Learning about norm change in girls’ education in low- and middle-income contexts

Lessons from the Girls’ Education Challenge (GEC) Fund
Key messages

- **GEC projects identified norms limiting girls’ ability to enrol, attend and learn in school.** These include their roles in the family, where they are expected to support housework and marry young, and in school, where they lack equal opportunities to participate in class. Girls in some communities are discouraged from attending school as their education is not sufficiently valued.

- **GEC projects aimed to change these norms by targeting the community, parents, teachers, and girl and boy students.** Interventions included clubs and mentoring activities for girls, while parents were reached through awareness-raising activities, such as household visits and parent groups. Teachers were reached mostly through training, community members through media campaigns, and traditional leaders through consultations and sensitisation.

- **The work with teachers proved particularly effective in improving education outcomes.** Teachers – particularly female teachers – are positive role models for girls and can improve their motivation and self-esteem. This, in turn, enhances attendance and learning.

- **Changing gender norms is difficult and time-consuming.** Projects reported more success in minimising the impact of norms on girls’ education than in changing those norms. In addition, changes may not take hold: gender norms are slow to change and need continued reinforcement.

- **Gender norm change needs to be matched by systemic investments in education.** Training teachers, providing quality infrastructure, and supplying learning materials are crucial for better education outcomes.
Methodology

The brief looks at whether and how changes in gender norms have improved education outcomes in GEC projects. We use ALIGN’s definition of gender norms to answer the following research questions:

- What social and gender norms were identified in GEC projects as limiting girls’ (and boys’, where applicable) ability to enrol, attend, and learn in school?
- What are the different activities through which GEC projects have tried to address discriminatory gender norms? Who have been the target groups for activities? What can we learn about how to mitigate and overcome discriminatory gender norms?
- What have been the main challenges and enabling factors when attempting to overcome discriminatory gender norms?

This desk study selected 21 projects that received GEC funding. All selected projects targeted barriers related to discriminatory gender norms, with at least one activity, or component, addressing them. However, the extent to which gender norms featured explicitly in projects’ designs varied.

We then conducted an in-depth document review of baseline, mid-line and endline external evaluation reports submitted by these projects as part of the GEC evaluation, as well as evaluation reports produced by Coffey. These reports were reviewed systematically, using a tool we designed to classify gender norms and activities according to the gender norm (such as early marriage or housework commitments) and type of activity (such as girls’ clubs or household visits). We triangulated our findings with raw quantitative data submitted by projects to Coffey during the GEC evaluation, which we re-analysed.

We identified 10 gender norms that act as barriers to educational outcomes for girls:

1. perceptions of girls’ education as inappropriate or irrelevant
2. early marriage and pregnancy
3. housework commitments
4. working outside the home
5. girls’ lack of aspirations or motivation
6. corporal punishment
7. religious or traditional concerns
8. gender-based violence and harassment
9. teacher bias against girls
10. rites of passage.

We also identified four groups of people that perpetuate the norms – and which are targeted by project activities:

1. communities
2. households
3. schools
4. peers (girls or boys).

Projects targeted barriers related to discriminatory gender norms, though often only indirectly through project activities. Given that the GEC’s main aim was to improve girls’ education outcomes rather than change gender norms, there was no consistent data collection or analysis on the latter. More broadly, projects did not always collect or present specific data by activity, so it was not possible to attribute norm change to one activity. Finally, this brief draws largely on project evaluation reports that were not verified independently by the authors, and so findings are based on the reported barriers and the effects of activities on them.

The GEC supported projects in three funding windows: i) Step Change Window (SCW), where projects were awarded funding of up to £30 million each to scale up successful interventions with a demonstrated impact on educational outcomes; ii) Innovation Window (IW), where projects were awarded up to £2 million funding to test new approaches to enable marginalised girls to improve educational outcomes; and iii) Strategic Partnerships Window (SPW), which supported partnerships between private sector partners and DFID, with a total budget of up to £27 million.
Findings

Gender norms that prevent girls from getting a quality education

Social and gender norms often limit the ability of girls to enrol, attend and do well in school. In many of the contexts we studied, and for many reasons, the education of girls is not valued as highly as that of boys. Parents, teachers and community members do not always believe girls need an education or expect them to do well in school or to work in the future. In some cases, the jobs considered appropriate for women are not seen as needing education, such as weaving and carpet-making in Afghanistan. In other cases, as seen in some communities in Kenya, educating girls is perceived to make them less ‘marriageable’.

Girls and women are seen as caregivers, with marriage often taking priority over education. Girls are expected to marry and have children while young, and to drop out of school in readiness, or once that happens. In Mozambique, for example, parental fears that girls will become sexually active and pregnant in school through contact with boys and male teachers lead to high adolescent drop-out rates. In the Afar region of Ethiopia, the tradition of absuma (arranged marriage between a girl and her maternal cousin), reflects parental fears of girls getting pregnant outside marriage, which leads them to keep girls out of school after puberty. Here, marriage is seen as a way to maintain clanship and family ties, with pregnancy outside marriage perceived as shameful for the entire family.

In many contexts targeted by GEC projects, pregnancy can also stigmatise girls who may try to return to school after giving birth – whether through discriminatory school policies that do not allow their return, or social segregation at school and concerns that young mothers are a ‘bad influence’ for other girls.

In very conservative societies, girls’ school attendance is seen as ‘shameful’ and at odds with religious teaching or tradition. In Afghanistan, for example, parents often view their attendance – and the resulting contact with boys and male teachers – as a dishonour, especially after they reach puberty. In some Somali communities, girls’ education is sometimes viewed as contradicting Sharia law. Some Christian groups in Zimbabwe, such as the Apostolic Sect, place more value on girls’ marriage than on education, which means girls tend to drop out at puberty.

Across all contexts in this study, girls are required to spend much time on household chores and caring for sick or elderly family members, or younger siblings. For example, girls are often responsible for fetching water or firewood, which can be very time-consuming and leaves them little time to study. This leaves girls doubly disadvantaged and at greater risk of repeating grades or dropping out of school – a finding that mirrors other research by Lyon et al. (2013), Dreibelbis et al., (2013), Nankhuni and Findeis (2004) and Nauges and Strand (2013).

Several project locations included in this study are affected by conflict. Here, security and mobility implications are often highly gendered, with girls at increased risk of violence. In South Sudan, inter-clan violence results in sexual violence and forced marriage: in the tradition of ‘consoling the family’ a girl is sent to a family to marry the brother or cousin of a man who has died in conflict.

Few projects examined the impact of traditional rituals and harmful cultural practices on girls, though these are common in some project areas. In some rural communities in Mozambique, when girls reach puberty, they face initiation ceremonies to prepare for womanhood and marriage. This not only leads to their immediate absenteeism, but sometimes also to their loss of interest in school due to expectations of marriage. Projects in Kenya and Somalia, however, discussed how female genital mutilation (FGM) ceremonies are often held during the school term, leading girls to miss classes (both during the ceremony and in the immediate aftermath).

---

2 While several countries in sub-Saharan Africa have policies to re-admit girls to school who have given birth (e.g., Botswana, Kenya, Malawi, South Africa and Zambia), others do not. Even where policies exist, there may be limited uptake: girls are often expected to take a break of at least one year from schooling, and may be discouraged from returning to the same school and/or face discrimination or a lack of support on return (Human Rights Watch, 2018). In South Africa, legislation forbids the exclusion of pregnant girls, but only about one-third return after childbirth. Many returning girls face negative attitudes and practices from teachers that impact on their schooling experiences (Bhana et al., 2010).
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Teachers’ views on gender roles, their teaching practices and the way they treat girls at school can damage girls’ participation and learning outcomes. In some school settings, as reported by projects in Ethiopia and Somalia, teachers often expect girls to not participate in class or do well in their studies, believing, for example, that boys work harder or that their education is more important. They may involve girls less in class, assuming they will leave school early. Girls internalise such attitudes to their education and can lose their motivation. They may often be quiet in class, especially in front of boys, and too shy to participate. Classroom dynamics, and the role of teachers in these dynamics, are shown in Box 1.

School violence – whether verbal, physical or sexual – perpetrated by pupils, teachers or community members, is a major barrier to gender equality in education (Leach et al. 2012). There is also growing recognition that it reflects and reinforces underlying gender norms and inequality, such as those perpetuated through curricula, textbooks, pedagogies and management structures (Unterhalter et al., 2014). A growing body of gender-disaggregated data demonstrates that corporal punishment is often highly gendered in practice, with qualitative research revealing its pivotal role in enforcing gender norms in schools (UNESCO 2015, 2017; Tao, 2015).

Box 1: Teachers are central in addressing gender norms in school

GEC projects included in our study identified two main barriers affecting girls’ learning in class:

• girls who are too shy to speak up and participate, even when something is not clear
• negative stereotypes that teachers have about girls’ learning behaviours, leading them to make little effort to involve girls or adapt to their learning needs.

Teacher bias is sometimes unintentional: in two of the projects we studied, teachers assumed girls and boys had similar learning needs in the classroom and did not adapt their teaching styles or content. To overcome this, GEC projects delivered two main activities:

• creating ‘safe spaces’ for girls to receive one-to-one learning support, often from mentors or female teachers
• changing the behaviour of teachers in the classroom, to make it a more inclusive environment for girls.

Projects often referred to the lack of role models to inspire girls. Girls were frequently reported as feeling uncomfortable speaking up in front of boys or male teachers, restricting their participation in class and hindering their learning. Having role models – especially females – helped motivate girls, increase their engagement in class and reduce dropout. Across nine projects included in our study, the combination of academic and personal support was reported as effective. It was found to give girls the confidence to speak up and participate fully in class. In Afghanistan, for example, BRAC reported improvements in their self-confidence through peer mentoring and one-to-one support. The final evaluation found significant improvements in numeracy and literacy for girls with mentors, compared to those without. Qualitative evidence suggests that mentors encourage their learning and help girls to do their homework and to catch up when they have missed class.

Gender-biased teaching methods can also harm girls’ participation and learning. Teachers sometimes held negative stereotypes about girls’ learning behaviours, seeing them as lazy or not interested in schoolwork. These stereotypes may lower their expectations of girls, leading them to prioritise boys, who they see as more hardworking or able to do well. Girls may then become even more discouraged. This is often because teachers lack the skills to use gender-sensitive teaching methods. In the locations targeted by the GEC, teacher training is often limited, and does not cover gender dynamics or issues. In the Discovery project in Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria, training on student-centred and gender-sensitive methods resulted in teachers using gender-equitable language and learning materials, and assigning classroom duties equally to boys and girls. These gender-sensitive and student-centred practices were, in turn, associated with higher learning scores.

Teachers’ views on gender roles, their teaching practices and the way they treat girls at school can damage girls’ participation and learning outcomes. In some school settings, as reported by projects in Ethiopia and Somalia, teachers often expect girls not to participate in class or do well in their studies, believing, for example, that boys work harder or that their education is more important. They may involve girls less in class, assuming they will leave school early. Girls internalise such attitudes to their education and can lose their motivation. They may often be quiet in class, especially in front of boys, and too shy to participate. Classroom dynamics, and the role of teachers in these dynamics, are shown in Box 1.

School violence – whether verbal, physical or sexual – perpetrated by pupils, teachers or community members, is a major barrier to gender equality in education (Leach et al. 2012). There is also growing recognition that it reflects and reinforces underlying gender norms and inequality, such as those perpetuated through curricula, textbooks, pedagogies and management structures (Unterhalter et al., 2014). A growing body of gender-disaggregated data demonstrates that corporal punishment is often highly gendered in practice, with qualitative research revealing its pivotal role in enforcing gender norms in schools (UNESCO 2015, 2017; Tao, 2015).

Gender norms and stereotypes are reinforced by school rules or practices that assign tasks such as sweeping and collecting water solely to girls, as seen in Malawi (Kendall, 2006).
Targeting norm change: interventions and key groups

Within each location, GEC projects worked with different target groups, often through several activities, as follows:

- Community members, including traditional leaders and village elders
- Parents
- Teachers and school groups, such as parent-teacher associations (PTAs)
- Peers, including girl and boy students.

Projects used specific strategies to work with each target group.

The most common activity was raising awareness in the community, through meetings, radio programmes and theatre. Projects also worked with traditional or religious leaders, such as imams or chiefs, through consultations and dialogue, and used their local influence to promote positive views about girls’ education.

Most projects that targeted parents did so in three ways: through home visits, parent groups or PTAs, and through community activities. These activities aimed primarily to challenge gendered expectations among parents that can lead girls to skip school or drop out, such as being responsible for housework and marrying early. Activities targeting girls, such as girls’ clubs and mentors, worked to build their self-esteem, motivation, confidence and aspirations. Some projects also worked with boys through boys’ clubs, for example, and aimed to address gender-based violence and harassment.

What worked – and what did not

Tackling gender norms related to education

Projects reported the greatest success in changing negative perceptions and beliefs about the value of girls’ education. Projects were effective when working directly with girls and boys: more than half of their activities led to changes. Creating clubs for girls (and in some cases, boys) helped to change perceptions of what girls can achieve, while providing ‘role models’ and mentors was particularly effective. ‘Big Sisters’ provided emotional and academic support to younger girls in Nepal, and ‘School Mothers’ encouraged and followed-up with absentee girls in South Sudan. In Kenya, girls received mentoring on early marriage and pregnancy, while boys were counselled to respect girls. The raising of awareness by mentors on the importance of education and their advice to girls and boys on issues such as FGM, early marriage and pregnancy was found to reduce dropouts due to early pregnancy. Female teachers were also often included in project activities as role models or mentors for girls (see Box 1).

Working with traditional leaders also proved effective, with buy-in from powerful individuals in the community helping to influence parental and community attitudes on what is appropriate for girls. In Malawi and South Sudan, traditional leaders and local authorities were instrumental in increasing community and parental support for girls’ education.

Most gender norms targeted by the sampled projects did not change, largely because this was not their primary objective. Some projects worked around gender norms and reduced their impact on girls’ education, rather than changing the norms themselves. For example, girls who enrolled in tutorial classes were more engaged and more likely to ask questions than those in mixed classroom settings because being in a smaller, girls-only environment allowed them to speak up without doing so in front of boys. The Theatre for a Change in Malawi project found that while girls were shy about speaking up in mathematics classes, which included boys, this was not the case in girl-only tutorials. This was not true for all projects, however: some supported girls to participate in their classes more generally: in Nepal, the support provided by Big Sisters gave Little Sisters the confidence to ask questions in class, including in front of boys.

Some norms were particularly difficult to change, including those around housework and early marriage. Sometimes this was because girls’ responsibilities at home increased as they got older, which projects could not reverse. There are links to poverty: many families cannot survive without their daughters’ help at home. Early marriage is also a survival strategy for many families, who often rely on dowries to support themselves. While these norms do not always stop girls attending school, they must often multi-task to maintain their school performance. For example, while Mothers’ Groups in Afghanistan raised awareness of the importance of girls’ education, the expectation that they would carry out housework remained unchanged, with their responsibilities increasing during the project.
Tackling education outcomes

Even when projects reported helping to change gender norms, it was more difficult to change education outcomes. Improving learning was particularly hard. It could simply be too soon to observe changes, as this phase of the GEC only ran for five years (2012-17). However, while reducing the impact of constraining norms may make it easier for girls to attend school, it does not always lead to improved learning.

One third of GEC projects included in our sample were able to improve girls’ enrolment or attendance in school, but only four managed to improve learning. For enrolment and attendance, projects were most successful when they worked with parents and community members. The greatest improvements in learning emerged from reducing teachers’ negative attitudes towards girls, especially through training in gender-sensitive pedagogy (see further Box 1), while improving girls’ aspirations and motivation through mentoring, for example, led to both better attendance and learning outcomes (see Box 2).

---

**Box 2: Peer mentors and role models promote self-esteem and mitigate negative gender norms**

Several GEC projects included in this study signal the importance of girls’ self-esteem and confidence in improving their attendance and learning. One common and effective mechanism was the introduction of mentors, role models or one-to-one peer support.

According to the evaluation of Theatre for a Change (Malawi), self-esteem has a positive correlation with performance in mathematics, as measured through Early Grade Mathematics Assessment scores. The project provided training and support for female Agents of Change (AoC) teachers, with a focus on interactive and participatory teaching methods. The AoC organised weekly afternoon girls’ clubs, during which in-school and out-of-school girls engaged in interactive group activities to increase their self-confidence, role-playing games to address real-life situations, and exercises to build numeracy and literacy skills. The evaluation reported that before the activity many girls believed mathematics was only a subject for boys and that this changed through AoC support. One limitation is that girls’ self-esteem and confidence did not increase in co-educational environments, but only in the girls’ clubs where they felt safe to speak up and ask questions.

Similarly, BRAC (Afghanistan) introduced a peer mentoring programme in its target schools, through which girls were supported to become mentors to their peers. Mentors encouraged other girls to attend school regularly, and to become more proactive in class. Girls were also encouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities, such as debating or maths competitions. The project reported that the mentoring programme increased girls’ motivation and confidence, leading to more regular attendance. Girls appreciated in particular the additional support on academic content. More regular attendance and one-to-one support were, in turn, associated with improvements in literacy and numeracy outcomes among those mentored.

---

4 Coffey’s Endline Evaluation Step Change Window Report (2017) notes that learning gains of projects activities may not yet be fully realised within the relatively short timescale of the GEC.

5 These were Discovery in Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria, BRAC in Afghanistan, ChildFund in Afghanistan and Link in Ethiopia.
Enabling factors and challenges

The factors that enable norm change include the following.

- **Role models and mentors are important.** Working with female role models and mentors, like teachers and community mobilisers, improved girls’ motivation and aspirations by showing them what they can achieve through study (see Box 2), and made it easier to discuss their problems.

- **Creating ‘safe spaces’ for girls to learn can improve their confidence and education outcomes.** Several projects reported that girls felt more confident in girl-only learning environments, became more engaged in class, started speaking up more and asked more questions. This was not usually the case in co-educational classes.

- **Interventions are most successful when they work with multiple stakeholders.** Buy-in from parents, teachers and community members is needed to improve girls’ ability to attend and learn (see Box 3). For example, Red Een Kind (South Sudan) helped to increase girls’ attendance thanks to the work of School Mothers who counselled and supported girls, while also raising awareness among parents through household visits.

- **Support is needed from head teachers, school authorities and community leaders.** Decision-makers, such as traditional leaders, need to be involved and engaged in the project to address gender norms effectively. Young female teachers may lack the authority to engage or work with village chiefs in awareness-raising activities. Ultimately, positive leadership from male decision-makers and wider support from men may be needed to prioritise initiatives at community level.

GEC projects also reported challenges in changing gender norms, as follows.

- **Harmful social norms and their impact on girls are often under-reported.** A culture of stigma and impunity – for example, around sexual violence, abuse and FGM – can mean under-reporting. Projects struggled to raise awareness around sensitive or taboo topics.

- **Gender norms do not exist in isolation.** They are often context-specific, inter-related, and influenced by other issues affecting education, such as poverty, making it difficult to address them. For example, parents in the Red Een Kind (South Sudan) project’s target areas said they disagreed with early marriage, often married girls off because of extreme poverty. This is because of their economic need for dowries, as well as the perceived ‘cost’ of a daughter, with expectations that, once married, that cost falls on her husband’s family.

- **Without follow-up or refresher activities, changes tended to be undone over time.** BRAC, for example, reported that life skills education provided to girls in Tanzania led to an initial change in mindset about women’s responsibilities. By endline, however, girls were more likely to believe that women should be responsible for childcare, housework and collecting water. Gender norms are slow to change and need continued reinforcement to take hold.

- **Working exclusively with girls sometimes lead to backlash from boys and men, and ignored the harmful effects of gender norms on boys.** As the GEC was a girl-focused programme, few projects addressed gender norms around boys’ education directly. The projects that did work with boys, for example through boys’ clubs, took a largely instrumental approach, engaging with boys to tackle barriers to girls’ education, rather than considering how gender norms might affect boys. In some cases, projects found that boys were more likely than girls to receive violent punishments from teachers, and become involved in violence at a young age. Gendered expectations of their work outside the home meant that that in some project areas, such as in Kenya, many boys dropped out of school early to work and support their families. These issues were not addressed by the projects. The narrow focus on girls sometimes caused boys to feel jealous or resentful towards girls, leading to tension and backlash from communities. In some cases, for example in Nepal, there were reports of boys turning violent and vandalising project equipment, while elsewhere (Kenya) some boys were absent from school or dropped out entirely because they felt neglected.

---

6 Research in low- and middle-income countries indicates that experiencing or observing violence at home or at school increases the risk of boys and girls growing up as victims or perpetrators of violence, entrenching harmful gender norms and reinforcing an intergenerational cycle of violence (Barker et al., 2011; Fulu et al., 2013).
Box 3: Addressing harmful gender norms through holistic interventions: the case of Link Community Development in Ethiopia (LCDE)

The ‘Improved Girls’ Learning in rural Wolaita’ project worked with marginalised* girls across 123 rural primary schools in the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People’s Regional State (SNNPRS) of Ethiopia. The goal of the project was to raise awareness, change attitudes and build capacity, and mobilise stakeholders to improve girls’ education. A holistic set of activities was designed to mobilise stakeholders to support girls’ access to education and learning, targeting parents, teachers, school directors, woreda (district) officials and community members.

The project reported significant improvements in attitudes towards girls’ education in target communities. As shown in Figure 1, while the treatment group (orange line) saw the harmful gender norm (perceptions of girls’ education as less important than boys’) decrease sharply between midline and endline, it remained unchanged in control areas where the project was not active. This indicates a sharp improvement in the perceived importance of girls’ education between midline and endline in targeted schools.

School attendance improved significantly for girls in targeted schools during the project. The project’s quasi-experimental evaluation found that improved parental support, gender-sensitive teaching and perceptions of equality in community gender norms all contributed to gains in girls’ literacy and numeracy. Numeracy improvements were also predicted by changes in attitudes towards school and girls’ aspirations and improved self-esteem.

According to the project, the observed change in attitudes was largely the result of a focus on engaging parents. This activity raised awareness of the importance of girls’ education among parents and in the community. In particular, the project highlighted the importance of community dialogue. School Performance Appraisal Meetings (SPAMs) brought together parents and community leaders to discuss children’s progress in school. Parents became involved in school activities, including school improvement plans and Gender Action Plans. The project also used media (DVDs) to raise awareness among parents and expose girls and parents to role models and inspire future careers.

The project led to a greater than expected appreciation for education at the community level. Women in the community also benefited, with married women returning to school after seeing their daughters and other girls attend. Teachers’ attitudes also improved: at endline, barriers related to teachers prioritising or valuing boys’ education more than girls’ had reduced since midline and in comparison with the control group. According to the report, this was because female teachers benefited from wider changes in community attitudes, resulting in more equitable teaching behaviours and attitudes at endline.

*Defined as economically-deprived girls in a remote rural area with high population density, and at risk of dropping out or non-completion of primary school.

Source: LCDE.
Conclusions

The GEC projects included in this study provide evidence of the importance of gender norms as a barrier to girls’ ability to enrol, attend and learn in school, and of how working directly or indirectly to reduce these barriers can contribute to positive effects on girls’ education.

While the projects have, in many cases, contributed to improvements in girls’ schooling, there is little evidence that they have led to changes in the norms themselves. For example, while education was often seen as limiting girls’ marriage prospects, it is now seen in some cases, as in Northern Nigeria, as helping girls to find a higher-quality husband. While the gender norm to marry early may not have changed, it is now more likely for girls to stay in school.

Norm change requires time, especially around sensitive topics such as early marriage or gender-based violence. Gender norms affect both demand-side barriers to education —by placing constraints on the time girls can dedicate to education, for example — and supply-side barriers, such as limited teacher training and awareness of girls’ needs. Gender norms are also closely related to other factors that affect their access to education, such as poverty: early marriage and housework responsibilities often reflect families’ survival strategies. Though attitudes may change, economic problems make it hard to change educational outcomes in the short-term.

Recommendations

• **Projects should engage many groups when trying to change gender norms around girls’ education.** There needs to be buy-in from parents, teachers, and the community — including boys and men. In particular, projects should involve boys in the promotion of girls’ education if they want to change classroom dynamics. Working with boys to enhance their support for girls’ education can make the environment more enabling and increase girls’ self-confidence in co-educational classes.

• **Projects need to map how contextual factors, such as conflict and economic shocks, interact with gender norms,** especially when the resulting survival strategies have a negative effect on girls. In addition, projects need to better understand wider gender dynamics, including in the community, household and at school, and how these affect education for everyone, not only girls. In-depth gender and context analyses before designing future interventions would help here.

• **Gender norms are one of many factors that need to be addressed.** Improving learning outcomes is particularly difficult, and addressing gender norms alone may not be enough. Improving teacher training, the quality of school facilities, and provision of school materials are also vital to enable all girls (and boys) to learn.

• **Projects should engage more with teachers and gain their support to ensure girls can participate in class and learn.** Teachers are crucial in helping to improve education outcomes, but may lack awareness of how gendered norms are reproduced in the classroom and how these affect the learning needs of girls and boys. They may also lack technical expertise in gender-sensitive teaching methods. As highlighted in Box 1, engaging and supporting teachers is vital, as feeling valued and encouraged by teachers can inspire girls, increasing their motivation to stay in school, participate in classes and learn.
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### Annex 1: Overview of GEC projects included in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Mostly rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aga Khan Foundation</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childfund</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Nomadic communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>In-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CfbT</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICL</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>Rural and urban poor, and pastoralans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUSC</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Girls in refugee camps, pastoralans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre for a Change</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Mostly rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls, ethnic minorities/ disadvantaged castes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPA</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Peri-urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief International</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Een Kind</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Girls living with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAS</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>In-school and out-of-school girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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