Ecological thinking has influenced the field of violence prevention for several decades, most notably in understanding intimate partner violence (Heise 1998, 2011). In general, iterations refer to micro-, meso-, and macro-factors that are often labelled as some combination of ‘individual’, ‘interpersonal’, ‘relationship’, ‘family’, ‘community’, ‘social’ or ‘societal’, and sometimes ‘global’. We applied a version of this model in the Multi-Country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children in Italy, Peru, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

Findings analyzed by our national teams showed that understandings of interpersonal violence towards children typically focus on risk and protective factors which reflect the likelihood of violence occurring due to characteristics most often measured at the individual, interpersonal, and community levels. While these factors are important, they cannot be understood in isolation of a child’s social ecology, or the child’s relationships within differing environments. Our teams expanded their understanding of violence to show how risk and protective factors are intimately connected to the drivers of violence, which we defined as the institutional and structural level factors that create the conditions in which violence is more (or less) likely to occur.

The analysis of national data followed by debate and discussion—now in over twelve countries pursuing drivers of violence work in the Americas, Africa, Asia and Europe—suggests several important points for policymakers and practitioners working on violence prevention:

**INTERACTION:** The interaction of institutional and structural drivers with risk and protective factors occurring at the community, interpersonal and individual spheres of children’s lives delineates how, where, when and why violence occurs. Interventions that consider the interplay of both macro and micro forces on children’s well-being, and how these forces affect their enabling environment, are likely to be more effective than simply addressing risk and protective factors alone.
How can we model this complex reality to produce improved knowledge, practice and policy within the field of violence prevention?

Reflecting and Revising: An Integrated Framework for Addressing Violence Affecting Children

A child-centered and integrated socio-ecological framework, builds on the work of several scholars and acknowledges that behavior is shaped by multiple, inter-related influences within multiple domains.\(^1\) This child-centred framework is designed to assist practitioners to visualize how drivers and risk and protective factors interact within a child’s social ecology. Importantly, it maintains the child (rather than ‘the individual’ representing a list of risk or protective factors) at the center—interacting, interfacing and overlapping with a variety of drivers, risk and protective factors throughout the lifespan.

Mapping national evidence—what we know about violence from surveys, research studies, service-based data and other sources, including children’s own understandings wherever possible—directly onto the framework helps visualize how a single type of violence is affected by a multitude of factors.

\(^1\)We fully acknowledge that Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 2005) model of hierarchically nested ecosystems is not new and that many scholars have acknowledged that human behavior is shaped by multiple, inter-related influences on multiple levels, and has been applied to complex issues such as child abuse (Belsky 1980), sexual coercion (Brown 1995), gender-based violence (Heise 1998), and application of social norms theory to gender-based violence (Heise and Cislaghi 2016).
Giving Complexity Clarity: Applying the Child-Centered Integrated Framework in Viet Nam

An example from the Multi-Country Study highlights the utility of this approach. In Viet Nam, findings around physical violence indicate multi-factorial reasons why corporal punishment is so widespread—ranging from the structural level to factors relating to the characteristics of the individual child.

Plotting the evidence, collected by each national team, helps clarify which stakeholders need to be engaged to address the myriad of factors occurring within and among each domain in order to inform more effective child protection coordination and systems building. The model shows how a single intervention approach—such as a parenting intervention to reduce discipline in the household—may overlook other important drivers and risk factors.

In this way, technical packages to address violence, such as INSPIRE: Seven Strategies for Ending Violence against Children, can be adapted in more meaningful ways to address a country’s unique historical, cultural, political and economic contexts. The approach is also inclusive, implicating multiple ministries as well as other stakeholders. For example, in Viet Nam the Ministries of Education; Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs; Planning; Home Affairs; and also specific offices such as the Department of Gender Equality and Viet Nam’s Social Evils Prevention Division were involved.

Frameworks for violence prevention are useful insofar as they support the successful application of learning. Using data to drive change, our proposed Child-Centered Framework for Violence Prevention serves to situate national findings according to a child’s social ecology, making clear how institutional and structural drivers and risk/protective factors together shape the many risks and opportunities of childhood around the world.

For further information on the Multi-Country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children, including a snapshot of Stage 1 findings, country reports, social norms manuals and a how-to guide, visit: www.unicef-irc.org/research/274/
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