statement demonstrated a larger positive change in the experimental group (male from $30.9 \%$ to $13.8 \%$, female from $19.7 \%$ to $16.1 \%$ ). Therefore, a negative impact from absence of the PDECM training was observed in terms of teachers' views about violent disciplinary measures.

### 3.8.2. Corporal punishment

Three questions were investigated to understand the teachers' views about corporal punishment.

Table 16 Teachers' agreement with corporal punishment

| Teachers' agreement with attitude questions about violence discipline | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\bar{E}} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | O ¢ 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\oplus}{\underline{\underline{U}}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\mathscr{D}} \end{aligned}$ | O ¢ 0 0 |  |
| Corporal punishment is part of the Cambodian culture and tradition. | 25.00\% | 2.80\% | 10.30\% | 20.00\% | 9.50\% | 11.30\% |


| There is a big difference <br> between serious violence <br> and corporal punishment. | $26.50 \%$ | $30.60 \%$ | $13.80 \%$ | $40.80 \%$ | $38.10 \%$ |  | $19.40 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Corporal punishment is not |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dangerous, causes little pain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and cannot be called child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| abuse. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The result from this section is not consistent however, overall, positive impact was observed in the experimental group regarding two key questions about corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment is part of the Cambodian culture and tradition: Both male and female teachers positively changed their view in the experimental group (male from $25 \%$ to $10.3 \%$, female from $20 \%$ to $11.3 \%$ ).

There is a difference between serious violence and corporal punishment; Notably, almost a half reduction was observed in agreeing with this statement in the experimental group (male from $26.5 \%$ to $13.8 \%$, female from $40.8 \%$ to $19.4 \%$ ).

My generation was beaten at school, it taught us how to behave better: Conversely another statement was more accepted in the endline than the baseline survey even in the experimental group (male from $32.4 \%$ to $41.4 \%$, female from $26.7 \%$ to $47.5 \%$ ). Most probably, there were circumstances that made teachers feel this way for some reason, but this result does not automatically mean that teachers were using more corporal punishment. Therefore, analysis based on qualitative data is necessary to identify the reason why.

### 3.8.3. Non-violent discipline

The next set of questions presented the percentage of teachers agreeing with the nonviolent discipline questions. Only one statement "corporal punishment is child abuse" showed lower level of agreement by both male and female in the experimental group, but other two items showed a positive change in the experimental group.

Table 17 Teachers' agreement with non-violent discipline

| Teachers' agreement with attitude questions about nonviolent discipline | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\bar{\omega}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | O $\substack{\text { ¢ } \\ 0 \\ 0}$ |  |  | O $\substack{\text { c } \\ 0 \\ 0}$ |  |
| Corporal punishment is child abuse. | 80.6\% | 75.0\% | 89.7\% | 64.0\% | 90.5\% | 74.2\% |
| Explaining why something is wrong is a better way of | 94.1\% | 97.2\% | 93.1\% | 92.1\% | 95.2\% | 91.9\% |

```
teaching a child than using
corporal punishment.
Children have the right not to be 94.0% 91.7% 年 96.6% 年 年.3% 100.0% 91.9%
punished psychically and
psychologically in school.
```

Corporal punishment is child abuse：A positive impact was observed in the experimental group（male from $80.6 \%$ to $89.7 \%$ ，female from $64 \%$ to $74.2 \%$ ）．

## Explaining why something is wrong is a better way of teaching a child than using corporal

 punishment：Both male and female teachers showed a lower agreement to this（male from $94.1 \%$ to $93.1 \%$ ，female from $92.1 \%$ to $91.9 \%$ ）．Most probably，the result was because not all the teachers in the experimental group attended the PDECM training course，and the difference（decrease）was minor，it was not negative result．However，it can be concluded that the PDECM training did not influence the understanding of this concept over the participating teachers．Children have the right not to be punished psychically and psychologically in school：The majority of both male and female teacher in the experimental groups increased their agreement to this statement（male from $94 \%$ to $96 \%$ ，female from $85.3 \%$ to $91.7 \%$ ）．

## 3．9．Teaching Styles and Anger Management

In this section，two issues are covered in regard to teachers＇performance；teaching styles （Table 20）and anger management（Table 18）．Teaching styles include traditional methods and new participatory methods（student－centred approach）．Traditional methods of teaching focus on passive learning where students receive information from teachers and internalize it．New participatory methods focus on active learning in which students engage in activities and are provided with opportunities to learn and express their ideas．

## 3．9．1．Teaching style

The Table 20 below shows that traditional methods of teaching are more common in Cambodian primary schools even after the PDECM training was conducted thereby impact from the training was very limited．Alarmingly，even in the experimental group，more than $95 \%$ of teachers used traditional methods of teaching．What needs further attention was that approximately only half of the teachers in the experimental group paid special attention to the slower learners．The result from this section remained problematic without further investigation because it showed limited impact from PDECM training．

In my class I ask my students to copy what I write on the blackboard：The result from the experimental group was worse than the baseline（male from $100 \%$ to $100 \%$ ，female from 92．1\％to 95．2\％）．

In my class I ask my students to repeat after me for most of the class：The result became slightly worse than the baseline in the experimental group（male from $91.2 \%$ to $96.6 \%$
female from $94.7 \%$ to $95.2 \%$ ). Those two items demonstrated that PDECM did not impact those teachers in positively fixing their traditional teaching styles. Therefore, there is an opportunity for further intervention in strengthening teachers' attitudes in teaching, beyond the reduction of violent discipline.

Table 18 Percentage of teachers agreeing with traditional/participatory teaching style

| Teachers agreeing with traditional and participatory teaching style | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\Perp}{\bar{U}} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\tilde{N}} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{0}$ $\substack{1 \\ 0 \\ 0}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{\Xi}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathscr{N}} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 0 |  |
| Teachers agreeing with traditional teaching style |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In my class I ask my students to copy what I write on the blackboard | 100.0\% | 97.2\% | 100.0\% | 92.1\% | 95.2\% | 95.2\% |
| In my class I ask my students to repeat after me for most of the class | 91.2\% | 88.9\% | 96.6\% | 94.7\% | 95.2\% | 95.2\% |
| Teachers agreeing with participatory teaching style |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| My class has a suggestion box so my students can share their ideas about the lessons | 52.2\% | 50.0\% | 55.2\% | 36.0\% | 47.6\% | 30.6\% |
| I regularly take the slow learners in my class separately to explain the lesson to them in more detail | 39.7\% | 44.4\% | 55.2\% | 48.0\% | 38.1\% | 46.8\% |

My class has a suggestion box so my students can share their ideas about the lessons: The male teachers in the experimental group slightly improved this (from $52.2 \%$ to $55.2 \%$ ) whilst female teachers reported reduction of their encouragement to students in raising their voices (from $36 \%$ to $46.8 \%$ ).

I regularly take the slow learners in my class separately to explain the lesson to them in more detail: The male teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a positive change (from $39.7 \%$ to $55.2 \%$ ) whilst female teachers slightly decreased to agreeing on this (from $48 \%$ to $46.8 \%)$.

### 3.9.2. Anger management

This section investigated teachers' anger management by asking three questions. All the teachers participated in the endline survey reported that their anger management style improved to some extent as in Table 19 below shows.

Table 19 Teachers agreeing with anger management statements

| Teacher agreeing with anger management statements | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{I}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | 0 + 0 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{O}$ ¢ CJ 0 |  |
| It makes me furious when I do a good job and students do not value to it. | 77.9\% | 69.4\% | 72.4\% | 80.3\% | 61.9\% | 58.1\% |
| I get angry when students do not respect me. | 80.9\% | 69.4\% | 75.9\% | 77.6\% | 76.2\% | 62.9\% |
| It makes me furious when I explain something to a student again and again and they simply do not get it. | 73.5\% | 75.0\% | 69.0\% | 69.7\% | 66.7\% | 59.7\% |

The results in anger management were very positive; and more than male teachers, female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a larger change in a positive way, therefore, the training package brought more impact over female teachers. Despite such a success, teachers still struggle to tackle with their anger management, as approximately more than $60 \%$ teachers (both male and female in the experimental group) agreed that they felt angry at some circumstances.

It makes me furious when I do a good job and students do not value it: The teachers in the experimental group showed a positive change, and impact over female teachers was larger than their male counterparts (male from 77.9\% to 69.4\%, female from $80.3 \%$ to 58.1\%).

I get angry when students do not respect me: Across all four categories the endline survey recorded a decrease and again, female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a large positive change (male from $80.9 \%$ to $75.9 \%$, female teachers from $77.6 \%$ to $62.9 \%$, both in the experimental group).

It makes me furious when I explain something to a student again and again and they simply do not get it: Both male and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in agreement with this statement (male from $73.5 \%$ to $69 \%$, female from $69.7 \%$ to $59.7 \%$ ).

### 3.10. Relationships in Schools

This section reports about findings about relationship among students and teachers and includes sub -sections: student-teacher relationship, student-student relationship, and teacher-teacher relationship.

### 3.10.1. Student-teacher relationship

This section investigated students' relationships with teachers. Notably, more than $95 \%$ of both male and female students agreed with all four statements: 1) I like my teacher, 2) My teacher is a good role model, 3) I feel encouraged by my teachers to study, and 4) If I have problems, I feel free to ask my teachers for help. However, because the result from the baseline was also very positive, only slight increase was observed.

Table 20 Percentage of students agreeing with student-teacher relationship statements

| Students agreeing with student-teacher relationship statements | Male Students |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ¢ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\oplus}{\underline{\leftrightharpoons}} \\ & \stackrel{\ddot{\omega}}{\tilde{\infty}} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{0}$ $\substack{\text { c } \\ 0 \\ 0}$ |  |
| I like my teacher | 99.4\% | 97.9\% | 100.0\% | 99.8\% | 99.4\% | 100.0\% |
| My teacher is a good role model | 97.2\% | 97.3\% | 98.8\% | 99.3\% | 98.6\% | 100.0\% |
| If I have a problem I feel free to ask help from my teacher | 91.6\% | 95.0\% | 97.6\% | 95.0\% | 97.1\% | 96.5\% |
| I feel encouraged by my teacher to study | 97.4\% | 95.5\% | 97.6\% | 97.8\% | 97.7\% | 98.9\% |

I like my teacher: Both male and female students in the experimental group showed the increase in agreeing this statement (male from 99.4\% to 100\%, female from $99.8 \%$ to $100 \%$ ).

My teacher is a good model: Again, both male and female students in the experimental group showed the increase in agreeing this statement (male from 97.3\% to 98.8\%, female from 99.3\% to 100\%).

If I have a problem I feel free to ask help from my teacher: Positive improvements were observed across all four categories (the experimental group male from 91.6\% to 97.6\%, female from 95\% to 96.5\%).

I feel encouraged by my teacher to study: Notably, the control group showed negative result whilst the experimental group reported a positive result (male from $97.4 \%$ to $97.6 \%$, female from $97.8 \%$ to $98.9 \%$ ).

### 3.10.2. Student-student relationship

This section describes the results of the relationship amongst students themselves and a total of five questions were asked. Because the participating students were one grade older than the baseline (baseline $4 \& 5$ and endline 5\&6), a simple comparison may
misdirect the result; one year difference in primary school age can make a big difference in children's personal development depending on the environment they are growing up in. The relationship with other students can be more complex than when they were one year younger, as they may pay more careful attention to relationships with others. Therefore, an analysis between baseline and endline is not reliable, but rather, the result from endline itself should be treated as important data.

Students in my class are kind and supportive of one another: Positive improvement was observed in both male and female students in the experimental group and more than 95\% of them agreed on this statement (male from $92 \%$ to $97.6 \%$, female from $95.4 \%$ to $96.5 \%$ ).

Students in my class stop other students who are unfair or disruptive: Notably, both male and female students in the experimental groups increased the percentage to agree on this statement but it still remain below $80 \%$ in both groups (male from $72.3 \%$ to $81.1 \%$, female from $74.3 \%$ to $77.1 \%)$.

Table 21 Percentage of students agreeing with student-student relationship statements

| Students agreeing with student-student relationship | Male Students |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{Z}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{3}$ ¢ 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{E}} \\ & \bar{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{O}$ ㄴ, O |  |
| Students in my class are kind and supportive of one another | 92.0\% | 93.8\% | 97.6\% | 95.4\% | 97.1\% | 96.5\% |
| Students in my class stop other students who are unfair or disruptive | 72.3\% | 73.0\% | 81.1\% | 74.3\% | 76.3\% | 77.1\% |
| Students in my class respectfully listen to each other during class discussions | 89.7\% | 90.5\% | 94.1\% | 92.7\% | 93.1\% | 91.2\% |
| I easily make friends at my school | 93.3\% | 91.4\% | 95.7\% | 96.3\% | 94.3\% | 95.8\% |
| I feel close to other students in my class | 95.0\% | 91.4\% | 96.5\% | 97.2\% | 94.6\% | 95.4\% |

Students in my class respectfully listen to each other during class discussions: More than $90 \%$ students across all four categories in the endline survey agreed on this statement. The male students in the experimental group showed a positive change (from 89.7\% to 94.1\%) whilst their female counterparts were not positive (from 92.7\% to 91.3\%).

I easily make friends at my school: More than 95\% of both male and female students in the experimental group agreed on this statement but the result from the female in this
group did not improve (male students from $93.3 \%$ to $95.7 \%$, female from $96.3 \%$ to $95.8 \%$ ).
I feel close to other students in my class: More than 95\% of both male and female students in the experimental group agreed on this (male from $95 \%$ to $96.5 \%$, female from $97.2 \%$ to 95.4\%).

Overall, the results in the experimental group was very promising, with more than $95 \%$ agreeing with the positive statement. Only one item, "Students in my class stop other students who are unfair or disruptive" was not very positive (endline=male 81.1\%, female $77.1 \%$ ), demonstrating the needs of more efforts from the teachers (and potentially by parents) to encourage students to stand up against wrongdoings in the classroom.

### 3.10.3. Teacher-teacher relationship ${ }^{16}$

This section describes the results from the teacher-teacher relationship, and almost all the teachers in both control and experimental groups agreed with all four statements, 1) I feel connected and close to the other teachers, 2) I enjoy being a teacher at my school, 3) I feel supported by the school management, and 4) I feel treated with respect by my students. The below findings indicate that teachers enjoy good relationships with their peers, managers and students at school.

I feel connected and close to the other teachers: Except male teachers in the control group, all others agreed on this statement in both baseline and endline survey (all 100\%).

I feel supported by the school management: All the teachers answered yes $100 \%$ to this question.

Table 22 Percentage of teachers agreeing with teacher-teacher relationship statements

| Teachers agreeing with teacher-teacher relationship statements | Male teachers |  |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{\cong} \\ & \stackrel{\cong}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ | O |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{c}} \\ & \stackrel{W}{0} \\ & \mathbb{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |
| I enjoy being a teacher at my school. | 100.0\% | 97.2\% |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| I feel supported by the school management | 98.5\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| I feel connected and close to the other teachers | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| I feel treated with respect by my students. | 98.5\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |

I feel connected and close to the other teachers: All the teachers answered yes $100 \%$ to

[^8]this question.
I feel treated with respect by my students: All the teachers in endline survey answered yes $100 \%$ to this question.

The similar positive results were also obtained as in the baseline, however, this result again indicated that teachers may refrain from pointing out the negative aspects in their school for fear of further punishments by their supervisors when the result comes out.

### 3.11. Child Protection in Schools

The issues of child protection in schools are also the focus of this study. Several indicators were used to assess child protection measures and procedures in school. The data are obtained from school directors, students, and teachers.

### 3.11.1. School Directors' Perspective

Three questions were asked (Table 23) about the child protection measure and the answers were categorized into 1) No, not in place, 2) partially done, and 3) Yes, in place. The survey team confirmed answers based on evidence such as written documents in case school directors answered child protection mechanisms are in place in their schools. As shown in the Table 25 below, none of the three indicators for child protection mechanisms were yet in place amongst the control group, which needs urgent attention. On the other hand, a visible and concrete outcome from the PDECM package was observed amongst the experimental group.

You have a written child protection policy in your school to make sure that the children are kept safe from harm. This policy prohibits all forms of violence against children: The strong impact from the PDECM training was observed in the experimental group in this aspect ("yes, in place" increased from $4.2 \%$ to $41.7 \%$ in the experimental group).

Your school has clear written child protection procedure in place: Same as above, the result from the experimental group showed a positive improvement owing to the PDECM training ("yes, in place" increased from $4.2 \%$ to $41.7 \%$ ). The percentage of the improvements in both the experimental group and the control group was identically the same in those two above items, therefore, most probably, when the school formulated a written child protection policy, the procedure to implement the policy was also formulated.

Table 23 School directors' assessment of child protection issues in school

| School directors' assessment of child protection issues in school | No, not in place |  |  | Partially done |  |  | Yes in place |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{=}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\otimes} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | O c 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{』}{\leftrightharpoons} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ | O N 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\Xi} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | O |  |

```
You have a written child 
protection policy in your school
to make sure that the children
are kept safe from harm. This
policy prohibits all forms of
violence against children.
Your school has clear written 
child protection procedures in
place that provide step-by-step
guidance for all members of the
school on what action to take if
there are concerns about a
child's safety or welfare
Your school has a designated
"child protection focal point"
with clear defined role and
responsibilities
```

Your school has a designated child protection focal point: The positive improvement was obtained in the experimental group ("yes in place" increased from $0 \%$ to $16.7 \%$ ) while no school in the control group made any improvement. Despite the progress was still limited in the experimental group, there is a clear difference between the control group and the experimental group in outcome from the PDECM training.

### 3.11.2. Students' Perspective

Child protection is the foundation that enables children to come to school safely and learn effectively for their development. In regard to this, three questions were asked relating to students' perception about children's safety and protection in school (Table 24). The result was not showing much improvement; however, this should be analysed in a fair manner by considering that those students were one year older than the baseline, therefore, their personal growth within the past year greatly affected the results.

Ifeel safe and protected at my school: The result was not very positive in this item and little improvements were reported in the experimental group (male from $98.9 \%$ to $96.5 \%$, female from $98.7 \%$ to $98.9 \%$ ).

There is a teacher in the school that I can trust: Again, the result was not very positive in this item even in the experimental group (male from $98.3 \%$ a to $96.5 \%$, female remained the same 98.2\%).

Table 24 Students' assessment of child protection issues in school

| Students' assessment of child protection issues in school | Male Students |  |  | Female Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | O | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{U} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{D} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x} \end{aligned}$ |  | 읓 |  |
| I feel safe and protected at my school | 98.9\% | 96.4\% | 96.5\% | 98.7\% | 97.7\% | 98.9\% |


| There is a teacher in the <br> school I can trust | $98.3 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ | $96.5 \%$ | $98.2 \%$ | $95.1 \%$ | $98.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| There is a teacher in the <br> school I would share <br> personal problems with | $70.1 \%$ | $80.1 \%$ | $85.4 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $79.1 \%$ | $84.5 \%$ |

There is a teacher in the school I would share personal problems with: The positive result in this category was observed in this question, with both male and female in the experimental group showed a positive change (male from $70.1 \%$ to $85.4 \%$, female students from $75.8 \%$ to $84.5 \%$ ).

The result showed that half of all the categories in this section (6 out of 12 in Table 26) recorded a slightly negative result against the baseline. This indicated that students gained more knowledge about the importance of safety, or roles of their teachers as an educator. Therefore, they were paying more attention, in comparison to the baseline, than when they were one year younger.

### 3.11.3. Teachers' Perspective

The results from teachers' views regarding child protection issues at school showed a high consistency with that of school directors (Table 25). There were three questions that were asked.

Table 25 Teachers' assessment of child protection issues in school

| Teachers' assessment of | Male teachers |  |  | Female teachers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| school | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{E}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{0}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 미 } \\ & \text { ㅇ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\underline{\Xi}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{0}$ 0 0 0 |  |
| Does the school have a code of ethics...? | 82.4\% | 97.2\% | 89.7\% | 93.3\% | 85.7\% | 95.2\% |
| Are the consequences of breaking the guidelines on behavior clearly written in the code of ethics..? | 83.6\% | 77.8\% | 62.1\% | 85.3\% | 71.4\% | 80.6\% |
| Does your school have clear written child protection procedures in place? | 70.6\% | 69.4\% | 82.8\% | 68.0\% | 61.9\% | 85.5\% |

Does the school have a code of ethics that includes detailed guidelines describing to teachers and school staff what behaviour is acceptable or unacceptable in their relationships and contact with children? The result amongst both male and female teachers in the experimental group showed a positive change (male from $82.4 \%$ to $89.7 \%$, female from 93.3\% to $95.2 \%$ ).

Are consequences of breaking the guidelines on behaviour clearly written in the code of ethics and linked to disciplinary procedures? Conversely, the result from both male and female teachers in the experimental group went negative in the experimental group (male from $83.6 \%$ to $62.1 \%$, female teachers from $85.3 \%$ to $80.6 \%$ ). The reason of why this unexpected result was obtained was unknown due to lack of qualitative analysis. ${ }^{17}$

Does your school have clear written child protection procedures in place that provides step-by-step guidance for all members of the school on what action to take if there are concerns about a child's safety or welfare? The positive results was obtained from both male and female teachers in the experimental group (male from $70.6 \%$ to $82.8 \%$, female from $68 \%$ to $85.5 \%)$.

In summary, the teachers in the experimental group reported the improvement in child protection mechanism (such as code of ethics and the protection procedure) whilst the control group did not make much progress since the baseline.

### 3.12. School Rules and Participation in Schools

The survey also investigated school rules (a code of conduct and classroom rules) and participation of students, teachers and parents in developing school rules, as reported by school directors.

### 3.12.1. School rules reported by school directors

Schools are required to equip certain class room rules or code of conducts as guided by the MoEYS. A code of conduct describes what behaviour is acceptable and unacceptable in students' relationships with teachers and peers at school level. In regard to those rules, four questions were asked and answered by the school directors. Out of four items, three items recorded improvements in the experimental group, demonstrating the positive impact from the PDECM training.

You have a code of conduct for students that describes what behaviour is acceptable or unacceptable in their relationships with teachers and peers: Conversely, the experimental group recorded the negative result ("yes in place" decreased from $20.8 \%$ to $16.7 \%$ ). The reason of why the number of schools that took away the code of conduct is unknown; furthermore, the result showed that there had been no progress in formulating a code of conduct in the experimental group.

Table 26 Directors' assessment of school rules and participation in writing them

| No, not in place | Partially done | Yes in place |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^9]| Directors' assessment of school rules and participation in writing them | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{U}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\bar{U}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| You have a code of conduct for students that describes what behaviour is acceptable and unacceptable in their relationships with teachers and peers | 70.8\% | 58.3\% | 75.0\% | 8.3\% | 25.0\% | 8.3\% | 20.8\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% |
| Students have participated in the development of the student code of conduct. | 100 \% | 100\% | 83.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 16.7\% |
| At your school there are classroom rules for each class. | 83.3\% | 41.7\% | 50.0\% | 4.2\% | 33.3\% | 16.7\% | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 33.3\% |
| Students and teachers establish these classroom rules together. | 87.5\% | 83.3\% | 66.7\% | 4.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 8.3\% | 16.7\% | 33.3\% |

Students have participated in the development of the student code of conduct: Notably, only the experimental group improved this aspect ("yes in place" from $0 \%$ to $16.7 \%$ ). This result is the same as the previous question, therefore, all the schools (2 out of 12 schools) that developed a code applied the student's participation in formulating the code.

At your school there are classroom rules for each class: The experimental group showed the positive result ("yes in place" from $12.5 \%$ to $33 \%$ ). Most probably, owing to the inputs from the PDECM training, almost half of the schools in the experimental group has taken some measures in this regard.

Students and teachers establish these classroom rules together: The result from the experimental group showed improvements ("yes" from $8.3 \%$ to $33.3 \%$ ). This result is the same as the previous question in regard to school rules therefore all the schools that developed classroom rules applied student's participation in formulating the rule.

### 3.12.2. School Support System

This section investigated the school support system and these questions were asked. All items showed a positive development in targeted schools and notably a larger improvement was recorded in the experimental group.

Table 27 Participation of school support committee, parents, teachers, and students

|  | No, not in place |  |  |  |  |  | Partially done |  |  | Yes in place |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| support committee, parents, teachers, and students | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\underline{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \tilde{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 믇 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\underline{\omega}} \\ & \text { W } \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | O O 0 |  |
| The school has a school support committee |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 8.3\% | 8.3\% | 8.3\% | 91.7\% | 91.7\% | 91.7\% |


| The school has a <br> student council. | $33.3 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ | $91.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| The school has parent <br> teacher association. | $83.3 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |

The school has a school support committee: The result remained the same from the baseline ("yes" $=91.7 \%$ ) in both the control and the experimental group.

The school has a student council: The experimental group showed better improvement ("yes" from 66.7\% to 91.7\%).

The school has parent teacher association: More schools in the experimental group established such association ("yes" from $16.7 \%$ a to $33.3 \%$ ).

## 4. Analysis and discussion

Based on the findings above, this section analyses the results according to the order of issues/topics investigated in the survey. The main aims of the PDECM training package was;

- Eliminate all forms of violence against children, including physical, emotional and sexual violence.
- Enhance mutual respect between teachers, teachers and students, teachers and parents, parents and children, and among students.
- Create an enjoyable, safe and non-violent learning environment at school.
- Enable teachers to be skilled in preventing and responding to violence against children and be accountable for all forms of violence against children in the school.

In order to support school management and teachers to achieve those above goals, PDECM training were conducted for the 12 selected schools, called the experimental group in this document. This section describes the direct impact from the PDECM training. Below is a summary of impact analysis by comparing three groups (baseline, control and experimental group) to show the impact. A separate analysis was also conducted to assess the reliability of those comparison, because the participants to two surveys were slightly different, and the result was positive that the comparison is valid and reliable (Annex 3).

Against the result from the baseline survey, positive impacts were statistically obtained in the experimental group (both teachers and students), whilst the results from the control group (both teachers and students) included some negative results. Therefore, in general, it can be concluded that the PDECM training package brought about some visible positive changes to those teachers who participated in it, and also enabled wider positive changes that influenced students' learning environment.

Despite the above mentioned improvements, the overall aim of MOEYS is to reduce all violent disciplinary measures to zero, and from that perspective, it should be noted that significant challenges still remained: perpetration of moderate physical discipline (endline total 56.3\%) followed by moderate verbal discipline (endline total 53.4\%) and harsh physical discipline (endline total $38.7 \%$ ).

### 4.1. Statistical analysis: Significant difference between the control and the experimental group

In order to statistically analyze the effectiveness of the PDECM training package, SPSS analysis was conducted and results from both teachers and students demonstrated that the PDECM training was effective, supporting the hypothesis that PDECM could bring about positive changes into school.

Below is a summary result of the SPSS analysis from teachers and students, extracted from disciplinary measures ( 26 items). ${ }^{18}$

Teachers: The 9 items out of 26 items (34.6\%) in five categories showed a significant difference between the control and the experimental groups, strongly backing the high effectiveness of the training. (Annex 5). The significant ( $p$-value) demonstrated the clear impact supporting the effectiveness of the PDECM training. For example, "Threatened to spank or hit a student but did not actually do so" was $0.028, \mathrm{P}$-Value $<0.05$ and this means that there is significant evidence to support the survey result that experiment group was differently affected in comparison to the control group.

The significant improvements in the experimental group were observed in the moderate physical discipline, and 60\% (6 items out of 10 items) showed significant difference to prove that the experimental group obtained knowledge and changed their attitudes in a positive manner. On the other hand, moderate verbal discipline showed $50 \%$, harsh physical discipline was $33 \%{ }^{19}$ In summary, the PDECM training was effective to influence teachers' behavior in regard to moderate verbal and moderate physical violence (more than $50 \%$ ), but it was limited in other categories.

Students: The 10 items out of 26 (38\%) demonstrated significant differences between the control and the experimental groups. This means that the experimental group had positively changed their disciplinary methods in comparison to the control group, supporting the effectiveness of the PDECM training. The SPSS analysis figured out that the positive changes were statistically proved in a similar manner to that of teachers'.

The result from the students also demonstrated that the experimental group reported the reduction of teachers' perpetration of violent disciplinary methods in comparison to the control group in regard to above ten items, supporting the effectiveness of the PDECM training.

### 4.2. Impact analysis: Disciplinary methods (five types)

In addition to the general analysis between baseline, the control and experimental groups in the endline survey, more detailed analysis against each item was carried out, in order to identify what types of disciplinary measure remained as problem at the time of the endline survey. Five types of disciplinary methods analysed are;

1) Moderate verbal discipline

[^10]2) Harsh verbal discipline
3) Moderate physical discipline
4) Harsh physical discipline
5) Severe physical discipline

The detailed analysis below was based on the reporting from teachers, because it was selfreported information of actual perpetration of disciplinary methods, and thereby more accurate than the reporting from the students which included both self-experience and experiences of eyewitnesses.

### 4.2.1. Moderate verbal discipline (4 methods)

Notably, except one item ("Refused to talk to a student"), all other three methods saw a huge reduction in the experiment group. ${ }^{20}$ In general, it can be concluded that teachers have reduced the usage of moderate verbal disciplinary measures, and positive impact from the PDECM was identified. The gender difference in perpetrating these methods was found; in all items male teachers perpetration was higher than that of females.

### 4.2.2. Harsh verbal discipline ( 5 methods)

Except one item ("Called students stupid or lazy or some other name like that"), reporting of perpetration of other four methods were all less than 6\%, therefore, in general terms, the occurrence of harsh verbal discipline was uncommon although more efforts are essential to reduce it to zero. Notably, the positive impact from the PDECM training was visible; the control group reported much higher occurrence of one method ("Called students stupid or lazy or some other name like that") than the experiment group.

Gendered dimension in perpetrating this violence was also observed; two violent methods were perpetrated only by female teachers in experimental groups although the occurrence reduced from the results in the baseline ("Didn't allow student to join the class" was 1.6\% and "Economic penalty, fined students" was 1.6\%)

Despite the improvement above, there needs to be further investigation regarding the act "Shaving or cut your hair", because this can be moderate/harsh discipline or even severe physical discipline depending on the circumstances and such a harsh method should be urgently stopped.

### 4.2.3. Moderate Physical discipline

The result showed positive behaviour changes in female teachers and students in the experimental groups, therefore, the PDECM training brought about stronger impact on females. However, despite whether teachers participated PDECM training or not, the physical discipline of "Hit a student on the bottom with an object like a stick or ruler" was

[^11]perpetrated by more than $40 \%$ of both male and female teachers, therefore, further attention is necessary.

Among the five methods, "Hit a student on the bottom with an object like a stick or ruler" was most common, but this reduced in the experimental group. The second common method was "Twisted or pulled the ears/hair/joints", followed by "Slapped a student". On the other hand, "Threw a pencil" was perpetrated by male teachers more than the baseline (1.5\%) in the experimental groups (3.4\%), which needs further investigation.

The perpetration of most methods was higher amongst male teachers, however, two methods were perpetrated slightly more amongst female teacher in the experimental group ("Threw a pencil or another item at a student" male3.4\%, female 4.8\%, "Asked a student to hit his/her knuckles against the table or the wall" male 6.9\%, female 8.1\%)

### 4.2.4. Harsh Physical discipline (4 methods)

Notably, all the groups in the experimental groups showed a large decrease in the action"Hit a student with a stick or ruler" (male teachers 17.3 \% and female teachers 8.1\%), demonstrating a strong impact from the training.

Male teachers perpetrated all the methods more than female counterparts in the experimental group, and only one method was perpetrated by female teachers ("Hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body")

### 4.2.5. Severe physical discipline ( 3 methods)

The same as the baseline survey, almost all the teachers reported to have never perpetrated this type of disciplinary method. This low occurrence of severe physical discipline was confirmed by students. However, students still reported the prevalence of this method, except "Grabbed you or one of your classmates" in female students in the experimental group (0\%).

The reporting of "Beat you or one of you classmates up" was highest amongst three violent acts, although this act might have been confused with "hit a student on the bottom" or "slapped a student" (both categorized in moderate physical violence) because students may use similar terms in describing this violence. Alarmingly, the method "burned or scalded you" was still reported by students and such a severe act should be immediately stopped at any school.

### 4.3. Analysis: Teachers' view towards violent discipline (6 items)

The experimental group demonstrated a positive change and obtained better understanding about the positive discipline methods. ${ }^{21}$ Provided the background and main

[^12]aim of the PDECM training, to stop violent disciplinary measures at school, two questions that were similar in context and involve crucial importance were analyzed; "Corporal punishment is child abuse" and "Children have the right not to be punished physically and psychologically".

A notable improvement was seen in regard to "Children have the right not to be punished" and both male teachers and female teachers in the experimental group increased understating about it against the baseline (male 96.6\%, female 91.9\%). On the other hand, understanding about "Corporal punishment is child abuse", was still limited, and less than $90 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group understood it (male 89.7\%, female 74.2\%) This limitation in improving teachers' understanding about corporal punishment was also confirmed by one more question, "There is a big difference between serious violence and corporal punishment"; less than $20 \%$ of the experimental group agreed to this. Therefore, despite an increase in understanding about corporal punishment, some part of the message delivered in PDECM training might have been wrongly understood by them provided low or decreased understanding about those principles in education.

### 4.4. Impact analysis: Teaching style (4 items)

The result under this section was not positive; mostly teachers continued to use traditional methods in teaching (total more than 90\%) and less than half of all teachers paid attention to slow learners (Experimental male 55.2\% and female 46.8\%). Therefore, there is a large space for further intervention in fixing teachers' attitudes in teaching, beyond the reduction of violent discipline.

### 4.5. Impact analysis: Anger management (3 items)

Overall, a positive improvement of anger management amongst the teachers were recorded. Female teachers in the experimental group apparently improved this skill more than the control group; therefore, it can be concluded that anger management training did have a positive impact on female teachers. For male teachers, although both control and experimental groups demonstrated improvement, two items out of three recorded better improvement in the control group than the experimental, therefore, regardless of the PDCECM training, male teachers might have had opportunities to better manage their emotions in front of student. However, alarmingly, more than half of the teachers reported that they got angry against their students at some unwanted situation (such as students do not respect them) even though this cannot be directly linked to the perpetration of

[^13]violent disciple. Recognizing these challenges and struggles amongst the teachers, more support is essential to assist them in anger management.

### 4.6. Impact analysis: Relationship in school

Overall, a positive result was obtained, which was also found in the baseline study.
Notably, more than $95 \%$ of both male and female students agreed with all four statements. However, because the result from the baseline was also very positive, only slight increase was observed.

Findings about the relationship amongst students themselves demonstrated that the results in the experimental group was very promising, with more than $95 \%$ agreeing with the positive statement.

Results from the teacher and teacher relationship was also good, and almost all the teachers in both control and experimental groups agreed with all four statements, 1) I feel connected and close to the other teachers, 2) I enjoy being a teacher at my school, 3) I feel supported by the school management, and 4) I feel treated with respect by my students. The below findings indicate that teachers enjoy good relationships with their peers, managers and students at school.

### 4.7. Impact analysis: Child Protection in School

### 4.7.1. School director results (Number of directors= 24)

The clear difference was observed between the control and the experimental group: 41.7\% of the experimental group have made a written "Child protection policy" while only $8.3 \%$ in the control group did so. Most probably, the policy was formulated along with the "Procedure", which can actually implement the Policy ( $41.7 \%$ of the experimental group have made a written "Procedure).

Despite a notable progress, the percentage of schools in the experiment group that had "Policy" and "Procedure" remained low (less than 50\%). Furthermore, for an effective implementation of "Procedure", each school is supposed to appoint a Focal Point, however, only $16.7 \%$ in the experimental group assigned anyone to be a Focal Point. In summary, more effort and intervention is necessary to institutionalize child protection mechanisms in school.

### 4.7.2. Students' and Teachers' view

Students' view: In general, school were identified as safe space for students but the experimental group showed slightly better results than the control group. More than $96 \%$ of the students agreed that "School is a safe place" and more than $96 \%$ of them agreed that "There is a teacher that they can trust" and these high percentages (over 95\%)
remained the same since the baseline. However, students' response to "There is a teacher that I can share personal problem with" went up amongst both male and female students in the experimental group.

Teachers' View: There was a clear gender difference. The male teachers in the control group showed a more positive response in their understanding about school safety issues than their female counterparts in the same group, demonstrating that male teachers in normal schools may have more access to school safety issues than female teachers because they are from the same 12 selected schools. The result from female teachers in the control group were all (three items) negative than their male counterparts in the same group.

On the other hand, in the experimental group, female teachers' responses were more positive than male counterparts in all the three questions. Most probably, females' limited access to general information at school were fixed through PDECM training, so that this gendered impact was observed.

The remaining challenge identified under this category was teachers' limited understanding about the consequences of breaching the code of conducts (Experimental male $61.2 \%$ and female $80.6 \%$ ). This percentage should have been improved to $100 \%$ amongst the experimental group as a primary prevention of disciplinary measures amongst the front-line educators.

### 4.8. Impact analysis: School rules and participation in school (Total schools number = 24)

Maintaining school discipline by formulating and implementing a code of conduct or class room rules can provide much clear understanding for both students and teachers in regard to their appropriate behaviour in school. In regard to a "Code of Conduct" for students, progress turned out to be rather slow. Furthermore, the control group took more measures ( $25 \%$ ) to start making one (experimental only $8.3 \%$ ). On the other hand, "Class room rules" demonstrated a slight difference between the control and experimental groups, the baseline was $12.5 \%$ and this increased to $25 \%$ in the control and this increased to $33.3 \%$ in the experimental group. Notably, one-third of schools in the experimental group reported that both students and teachers made those rules together, whilst the control group was $16.7 \%$.

Ensuring the supportive environment for children is a foundational condition for students and some formal committees at school can assist those processes. 91.7\% of both control and experimental groups have established "School support committee", and this remained as same as the baseline. A positive sign was that the remaining $8.3 \%$ in each group have started an initiative to make one. Another positive aspect was that most schools have
started to establish a "Parent teacher association"; the baseline was $16.7 \%$ and this increased to $25 \%$ in the control and $33.3 \%$ in the experimental group.

### 4.9. Remaining challenges

Amongst all the disciplinary measures (total 26) investigated in the study, 6 methods below was perpetrated by at least $30 \%$ teachers (either male of/and female).

Table 18 Six most frequent disciplinary measures reported by teachers (over 30\%)

| Type | Method | Male control | Female control | Male experimental | Female experimenta I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moderate verbal | Threatened to spank or hit | 33.3\% | 31\% | 57.1\% | 24.2\% |
|  | Shouted, yelled or screamed | 50\% | 37.9\% | 66.7\% | 32.3\% |
| Harsh verbal | Called students a stupid | 19.4\% | 6.9\% | 13.3\% | 33.3\% |
| Moderate physical | Hit a student on the bottom | 44.4\% | 17.2\% | 42.9\% | 16.1\% |
|  | Twisted or pulled the ears | 33.3\% | 20.7\% | 9.5\% | 4.8\% |
|  | Asked a student to hit his knuckles against the table | 8.3\% | 6.9\% | 22.4\% | 33.3\% |

Despite the fact that reduction of all those six methods were observed amongst the experimental group, the prevalence of those six methods were reported as yet common. Most probably, when teachers obtain basic skills in anger management, perpetration of those disciplinary methods could be reduced. Educating teachers about corporal punishment or non-violent disciplinary measure is not enough; it is essential to enable them to manage their feelings in a professional manner to adhere code of ethics.

## Recommendations

## 5. Policy/Legislative recommendations

1) Primary prevention by notifying all the teachers about the prohibition of violent discipline: Almost half the teachers in the endline survey (Moderate verbal discipline=53.4\%) still use violent measures at school to discipline students. Therefore, urgent measures should be taken by the MOEYS to notify all school directors across the nation in a written form to inform them that no teacher should use any type of violent discipline in school and their perpetrating such an act may be subject to punishment such as suspension from their teaching role. In the notification, a summary result from this survey (such as $41.2 \%$ of teachers surveyed used moderate physical discipline method, which is not acceptable and against the MOEYS's instruction) to show the seriousness and magnitude of the problem. These measures should also be accompanied with rigorous enforcement measures by school directors in their supervising roles; responsibilities of school directors must be in place to hold them accountable to their teachers and students. This can be the quickest primary prevention measure that can be immediately taken.
2) Include PDECM training in to Action Plan to effectively implement the Child Protection Policy in Schools in 2016: The MoEYS approved the Child Protection Policy in Schools in 2016 and is developing a long-term action plan to ensure its effective implementation. Provided the strong impact that PDECM training can impose over the perception and attitudes of teachers, it is essential to consider inserting this training into an action plan. Also, it is key to make sure that all the major emerging issues in the country are included as key elements in the action plan such as out-of-school children, school/cyber bullying, online child sexual exploitation, as well as school-related gender-based violence and positive discipline.
3) Ensure every school has a child protection policy: Although a dramatic increase was observed in the experimental group, $41.7 \%$ of them have been equipped with a child protection policy whilst only $8.3 \%$ in the control group; demonstrating there is a possibility that most schools that have not undergone PDECM training package might have not established such policy. Therefore, the MOEYS should immediately take a rigorous policy measure to ensure that all primary schools develop such policy and implement it with a clear procedure.
4) Distribute a slogan "Zero tolerance" to be posted in classroom: There are many slogans posted on the wall in the classroom, but it is rare to see one related to prohibition of violent measures. Thus, the MOEYS should consider printing out one and distribute it to all classrooms to remind teachers about a zero tolerance slogan.
5) Set up a protection mechanism in school for students: This endline survey found out that less than $70 \%$ of male and female teachers' schools in the control group
had a child protection procedure (experimental male $82.8 \%$ and female $85.5 \%$ ). Such a mechanism should not be limited to sexual violence, but also be a protection mechanism which in general must be established in each school, and all students and guardians/parents must be informed about its availability and functions. In addition, such a mechanism should also be equipped with a uniformed reporting system, referral system if necessary (such as to health facilities), and response systems (such as punishment of perpetrators or reporting to police) in order to prevent any type of violence in school.
6) Set up a transparent mechanism to implement code of conduct: School directors need more support in formulating a code of conduct for students as only $16.7 \%$ of all surveyed school has made one. By the same token, despite the fact that teachers reported that they have a code of ethics for teachers (male=85.7\%, female 95.2\%) and almost one-fourth of teachers do not know the rules regarding the consequences of breaking the code (those whose knew were $71.4 \%$ among male and $80.6 \%$ among female). Not all teachers were aware of the reference in the code of conduct in regard to the consequence of breaching the code (control male 69.4\% and female $71.4 \%$, experimental male $62.1 \%$ and female $80.6 \% \%$ ). Therefore, all teachers must be regularly informed about the contents of code of conduct with a focus on disciplinary measures in order to ensure teachers are adhering to the code of conduct. This can be systematically done by linking this to District Training and Monitoring Team (DTMT) regular follow up system by ensuring these issues are systematically asked by the DTMT team.
7) Identifying champions to be models: The MOEYS would select champions from the PDECM training, who have changed their perception and attitude in a positive manner and share his/her experience at an annual education congress, here in a web-site, FB or Instagram. Those selected champion can be celebrated at the national teacher' day event or at the national education congress.
8) Ensure PDECM training packages will reach all primary schools in Cambodia: A noticeable impact from the PDECM training was identified, therefore, the MOEYS needs to formulate a plan to scale up the training across schools nationwide (inhouse training). Also, teachers to be should be trained with this package while they are trained at teacher colleges in provinces or at national institutes of education. A longer-term strategic approach is to expand this training to pre-primary or to secondary school so that all the students can learn in a safer environment. This plan must come with the follow up/monitoring plan so that the MOEYS can track the progress annually. Beyond the supervision by the school directors or DTMT team, peer- to peer monitoring and encouragement system amongst the teachers can also assist the improvement of their performance by sharing positive experiences.
9) Increase community awareness about violence against children: Engage parents/guardians and the broader community in the positive discipline
programme (such as School Support Committees). Ensure that parents and people in community are informed about the code of conduct for teachers and the complaint/protection mechanism so that they can seek for help on behalf of their children.
10) Encourage students to participate in school management: Many teachers have not set up a suggestion box (male control 50\%, experimental 55.2\%, female control $47.6 \%$, experimental $30.6 \%$ ). This is a practical action that can be immediately taken, therefore, all the teachers need to urgently be instructed on how to set one up to show their openness to suggestions to the students. Creating the environment in class room where students can raise their voices to their teachers and that their voices are heard can contribute to raising awareness amongst the teachers that they should stop using violent disciplinary measures.
11) School support mechanism: Notably, most school have already established school support committees ( $91.7 \%$ ) and students' councils ( $83.3 \%$ in the control and $91.7 \%$ in the experimental group), however, teacher-parents' association has not been set up in many schools (only $25 \%$ in the control and $33.3 \%$ in the experimental group). Creating a venue where parents can see teachers can facilitate the dialogues about their children's safety issues with their teachers. Such a dialogue can be a deterrence to teachers for stopping violent disciplinary measures. Thus, more support is essential for school management to initiate the formulation of the association.

### 5.1. Operational/Programme recommendations:

12) Ensure PDECM training packages will reach all primary schools in Cambodia:

Despite the strong impact from the PDECM in reducing violent disciplinary methods, however, the occurrence of violent discipline still remained high. Therefore, it is suggested that the MOEYS formulate a costed plan to scale up the training across schools nationwide (in-service training). Also, teachers to be should be trained with this package while they are trained at teacher colleges in provinces or at national institutes of education.
13) Make the PDECM training package more gender sensitive: The results showed that more male teachers used both verbal and physical violent methods than females while more male students experienced or witnessed both verbal and physical violence at schools. Therefore, PDECM training package needs to ensure gender sensitivity in delivery of the training to influence more male teachers, and to reduce violence against male students.
14) Align the PDECM training with other efforts to reduce violence against children in homes and communities as well as schools: The PDECM training needs to be aligned with other training aiming at promoting positive discipline at homes and communities such as the training on positive parenting conducted by the Ministry
of Women's Affairs (MOWA). These two trainings need to be conducted concurrently in target communities involving parents, school support committees, teachers and school directors. These two areas of work are mutually reinforcing in tackling the challenge of violence in schools, therefore, if both trainings are rolled out in the same areas, a larger impact could be obtained.
15) The training would be delivered to build the capacity of social workers, community volunteers and local authorities who will further support parents and caregivers in communities to practice positive parenting. This positive parenting training could involve bringing parents to schools to partake in some joint components of the training with teachers. The training will utilise positive parenting training toolkits previously developed by the MoWA
16) Articulate key messages more clearly in the PDECM training package to promote teacher's attitudes towards positive discipline: Even after the training, teachers still held the wrong perception that corporal punishment is not child abuse (experimental "agree" male $89.7 \%$ and female $74.2 \%$ ). Also, more than $40 \%$ of teachers in the experimental group perpetrated "hit a student on the bottom with an object", therefore, the training needs to deliver a clear message that they can no hit a student. In summary, a clear and simple message such as "zero tolerance to violence (corporal punishment)" should be repeated again and again in the training sessions to condition teachers' thinking so that they can never use any violence in school.
17) Strengthen teachers' Anger management: Despite the improvement observed in the experimental group, the result from anger management related questions were not very promising. Therefore, formulating a more in-depth manual to assist teachers in learning anger management will contribute to improve it. Such an intervention can also contribute to the wellbeing of teachers and can assist them to transform themselves to become a model for students and other teachers.
18) Promote participatory teaching methods through the PDECM training: The result showed that most teachers still continued to use traditional teaching methods. Therefore, beyond the prohibition of disciplinary measures, the PDECM training can have more emphasis on participatory teaching methods that can increase student's motivation to learn, and could prevent more teachers from using violent methods to encourage students to learn.
19) Increase community awareness about violence against children: Engage parents/guardians and the broader community in the positive discipline programme (such as School Support Committees). Ensure that parents and people in community are informed about the code of conduct for teachers and the complaint/protection mechanism so that they can seek for help on behalf of their children.

### 5.2. Further research needs

20) Research will be undertaken in various forms and at various levels of the education system. The main purpose of the research will be: (i) to continue to build a better understanding of the dimensions of violence in schools and in households, including gender aspects; (ii) to comprehensively measure the impact of teacher capacity building in relation to understanding and utilization of positive discipline approaches, and the impact of positive parenting in communities; and (iii) to provide sound and credible evidence to reinforce the synergies between these two interventions, and to inform policy making.)
21) Qualitative assessment: The endline survey did not investigate why positive changes occurred, or why some teachers did not change their attitudes despite the PDECM training. More in-depth analysis is essential to provide concrete recommendations as to which part of training package worked well in order to bring effective recommendations to further modify the training package if necessary.
22) Parallel research with positive parenting training: For a better knowledge generation, a robust and credible research needs to be undertaken to identify success, strengthens and challenges by comparing performance and differing impact between PDCEM and positive parenting training carried out by MOWA.
23) Impact assesses of physiological violence: This endline survey could document the prevalence of both verbal and physical violence in schools, however it is limited to assessing the physiological impact from this violence against students. For example, children who were subjected to violence may suffer from severe psychological problems and may stop attending school. Provided the fact that 56.3\% of students investigated in this study have experienced at least one type of moderate physical violence, further research is essential to identify the psychological impact and consider taking proactive measures to support those students' well-being.
24) Identification of disciplinary methods by the students: One of the biggest challenges found in the analysis process in this endline survey was accuracy of the results as it lacked qualitative information. For example, the wording of disciplinary methods (such as "hit" was used multiple times across different categories and "beat" was translated into "hit" in Khmer questionnaire). Also, the categorization (24 methods into 5 types) might not have reflected students' view because each item did not include any impact from the methods over the physiological well-being of students. In formulating the further study/survey, it is highly recommended to engage students with a questionnaire formulation to ensuring that more accurate data can be collected for analysis.
25) Research coverage of wider range of children: Vulnerability of younger students (grade 1-4) or early childhood education level is yet unknown, therefore, an investigation of the feasibility of introducing positive discipline training at those levels is advisable. Furthermore, marginalized students in primary school such as
students with disabilities need to be included for further research because their experiences may be notably different from other students, due to their vulnerability and the greater danger that violence can cause to them.

## Annex

## Annex 1 Questionnaires
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## ANNEX 2 Tools used for survey with students

## Consent form

If your child is selected, we will ask the child for his/her permission as well. We will not continue if your child does not want to participate. If your child wants to participate we will ask him/her to complete a questionnaire. Students from the same class will be asked to sit together in the classroom. We will give each child a sheet with answer boxes. We will then read the questions aloud one by one. We will ask them to answer the questions by placing a cross in the box on the answer sheet. The questions are about the relationship between students and teachers and about how teachers educate and discipline students. Some of the questions may be sensitive. Your child is allowed to skip any question they do not want to answer. Also your child can stop his/her participation at any time. The information recorded is confidential, and no one else except the research team will have access to the answers your child provided. The questionnaire from your child will have a number instead of a name. The research team will see this number, but they will not know which number is linked to which child. Nobody will later know who gave which answer. We will only use the answers for the purpose of this study. We will destroy the questionnaires after one year. There is little or no possibility that bad things will happen to your child as a result of answering the questionnaire. Some of the questions we will ask your child may be sensitive and answering questions like this can be difficult. But your child can choose not to answer questions that are difficult or end his/her participation at any time. Your child may choose to tell you about the study and the questionnaire but he/she does not have to do this. We will not be sharing with you the questions we ask. We will also not be sharing with you the answers given to us by your child. There are no direct benefits for being in the survey. This means that your child will not get any money or gifts for being in this study. If you have any questions you may contact the head of the research team.

## Oral guidance for students

We conduct this survey to better understand the relationships between students and teachers and how teachers educate and discipline students at your school. I would like to tell you that some of the questions I will ask are sensitive. I will ask questions about your school, your teachers, your classmates and how you feel at school. There
are a few things you should know about this survey: You get to decide if you want to be in the survey and whatever you decide is OK. It is also OK to say 'Yes' and change your mind later. You can stop being in the survey at any time. If you want to stop, please tell me and I will not be upset. You can say 'Yes' to the study and as I ask you questions, you can say ' $\mathrm{No}^{\prime}$ to any question that you do not want to answer. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. I am interested to know how you feel and think about the issues as this will help us understand the real situation. Sometimes you might not know the answer to a question or might not want to answer a question. I would rather you say you don't know or that you don't want to answer a question than tell me a story that isn't true. What will I do with your answers in the questionnaire? I will use your answers only for the purpose of research. All your answers will be treated as strictly confidential. I guarantee absolute anonymity. Nobody will later know who gave which answer. So your answers can never be connected to you. You might be wondering what would happen if you join this survey. If you decide to be in the survey, I will ask you some questions about the experiences of you and your classmates at school and with your teacher. I will ask you to remember and tell me about some things that may have happened to you or your classmates and it will take about 45-60 minutes to answer the questions. You might be wondering if bad things could happen to you if you participate in this survey. There is little or no possibility that bad things will happen as a result of answering these questions. As I told you, some of the questions are sensitive and answering questions like this can be difficult, but you can choose not to answer questions that are difficult or end your participation at any time. I already told you that all you answers will be treated strictly confidential and the information is between you and me. Do you have any questions?

Yes/No

## Debrief after the survey

Now, we reached the end of the questionnaire. I would like to thank you! You did a great job! Next, I will ask you to bring the questionnaire to me. I will check it quickly. As a thank you from our side, we give you the book with an interesting and funny story about children's rights. You have to know that rights are things every child should have. All children have the same rights. Regarding school, you have the right to a good quality education. You should be encouraged to go to school. You also have the right to be protected from being hurt and mistreated, in body or mind. No one and no teacher is allowed to punish you physically or emotionally. If you or someone you know is having their rights abused in any way, then the most important thing to do is talk to someone about it. You can talk to an adult you trust, or to the police or to an authority of your community. If you don't have such a person, you can call the

Child Helpline Cambodia anytime for free on $1280^{22}$. You find the telephone number at the last page of the book. (Show the number in the book to the children.) And one more thing: If you would like to speak with me, you can find me at ... (determine a time) at ... (determine a place, e.g. a bench under a tree) for 30 minutes. I will be there. You could come alone or you can bring a friend with you. As you like.

[^14]
## Annex 3 SPSS analysis about participants to two surveys

## Comparison regarding the Participation in the Baseline Survey

In order to have a accurate comparative analysis between baseline survey and endline survey, it was desirable that all the participants to the baseline survey participated in the endline survey. However there was slight difference between the participants to the two surveys therefore this additional statistical analysis was conducted to assess the reliability of using the endline survey to assess the impact from the PDECM package. The result of analysis demonstrated that despite minor problems, the results from the endline survey could be used to assess the impact.

## Steps of SPSS analysis

To assess the reliability of data, an additional analysis was performed to detect the impact of the survey instrument on respondents' responses over time. In other words, their responses were compared between those participating in this survey 9 months earlier and those who did not participate in that survey. Chi-square test was performed to test the significant difference between the two groups. A significant difference between the two groups suggests the presence of instrument effect of the baseline survey on the endline survey, leading to a need for disaggregation of the impact analysis. Thus, it is desirable to find the difference not statistically significant. Simply put, any significant difference between participants and non-participants would indicate that the groups are different due to participation in the baseline survey might have impacted on their response to endline survey.

## Results: Students

$73 \%$ of students had participated in the baseline survey conducted in 2015 and the remaining $27 \%$ of students did not. Among the two groups of students, no statistically significant difference was found (p value is greater than 0.05) between the group of students who participated and the group of students who did not participate in the baseline survey. Therefore, no participation impact is found and the two groups can be considered as homogenous for subsequent analysis.

## Result: Teachers

Among the teachers interviewed, $81.1 \%$ participated in this survey in 2015. The chi-square test of difference between the group of teachers participating in the baseline survey and the group of teachers who did not participate in the baseline survey was conducted regarding all the school disciplinary related questions. The result showed that the only three questions demonstrated significant difference.

The percentage of teachers who refused to speak to students was $0 \%$ among those not participating in the baseline survey and $7.4 \%$ among those who participated in the survey. The change is in unexpected direction. The difference was barely significant ( $p=0.049$ ). The differences in the other two questions were related to disciplinary methods and were in the expected direction. Specifically, the use of moderate physical disciplinary method was significantly lower among teachers who participated in the baseline survey than those who did not participate in the baseline survey (decrease by 11.2 percentage points for forcing students to kneel down and 23.7 percentage points for hitting students with a stick or ruler). Since only two items were different between the participants and nonparticipants in the baseline survey, the difference could be due to the decline in the use of physical violent discipline method rather that due to the impact of the instrument. If this is the case, the result warrants internal validity of the survey.

Table 1 Difference between pre- and post- surveys on school discipline: Teachers

| Items | Participation |  | Difference | Chi-Square | P Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | $\underline{\text { Yes }}$ |  |  |  |
| D10T Refused to speak to a student | 0.0 | 7.4 | -7.4 | 6.013 | 0.049 |
| D24T Forced a student to kneel down or stand in the same position for at least 15 minutes in the classroom | 12.7 | 1.5 | 11.2 | 6.688 | 0.035 |
| D28T Hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body | 35.4 | 11.8 | 23.7 | 12.806 | 0.002 |

Teaching styles and anger management items were also compared and analyzed between teachers who participated and teachers who did not participate in the baseline survey. Among them, only 4 items were found to have statistically significant differences (Table 2 below). Although the difference on these four items was statistically significant, the difference might occur due to the increase in the use of effective classroom management amongst teachers in general.

Table 2 Difference between pre- and post- surveys on teaching style and anger management: Teachers

| Comparing the percentage of students agreeing with the school discipline questions between those participating and not participating in the baseline survey (Part 1: TI1-TI32) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Items | Description | Participation |  | Difference | Chi-Square | P Value |
|  |  | No | Yes |  |  |  |
| TI17 | I actively work to make learning fun | 93.7 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 4.455 | 0.035 |
| TI28 | I asked my students to participate in writing the classroom rules | 84.8 | 97.1 | 12.3 | 6.363 | 0.012 |
| TI46 | It makes me furious when I explain something to a student again and again and they simply do not get it. | 40.5 | 25.0 | -15.5 | 3.954 | 0.047 |
| TI47 | Students will disrespect teachers if they don't fear them. | 68.4 | 35.3 | -33.1 | 16.037 | 0.000 |

In summary, there were no significant problem in using the endline survey results to assess the impact from the PDECM package.

## Annex 4. Statistical analysis over all the questions

## Demographic Characteristics

Figure 3.1 Percentage of students from poor and non-poor families


The majority of students receive scholarship (65.8\%). The percentage slightly varies by gender ( $66.8 \%$ among boys and $64.9 \%$ among girls). On the other hand, the percentage of students who are scholarship recipients (from poor families) is $34.2 \%$ ( $33.25 \%$ among boys and $35.1 \%$ among girls).

Figure 3.2 Percentage of students participating in the previous survey


Nearly three fourth of the students interviewed (73\%) did participate in the baseline study, and the percentage is higher among girls (75.8\%) than among boys (69.9\%).

## Moderate verbal discipline

Figure 4.1 Incident of moderate verbal discipline by gender


The male teachers in the experimental group who committed at least one incident of moderate verbal discipline toward student have dramatically decreased ( $67.2 \%$ to $44.8 \%$ ). On the other hand, male teachers in the control group remain high perpetration of the disciplinary method (66.7\%), showing no improvement since the baseline study (slightly $1 \%$ decrease only). On the other hand, female teachers' data show unexpected result. Female teachers in the experimental group showed the increase in at least one incident of moderate verbal discipline toward student On the other hand, female in the experimental group have dramatically decreased the usage of such method.

In regard to students, the result shows the similar changes as in teachers; a dramatic reduce in the experimental group was reported while the changes in the control groups are not significant. The positive change amongst male students in the experimental group is a decrease of moderate verbal discipline from $55.2 \%$ to $37.8 \%$, while in the control group this contradicted and increased from $55.2 \%$ to $57.6 \%$. For female students in the experimental group, it decreased nearly a half of the baseline ( $50.6 \%$ to $27.1 \%$ ) while in the control group it shows only slight decrease from $50.2 \%$ to $42 \%$.

Figure 4.2: Incident of each moderate verbal discipline question by gender: Teacher and Students Respond

Figure 4.2.1: Threatened to spank or hit to hit students but did not actually do so:


The result from the baseline was similar between female teachers and male teachers in regard to a question "threatened to spank or hit students but did not actually do so" (male $38.2 \%$ and female $39.5 \%$ ). Both male and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease of this discipline in the endline survey, male to $31 \%$ and female to $24.2 \%$. On the other hand, although male teachers in the control group showed a slight decrease ( $38.2 \%$ to $33.3 \%$ ), the result from female teachers increased from $39.5 \%$ to 57.1\%.

Likewise, both male and female students in the experimental group reported a dramatic decrease in this disciplinary method (male from $26.7 \%$ to $19.3 \%$ and female from $23.9 \%$ to 9.9\%), both male and female students in the control group remain high reporting percentage (male $25.5 \%$ and female $20.3 \%$ ). Therefore, from both teachers' view and students' view, the experimental group showed a notable decrease while the control group did not.

Figure 4.2.2: Shouted, yelled or screamed at student: Teacher and Students respond


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $48.5 \%$ of such disciplinary measure, and this decreased to $37.9 \%$ amongst the experimental male teachers. For female teachers, baseline result was $53.9 \%$ and female in the experimental group showed a huge decrease to $32.3 \%$. On the other hand, both male and female teachers in the control groups showed an increase of this disciplinary measure; male to $50 \%$ and female to $66.7 \%$.

The result was similar amongst the students; both male and female students in the experimental groups reported a decrease in this method (male from $40.1 \%$ to $20.5 \%$ and female from $36.1 \%$ to $15.5 \%$ ), while male students in the control group remained the same as baseline (40.1\%) and female in the control group showed some decrease in this method (from $36.1 \%$ to $28.6 \%$ ).

Figure 4.2.3: Refused to speak with students: Teacher and Students respond


Amongst female students, baseline was $8.6 \%$ and this goes down to $5.3 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $11.7 \%$ in the control group. On the other hand, male
students in both control and experimental groups reported an increase of the incident (control from $10.1 \%$ to $15.7 \%$ and experiment from $10.1 \%$ to $11.8 \%$ ). This could occur due to the sampling size (not all students participated in baseline study) but the teachers' using this disciplinary measure as reported by male students remained as a similar level problem between baseline and endline study.

Figure 4.2.4: Embarrassed or humiliated a student for not knowing the answer to a question or for making a mistake in class


Amongst male teachers, while baseline was $13.2 \%$, the experimental group decreased this to $6.9 \%$, while control group remain high prevalence of $11.1 \%$. Amongst female teachers, baseline was $9.2 \%$ and this decreased to $8.1 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to 9.5\% in the control group.

The similar trend is observed amongst students; both male and female students in the experimental group reported the decrease of such method in classroom. Baseline of male students was $17.4 \%$ and this decreased to $13 \%$ in the experimental group while this increased to $25.8 \%$ in the control group. As for female students, baseline was $17.6 \%$ and this decreased almost half to $8.8 \%$ in the experimental group while control group recorded only slight decrease to $14.6 \%$.

## Harsh Verbal Discipline

Figure 4.4 Incident of harsh verbal discipline by gender


When disaggregated by gender, male students are more likely to report experiencing at least one incident of harsh verbal discipline in the last 30 days than female students (male $32.3 \%$ and female 29.6\%). Similarly, male teachers are more likely thantheir female counterparts to report using harsh verbal discipline at least once in the last 30 days (male $27.9 \%$ and female $18.7 \%$ ). The students also reported the similar pattern of reduction of harsh verbal discipline in both male and female in the experimental group. Amongst male students, baseline data was $32.3 \%$, and this decreased to $28 \%$ in the experimental group but remained as high (31.8\%) in the control group. For female students, baseline was $29.6 \%$ and this decreased to $13.7 \%$ in the experimental groups while it decreased only to $22.6 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.5: Incident of each harsh verbal discipline question by gender: Teacher and Students Respond

Figure 4.5.1: Swore or cursed at students: by gender: Teacher and Students


In the baseline study, it was reported that no male teachers used a disciplinary method to "Swore or cursed at students" while $2.6 \%$ of female teachers reported having done so. The result from the endline study showed mixed and confusing result, and this may occur due to sampling error that not all teachers in the experimental group participated in the baseline study.

Amongst the male teachers, the baseline data zero\% increased to $2.8 \%$, while the result from the experimental group increased even to $3.4 \%$. Female teachers' result is also confusing, with baseline $2.6 \%$, control group decreased to zero while experimental group increased to $1.6 \%$.

Amongst students, the result was worse than reporting by teachers. The result from baseline was $9.1 \%$ amongst male students and this decreased to $8.7 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $11 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $7.9 \%$ and this decreased to $2.1 \%$ in the experimental group and the control group also shows slight decrease to $7.4 \%$

Figure 4.5.2: Called students stupid or lazy or some other name like that: Teachers and students respond


In baseline study, 20.6\% of male teachers used this method and this decreased to 6.9\% in the experimental group and it also slightly decreased to $19.4 \%$ in the control group. For female group, baseline was $13.3 \%$ and this decreased to $6.5 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $33.3 \%$ in the control group. The reduction of this method by teachers was also confirmed by students. The baseline data amongst male students was $14.2 \%$ and this decreased to $11 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $17.9 \%$ in the control group. For female students, a similar change was observed, and baseline data $13.8 \%$ was decreased to $7 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $14.9 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.5.3: Didn't allow student to join the class: Teachers and Students respond


Another harsh verbal disciplinary measure, "Didn't allow student to join the class", the experimental group showed dramatic reduction of such perpetration of such discipline. For male teachers, baseline data was $4.4 \%$, and notably this decreased to $0 \%$ in the experimental group while it slightly decreased to $2.8 \%$ in the control group. Amongst female teachers, baseline data was $6.7 \%$ and this somehow decreased to $0 \%$ in the control group and decreased to $1.6 \%$ in the experimental group.

The result from both baseline and endline studies demonstrated that students' reporting of the prevalence of this method is much higher than that of teachers. Amongst male student, baseline data was $9.9 \%$ and it decreased to $8.9 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $10.2 \%$ in the experimental experimental group, but the increase is only $0.3 \%$ within the experimental group. As for female students' baseline data was similarly high with male students; $10.8 \%$, and this decreased to $4.2 \%$ amongst female students and decreased to $8 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.5.4: Shaved or cut your hair or the hair of one of students: Teachers and Students respond


This humiliating and embarrassing act was perpetrated by both male and female teachers. The baseline data about male teachers recorded that $2.9 \%$ admitted perpetrating this act, and this decreased to $0 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $3.4 \%$ in the experimental group. Amongst female teachers, baseline data was $1.3 \%$ and this increased to $4.8 \%$ in the control group while it also slightly increased to $1.6 \%$ in the experimental group. The reporting of this harsh disciplinary method by students is much higher than that of teachers'. The baseline amongst male students was $5.6 \%$ and this increased to $9.8 \%$ in the experimental experimental group and also increased to $6.5 \%$ in the control group. Amongst female, baseline data was $3.9 \%$ and this decreased to $3.5 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $5.2 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.5.5: Economic penalty, fined students: Teachers and students respond


Amongst male teachers, baseline was $1.5 \%$ and this decreased to $0 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $5.6 \%$ in the control group. For female teachers, baseline was $2.6 \%$ and this decreased to $0 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $1.6 \%$ in the experimental group. Amongst the students, baseline data amongst male students was 6.9\% and this decreased to $3.5 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $8.6 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline data was higher than males with $10.5 \%$ reporting such incident, and this decreased to $2.1 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased to 6\% in the control group.

## Moderate Physical Discipline

Figure 4.7 Incident of moderate physical discipline by gender
At least one incident of all types of moderate physical discipline


The overall incident of moderate physical discipline is still high in endline study (Figure 4.7). However, in comparison to the baseline survey, the incident of moderate physical discipline is largely decreased as reported by teachers in the experimental group. Amongst male teachers, baseline data was $63.2 \%$ and this decreased to $41.4 \%$ in the experimental group while it remained as high as $63.9 \%$ in the control group. For female teachers, baseline was $63.2 \%$ and this decreased to $22.6 \%$ in the experimental group while it remained at high level of $57.1 \%$ in the control group.

The reporting by students about occurrence of moderate physical discipline is higher than that of teachers'. Amongst male students, baseline was $78.5 \%$ and this decreased to $50.8 \%$ in the experimental group and it also deceased to $73 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $68.3 \%$ and this decreased to $42.6 \%$ in the experimental group and decreased to $55.4 \%$ in the control groups. Therefore, except male teachers in the control group, all other groups demonstrated a decrease of moderate physical disciplinary measures in endline survey in comparison to baseline survey.

Figure 4.8: Incident of each moderate physical verbal discipline question by gender: Teacher and Students Respond

Figure 4.8.1: Slapped a student on the hand, arm or leg: Teachers and Students respond
4.8.1 Slapped a student on the hand, arm or leg: Teachers and Students respond


The baseline data amongst male teacher was $20.6 \%$ and this remained almost the same in the experimental group (20.7\%) while it slightly decreased to $19.4 \%$ in the control group. Amongst female teachers, reported occurrence of this method was higher than male teachers; baseline data was $27.6 \%$ and this decreased to $9.7 \%$ in the experimental group and slightly decreased in the control group to $23.8 \%$. The students' reporting of occurrence of this method is higher than that of teachers' and the baseline amongst male students was $30.8 \%$ and this decreased to $13.4 \%$ in the control group and it also decreased to $19.9 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline data was $27.5 \%$ and this decreased to $8.9 \%$ in the control group and it also decreased to $10.6 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 4.8.2: Hit a student on the bottom with an object like a stick or ruler: Teachers and Students respond


For male teachers, baseline was $39.7 \%$ and this decreased to $17.2 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $44.4 \%$ in the control group. As for female teachers, baseline was $43.4 \%$ and this decreased to $16.1 \%$ in the experimental group high it remained as high in the control group (42.9\%). The result from students also showed the similar changes as teachers. For male students, baseline was $40.7 \%$ and this decreased to $24.8 \%$ in the experimental group and it remained almost the same in the control group (39.5\%). For female students, baseline was $32.5 \%$ and this decreased to $15.5 \%$ in the experimental group while it remained similar to baseline in the control group (29.1\%).

Figure 4.8.3: Incident of moderate physical discipline questions: Teachers and Students


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $1.5 \%$ and this increased to $5.6 \%$ in the control group while it also increased to $3.4 \%$ in the experimental group. The female teacher's baseline data was $7.9 \%$ and this decreased to $4.8 \%$ in both experimental and control groups. In regard to students' responses, reporting of occurrence of this method is higher than in that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $22.2 \%$ and this decreased to $15.7 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $22.8 \%$ in the control group. The female students' baseline was $19.1 \%$ and this decreased to $9.9 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased in the control group to $13.1 \%$.

Figure 4.8.4: Twisted or pulled the ears, hair or joints of a student: Teachers and Students respond


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $23.5 \%$ and this decreased to $20.7 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $33.3 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline data was $23.7 \%$ and this decreased to $4.8 \%$ in the experimental group and to $9.5 \%$ in the control groups. In regard to students' response, again, reporting of occurrence
of this method is higher than that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $34.9 \%$ and this decreased to $22.0 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $32.6 \%$ in the control group. Female students, baseline was $27.2 \%$ and this decreased to $10.2 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased in the control group to $19.4 \%$.

Figure 4.8.5: Hit a student on the head with the knuckles: Teachers and Students respond


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $2.9 \%$ and this decreased to $2.8 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $6.9 \%$ in the experimental group. Noting that selection of teachers in endline survey was random, this result might have occurred. The female teacher's baseline data was $3.9 \%$ and this decreased to $1.6 \%$ in experimental group and to $0 \%$ in the control groups. In regard to students' response, again, reporting of occurrence of this method is much higher than that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $10.8 \%$ and this decreased to $6.7 \%$ in the experimental group but it also increased to $13.9 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $10.1 \%$ and this decreased to $4.2 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased in the control group to 7.1\%.

Figure 4.8.6: Asked a student to hit his/her knuckles against the table or the wall: Teachers and Students respond


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $19.1 \%$ and this decreased to $6.9 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $8.3 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline data was $22.4 \%$ and this decreased to $8.1 \%$ in the experimental group but conversely increased to $33.3 \%$ in the control groups.

In regard to students' response, again, reporting of occurrence of this method is much higher than that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $25.4 \%$ and this decreased to $13.8 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $15.7 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $21.5 \%$ and this decreased to $16.5 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased in the control group to $14.3 \%$.

Figure 4.8.6: Grabbed a student by the collar or by the neck: Teachers and Students respond


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $2.9 \%$ and this increased to $3.4 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $0 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline data was $2.6 \%$ and this decreased to $1.6 \%$ in the experimental group and decreased to $0 \%$ in the control groups. Students' reporting of occurrence of this method is much higher than that of teachers in the baseline study. Amongst male students, baseline was $4.3 \%$ and this decreased to $2.4 \%$ in the experimental group but it conversely increased to $4.5 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was 4.2 and this decreased to 2.1\% in the experimental group and also decreased in the control group to $1.7 \%$.

Figure 4.8.6: Forced a student to kneel down or stand in the same position for at least 15 minutes in the classroom: Teachers and students respond


All the categories in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in this method. The baseline data amongst male teachers was $7.4 \%$ and this decreased to $3.4 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $5.6 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline data was $17.1 \%$ and this decreased to $1.6 \%$ in the experimental group, however, it dramatically increased almost double to $33.3 \%$ in the control groups.

In regard to students' response, again, amongst male students, baseline was $11.2 \%$ and this decreased to $14.2 \%$ in the control group but it decreased to $7.1 \%$ in the experimental group. Female students, baseline was $10.1 \%$ and this decreased to $4.9 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $12.3 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.8.9: Forced a student to stand in the sun for more than 15 min: Teachers and Students respond


No male teachers reported to have done this in both baseline and endline study while 1.3\% of female teachers reported to have done this in baseline, and this decreased to $0 \%$ in endline survey in both control and experimental groups.
On the contrary, students reported to have experienced or witnessed this measure perpetrated. Amongst male students, baseline was $3.5 \%$ and this decreased to $2.8 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $6.5 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $3.3 \%$ and this decreased to $0.7 \%$ in the experimental group and decreased to $3.1 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.8.10: Forced a student to fetch water for the toilets: Teachers and Students respond


All four groups in the experimental groups showed a decrease in this method. The baseline data amongst male teachers was $13.2 \%$ and this decreased to $3.4 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $5.6 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline
data was 3.9 \% and this decreased to $0 \%$ in the experimental group, however, it dramatically increased almost triple to $9.5 \%$ in the control group. In regard to students' response, again, reporting of this incident's occurrence is much higher than that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $23.9 \%$ and this decreased to $9.4 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $27 \%$ in the control group. Female students, baseline was $18 \%$ and this decreased to $11.6 \%$ in the experimental group and also slightly increased to $15.4 \%$ in the control group.

## Harsh Physical Discipline

Figure 4.10: Incident of overall harsh physical discipline index


Positively, all four groups in the experimental groups showed a decrease in this method. The baseline data amongst male teachers was $36.8 \%$ and this decreased to $17.2 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $47.2 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline data was $32 \%$ and this decreased to $8.1 \%$ in the experimental group, however, it increased to $42.9 \%$ in the control group.

In regard to students' response, again, reporting of this incident's occurrence is much higher than that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $45 \%$ and this decreased to $33.1 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $53.1 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $40.4 \%$ and this decreased to $21.5 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $42.9 \%$ in the control group. As the students and teachers in the control groups are from the same schools, findings demonstrate that in all the schools in the control groups, harsh physical discipline had increased from baseline to endline study.

## Figure 4.11: Incident of harsh physical discipline methods: Teachers and Students

Figure 4.11.1: Slapped a student in the face: Teachers and Students respond
4.11.1 Slapped a student in the face: Teachers and Students respond


Only male teachers in the experimental group reported to have perpetrated this act and all other categories amongst teachers reported to have never done so.

On the contrary, students reported occurrence of slapping a student in a class. Amongst male students, baseline was $5.8 \%$ and this decreased to $5.1 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $7.7 \%$ in the control group. Female students, baseline was $4.2 \%$ and this decreased to $1.4 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $5.1 \%$ in the control group. Alarmingly, the reported occurrence of this method increased amongst both male and female students in the control groups, while both male and female teachers in the control group denied perpetrating this act.

Figure 4.11.2 Hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body: Teachers and Students respond
4.11.2 Hit a student with a stick or ruler on some part of the body: Teachers and Students respond


All the categories in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in this method. The baseline data amongst male teachers was $33.8 \%$ and this decreased to $17.2 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $47.2 \%$ in the control group. The female teacher's baseline data was $30.7 \%$ and this decreased to $8.1 \%$ in the experimental group, however,
it also increased to $42.9 \%$ in the control groups. The students' responses showed a similar result; both male and female students in the control groups reported an increase of this method. Amongst male students, baseline was $39.7 \%$ and this decreased to $28.3 \%$ in the experimental group but it increased to $48.1 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $36.7 \%$ and this decreased to $19 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $38 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.11.3: Threw or knocked a student down: Teachers and Students respond


Again, reporting of the occurrence of this method is much higher amongst students. The baseline data amongst male teachers was $2.9 \%$ and female teachers was $1.3 \%$ and these decreased to $0 \%$ in all groups of the endline study.

On the contrary, the students' responses showed very different result; amongst male students, baseline was $9.9 \%$ and this decreased to $3.1 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $6.2 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $7.7 \%$ and this decreased to $1.1 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased to $2.9 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 4.11.4: Hit a student with a fist or kicked hard: Teachers and Students respond


No female teachers reported to have done this in both baseline and endline study while $3.4 \%$ of male teachers in the experimental group in endline survey reported to have done this. As not all teachers in the experimental groups in endline survey attended the PDECM training course, such a result was possible. On the contrary, students reported to have experienced or witnessed this disciplinary method perpetrated. Amongst male students, baseline was $5.6 \%$ and this decreased to $2.4 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased to $4.7 \%$ in the control group. For female students, baseline was $3.9 \%$ and this decreased to $1.1 \%$ in the experimental group and decreased to $3.4 \%$ in the control group.

## Severe Physical Discipline

Figure 4.13 Incident of severe physical discipline index


The overall index of severe physical discipline is measured as the percentage of at least one incident of any of the three types. Interestingly, none of the teachers reported to have perpetrated this kind of punishment to their students. Nevertheless, a small number of students reported to have experienced such punishment from their teachers (4.6\% among boys and $3.2 \%$ among girls). The discrepancy in the report between teachers and students suggests caution in use of this finding. Further investigation is needed for data validation, especially among students who reported so.

The baseline data amongst male teachers was $1.5 \%$ and female was $0 \%$, and this decreased to $0 \%$ in both the control group and in the experimental group.

In regard to students' responses, reporting of occurrence of severe physical discipline is higher than that of teachers. Amongst male students, baseline was $3.5 \%$ and this increased to $6.5 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $2 \%$ in the control group. The female students' baseline was $2.4 \%$ and this decreased to $1.8 \%$ in the experimental group but increased in the control group to $4.3 \%$.

Figure 4.14 Incident of severe physical discipline methods: Students
Figure 4.14.1: Beat you or one of your classmates up


In regard to a question, "beat you or one of your classmates up", amongst male students, baseline was $1.7 \%$ and this decreased to $1.6 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $4.7 \%$ in the control group. The female students' baseline was $1.8 \%$ and this decreased to $1.1 \%$ in the experimental group but increased in the control group to $3.4 \%$.

Figure 4.14.2: Grabbed you or one of your classmates around the neck and choked you or your classmate


Amongst male students, baseline was $0.9 \%$ and this decreased to $0.8 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $1.5 \%$ in the control group. The female students' baseline was $0.7 \%$ and this decreased to $0 \%$ in the experimental group and decreased in the control group to $0.6 \%$.

Figure 4.14.3: Burned or scaled you or one of your classmates on purpose


Amongst male students, baseline was $2.2 \%$ and this decreased to $0.8 \%$ in the experimental group and it also decreased to $2.1 \%$ in the control group. The female students' baseline was $1.1 \%$ and this decreased to $0.7 \%$ in the experimental group and decreased in the control group to $0.9 \%$.

## Attitudes towards Violent and Non-violent Discipline Methods in Schools

Figure 5.1 Teachers' agreement with attitude questions about violence discipline

Figure 5.1.1: Students will disrespect teachers if they don't fear them


The baseline data amongst male teachers was $52.9 \%$ and this increased to $63.9 \%$ in the control group while it decreased to $31 \%$ in the experimental group. The female teacher's baseline data was $47.4 \%$ and this decreased to $48.4 \%$ in the experimental group while it increased to $76.2 \%$ in the control groups.

Figure 5.1.2: If you give children too much freedom and space you will spoil them


The baseline amongst male teacher was $58.8 \%$ and this increased to $61.1 \%$ in the control group while it decreased to $44.8 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, the result also showed a similar change, with baseline $52 \%$ and this increased to $61.9 \%$ in the control group and it decreased to $50 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 5.1.3: Sometimes nothing else works. Schools/teachers need corporal punishment as a last resort.


Responding to "the need of corporal punishment" question, both male and female teachers in the experimental group decreased the percentage to agree on this statement. The baseline was $30.9 \%$ and this decreased to $11.1 \%$ in the control group and also decreased in the experimental group to $13.8 \%$. For female teachers, baseline was $19.7 \%$ and this increased to $33.3 \%$ in the control group while decreased in the experimental group to $16.1 \%$.

Figure 5.2: Teachers' agreement with attitude questions about violence discipline

Figure 5.2.1: Corporal punishment is part of the Cambodian culture and tradition.


For male teacher, the belief "corporal punishment is part of the Cambodian culture and tradition", the baseline data was $25 \%$ and this decreased to 2.8 in the control group and also decreased to $10.3 \%$ in the experimental group. As for female teachers, baseline was (10.3\%) are decreased significantly. Indeed, both control (9.5\%) and experiment (11.3\%) of female also narrow down positively compare to its baseline (20\%).

Figure 5.2.2: There is a big difference between serious violence and corporal punishment. Corporal punishment is not dangerous, causes little pain and cannot be called child abuse


There was different view between male and female teacher response about the statement of "There is a big difference between serious violence and corporal punishment." The baseline data with male teacher was $26.5 \%$ while there was 40.8 per cent from female teachers. For male teachers, this decreased to $13.8 \%$ in the experimental group but increased to $30.6 \%$, and for female teachers, it decreased to $19.4 \%$ in the experimental group and also decreased to $38.1 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 5.2.3: My generation was beaten at school, it taught us how to behave better


For male teacher, the baseline data was $32.4 \%$ and this increased to $50 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $41.4 \%$ in the experimental group. As for female teachers, the baseline was $26.7 \%$ and this increased to $61.9 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $47.5 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 5.3 Teachers' agreement with attitude questions about non-violent discipline

Figure 5.3.1: Corporal punishment is child abuse


An overwhelming majority of male teachers in the experimental group (almost 90\%) agree that corporal punishment is a child abuse. The baseline for male teachers was $80.6 \%$ and this decreased to $75 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $89.7 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teacher, the baseline data was $64 \%$ and this increased to $90.5 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $74.2 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 5.3.2: Explaining why something is wrong is a better way of teaching a child than using corporal punishment


Across all the categories, both male and female teachers agreed on this statement. The baseline with male teachers was $94.1 \%$ and this increased to $97.2 \%$ in the control group while it slightly decreased to $93.1 \%$ in the experimental group. On the other hand, female teachers' baseline was $92.1 \%$ and this increased to $95.2 \%$ in the control group but it again slightly decreased to $91.9 \%$ in the experimental group. However, as not all the teachers in the experimental group attended the PDECM training course, and the difference (decrease) is minor, it is not negative result but rather the training did not influence the understanding of this concept over the participating teachers.

Figure 5.3.2: Children have the right not to be punished psychically and psychologically in school


The majority of both male and female teacher in the experimental groups increased their agreement to this statement. The baseline with male teachers was $94 \%$ and this decreased to $91.7 \%$ in the control group but increased to $96 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, baseline was $85.3 \%$ and this increased to $100 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $91.7 \%$ in the experimental group.

## Teaching Styles and Anger Management

Figure 6.1 Percentage of teachers agreeing with traditional teaching style
Figure 6.1.1: In my class I ask my students to copy what I write on the blackboard


More than 90 per cent of teachers use traditional methods of teaching in the baseline: $100 \%$ of male teachers and $92.1 \%$ of female teachers asked students to copy what they wrote on the backboard. Amongst male teachers, this decreased to $97.2 \%$ in the control group while it remained the same (100\%) in the experimental group. On the other hand, female teachers in both groups showed a slight increase of a traditional method; $95.2 \%$ in the control group and $95.2 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 6.1.2: In my class I ask my students to repeat after me for most of the class


The next question was "In my class I ask my students to repeat after me for most of the class". Again, both male and female teachers in the experimental group increased the usage of the traditional method. The baseline with male teacher was $91.2 \%$ and this decreased to $88.9 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $96.6 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, baseline was $94.7 \%$ and this increased to $95.2 \%$ in the control group an also increased to $95.2 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 6.2 Percentage of teachers agreeing with participatory teaching style
Figure 6.2.1: My class has a suggestion box so my students can share their ideas about the lessons


The baseline of male teachers was $52.2 \%$ and this decreased to $50 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $55.2 \%$ in the experimental group. Amongst female teachers, baseline was $36 \%$ and this increased to $47.6 \%$ in the control group while it decreased to $30.6 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 6.2.2: I regularly take the slow learners in my class separately to explain the lesson to them in more detail


Both male and female teachers in the experimental group reported the increase of this method. Amongst male teachers, baseline was $39.7 \%$ and this increased to $44.4 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $55.2 \%$ in the experimental group. Amongst female teachers, baseline was $48 \%$ and this decreased to $38.1 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $46.8 \%$ in the experimental group.

The next section shows the results from three questions in regard to teacher's anger management. Anger management means how to cope with anger, keep one's temper and express one's anger. Despite the positive change observed across the categories, the findings suggest that anger management has room to improve among these teachers.

The first question amongst three was "I feel furious when I do a good job and students do not give a value to $\mathrm{it}^{\prime \prime}$.

Figure 6.3 Percentage of teachers agreeing with anger management statements

Figure 6.3.1: It makes me furious when I do a good job and students do not give value to it


The baseline of male teachers was $77.9 \%$ and this decreased to $69.4 \%$ in the control group and decreased to $69.4 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, baseline as $80.3 \%$ and this decreased to $61.9 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $58.1 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 6.3.2: I get angry when students do not respect me


Across all four categories in the endline survey, a decrease is recorded. The baseline with male teachers was $80.9 \%$ and this decreased to $69.4 \%$ in the control group while it decreased to $75.9 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, baseline was $77.6 \%$ and this slightly decreased to $76.2 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $62.9 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 6.3.3: It makes me furious when I explain something to a student again and again and they simply do not get it


Both male and female teachers in the experimental group demonstrated a decrease in agreeing with this statement. The baseline with male teachers was $73.5 \%$ and this increased to $75 \%$ in the control group while it decreased to $69 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, baseline was $69.7 \%$ and this decreased to $66.7 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $59.7 \%$ in the experimental group.

## Relationships in Schools

## Figure 7.1 Percentage of students agreeing with student-teacher relationship statements

Figure 7.1.1: I like my teacher


Amongst male students, baseline was $99.4 \%$ and this decreased to $97.9 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $100 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $99.8 \%$ and this slightly decreased to $99.4 \%$ in the control group but increased to $100 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.1.2: $M y$ teacher is a good role model


Amongst male students, baseline was $97.3 \%$ and this slightly increased to $97.3 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $98.8 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $99.3 \%$ and this slightly decreased to $98.6 \%$ in the control group but increased to $100 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.1.3: If I have a problem I feel free to ask help from my teacher


Amongst male students, baseline was $91.6 \%$ and this increased to $95.0 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $97.6 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $95 \%$ and this increased to $97.1 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $96.5 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.1.4: I feel encouraged by my teacher to study


Amongst male students, baseline was $97.4 \%$ and this decreased to $95.5 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $97.6 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $97.8 \%$ and this slightly decreased to $97.7 \%$ in the control group but increased to $98.9 \%$ in the experimental group.

## Figure 7.2 Percentage of students agreeing with student-student

 relationship statementsFigure 7.2.1: Students in my class are kind and supportive of one another


The first question was "students in my class are kind and supportive of one another" and more than $95 \%$ of both male and female students in the experimental group agreed on this statement. Amongst male students, baseline was $92 \%$ and this increased to $93.8 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $97.6 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $95.4 \%$ and this also increased to $97.1 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $96.5 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.2.2: Students in my class stop other students who are unfair or disruptive


Although both male and female students in the experimental groups increased the percentage to agree on this statement but it still remain below $80 \%$ in both groups. Amongst male students, baseline was $72.3 \%$ and this increased to $73 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $81.1 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $74.3 \%$ and this increased to $76.3 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $77.1 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.2.3: Students in my class respectfully listen to each other during class discussions


More than $90 \%$ students across all four categories in the endline survey agreed on this statement. Amongst male students, baseline was $89.7 \%$ and this increased to $90.5 \%$ in the control group and it also increased to $94.1 \%$ in the experimental group. The female
students' baseline was $92.7 \%$ and this increased to $93.1 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $91.3 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.2.4: easily make friends at my school


More than $95 \%$ of both male and female students in the experimental group in the endline survey agreed on this. Amongst male students, baseline was $93.3 \%$ and this decreased to $91.4 \%$ in the control group but it increased to $95.7 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $96.3 \%$ and this also decreased as of males to $94.3 \%$ in the control group but increased to $95.8 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.2.5: I feel close to other students in my class


More than $95 \%$ of both male and female students in the experimental group agreed on this. Amongst male students, baseline was $95 \%$ and this decreased to $91.4 \%$ in the control
group but increased to $96.5 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $97.2 \%$ and this also decreased as of males to $94.6 \%$ in the control group and decreased to $95.4 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 7.3 Percentage of teachers agreeing with teacher-teacher relationship statements

Figure 7.3.1: I enjoy being a teacher at my school


Except male teachers in the control group, all others agreed on this statement in both baseline and endline survey. Only male teachers in the control group in the endline survey decreased from 100\% to 97.2\%.

Figure 7.3.2: I feel supported by the school management


The next question was "I feel supported by the school management" and all the teachers answered yes $100 \%$ to this question.

Figure 7.3.3: I feel connected and close to the other teachers


The question was "I feel connected and close to the other teachers" and all the teachers answered yes $100 \%$ to this question.

Figure 7.3.4: I feel treated with respect by my students


The final question in this section was " $I$ feel treated with respect by my students" and all the teachers in endline survey answered yes $100 \%$ to this question. Only a slight change was amongst male teachers; baseline data was $98.5 \%$ and in endline survey both the control and the experimental group agreed $100 \%$ to this answer.

## Child Protection in Schools

Figure 8.1 School directors' assessment of child protection issues in school
Figure 8.1.1: You have a written child protection policy in your school to make sure that the children are kept safe from harm. This policy prohibits all forms of violence against children.


The baseline data was $95.8 \%$ for the answer "not in place" and this decreased to $83.3 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $58.3 \%$ in the experimental group. On the other hand, to the answer "yes, in place", the baseline was $4.2 \%$ and it dramatically increased to $41.7 \%$ in the experimental group and it also increased to $8.3 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 8.1.2: Your school has clear written child protection procedures in place that provide step-by-step guidance for all members of the school on what action to take if there are concerns about a child's safety or welfare


The next question was "Your school has clear written child protection procedure in place" indicators of child protection mechanisms are not yet in place. The answer was exactly the same as the previous question, indicating that the policy and the measures are developed at the same time. The baseline data was $95.8 \%$ for the answer "not in place" and this decreased to $83.3 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $58.3 \%$ in the experimental group. The same as the previous question, to the answer "yes, in place", the baseline was 4.2\% and it dramatically increased to $41.7 \%$ in the experimental group and it also increased to $8.3 \%$ in the control group.

Figure 8.1.3: Your school has a designated "child protection focal point" with clear defined role and responsibilities


The baseline was that there was no school that had such a focal point but the experimental group took a positive step to assign someone. To the answer, "no, not in place", the baseline was $100 \%$ and this remained the same $100 \%$ in the control group. On the other hand, $16.7 \%$ of the experimental group took an action and "partially done" and $16.7 \%$ in the experimental group already assigned someone to be a focal point. Therefore even though a progress is limited, there is a clear difference between the control group and the experimental group in outcome from the PDECM training.

Figure 8.2 Students' assessment of child protection issues in school
Figure 8.2.1: I feel safe and protected at my school


Amongst male students, baseline was $98.9 \%$ and this decreased to $96.4 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $96.5 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $98.7 \%$ and this also decreased as of males to $97.7 \%$ in the control group but slightly increased to $98.9 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 8.2.2: There is a teacher in the school I can trust


Amongst male students, baseline was $98.3 \%$ and this decreased to $94.4 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $96.5 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was $98.2 \%$ and this also decreased as of males to $95.1 \%$ in the control group but remained the same ( $98.2 \%$ ) in the experimental group.

The next question is "there is a teacher in the school I would share personal problems with".

Figure 8.2.3: There is a teacher in the school I would share personal problems with


Amongst male students, baseline was $70.1 \%$ and this increased to $80.1 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $85.4 \%$ in the experimental group. The female students' baseline was slightly higher than that of males with $75.8 \%$ and this increased to $79.1 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $84.5 \%$ in the experimental group.

## Figure 8.3 Teachers' assessment of child protection issues in school

Figure 8.3.1: Does the school have a code of ethics that includes detailed guidelines describing to teachers and school staff what behaviour is acceptable and unacceptable in their relationships and contact with children?


The baseline amongst male teachers was $82.4 \%$ for the answer "yes" and this increased to $97.2 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $89.7 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, the baseline was $93.3 \%$ for the answer "yes" and this decreased to $85.7 \%$ in the control group but increased to $95.2 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 8.3.2: Are the consequences of breaking the guidelines on behavior clearly written in the code of ethics and linked to disciplinary procedures?


The baseline amongst male teachers was $83.6 \%$ for the answer "yes" and this increased to $77.8 \%$ in the control group and also decreased to $62.1 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, the baseline was $85.3 \%$ for the answer "yes" and this decreased to $71.4 \%$ in the control group but increased to $80.6 \%$ in the experimental group.

Figure 8.3.3: Does your school have clear written child protection procedures in place that provide step-by-step guidance for all members of the school on what action to take if there are concerns about a child's safety or welfare?


The baseline amongst male teachers was $70.6 \%$ for the answer "yes" and this decreased to $69.4 \%$ in the control group but increased to $82.8 \%$ in the experimental group. For female teachers, the baseline was 68\% for the answer "yes" and this decreased to 61.9\% in the control group but increased to $85.5 \%$ in the experimental group.

## School Rules and Participation in Schools

Figure 9.1 Directors' assessment of school rules and participation in writing them

Figure 9.1.1: You have a code of conduct for students that describes what behaviour is acceptable and unacceptable in their relationships with teachers and peers


To the answer, "no, not in place", the baseline was $70.8 \%$ and this decreased to $58.3 \%$ in the control group while it increased to $75 \%$ in the experimental group. On the contrary, "yes in place" for the baseline was $20.8 \%$ and this decreased to $16.7 \%$ in both the control and the experimental groups. The reason of why the number of schools that took away the code of conduct is unknown, however, the result shows that there had been no progress in formulating a code of conduct.

Figure 9.1.2: Students have participated in the development of the student code of conduct


The baseline was $100 \%$ for the answer "no" and this remained the same ( $100 \%$ ) in the control group but decreased to $83.3 \%$ in the experimental group. Thus, as a result $16.7 \%$ schools in the experimental group took an initiative to engage students in formulating the code. This results is the same as Figure 9.1.1 above, therefore, all the schools ( 2 out of 12 schools) that developed a code applied the student's participatory methods in formulating the code.

Figure 9.1.3: At your school there are classroom rules for each class


To the answer, "no, not in place", the baseline was $83.3 \%$ and this decreased to $41.7 \%$ in the control group and it also decreased to $50 \%$ in the experimental group. On the contrary, "yes in place" for the baseline was $12.5 \%$ and this increased to $25 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $33 \%$ in the experimental group. In regard to the answer "partially done", baseline was $4.2 \%$ and this increased to $33.3 \%$ in the control group and increased to $16.7 \%$ in the experimental group therefore more schools have taken some steps to equip the class room rules.

Figure 9.1.4: Students and teachers establish these classroom rules together


The baseline was $87.5 \%$ for the answer "no" and this remained high (83.3\%) in the control group but decreased to $66.7 \%$ in the experimental group. The baseline for the answer "yes" was $8.3 \%$ and this increased to $16.7 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $33.3 \%$ in the experimental group. This result is the same as Figure 9.1.3 above in regard to school rules therefore all the schools (4 out of 12 schools) that developed a class room rule applied the student's participatory methods in formulating the rule.

## Figure 9.2 Directors assessment of participation of school support committee, parents, teachers, and students

The section is asking about the school support system. Regarding the committees, the majority of schools reported to have school support committee (91.7\%) and also students' council (87.5\%) and. However, less than one third of schools (29.2\%) have established
parent-teacher associations and only one school is working to establish this association, while $66.7 \%$ of schools do not have the association.

Figure 9.2.1: The school has a school support committee


The first question was about the school support committee. The baseline was $91.7 \%$ for the answer "yes in place" and this remained the same (91.7\%) in both the control and experimental group. Remaining schools (8.3\%) in both control and experimental groups already took an initiative to establish a committee. No school replied "not in place".

Figure 9.2.2: The school has a students' council


The second question was about the student's council. The baseline was $91.7 \%$ for the answer "yes in place" and this remained the same (91.7\%) in both the control and experimental group. Remaining schools (8.3\%) in both control and experimental groups already took an initiative to establish a council. No school replied "not in place".

Figure 9.2.3: The school has parent teacher association


The final question in this category was about teacher association. The baseline was $83.3 \%$ for the answer "no not in place" and this decreased to $66.7 \%$ in both the control and experimental groups. One school (8.3\%) in the control group took an initiative to establish one. For the answer "Yes", baseline was $16.7 \%$ and this increased to $25 \%$ in the control group and also increased to $33.3 \%$ in the experimental group.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This Guide is designed primarily for District Training and Monitoring Teams as a tool book for those providing training to school leaders and school teachers.
    ${ }^{2}$ This Guide is primarily designed for school directors as well as others in school leadership positions.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Simultaneously, with technical support from UNICEF, the in-service teacher training package has been rolled out in 160 more primary schools in the three target provinces. Over the 2015-16 school year, training was provided for a total of 1,608 teachers and 265 school directors in 172 primary schools, which impacted 51,000 students.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intra family conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family 41 (1): 75-88. doi:10.2307/351733.
    ${ }^{5}$ Frick, P. J. (1991). Alabama parenting questionnaire. University of Alabama.
    ${ }^{6}$ UNICEF (2010). Child disciplinary practices at home. Evidence from a range of low- and middle-income countries. Division of Policy and Practices.
    ${ }^{7}$ It is important to note two questions on sexual violence in school were excluded from the end-line survey questionnaire due to their sensitivity and data validity, as experienced with the baseline survey
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[^3]:    ${ }^{10}$ http://childhelpline.org.kh/

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ Three questionnaire sheets were excluded from the data analysis because those contained some missing answers and were therefore not valid.
    12 Total number of students in grade 5 and grade 6 is only 1,223 because one student missed putting his/her grade in the questionnaire. The questionnaire filled by the student was used for data analysis as all questions were answered except for the grade.

[^5]:    ${ }^{13}$ The selection of teacher interviewees was randomly done.

[^6]:    ${ }^{14}$ It is important to note two questions on sexual violence in school were excluded from the endline survey questionnaire due to their sensitivity and data validity, as experienced with the baseline survey

[^7]:    ${ }^{15}$ Using an object to hit a student is no doubt unacceptable act, however, it could have been a very light blow which can be similar to the act "Hit a student" categorized in moderate physical discipline.

[^8]:    ${ }^{16}$ The baseline data in this report was re-analyzed and cleaned up, and the result of this process generated slightly different data from the baseline report, but there is no major difference.

[^9]:    ${ }^{17}$ One assumption could be that the PDECM package impacted those teachers who attended it (the experimental group) and they started to pay more attention to the child protection issues in schools. Therefore, when they carefully considered the meanings of this questions, they might have chosen the correct answer (which was negative) and this was overlooked in the baseline.

[^10]:    ${ }^{18}$ The SPSS analysis was conducted only against disciplinary measures, because that is an area of the most visible and actual changes in attitudes were identified. Also, other than disciplinary measures, collected data under each category was small (3-5 items) and it cannot prove statistical accuracy if the sample number is so small.
    ${ }^{19}$ Severe physical discipline was not analysed because the baseline was almost $0 \%$ and this remained as $0 \%$ in the endline.

[^11]:    ${ }^{20}$ However, problematically, this only one negative result ("Refused to talk to a student") was found amongst the male and female teachers in the experimental group.

[^12]:    ${ }^{21}$ Only one item "My generation was beaten at school and it taught us to behave better" was, in comparison to baseline, more agreed by both the control and the experimental group. However,

[^13]:    this statement is rather a reflection, and less than half of them agreed in the experimental group. If teachers were taught a new teaching methods that required additional efforts and patience, it is rather to be expected that they reflect their past in a positive way because they could simply use violence to educate a student. Thus, the increase of agreement to this item should not be understood as undermine the result from the PDECM training.

[^14]:    ${ }^{22}$ Child Helpline Cambodia: http://childhelpline.org.kh/home/information/your-rights/

