Regular Psychological Support and Student Outcomes: Experimental Evidence at Scale from Peru*

Jonathan Enriquez Stephanie Majerowicz

Clémentine Van Effenterre Román Andrés Zárate

Preliminary and incomplete

This version: March 2026

Abstract

This paper studies the impact of a large-scale randomized program that assigned full-time school psychologists to 465 of 1,000 high-violence public secondary schools in Peru, serving approximately 1.3 million students annually between 2020 and 2025. The program combined structured workshops on violence prevention with individualized counseling and case management. Using administrative and survey data, we find that the program substantially increased formal violence reporting without changing perceived prevalence of school violence or overall school climate. Treated students report greater access to trusted adults and institutional support, which translates into meaningful improvements in emotional regulation and sense of belonging, particularly among female students. Despite these gains, we find no effects on test scores, grades, or school retention. We document implementation challenges at scale: teachers increased their participation in violence prevention activities but also report lower job satisfaction and fewer available resources, suggesting that additional demands on school staff may have limited the program's ability to generate academic improvements.

*Enriquez: Peruvian Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF); Majerowicz: Universidad de los Andes, s.majerowicz@uniandes.edu.co; Van Effenterre: University of Toronto, c.vaneffenterre@utoronto.ca; Zárate: University of Toronto, ra.zarate@utoronto.ca. We thank the J-PAL Learning for All Initiative and the Weiss Fund for financial support. Rafael Alejandro Camelo Vaca provided outstanding research assistance. IRB clearance was obtained from the University of Toronto (RIS Human Protocol Number 45985). The survey experiment was pre-registered on September 6, 2024, ID: AEARCTR-0012913, a pre-analysis plan was uploaded on the AEA RCT Registry website on October 29, 2025.

1 Introduction

School violence is a widespread problem in school systems. About a third of children in low- and middle-income countries are regularly exposed to physical or sexual violence (Evans et al., 2023), affecting students' well-being and their learning potential (Maiti, 2021; Delprato et al., 2017; Aguirre et al., 2025). While reducing school violence is becoming a priority for many stakeholders, there is little rigorous evidence on effective interventions implemented at scale designed to curb school violence and on their impact on learning outcomes. A growing body of evidence highlights the importance of school staff beyond teachers, such as counselors and psychologists, in shaping students' academic trajectories and non-cognitive outcomes (Mulhern, 2023). Yet the success of school-based interventions that rely on such staff may critically depend on the resources available to schools and on the demands placed on existing personnel, which may limit the scalability of such programs.

This paper studies the effects of a large-scale experiment in Peru that provided 465 out of 1,000 large public secondary schools with high reports of school violence the resources to hire a full-time on-site psychologist. Using administrative and survey data, we estimate the effects of the program on school violence reporting, students' perception of violence and school climate, non-cognitive skills and well-being, and learning outcomes. We also use these data to shed light on the challenges of implementing such interventions at scale by examining impacts on teachers and school staff.

Peru provides a compelling setting for this study. The prevalence of school violence is notably high: an online portal for reporting incidents of school violence has received more than 40,000 reports since its launch in 2013. Government surveys further reveal alarming statistics, with 80 percent of students reporting witnessing some form of violence among their peers and 50 percent perceiving violence from teachers towards students. The nature of violence tends to differ by gender, with boys more often subjected to physical aggression while girls experience higher levels of psychological and sexual violence.

In response to this problem, the Ministry of Education (Minedu) launched the School Climate Strategy, a comprehensive intervention designed to strengthen the management of school climate and reduce violence in public schools. One of this strategy's main delivery mechanisms, the Regular Psychological Support (RPS) program, which is the focus of this

study, involves placing a full-time professional psychologist permanently at the school. As part of this program, psychologists work closely with school staff, educators, students, and parents, providing psychological support while implementing policies and interventions to prevent and reduce school violence.

The psychologist's activities in the school span two main domains. First, the Minedu provides psychologists with guidelines for leading structured workshops designed to improve school climate along five dimensions: i) care for self and others, ii) positive interpersonal relationships, iii) inclusion and democratic participation at school, iv) an approach to discipline respectful of students' rights, and v) safety and security. Second, beyond these structured activities, psychologists provide individualized socioemotional support to all members of the educational community, including direct counseling, case management, and coordination with teachers and families to identify and address risk factors for violence.

To study the effects of the program on student and teacher outcomes, we combine multiple data sources. These include individual-level records of school violence reports from *SíSeVe*, a portal created by the Minedu; enrollment and academic grade records covering all students between 2018 and 2024; standardized test scores and associated school climate and well-being questionnaires collected by the government, primarily for students in 2nd grade of secondary school; and original survey data collecting measures of victimization, help-seeking behavior, and teacher outcomes.

We find a strong first stage: treatment assignment increases the likelihood of a school hiring a full-time psychologist by 80 to 100 percentage points, with an average exposure of around six months per academic year. Treated schools also implement Ministry-designed workshops at substantially higher rates than control schools throughout the program's duration.

The presence of a full-time psychologist led to a substantial increase in the formal reporting of school violence — a 28 percent increase in victim status and a 37 percent increase in aggressor status in the *SíSeVe* system. Survey evidence on direct victimization is consistent with this pattern, with particularly large effects on girls' reporting of sexual and psychological violence.

However, this increase in reporting is not explained by a change in the actual prevalence of violence: we find no evidence of effects on students' perceptions of peer- or teacher-perpetrated violence, or on overall school climate. Instead, the key change is in students' access to institu-

tional support: treated students are significantly more likely to report having a trusted adult at school they can turn to when facing difficult situations, and are more likely to seek help from school staff when experiencing aggression.

These changes in institutional support translate into meaningful improvements in students' non-cognitive outcomes. Students in treated schools report lower prevalence of negative emotions (0.032 standard deviations) and an improved sense of belonging (0.023 standard deviations), with stronger and more consistent effects for female students. Despite these gains in socioemotional well-being, the RPS program had no detectable short-term effects on academic outcomes: we find no evidence of effects on grades, school progression, dropout, or standardized test scores for either the full sample, students in secondary school, or those identified as victims or aggressors in the reporting system.

Finally, we examine teacher outcomes to shed light on the implementation challenges of scaling such programs. Teachers in treated schools are significantly more likely to have consulted with the psychologist about violence prevention, to have organized educational activities in response to violent events, and to have adopted more supportive approaches toward students identified as perpetrators. The school violence prevention and management index increases substantially among teachers in treated schools. However, these additional responsibilities appear to come at a cost: teachers report significantly lower job satisfaction and worse perceptions of the availability of school resources, while their overall well-being and teaching self-efficacy remain unaffected. This pattern is consistent with the program increasing teachers' workload in ways that may have limited its ability to generate broader academic improvements.

Our paper contributes to several strands of the literature. First, we provide causal evidence on the effects of school-based interventions aimed at reducing violence (Devries et al., 2015; Delprato et al., 2017; Karmaliani et al., 2020; Alan et al., 2021; Maiti, 2021; Fabbri et al., 2021; Cunha et al., 2023; Dinarte-Diaz and Egana-delSol, 2024; Smarrelli et al., 2024). The results from the RPS program complement the existing evidence on other strategies implemented by the Peruvian government (Gutierrez et al., 2025; Smarrelli, 2023). All of these interventions are part of the Ministry of Education's broader policy agenda to improve school climate and reduce violence through prevention, reporting, and response mechanisms. Within this common framework, the RPS differs from the two other interventions in both scope and

mode of delivery. Whereas the other interventions rely on relatively short-term training or workshops targeting students specifically (Gutierrez et al., 2025) or school leaders (Smarrelli, 2023), the RPS is a multi-year program embedding a full-time psychologist within the school. This allows for more continuous engagement with students, teachers, and families, and enables the provision of both preventive activities and direct support in response to incidents of violence. As a result, the RPS combines elements of skills-building with individualized support, potentially addressing both the underlying determinants of violence and its manifestations. At the same time, its greater intensity and resource requirements distinguish it from the more targeted and scalable approaches studied by Gutierrez et al. (2025) and Smarrelli (2023). Our differential effect by gender suggests that a universal approach to strengthening support systems for victims can be relevant to address gender-based violence in school contexts (Amaral et al., 2024; Sharma, 2023).

Second, we contribute to the literature on the impact of mental health interventions on behavioral and economic outcomes (Currie and Stabile, 2007; Heller et al., 2016; Blattman et al., 2023; Bhatt et al., 2024), especially in low-income settings (Blattman et al., 2017; Bhat et al., 2022; Baranov et al., 2020; Bossuroy et al., 2022). Heller et al. (2016) use several RCTs to test interventions aiming at reducing crime and dropout by changing the decision-making of economically disadvantaged youth. Several studies focus on the use of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) interventions to reduce crime and violence (Blattman et al., 2017, 2023; Bhatt et al., 2024). Our results suggest that continuous, long-term embedded psychological support in school, combined with workshops and counseling emphasizing awareness, leads to significant increases in reporting violence and to a net improvement of students' emotional regulation and overall well-being.

Finally, we contribute to the literature on the challenges of scaling up evidence-based interventions (Al-Ubaydli et al., 2017; Muralidharan and Niehaus, 2017; List, 2022), particularly to improve the effectiveness of the public sector in developing countries (Muralidharan and Singh, 2020, 2025). While existing evidence identifies effective strategies to reduce school violence, evidence on their cost-effectiveness and implementation at scale remains limited (Smarrelli et al., 2024). With our unique combination of administrative reporting and survey data, we are able to identify implementation challenges related to the increased burden on teachers. While we find clear effects on violence reporting, the pathway following the reporting of vio-

lence remains unclear. It is not well understood how reported cases are processed, and whether they translate into effective responses or instead trigger social sanctions. More broadly, institutional features and lack of appropriate resources may help explain the limited effects of such interventions on students' human capital outcomes.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the context of school violence in Peru and institutional details related to the School Climate Strategy and specifically the Regular Psychological Support Program. Section 3 presents the experimental design, the data, and empirical strategy. We present results in Section 4 and conclude in Section 5.

2 Context and Intervention

2.1 School Violence in Peru

Peru's public education system serves approximately 6.5 million students across more than 50,000 primary and secondary schools. The system is administered through a decentralized structure: the Ministry of Education (Minedu) sets national policy and curriculum, while 26 Regional Education Directorates (DRE) and over 220 Local Educational Management Units (UGEL) oversee schools at the regional and district levels, respectively. Each UGEL manages between a few dozen and several hundred schools, and is responsible for hiring and supervising staff, managing budgets, and monitoring school-level implementation of national policies.

School violence is a pervasive problem in Peru. Between September 2013 and May 2021, over 40,000 cases of school violence were reported through *SíseVe*, the Ministry's online reporting portal. Of these, approximately 52% involved violence between students, while 48% involved violence perpetrated by school staff against students. Physical violence accounted for half of all reported cases, followed by psychological violence (34%) and sexual violence (16%). These administrative reports likely understate the true prevalence, as they depend on awareness, willingness, and institutional capacity to document incidents.

Data from Peru's 2018 national standardized assessment (ECE), which surveyed over 516,000 second-year secondary students, paint a more complete picture. When asked about violence they had witnessed in their schools during the school year, 43% of students reported that classmates had physically hit or hurt another student, 40% reported that classmates had mocked or insulted another student, and 61% reported that classmates had stolen, hidden, or

damaged another student's belongings. Violence by school staff was also widespread: 29% of students reported that a teacher or other school adult had mocked or insulted a student, 28% reported witnessing a teacher humiliate a student, and 21% reported that a teacher had physically struck a student. For many forms of violence, roughly half of the students who reported witnessing such incidents indicated that the behavior occurred on a monthly or weekly basis.

In response to this prevalence of violence, in 2018, the Minedu established national guidelines for the management of school climate and the prevention and response to violence against children and adolescents (Decreto Supremo N°004-2018-MINEDU). These guidelines mandated three lines of action across all public schools: the promotion of a positive school climate (*convivencia escolar*), the prevention of school violence, and the institutional response to reported cases of violence. The guidelines also required every school to establish a Wellbeing Committee (*Comité de Gestión del Bienestar*), responsible for coordinating activities related to school climate and serving as the first point of contact for reports of violence.

2.2 The School Climate Strategy

Building on this normative framework, in 2019, the Minedu launched the *Estrategia de Convivencia Escolar* (School Climate Strategy), a comprehensive intervention designed to strengthen the management of school climate across targeted public schools. The strategy was organized around six thematic dimensions: (i) care for self and others, (ii) positive interpersonal relationships, (iii) inclusion and democratic participation, (iv) rights-based approaches to discipline, (v) safety and security, and (vi) decentralized management with a territorial focus.

The strategy was implemented through two main delivery mechanisms at the school level, both operating under the supervision of *convivencia escolar* specialists at the UGEL and DRE levels. The first, *Soporte Psicológico* (Regular Psychological Support, hereafter RPS), assigned a full-time professional psychologist to each targeted school. The psychologist was permanently based at the school, integrated into the Wellbeing Committee, and worked directly with administrators, teachers, students, and parents. This modality targeted large schools (those with more than 600 students enrolled in secondary education) that had high levels of reported school violence and did not already have a psychologist on staff.

The second delivery mechanism, the *Equipos Itinerantes de Convivencia Escolar* (hereafter rotating teams), deployed interdisciplinary teams (comprising a psychologist, an educator,

and a social worker) to periodically visit clusters of smaller schools. Each rotating team was responsible for approximately four to seven schools, conducting visits of roughly one week per school per month. This modality was designed for schools that were too small to justify a permanent psychologist but still exhibited elevated levels of violence. While both modalities delivered workshops and technical assistance organized around the same thematic dimensions, the rotating teams were explicitly designed as a complement to, rather than a substitute for, the full-time psychologist model.

2.3 The Regular Psychological Support Program

The RPS program, which is the focus of this study, involves placing a full-time professional psychologist at the assigned school for the duration of the academic year. The psychologist's responsibilities span two broad domains: (1) structured workshops with the school community, and (2) individualized support and case management.

Workshops. The Minedu provides psychologists with detailed guidelines and materials for conducting workshops along five school-facing dimensions of the strategy: (i) care for self and others, (ii) positive interpersonal relationships, (iii) inclusion and democratic participation, (iv) rights-based discipline, and (v) safety and security. Each psychologist is expected to carry out a specified number of workshops during each school year (see Table A20 for a full list of workshops and their topics by year). The academic year is divided into two terms, each with two phases, and workshop content is updated by the Minedu at the start of each phase. Workshops targeting school administrators and teachers focus on building skills to identify, prevent, and respond to school violence, and on providing information about reporting protocols and child welfare legislation. Workshops with parents address parenting practices, non-violent communication, and topics such as substance use, teenage pregnancy, and social media safety.

Individualized support and case management. Beyond the structured workshops, the psychologist provides continuous socioemotional support to the entire school community. According to the Minedu's official guidelines, the psychologist is responsible for: (i) conducting an initial diagnostic assessment of the school's climate and identifying risk factors for violence; (ii) verifying that school conduct rules are in place and being applied consistently; (iii) designing and implementing capacity-building programs for administrators and teachers on school

climate promotion, and on strategies for detecting and responding to violence; (iv) accompanying teachers in developing students' socioemotional competencies in the classroom;(v) coordinating with UGEL-level *convivencia* specialists; (vi) promoting student participation as active agents of violence prevention; and (vii) providing orientation and guidance to families in coordination with the Wellbeing Committee. In practice, a substantial share of the psychologist's time is devoted to direct counseling and case management: teachers refer students who exhibit behavioral problems, are victims or perpetrators of violence, or are struggling with mental health or family difficulties, and the psychologist provides ongoing support and, when necessary, refers cases to external services.

Organizational structure. The broader strategy involves several layers of supervision and technical assistance. At the Minedu level, sector coordinators oversee the strategy nationally, supported by technical assistants for both implementation and case management. At the regional level, specialists coordinate strategy implementation across each DRE, while UGEL-level specialists supervise the psychologists and rotating teams within their jurisdiction. This structure is designed to ensure that guidelines are adapted to local contexts, that psychologists receive ongoing training and support, and that cases of violence reported through *SíseVe* are handled according to established protocols.

Figure 1 shows a diagram of the theory of change of the program. The program operates through four actors and can affect teacher and student outcomes through a variety of mechanisms. First, psychologists are responsible for detecting, reporting, and following up on cases of school violence, which may affect the prevalence of school violence reports and the successful resolution of cases, which in turn could increase student well-being. In addition, psychologists provide workshops to strengthen teachers' socioemotional skills and their tools for managing conflict and discipline in the classroom, all of which could improve the school climate and student well-being and learning. In addition, psychologists conduct workshops for students designed to strengthen their socioemotional skills and provide direct support to students struggling with mental health or behavioral problems, all of which can lead to improved socioemotional skills, student well-being, and learning. Finally, the psychologists also lead workshops directly with parents on positive parenting practices, which may lead to another indirect channel through which the intervention could impact student wellbeing and learning.

2.3.1 Timeline and Implementation Phases

The RPS program was designed in late 2019, with implementation planned to begin at the start of the 2020 academic year. However, this implementation was disrupted by the COVID pandemic in 2020 and 2021. Overall, the program's implementation can be divided into two broad phases of three years each: Phase I (2020–2022) and Phase II (2023–2025).

Phase I: 2020–2022. The COVID-19 pandemic led to the closure of all schools in Peru in March 2020, and in-person instruction did not fully resume until the 2022 academic year. As a result, during 2020 and 2021, the program was adapted to a virtual format. Psychologists conducted workshops remotely via videoconference, email, and other digital channels, targeting school administrators and teachers rather than students directly. The virtual workshops covered topics aligned with the original dimensions but adapted to the context of remote education, including socioemotional support during the pandemic, self-care for teachers, prevention of cyberbullying, and guidance for families during school closures.

The number and thematic content of workshops varied across years as the Minedu adjusted the program to the evolving circumstances of the pandemic. The program returned to its originally planned in-person format in 2022, with psychologists physically present in schools. The 2022 workshop cycle, the first full year of in-person delivery, was organized in two terms with workshops covering topics such as the psychosocial impact of the pandemic, the return to in-person learning, sexual violence, xenophobia, bullying and cyberbullying, suicide prevention, children's rights, and family well-being (see Table A20).

Phase II: 2023–2025. Beginning in 2023, the Minedu restructured the workshop content into a more systematic three-year curriculum called PREVI (*Programa de Prevención de la Violencia Escolar*), designed to progressively build the school community's capacity to prevent violence.[1]

The three years of PREVI correspond to three phases: sensitization (Year 1, 2023), strengthening (Year 2, 2024), and consolidation (Year 3, 2025), with the explicit goal that by the third year, schools would be able to sustain violence prevention activities autonomously.

The PREVI curriculum is organized around seven core activities, each with progressive tasks across the three years: (1) integrating violence prevention into school management

[1]Detailed materials for the PREVI curriculum are available at https://sites.google.com/view/previ-convivencia.

instruments and community partnerships; (2) strengthening teachers' competencies for creating a positive classroom climate, democratic conduct rules, and appreciation of diversity; (3) developing students' socioemotional skills and providing comprehensive sexual education; (4) engaging families in violence prevention and strengthening parenting competencies; (5) promoting student participation in school governance and violence prevention; (6) building the capacity of the school community to identify risks, report incidents through the *SíseVe* portal, and respond to cases of violence according to established protocols; and (7) identifying unsafe spaces within and around the school and developing collaborative solutions.

Both the school psychologist (in RPS schools) and the rotating teams (in EICE schools) served as the primary facilitators of these activities, supported by materials and guidelines developed by the Minedu's *Dirección de Gestión Escolar*.

3 Experimental Design, Data, and Empirical Strategy

3.1 Experimental Design

The Ministry of Education (Minedu) identified 1,000 large public schools with high rates of reported school violence as eligible for the RPS program. Eligible schools were required to offer secondary education, enroll more than 600 students, not participate in the full-day schooling program (*Jornada Escolar Completa*) or the network of high-performance schools (*Colegios de Alto Rendimiento*), and not already have a psychologist on staff. These schools enroll approximately 1,300 students each, for a total experimental sample of about 1.3 million students.

Staff at the Ministry of Education conducted the randomization in 2019 at the school level, stratifying by Local Educational Management Unit (UGEL). Some UGELs with few eligible schools were grouped together, yielding 69 strata. Within each stratum, the number of treatment slots was determined proportionally, with adjustments in regions facing limited psychologist availability. Schools participating in the *Barrio Seguro* program were assigned directly to treatment. The final allocation resulted in 465 treatment schools and 500 control schools.[2]

The primary treatment is the provision of resources to hire a full-time psychologist in each

[2] An additional 33 schools in the *Barrio Seguro* program and 1 school in Huancavelica were directly assigned to treatment, and 1 school was dropped, accounting for the difference from the initial 1,000 schools.

treatment school during the academic year, as described in Section 2.3. The target population comprises students and teachers in large secondary schools with high levels of reported school violence. The primary outcomes of interest are school climate, school violence, and the social integration of students, measured using both administrative and survey data, as described in the following section. As discussed in Section 2.3, the program operated in a virtual format in 2020 and 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and shifted to an in-person format from 2022 onward.

Some schools in both the treatment and control groups were also eligible for other school violence reduction initiatives, including the rotating teams described in Section 2.2. This eligibility is balanced between groups: 662 schools (331 treatment and 331 control) were exclusively targeted by the RPS program. Our estimates should therefore be interpreted as the effect of having a full-time, permanently stationed psychologist relative to whatever level of support control schools received under the broader national strategy.

The data suggest that this concern is limited in practice. While some control schools did conduct workshops through other Minedu initiatives, participation rates were substantially lower than in treated schools. On average across all years, control schools implemented only 25.9% of the assigned workshops, compared to 64.0% in treated schools. The gap was particularly stark during Phase II of the program (2023–2024), when control schools implemented only 21.7% and 20.0% of workshops, respectively, compared to 54.4% and 75.5% in treated schools.

Moreover, even where control schools did receive support from rotating teams, the nature of that support was categorically different from the RPS. Rotating teams deployed an interdisciplinary team for approximately one week per month, whereas the RPS provided a dedicated psychologist present every day of the school year. This difference in intensity is not merely quantitative as the continuous presence of the psychologist enables sustained relationship-building with students, teachers, and families; real-time identification and follow-up of at-risk cases; ongoing classroom support for teachers; and individualized counseling that a team visiting once a month cannot replicate. We discuss the first stage evidence on workshop implementation in more detail in Section 3.3.

3.2 Data

3.2.1 Administrative Data

We combine multiple administrative data sets to study the impact of the RPS program on school climate, violence, student learning, and longer-term educational outcomes.

1. Randomization files. The first data set consists of the randomization files produced by the Minedu in 2019, which record the treatment assignment for all 1,000 schools in the experimental sample. These files contain school identifiers, the assigned treatment status, and the stratification variables used in the randomization, including the UGEL. We use these files to define the analysis sample and verify balance across treatment and control schools.

2. School enrollment files. Our second data set consists of school enrollment records from 2018 to 2025. These files allow us to track the full schooling trajectory of all students enrolled in the 1,000 schools in the sample. In addition to enrollment, the records capture students' end-of-year outcomes, including grade promotion, grade repetition, school transfers, and partial and permanent dropout. We use pre-treatment enrollment records (2018–2019) to characterize the student population at baseline and verify balance, and post-treatment records (2020–2025) to construct outcomes related to school retention, grade progression, and dropout.

3. National standardized tests (ECE). Our third data set consists of Peru's national standardized census tests, administered by the Minedu. These are low-stakes assessments with no direct consequences for students' academic trajectories or college admissions. The tests are available for the pre-treatment period (2018–2019) and the post-treatment period (2022–2025), with no tests administered during the pandemic years of 2020 and a virtual test in 2021. Each wave includes assessments in reading and mathematics for specific grades in both primary and secondary school.

The test files include a non-academic questionnaire administered to students in grades that vary by year. In particular, the 2018–2019 and 2023–2025 ECE files contain an additional questionnaire administered to students in the second grade of secondary school, designed to capture non-academic outcomes and reports of school violence. While the specific questions vary by year, this questionnaire generally includes modules on school belonging and school violence and, in some years, also covers school climate, emotional stability, and perceptions of

safety. The exact questions and their availability by year are described in Appendix TBD.

We use these data for three purposes: pre-treatment test scores (2018–2019) serve as baseline controls and balance checks; post-treatment test scores (2022–2025) constitute our primary measures of learning outcomes; and the non-academic questionnaire provides direct measures of our primary outcomes of interest, including school belonging, emotional well-being, perceptions of violence, and related dimensions of school climate.

4. SíseVe *violence reports.* Our fourth data set consists of individual-level records of school violence cases reported through *SíseVe* (Sistema Especializado en Reporte de Casos sobre Violencia Escolar), an online portal launched by the Minedu in 2013 as part of Peru's National Strategy against School Violence. The portal allows any member of the educational community (students, parents, teachers, or school staff) to report incidents of physical, psychological, or sexual violence occurring at school, in its surroundings, or on social media. Each report is time-stamped and linked to a specific school, and records the type of violence, the relationship between aggressor and victim (peer-to-peer or staff-to-student), and the current status of the case.

SíseVe functions as an active case-management system embedded within a formal institutional protocol. Any member of the school community may file a report, after which the school principal and the designated *SíseVe* coordinator must initiate a response following standardized procedures that vary by the type and severity of the incident. Depending on the case, this may involve interviewing the parties involved, gathering additional evidence, meeting with parents, referring students to psychological or health services, defining disciplinary consequences, following up to ensure that the violence ceases and victims receive appropriate support, and ultimately closing the case. In cases of physical violence with injuries or sexual violence, the *SíseVe* Coordinator must also provide the victims with support in denouncing the case with external institutions such as the National Police or the Public Prosecutor's Office. Schools are required to document case progress until it is resolved, under the oversight of UGEL and regional education authorities.

SíseVe reports provide an important but imperfect measure of school violence. Reporting rates may reflect not only the true prevalence of violence but also schools' willingness and capacity to document incidents, both of which may be affected by the RPS program. The presence of a psychologist may reduce actual violence, leading to fewer reports, but may also

increase awareness and improve compliance with reporting protocols, leading to more reports. We use *SíseVe* data to construct student-level measures of victimization and perpetration, disaggregated by type of violence and by the relationship between the parties involved.

5. College applications and enrollment files. Our final administrative data set consists of college application and enrollment records for all public and private universities in Peru [YEARS]. The application files contain information on each student-university application, including the application period, the applicant's score, and the admission decision. The enrollment files record students' final enrollment decisions. We use these data to construct outcomes capturing students' applications, admissions, and enrollment, allowing us to assess the longer-term effects of the RPS program on educational trajectories beyond secondary school.

3.2.2 Survey Data

In addition to administrative data, we collected original survey data from a sample of schools in the experimental sample in partnership with a survey firm (Equilibrium SDC). The surveys target second-year secondary school students and their teachers, and are designed to capture dimensions of school climate and violence that are not well measured in administrative records.

Survey Items The student survey is adapted from the ENCEVE (*Encuesta Nacional de Convivencia Escolar y Violencia en la Escuela*),[3] a validated official instrument from the Minedu designed to measure the quality of interpersonal relationships at school. We enriched the ENCEVE instrument with measures of social networks and friendships, following the methodology of Zárate (2023). These modules allow us to map the social structure within classrooms and assess the program's impact on network-level outcomes such as centrality, social cohesion, and prosociality, including heterogeneous effects across groups defined by immigration status and family income.

The teacher survey is designed to measure classroom activities, teachers' perceptions of their students and of the school climate, their knowledge of the School Climate Strategy and the role of school psychologists, and their familiarity with the SíseVe reporting portal.

Sample Selection Schools in the survey sample were selected to be comparable to those in the full study sample, while being located in the Lima region for logistical reasons. Table A4 confirms that the sociodemographic characteristics of students in the survey sample

[3]Link to ENCEVE survey: https://repositorio.minedu.gob.pe/handle/20.500.12799/7778.

are comparable to those in the overall experimental sample (Panel A) and to the experimental sample restricted to schools located in Lima (Panel B), both for treated and control schools. The sample selection for the survey included 74 treated and 74 control schools. Within each school, we planned to survey second-grade students, yielding a total of 4,603 students, as well as approximately 120 teachers. The final survey sample includes 60 treated and 60 control schools, and 3,765 students, out of which 2,697 took the survey, yielding a 72 percent response rate. Table A5 shows that the response rate is lower in treated schools (67 percent) compared to control schools (76 percent). In our robustness checks, we account for this differential response rate by reweighting the survey sample by the inverse of the response rate.

Schools were first contacted by the Ministry of Education (MINEDU) to inform them about the data collection process and to coordinate fieldwork. The survey firm, Equilibrium SDC, then followed up with school principals to confirm participant lists, identify a suitable space to conduct surveys individually and confidentially, and coordinate schedules with selected students and teachers in a way that minimized disruption to regular school activities.

Survey Conditions and Risk Mitigation Strategies We implemented several measures to mitigate risks related to data collection. Prior to fieldwork, enumerators received specialized training to recognize signs of emotional distress, provide basic emotional support, and activate referral procedures in coordination with school staff. Participation required informed consent from a parent or legal guardian, as well as student assent. These materials emphasized the voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality protections, and the right to withdraw at any time without consequences.

During data collection, enumerators monitored students' behavior and were authorized to pause or terminate the survey if a student appeared distressed. A field coordinator maintained direct communication with school personnel (e.g., the school psychologist, the school coexistence officer, or administrators) to ensure the timely and confidential activation of referral mechanisms. In cases of persistent or serious distress, enumerators reported the situation to the field coordinator, who notified the appropriate school professional without disclosing unnecessary identifying details. The school then assessed the situation and determined the appropriate support, including, when required by institutional protocols, informing parents or guardians.

If a student disclosed experiences of harassment, school violence, or bullying, the field

team followed a dedicated protocol. Incidents were reported to the school administration or the designated school coexistence officer, who is responsible for registering the case in the SíseVe platform and initiating the procedures established under Law No. 29719. All consent and assent materials informed participants that, in the event of emotional discomfort or disclosure of sensitive situations, an established protocol would provide immediate support, allow students to pause or discontinue participation, and, if necessary, refer them to school authorities.[4]

3.3 Empirical Strategy

Given that the program was randomly assigned at the school level, our main empirical strategy estimates intent-to-treat (ITT) effects using the following specification:

$$Y_{isgt} = \beta T_s + \Gamma' X_{isgt} + \gamma_{gst} + \varepsilon_{isgt} \tag{1}$$

where Y_{isgt} is the outcome for individual i in school s, grade g, and year t; T_s is an indicator equal to one if school s was randomly assigned to treatment; X_{isgt} is a vector of baseline covariates selected using the post-double lasso procedure (Belloni et al., 2013); and $\gamma_{g(s)t}$ denotes strata-by-grade-by-year fixed effects. The coefficient of interest is β, which captures the ITT effect of the RPS program. Standard errors are clustered at the school level, the unit of randomization (Abadie et al., 2022).

Table A1 reports estimates of equation (1) for baseline balance across school characteristics. These correspond to the main set of covariates used by Minedu during the randomization process. In addition, Table A2 presents estimates of equation (1) for pre-treatment student outcomes in 2018 and 2019. Panel A reports results for outcomes from the school enrollment files, while Panel B reports results for baseline outcomes from the standardized test files.

Overall, prior to the intervention, treatment and control schools are similar across student enrollment variables, academic performance, standardized test scores, and measures of school violence and school climate. We also report the F-statistic from joint significance tests of all baseline covariates in each panel, which fails to reject the null of balance.

One potential concern, given that the program was randomized at the school level in late 2019, is that students and their families may sort into schools due to the availability of a

[4]These procedures were implemented in accordance with national regulations (Supreme Decree No. 004-2018-MINEDU, Law No. 29719, and Supreme Decree No. 009-2016-MIMP).

psychologist. Appendix Figure A1 reports, for students enrolled in the sample schools in 2020 and 2022, the type of school they attended in 2019. As expected, the vast majority of students in both treated and control schools were already enrolled in the same school the previous year. The main exception is for first grades of primary and secondary school, where a higher proportion of students naturally come from outside the sample as new entrants. The patterns are similar across years and balanced between treated and control schools. Moreover, we find that treatment assignment does not predict students' demographic characteristics by grade and year, alleviating concerns about differential sorting into treated schools due to the program.

3.4 First Stage: Program Implementation

Our analysis begins by examining the first stage of the program. Figure 2 reports the effect of treatment assignment (parameter β in equation 1) on the likelihood that a school hired a psychologist (Panel A) and the number of months a psychologist was employed at the school (Panel B) for each year from 2020 to 2023.

The results confirm a strong first stage. Treatment assignment increases the likelihood of a school hiring a full-time psychologist by 80 to 100 percentage points across all years, with the exception of 2021, when program implementation was disrupted by the pandemic. In terms of contract duration, assignment to treatment increases the number of months a full-time psychologist is present in the school by slightly over six months out of the nine-month academic year.

Table A3 presents summary statistics on the profile of psychologists employed through the RPS program since its inception. The workforce is predominantly female (78.7%), with an average of 6.2 years of general work experience and 3.7 years of experience specifically in psychology. In terms of education, 92.1% of hired psychologists held a bachelor's degree in psychology or related fields, while 7.7% held a master's degree.

As discussed in Section 2.3, part of the psychologist's role involved the implementation of workshops designed by the Ministry of Education to improve school climate and prevent and reduce school violence. Panel A of Figure 3 reports implementation rates of each workshop for control and treated schools, while Panel B reports the ITT estimates of equation 1 on the likelihood of conducting each workshop session across years. As noted in Section 3.1, some

control schools received workshop programming through other Minedu initiatives as part of the broader national strategy to prevent and reduce school violence, which attenuates the estimated treatment effects for some sessions.

"Overall, we find that treatment assignment significantly predicts workshop implementation, particularly in 2020 and 2024, where estimated effects on the likelihood of conducting a session range from 50 to 80 p.p. relative to control schools. Effects are more muted in 2021, reflecting disruptions caused by the pandemic, moderate but positive and statistically significant in 2022, and larger in 2023 than in 2022. By the later workshops of 2023, participation rates among treated schools were already comparable to those observed in 2024."

The full list of workshops, organized by year, is described in Appendix Table A20. Across all years, the workshops cover three broad thematic areas. The first is the development of socio-emotional skills among school staff and students, including modules on emotion recognition, assertive communication, empathy, and conflict management. The second is the prevention of and response to school violence, encompassing sessions on bullying, cyberbullying, sexual violence, and the use of official reporting platforms such as *SíseVe*. The third is the promotion of a positive school and classroom climate, through workshops on rights-based discipline, coexistence rules, self-care practices for educators, and in later years, family engagement and comprehensive sexuality education.

4 Results on Student and Teacher Outcomes

We next examine the effects of the program on student and teacher outcomes. Guided by the theory of change in Figure **??**, we organize the analysis as follows. We first present results on (i) the reporting of school violence. We then turn to (ii) students' perceptions of violence, school climate, and the availability of school support for violence and socio-emotional problems. Next, we examine (iii) non-cognitive skills and well-being, followed by (iv) academic outcomes. Finally, we analyze (v) teacher-related outcomes to shed light on implementation challenges at scale.

For each group of outcomes, we begin with administrative data from enrollment records, which cover all students. We then present results using administrative test score data and associated questionnaires collected by the government, available for selected grades and years. We conclude with evidence from survey data.

4.1 Violence Reporting and Direct Victimization

We first analyze the effects on the reporting of school violence in the *SíSeVe* portal. Consistent with the overarching goal of promoting a reporting culture and improving information on violence response protocols, the program overall led to a substantial increase in violence reporting.

The presence of a full-time psychologist substantially increased the reporting of violence, particularly among female students, as evidenced by individual-level records from the *SíSeVe* system. Table 1 reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on the probability of being reported as either a victim or an aggressor. All outcome variables in this analysis are binary indicators multiplied by 100.

Panel A shows that the likelihood of being reported as a victim increases by 0.061 percentage points, corresponding to 28 percent of the control mean. On average, only 0.21% of students in control schools are reported as victims and 0.18% as aggressors in a given year, showing that only a very small fraction of students are formally reported in the system. Reporting rises across most types of violence, with sizable increases in physical violence (0.032 pp, 32 percent of the control mean) and psychological violence (0.026 pp, 33 percent). We do not detect a significant effect for sexual violence. The overall increase is primarily driven by peer-perpetrated incidents (0.056 pp), rather than violence involving adults (0.007 pp). Panel B shows that the likelihood of being reported as an aggressor increases by 0.071 percentage points (37 percent of the control mean). This increase is observed across all categories of violence, with effect sizes of 33%, 46%, and 35% of the control mean for physical, psychological, and sexual violence, respectively. The effects on aggressor status are larger for boys than for girls across all types of violence. As violence is more prevalent in secondary school, Appendix Table A6 reports the same estimates for secondary school students, finding overall larger effects on violence reporting for this group.

Table 2 further studies the nature of the increase in reporting by examining the type of perpetrator and the identity of the reporter. The results confirm that most of the effect is driven by peer-perpetrated violence, particularly from students in the same grade. In terms of the identity of the reporter, the effects are mainly driven by the "other" category (0.024 pp), which includes school psychologists, followed by mothers of victims (0.017 pp) and teachers (0.017 pp). This pattern suggests that the effects on reporting operate through

two complementary channels: the direct presence of the psychologist at the school, and the information and workshops on violence detection and reporting that psychologists implement with teachers and parents.

We next turn to the survey results that capture direct measures of victimization. Overall, the victimization survey yields consistent results but indicates higher prevalence of violence and larger treatment effects across all types of violence, especially for sexual violence. Table 3 shows that in control schools 8.1% of girls and 8.8% of boys report being victims of sexual violence, with higher prevalence of psychological violence (27.6% of girls and 24.2% of boys) and physical violence (9.0% of girls and 11.4% of boys) than what is captured by the *SíSeVe* reporting system. The program has a positive effect on the self-reporting of direct victimization, especially for girls, with effects of 2.7 pp (33% of the control mean) on sexual violence, 4.2 pp (15% of the control mean) on psychological violence, and no statistically significant effect on physical violence. These effects on girls' sexual and psychological victimization are statistically significant for ever experiencing this type of violence, as well as during the past month and the past year, and are statistically different from the corresponding effects for boys.

In contrast to the increase in direct victimization of violence between students, Table A8 shows virtually no change in survey-reported violence by teachers against students, with the exception of a marginally significant decrease in physical violence reported by male students. This is consistent with the administrative evidence, as most of the effects on reporting in the *SíSeVe* portal are driven by peer-perpetrated rather than teacher-perpetrated violence.

4.2 Perception of Violence, School Climate and School Support

We next explore whether the effects on reporting and awareness of school violence are reflected in students' perceptions of violence at school or in changes in school climate. This set of outcomes comes from additional questionnaires associated with the standardized tests collected by the government for students in 2nd grade of secondary school in 2024. Table A7 reports the ITT estimates on violence reports for students in the questionnaire sample, showing even higher prevalence of violence and larger effects for this group, confirming that the questionnaire sample is not more sheltered from violence than the broader experimental sample.

Perception of Violence. Table A9 shows that the increase in reporting is not explained by an increase in the perceived prevalence of school violence. The outcomes come from ques-

tions asking students how frequently they have witnessed violence between students and from teachers to students at their school. For peer-perpetrated violence, students are asked about threats and intimidation, physical assault, mocking and insults, theft or damage of belongings, rumor-spreading, public shouting, non-consensual contact, and online harassment. For teacher-perpetrated violence, the questions cover threats and intimidation, mocking and insults, physical punishment using the body or an object, humiliating punishment, and non-consensual contact. We report ITT estimates for each of these questions and for an overall index standardized on the full test-taking population.

In general, we find no evidence that the program significantly shifted students' perceptions of peer-perpetrated (Panel A) or teacher-perpetrated (Panel B) violence at school. Our point estimates on both indexes are precise, ruling out effects smaller than -0.036 and -0.019 standard deviations and larger than 0.023 and 0.043 standard deviations on the peer- and teacher-violence indexes, respectively. The estimates are similarly small and non-statistically significant for each individual question on both peer- and teacher-perpetrated violence. These results, taken together with the increase in formal reporting documented above, suggest that the program succeeded in building a reporting culture and improving institutional compliance with documentation protocols, rather than reflecting an actual change in the prevalence of violence at school.

The survey results are consistent with the absence of changes in students' perceptions of the prevalence of violence at school documented above. Table A10 shows muted and statistically insignificant effects across all three survey-based measures of perceived violence: conflict management, security and disruptiveness, and other safety concerns. The point estimates are small and precisely estimated for both girls and boys, and we find no statistically significant differences between them. Taken together, the evidence from both the standardized test questionnaires and the original survey suggests that the program increased the reporting of violence and awareness of victimization, but did not alter how students perceive the safety and climate of their school environment.

School Climate and School Support. As the program did not change students' perception of violence, we next explore whether it led to changes in school climate and sources of institutional support. Overall, we find that the average student reports no significant changes in school climate. Panel A of Table 4 reports results on a general index of school climate and

specific questions from the *ENLA* additional questionnaires, covering the quality of relationships between students and measures of mutual care and help. We find no effects on any of these variables, and the results are consistent with the treatment effect estimates from the victimization survey reported in Table A11.

However, we find consistent evidence of an improvement in perceived school support. Panel B of Table 4 shows that students in RPS schools are significantly more likely to report that when they have a personal problem there is someone at school who can help them, with an overall increase of 7.8 points (0.09 standard deviations) and similar effects for boys and girls. Students also report a significantly higher level of agreement with the statement that there is a trusted adult at school they can reach out to when feeling unsafe or mistreated, with an overall increase of 14.8 points (0.15 standard deviations), again similar for both genders. Moreover, when students witness any form of violence at school, the program increases by 5.7 percentage points the likelihood that they seek help or reach out to the psychologist, shifting away from reaching out to friends or other teachers.

This increase in perceived school support is also reflected in our victimization survey. Table A12 shows that treated female students are more likely to have reported to school staff members when they faced situations of aggression at school compared to the control group (0.042 pp, 31 percent of the control mean). We find suggestive evidence that these students face mixed responses from adults once they report: they are more likely to be ignored or not believed (0.091 pp, 85 percent of the control mean), to be advised (0.071 pp, 8 percent of the control mean), to have their parents informed (0.113 pp, 28 percent of the control mean), or to have their case registered on the *SíSeVe* platform (0.044 pp).

Taken together, the results on violence reporting, perception of violence, school climate, and school support point to a coherent picture. The program did not reduce the prevalence of violence as perceived by students, nor did it improve the general quality of relationships and interactions at school. Instead, its main effect was to increase the visibility of violence through formal reporting and to provide students with a credible source of institutional support when facing difficult situations. This shift in the availability and perceived accessibility of support within the school is one of the key mechanisms linking the program to the improvements in non-cognitive outcomes documented in the next section.

4.3 Non-Academic Outcomes and Well-being Measures

One of the pillars of the RPS program was the promotion of activities to foster socioemotional skills development for students. According to the theory of change, the program was expected to improve students' non-cognitive outcomes through three main channels: direct development of students' intrapersonal and interpersonal skills through workshops and counseling, improved teacher-student interactions resulting from teachers' participation in the program, and reinforcement of socioemotional development through greater family engagement. Consistent with these objectives, we find that the RPS program led to significant improvements in non-academic and well-being outcomes.

Panel A of Table 5 reports ITT estimates on students' sense of belonging. The overall belonging index increases by 0.023 standard deviations in treated schools. Looking at the individual components, treated students are significantly less likely to feel bored at school (0.025 points), less likely to feel alone (0.011 points), less likely to prefer skipping school (0.019 points), less likely to feel like a stranger (0.014 points), and less likely to feel excluded (0.013 points). The effects are more pronounced for female students, for whom the belonging index increases by 0.030 standard deviations, with statistically significant effects across most individual items. By contrast, the effects for boys are smaller, with only significant effects for not feeling bored at school and less likely to prefer skipping school.

Panel B reports ITT estimates on emotional regulation, where we find an overall improvement of 0.032 standard deviations. Treated students report being less nervous or on edge (0.023 points), better able to control their worries (0.022 points), less prone to worrying about many things (0.030 points), less restless (0.023 points), and less easily irritable (0.030 points). As with belonging, these effects are concentrated among female students, for whom the emotional regulation index increases by 0.043 standard deviations. Girls report consistent reductions in nervousness (0.025 points), improved worry control (0.027 points), reduced general worry (0.039 points), reduced restlessness (0.034 points), and lower irritability (0.047 points). The effects for boys are consistently smaller and statistically insignificant across all individual items.

The stronger effects for girls are consistent with the evidence on victimization documented above from the survey, where the program had larger impacts on the reporting and awareness of sexual and psychological violence among female students. The improved access to institu-

tional support and trusted adults documented in the previous section likely played a central role in driving these well-being improvements, particularly for girls who face higher levels of psychological and sexual violence and may have benefited most from having a credible and accessible source of support within the school.

4.4 Academic Outcomes

Despite notable improvements in socioemotional skills and well-being, we find no evidence that the RPS program had short-term effects on academic outcomes. According to the theory of change, the program could affect academic outcomes through three main channels: improved student intrapersonal and interpersonal skills that support learning, better classroom management and teacher-student interactions, and greater family engagement and monitoring. However, these channels may take time to materialize, and some of them may have been offset by competing demands on teachers' time and resources.

Table 6 reports ITT estimates on educational outcomes for all students across all grades from 2022 to 2024. We find no statistically significant effects on language grades, math grades, behavior grades, or GPA. Similarly, school progression and retention outcomes are unaffected by the program: the likelihood of passing the academic year, being placed in remedial status, failing, transferring schools, or dropping out permanently are all statistically indistinguishable between treated and control schools for both girls and boys. Since violence is more prevalent in secondary school than in primary school, and given that the additional questionnaires and original survey focus on students in 2nd grade of secondary school, Appendix Table A15 reports the same estimates restricted to secondary school students. The results are qualitatively identical, with no statistically significant effects on any educational outcome for this group either.

Table 7 reports ITT estimates on standardized test scores. Panel A shows no significant effects on math or reading scores for the full sample of students. Panel B restricts the sample to secondary school students, for whom we additionally observe social sciences scores, and finds equally muted effects across all three subjects for both girls and boys. The point estimates are small and precisely estimated, ruling out meaningful positive or negative effects on learning in the short run.

4.5 Victims and Aggressors

We next explore whether the program had differential effects on the outcomes of reported victims and perpetrators of violence. These are the students most directly targeted by the program's individualized support and case management activities, and therefore the ones most likely to benefit from it.

Since the program affects the likelihood of being reported as a victim or aggressor in the *Sí-SeVe* system, the composition of these groups may itself change as a result of the intervention. To address this concern, we first examine whether the program led to changes in the observable characteristics of reported victims and aggressors, with results reported in Appendix Table A16.

Overall, we find limited evidence of systematic selection. For victims, male students in treated schools tend to have slightly lower baseline behavior grades and GPA, while most other demographic and academic characteristics are balanced across groups. For aggressors, those reported in treated schools are more likely to be male (4.4 pp) and to have a disability (0.7 pp), while socioeconomic characteristics and baseline academic outcomes are broadly similar. While these differences warrant some caution, they do not point to systematic selection on the most observable dimensions.

Turning to academic outcomes, Panel A of Table A17 reports results for victims. We find limited and mostly insignificant effects on grades and school outcomes. The exception is male victims in RPS schools, who tend to have slightly lower grades in language, math, behavior, and overall GPA, and are marginally less likely to pass the academic year. These effects are not observed for girls.

Panel B reports results for aggressors. Perpetrators in RPS schools have significantly lower math grades (-0.234, significant at the 5 percent level), driven mainly by female aggressors (-0.386). They are also marginally less likely to pass the academic year (-1.8 pp) and more likely to be placed in remediation (1.4 pp). However, aggressors in treated schools are significantly less likely to permanently drop out (-0.8 pp, 28 percent of the control mean) or to partially drop out (-0.1 pp), with effects observed for both boys and girls. This suggests that while being identified as an aggressor may be associated with some academic costs, it also reduces the risk of school disengagement, possibly through the individualized follow-up and counseling provided by the psychologist.

We cannot examine effects on standardized test scores for these subgroups, as the low baseline probability of being reported as a victim or aggressor results in sample sizes that are too small to yield precise estimates.

Finally, to explore whether the program conveyed relevant information about reporting to potential victims, we use our original survey in which teachers were asked to identify the five students in their classroom most likely to be victims of violence. We match this information to the individual-level student survey data. Table A13 shows that identified victims in treated schools are significantly more likely to report that anyone can file a report on *SíSeVe*, suggesting that the program successfully diffused information about reporting channels to the most at-risk students. Table A14 further shows that these students are more likely to have actually reported their cases, consistent with the broader pattern of increased reporting documented in the administrative data.

These null results on academic outcomes are not entirely surprising given the primary focus of the program on school climate and violence prevention rather than instruction. The channels through which improved socioemotional well-being could translate into better academic performance, reduced absenteeism, greater engagement, improved teacher-student interactions, are likely to operate over longer time horizons than those captured by our current data. We explore the role of teachers more directly in the next section.

4.6 The Role of Teachers in Violence Management

Teachers were a critical pillar of the program implementation. Participation in trainings and workshops was designed to equip them with the skills to identify, prevent, and respond to school violence. Using a dedicated survey module of teachers, we explore how they participated in the implementation of the program, their impact on the targeted students, and the impact of the program on their overall satisfaction and well-being.

In Table 8, we confirm our first stage results and show that teachers in the treated group are significantly more likely to report that they consulted with the school psychologist about ways to prevent and manage violence (Coeff=0.466, p-value=0.000). They are also more likely to have organized or helped organize educational activities or discussions due to a violent event at school (Coeff=0.196, p-value=0.047), and are more likely to be aware that program(s), workshop(s), or training(s) have been conducted at the school to directly address the issue of

school violence (Coeff=0.172, p-value= 0.020). This confirms teachers' active participation in the overall organizational strategy to improve prevention and management of violence.

Among the core priorities of the program was improving teachers' referral of students who exhibit behavioral problems, are victims or perpetrators of violence, or who are struggling with mental health issues or family conflict. Teachers' training materializes in a different approach of targeted students, in particular of perpetrators of violence. We rely on the survey of teachers in which we also asked them to report the five names of students most likely to be perpetrators of violence in their classroom. Students identified as perpetrators are significantly less likely to say that they suffer from psychological violence from their teachers in schools that implemented the program (Table A18).

Overall, the school violence prevention and management index increases substantially according teachers in schools that hired a psychologist (Table 9, Coeff=0.112, p-value=0.010). However, these additional activities apprear to come at a cost. We find that teachers' overall job satisfaction decreases (Coeff=-0.165, p-value=0.034), while their general well-being, self-confidence in teaching and self-efficacy remain unaffected. This patterns is consistent with the program increasing teachers' workload. Using the teachers' module of the ENLA survey, we further find in Table A19 that teachers in RPS schools have worse perceptions of relations between students (0.142, 52 percent of the control mean, p-value= 0.04), and worse perceptions regarding lack of resources in school (0.185, 68 percent of the control mean, p-value= 0.013).

5 Conclusion

School violence is pervasive in low- and middle-income countries, yet rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of large-scale interventions remains scarce. This paper studies the Regular Psychological Support program, a nationwide randomized experiment in Peru that randomly assigned 465 out of 1,000 large public secondary schools to receive resources to hire a full-time on-site psychologist. The program combined structured workshops on violence prevention with continuous individualized counseling and case management.

We find a strong first stage: treated schools were substantially more likely to hire a psychologist and implemented Ministry-designed workshops at much higher rates than control schools throughout the program's duration.

Our results point to a coherent pattern across outcomes. The program substantially in-

creased formal violence reporting: a 28% increase in victim status and a 37% increase in aggressor status without any detectable change in students' perceptions of the prevalence of peer- or teacher-perpetrated violence or in overall school climate. The key channel appears to be access to institutional support rather than a reduction in violence itself: students in treated schools are significantly more likely to report having access to a trusted adult and to perceive that the school provides support when they face difficult situations. This improved sense of support translates into meaningful gains in students' non-cognitive outcomes, including emotional regulation (0.032 SD) and sense of belonging (0.023 SD), with effects concentrated among female students.

Despite these improvements in well-being and institutional support, we find no evidence of effects on test scores, grades, or school retention. Teachers in treated schools increased their participation in violence prevention activities and adopted more supportive approaches toward identified perpetrators, but also report lower job satisfaction, consistent with the program increasing their workload and responsibilities beyond their core instructional duties.

Together, our findings suggest that embedding a full-time psychologist in high-violence schools can improve students' access to institutional support and their socioemotional well-being, but does not translate into short-run academic gains. The results highlight the importance of anticipating implementation costs at scale, in particular the demands placed on school staff, when designing and scaling up whole-school psychological support programs.

References

Abadie, Alberto, Susan Athey, Guido W Imbens, and Jeffrey M Wooldridge. 2022. "When Should You Adjust Standard Errors for Clustering?*." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138(1): 1–35.

Aguirre, Josefa, Fernanda Ramírez-Espinoza, and Roman Andres Zarate. 2025. "Violence at School." Institute of Labor Economics (IZA) IZA Discussion Paper 18126, Bonn.

Alan, Sule, Ceren Baysan, Mert Gumren, and Elif Kubilay. 2021. "Building social cohesion in ethnically mixed schools: An intervention on perspective taking." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(4): 2147–2194.

Al-Ubaydli, Omar, John A List, and Dana L Suskind. 2017. "What can we learn from experiments? Understanding the threats to the scalability of experimental results." *American Economic Review*, 107(5): 282–286.

Amaral, Sofia, Aixa Garcia-Ramos, Selim Gulesci, Alejandra Ramos, Sarita P Ore-Quispe, and Maria Micaela Sviatschi. 2024. "Gender-Based Violence in Schools and Girls' Education: Experimental Evidence from Mozambique." National Bureau of Economic Research.

Anderson, Michael L. 2008. "Multiple inference and gender differences in the effects of early intervention: A reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects." *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 103(484): 1481–1495.

Baranov, Victoria, Sonia Bhalotra, Pietro Biroli, and Joanna Maselko. 2020. "Maternal depression, women's empowerment, and parental investment: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial." *American economic review*, 110(3): 824–859.

Belloni, Alexandre, Victor Chernozhukov, and Christian Hansen. 2013. "Inference on Treatment Effects after Selection among High-Dimensional Controls†." *The Review of Economic Studies*, 81(2): 608–650.

Benjamini, Yoav, Abba M Krieger, and Daniel Yekutieli. 2006. "Adaptive linear step-up procedures that control the false discovery rate." *biometrika*, 491–507.

Bhat, Bhargav, Jonathan De Quidt, Johannes Haushofer, Vikram H Patel, Gautam Rao, Frank Schilbach, and Pierre-Luc P Vautrey. 2022. "The long-run effects of psychotherapy on depression, beliefs, and economic outcomes." National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bhatt, Monica P, Sara B Heller, Max Kapustin, Marianne Bertrand, and Christopher Blattman. 2024. "Predicting and preventing gun violence: An experimental evaluation of READI Chicago." *The quarterly journal of economics*, 139(1): 1–56.

Blattman, Christopher, Julian C Jamison, and Margaret Sheridan. 2017. "Reducing crime and violence: Experimental evidence from cognitive behavioral therapy in Liberia." *American Economic Review*, 107(4): 1165–1206.

Blattman, Christopher, Sebastian Chaskel, Julian C Jamison, and Margaret Sheridan. 2023. "Cognitive behavioral therapy reduces crime and violence over ten years: Experimental evidence." *American Economic Review: Insights*, 5(4): 527–545.

Bossuroy, Thomas, Markus Goldstein, Bassirou Karimou, Dean Karlan, Harounan Kazianga, William Parienté, Patrick Premand, Catherine C Thomas, Christopher Udry, Julia Vaillant, et al. 2022. "Tackling psychosocial and capital constraints to alleviate poverty." *Nature*, 605(7909): 291–297.

Cunha, Flavio, Qinyou Hu, Yiming Xia, and Naibao Zhao. 2023. "Reducing bullying: Evidence from a parental involvement program on empathy education." National Bureau of Economic Research.

Currie, Janet, and Mark Stabile. 2007. "Mental health in childhood and human capital." In *The problems of disadvantaged youth: An economic perspective*. 115–148. University of Chicago Press.

Delprato, Marcos, Kwame Akyeampong, and Máiréad Dunne. 2017. "The impact of bullying on students? learning in Latin America: A matching approach for 15 countries." *International journal of educational development*, 52: 37–57.

Devries, Karen M, Louise Knight, Jennifer C Child, Angel Mirembe, Janet Nakuti, Rebecca Jones, Joanna Sturgess, Elizabeth Allen, Nambusi Kyegombe, Jenny Parkes, et al. 2015. "The Good School Toolkit for reducing physical violence from school staff to primary school students: a cluster-randomised controlled trial in Uganda." *The Lancet Global Health*, 3(7): e378–e386.

Dinarte-Diaz, Lelys, and Pablo Egana-delSol. 2024. "Preventing violence in the most violent contexts: Behavioral and neurophysiological evidence from el salvador." *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 22(3): 1367–1406.

Evans, David K, Susannah Hares, Peter A Holland, and Amina Mendez Acosta. 2023. "Adolescent girls? safety in and out of school: evidence on physical and sexual violence from across Sub-Saharan Africa." *The Journal of Development Studies*, 59(5): 739–757.

Fabbri, Camilla, Katherine Rodrigues, Baptiste Leurent, Elizabeth Allen, Mary Qiu, Martin Zuakulu, Dennis Nombo, Michael Kaemingk, Alexandra De Filippo, Gerard Torrats-Espinosa, et al. 2021. "The EmpaTeach intervention for reducing physical violence from teachers to students in Nyarugusu Refugee Camp: A cluster-randomised controlled trial." *PLoS medicine*, 18(10): e1003808.

Gutierrez, Italo, Oswaldo Molina, Hugo Ñopo, and Maria Micaela Sviatschi. 2025. "an Attitudinal Changes Towards Reporting Curb Violence? An Experimental School Intervention in Peru." IZA. Institute of Labor Economics.

Heller, Sara B., Anuj K. Shah, Jonathan Guryan, Jens Ludwig, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Harold A. Pollack. 2016. "Thinking, Fast and Slow? Some Field Experiments to Reduce Crime and Dropout in Chicago*." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(1): 1–54.

Karmaliani, Rozina, Judith McFarlane, Hussain Maqbool Ahmed Khuwaja, Yasmeen Somani, Shireen Shehzad Bhamani, Tazeen Saeed Ali, Nargis Asad, Esnat D Chirwa, and Rachel Jewkes. 2020. "Right To Play's intervention to reduce peer violence among children in public schools in Pakistan: a cluster-randomized controlled trial." *Global health action*, 13(1): 1836604.

List, John A. 2022. *The voltage effect: How to make good ideas great and great ideas scale.* Crown Currency.

Maiti, Abhradeep. 2021. "Effect of corporal punishment on young children?s educational outcomes." *Education Economics*, 29(4): 411–423.

Mulhern, Christine. 2023. "Beyond Teachers: Estimating Individual School Counselors' Effects on Educational Attainment." *American Economic Review*, 113(11): 2846–93.

Muralidharan, Karthik, and Abhijeet Singh. 2020. "Improving public sector management at scale? experimental evidence on school governance india." National Bureau of Economic Research.

Muralidharan, Karthik, and Abhijeet Singh. 2025. "Adapting for scale: Experimental Evidence on Technology-aided Instruction in India." National Bureau of Economic Research.

Muralidharan, Karthik, and Paul Niehaus. 2017. "Experimentation at scale." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(4): 103–124.

Sharma, Karmini. 2023. "Tackling Sexual Harassment: Short and Long-Run Experimental Evidence from India." Mimeo.

Smarrelli, Gabriela. 2023. "Improving school management of violence: Evidence from a nationwide policy in peru." JSTOR.

Smarrelli, Gabriela, Dongyi Wu, Line Baago-Rasmussen, Susannah Hares, and Dipak Naker. 2024. *Violence in Schools: Prevalence, Impact, and Interventions.* JSTOR.

Zárate, Román Andrés. 2023. "Uncovering peer effects in social and academic skills." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 15(3): 35–79.

Tables and Figures

FIGURE 1. Channels of impact and expected outcomes of the RPS program






FIGURE 2. First Stage – Psychologists

(A) Hiring of Psychologists




(B) Contract Duration of Psychologists




Notes: This figure shows estimates of the first stage: the ITT estimate on the probability that a psychologist was hired (Panel A) and the number of month of the psychologist's contract (Panel B). They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a RPS program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school).

FIGURE 3. First Stage – Workshops

(A) Implementation Rates



(B) Treatment Effects



Notes: This figure shows workshop implementation rates among treated and control schools (Panel A) and estimates of the effect of treatment assignment on the likelihood that each individual workshop was implemented at the school (Panel B). The list of workshops is in Table A20. The estimates in Panel B are from a regression of the outcome of interest on the RPS program indicator controlling for strata fixed effects. The 95% confidence-intervals cluster the standard errors at the school level. The vertical black lines in each plot indicate each year.

Table 1 – ITT Effects on Reports of School Violence

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Victim status						
Victim	0.214	0.061***	0.232	0.061***	0.196	0.058***
		(0.013)		(0.015)		(0.015)
Victim physical	0.098	0.032***	0.071	0.025***	0.125	0.035***
		(0.008)		(0.007)		(0.010)
Victim psychological	0.077	0.026***	0.092	0.030***	0.061	0.022***
		(0.006)		(0.008)		(0.006)
Victim sexual	0.042	0.005	0.072	0.008	0.012	0.003
		(0.003)		(0.006)		(0.002)
Victim peers	0.142	0.056***	0.138	0.055***	0.145	0.053***
		(0.011)		(0.012)		(0.013)
Victim adults	0.074	0.007	0.095	0.007	0.053	0.006
		(0.005)		(0.007)		(0.005)
B. Aggressor status						
Aggressor	0.188	0.071***	0.125	0.034***	0.254	0.100***
		(0.014)		(0.011)		(0.021)
Aggressor physical	0.106	0.035***	0.067	0.019***	0.146	0.047***
		(0.009)		(0.007)		(0.013)
Aggressor psychological	0.067	0.031***	0.056	0.017**	0.079	0.042***
		(0.007)		(0.007)		(0.010)
Aggressor sexual	0.020	0.007**	0.003	-0.000	0.038	0.014**
		(0.003)		(0.001)		(0.006)
N	2,055,483	1,914,188	1,039,881	957,979	1,015,602	956,209

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on the likelihood of being reported in the *SíSeVe* as either a victim or an aggressor. The sample includes all students in treated and control schools across all grades from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table 2 – ITT Effects on the Type of Perpetrator and Identity of the Reporter

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Type of perpetrator						
Student (same grade)	0.113	0.043***	0.113	0.040***	0.114	0.045***
		(0.009)		(0.010)		(0.011)
Student (lower grade)	0.008	0.007***	0.006	0.011***	0.010	0.003**
		(0.001)		(0.002)		(0.002)
Student (higher grade)	0.019	0.006***	0.017	0.007***	0.020	0.005*
		(0.002)		(0.002)		(0.003)
Student (other school)	0.002	0.000	0.003	-0.000	0.001	0.001
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Teacher	0.064	0.006	0.082	0.005	0.046	0.006
		(0.005)		(0.007)		(0.005)
Principal	0.002	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.003	-0.000
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Assistant	0.005	0.001	0.006	0.000	0.003	0.001
		(0.001)		(0.002)		(0.001)
Support staff	0.003	-0.000	0.004	-0.000	0.001	-0.000
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.000)
Other school staff	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	-0.000
		(0.000)		(0.000)		(0.000)
B. Identity of the reporter						
Victim (student)	0.002	0.000	0.003	-0.000	0.001	0.001
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Mother	0.059	0.017***	0.063	0.017**	0.055	0.015**
		(0.006)		(0.007)		(0.006)
Father	0.013	0.001	0.014	-0.000	0.012	0.002
		(0.002)		(0.002)		(0.002)
Sibling	0.003	0.001*	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.001
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Other relative	0.004	0.001	0.003	0.002*	0.004	-0.000
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Friend	0.001	-0.000	0.001	-0.000	0.001	0.000
		(0.000)		(0.000)		(0.000)
Schoolmate	0.002	-0.000	0.003	-0.000	0.002	0.000
		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Neighbor	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000
		(0.000)		(0.000)		(0.000)
Principal	0.040	0.003	0.047	0.001	0.034	0.004
		(0.004)		(0.005)		(0.004)
Teacher	0.072	0.017**	0.077	0.019**	0.067	0.013
		(0.008)		(0.008)		(0.009)
Teacher committee	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		(0.000)		(0.000)		(0.000)
Other	0.021	0.024***	0.023	0.023***	0.019	0.024***
		(0.004)		(0.004)		(0.004)
N	2,055,483	1,914,188	1,039,881	957,979	1,015,602	956,209

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on the type of perpetrator (Panel A) and the identity of the reporter (Panel B) in *SiSeVe* for secondary school students. The sample includes all students in treated and control schools across secondary grades from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table 3 – Reporting of Violence Between Students

	Girls			Boys			Difference
	Control group mean	Treatment effect (ITT)	p-value [q-value]	Control group mean	Treatment effect (ITT)	p-value [q-value]	p-value
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Sexual: ever	0.081	0.027**	0.019	0.088	−0.007	0.593	0.039
		(0.011)	[0.086]		(0.012)	[0.965]	
Sexual: in the past year	0.057	0.014	0.164	0.065	−0.009	0.369	0.091
		(0.010)	[0.279]		(0.010)	[0.965]	
Sexual: in the past month	0.029	0.012*	0.075	0.043	−0.008	0.346	0.066
		(0.007)	[0.213]		(0.008)	[0.965]	
Sexual: frequency in the past month	0.048	0.018	0.149	0.067	−0.002	0.926	0.522
		(0.012)	[0.279]		(0.017)	[0.965]	
Psychological: ever	0.276	0.042***	0.009	0.242	0.021	0.284	0.362
		(0.016)	[0.080]		(0.019)	[0.965]	
Psychological: in the past month	0.111	0.029**	0.020	0.108	0.009	0.531	0.214
		(0.012)	[0.086]		(0.014)	[0.965]	
Psychological: in the past year	0.188	0.039***	0.006	0.174	0.013	0.464	0.152
		(0.014)	[0.080]		(0.018)	[0.965]	
Psychological: frequency in the past month	0.196	0.051*	0.075	0.185	0.020	0.509	0.437
		(0.028)	[0.213]		(0.031)	[0.965]	
Physical: ever	0.090	0.018	0.122	0.114	0.001	0.939	0.752
		(0.011)	[0.260]		(0.019)	[0.965]	
Physical: in the past month	0.035	0.010	0.244	0.048	0.003	0.792	0.749
		(0.008)	[0.377]		(0.013)	[0.965]	
Physical: in the past year	0.053	0.017	0.109	0.079	−0.001	0.965	0.422
		(0.010)	[0.260]		(0.017)	[0.965]	
Physical: frequency in the past month	0.062	0.015	0.422	0.077	0.006	0.772	0.986
		(0.019)	[0.513]		(0.022)	[0.965]	
Serious problem of violence among students	2.225	−0.006	0.907	2.164	0.038	0.455	0.766
		(0.054)	[0.939]		(0.051)	[0.965]	
Familiar with the SíseVe Portal	0.195	0.045	0.334	0.231	0.018	0.644	0.461
		(0.046)	[0.437]		(0.038)	[0.965]	
All cases can be reported on SíseVe	0.154	0.002	0.939	0.168	0.002	0.923	0.989
		(0.023)	[0.939]		(0.025)	[0.965]	
Anyone can report a case on SíseVe	0.889	−0.003	0.908	0.866	0.049	0.135	0.526
		(0.029)	[0.939]		(0.033)	[0.965]	
Anyone can report a case on SíseVe - Doesn't know	0.530	−0.043	0.305	0.453	−0.047	0.150	0.543
		(0.042)	[0.432]		(0.032)	[0.965]	
N	1,361			1,341			

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table 4 – ITT Effects on School Climate and School Support

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. School climate						
School climate index	0.014	-0.011	-0.021	-0.000	0.051	-0.019
	[1.003]	(0.012)	[0.988]	(0.015)	[1.018]	(0.015)
Students at my school get along well	2.759	-0.011	2.683	-0.014	2.838	-0.008
	[0.755]	(0.009)	[0.753]	(0.012)	[0.750]	(0.011)
I help my classmates when they need it	3.068	-0.001	3.108	0.007	3.028	-0.008
	[0.612]	(0.007)	[0.590]	(0.008)	[0.630]	(0.008)
My classmates care about me	2.433	-0.005	2.408	-0.001	2.460	-0.007
	[0.767]	(0.008)	[0.758]	(0.010)	[0.775]	(0.010)
My classmates help me when I need it	2.827	-0.006	2.816	0.007	2.839	-0.016
	[0.778]	(0.008)	[0.776]	(0.010)	[0.781]	(0.010)
B. School support						
School support index	0.014	-0.011	-0.021	-0.000	0.051	-0.019
	[1.003]	(0.012)	[0.988]	(0.015)	[1.018]	(0.015)
Help for bullied students	2.644	0.006	2.694	0.001	2.593	0.011
	[0.913]	(0.012)	[0.903]	(0.014)	[0.921]	(0.014)
Can report teacher misconduct	2.539	-0.004	2.613	-0.011	2.463	0.006
	[1.063]	(0.012)	[1.039]	(0.015)	[1.082]	(0.014)
Teachers help resolve conflicts	2.855	-0.003	2.910	0.005	2.799	-0.009
	[0.902]	(0.011)	[0.879]	(0.013)	[0.921]	(0.013)
Can appeal school sanctions	2.140	0.004	2.170	-0.012	2.110	0.021*
	[0.915]	(0.010)	[0.915]	(0.013)	[0.915]	(0.012)
Support for student problems	2.953	0.078***	2.979	0.080***	2.926	0.076***
	[0.878]	(0.012)	[0.864]	(0.014)	[0.891]	(0.014)
Trusted adult for safety concerns	2.759	0.148***	2.749	0.155***	2.770	0.140***
	[0.956]	(0.014)	[0.954]	(0.018)	[0.957]	(0.015)
C. Sources of support when witnessing violence						
Tutor	0.513	-0.004	0.521	-0.005	0.505	-0.003
	[0.500]	(0.006)	[0.500]	(0.008)	[0.500]	(0.008)
Other teacher	0.386	-0.010*	0.380	-0.008	0.392	-0.013**
	[0.487]	(0.005)	[0.485]	(0.007)	[0.488]	(0.006)
Principal	0.161	0.006	0.146	0.003	0.176	0.010
	[0.367]	(0.005)	[0.353]	(0.006)	[0.381]	(0.006)
Assistant	0.454	0.010	0.451	0.002	0.457	0.015*
	[0.498]	(0.008)	[0.498]	(0.009)	[0.498]	(0.008)
School psychologist	0.194	0.057***	0.214	0.054***	0.174	0.060***
	[0.395]	(0.007)	[0.410]	(0.008)	[0.379]	(0.007)
Admin/cleaning/security staff	0.077	-0.003	0.062	-0.004	0.093	- 0.002
	[0.267]	(0.003)	[0.240]	(0.004)	[0.291]	(0.004)
Family member	0.671	0.001	0.700	0.009	0.642	-0.004
	[0.470]	(0.004)	[0.458]	(0.005)	[0.479]	(0.006)
Friend	0.701	-0.014***	0.739	-0.011**	0.663	-0.016***
	[0.458]	(0.004)	[0.439]	(0.006)	[0.473]	(0.006)
N	39,069	36,177	19,786	18,123	19,283	18,054

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on school climate (Panel A) and school support (Panel B). The sample includes all students in treated and control schools in 2nd grade of secondary school in 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table 5 – ITT Effects on Non-Academic and Well-being Outcomes

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Sense of belonging						
Belonging	-0.006	0.023**	-0.074	0.030**	0.064	0.013
	[1.000]	(0.010)	[1.034]	(0.013)	[0.959]	(0.011)
Is not bored at school	2.692	0.025**	2.705	0.030**	2.679	0.022*
	[0.844]	(0.010)	[0.826]	(0.013)	[0.862]	(0.012)
Doesn't feel alone at school	3.223	0.011*	3.187	0.015*	3.261	0.007
	[0.760]	(0.006)	[0.768]	(0.008)	[0.750]	(0.007)
Doesn't prefer to skip school	3.393	0.019***	3.366	0.022**	3.421	0.013*
	[0.720]	(0.007)	[0.731]	(0.009)	[0.707]	(0.008)
Doesn't feel out of place	3.231	0.007	3.191	0.009	3.273	0.003
	[0.761]	(0.006)	[0.776]	(0.009)	[0.743]	(0.007)
Doesn't feel like a stranger	3.300	0.014**	3.264	0.018**	3.337	0.010
	[0.759]	(0.006)	[0.771]	(0.008)	[0.744]	(0.008)
Doesn't feel excluded	3.220	0.013*	3.146	0.021*	3.297	0.003
	[0.754]	(0.007)	[0.786]	(0.011)	[0.712]	(0.009)
Has good friends	3.182	-0.004	3.153	0.003	3.212	-0.012
	[0.804]	(0.009)	[0.801]	(0.011)	[0.805]	(0.011)
N	60,729	49,196	31,049	24,820	29,680	24,376
B. Emotional Regulation						
Emotional regulation	0.001	0.032**	-0.206	0.043***	0.215	0.014
	[1.000]	(0.013)	[1.056]	(0.016)	[0.889]	(0.012)
No nervous or on edge	3.114	0.023**	2.963	0.025*	3.270	0.015
	[0.934]	(0.011)	[0.973]	(0.014)	[0.865]	(0.011)
Can control worry	3.159	0.022*	2.965	0.027*	3.357	0.012
	[0.969]	(0.011)	[1.022]	(0.014)	[0.867]	(0.011)
Doesn't worry about many things	2.895	0.030**	2.677	0.039***	3.119	0.014
	[1.023]	(0.012)	[1.048]	(0.014)	[0.945]	(0.013)
No difficulty relaxing	3.084	0.016	2.923	0.021	3.250	0.005
	[1.021]	(0.011)	[1.063]	(0.015)	[0.947]	(0.012)
No restlessness (can sit still)	3.386	0.023**	3.407	0.034***	3.363	0.008
	[0.933]	(0.009)	[0.941]	(0.013)	[0.926]	(0.011)
Not easily irritable	3.325	0.030***	3.127	0.047***	3.530	0.009
	[0.969]	(0.010)	[1.058]	(0.014)	[0.820]	(0.010)
N	38,783	35,925	19,664	18,037	19,119	17,888

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on students' sense of belonging (Panel A) and emotional regulation (Panel B). The sample includes all students in treated and control schools in 2nd grade of secondary school in 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table 6 – ITT Effects on Educational Outcomes

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Language grade	14.105	-0.038	14.442	-0.023	13.758	-0.050
	[3.144]	(0.037)	[3.033]	(0.038)	[3.216]	(0.040)
Math grade	13.687	-0.054	13.866	-0.057	13.503	-0.050
	[3.060]	(0.038)	[2.934]	(0.039)	[3.206]	(0.040)
Behavior grade	14.635	-0.049	14.995	-0.040	14.263	-0.052
	[3.286]	(0.040)	[3.178]	(0.042)	[3.353]	(0.042)
GPA	14.460	-0.033	14.761	-0.027	14.151	-0.032
	[2.564]	(0.032)	[2.469]	(0.033)	[2.623]	(0.035)
Approved academic year	0.845	-0.004	0.868	-0.004	0.822	-0.003
	[0.362]	(0.003)	[0.339]	(0.003)	[0.383]	(0.004)
Remedial academic year	0.108	0.003	0.093	0.003	0.122	0.002
	[0.310]	(0.002)	[0.291]	(0.002)	[0.328]	(0.003)
Failed academic year	0.033	0.001	0.026	0.000	0.039	0.001
	[0.178]	(0.001)	[0.159]	(0.001)	[0.195]	(0.001)
School transfer	0.105	-0.000	0.106	-0.000	0.104	-0.000
	[0.306]	(0.001)	[0.308]	(0.001)	[0.305]	(0.001)
Permanent dropout	0.022	0.001	0.021	0.001	0.023	0.000
	[0.148]	(0.001)	[0.145]	(0.001)	[0.151]	(0.001)
Partial dropout	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000*
	[0.020]	(0.000)	[0.021]	(0.000)	[0.020]	(0.000)
N	2,055,483	1,914,188	1,039,881	957,979	1,015,602	956,209

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on educational outcomes. The sample includes all students in treated and control schools across all grades from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table 7 – ITT Effects on Test Scores

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Test Scores for all students						
Math score	-0.034	-0.022	-0.113	-0.027	0.048	-0.017
	[0.999]	(0.018)	[0.965]	(0.019)	[1.027]	(0.020)
Reading score	-0.024	-0.028	0.020	-0.027	-0.070	-0.027
	[1.005]	(0.019)	[1.001]	(0.021)	[1.007]	(0.020)
N	183,106	117,452	92,822	59,214	90,284	58,238
B. Test Scores for secondary school students						
Math score	-0.021	-0.024	-0.107	-0.021	0.071	-0.028
	[1.004]	(0.024)	[0.970]	(0.028)	[1.033]	(0.028)
Reading score	-0.017	-0.026	0.032	-0.015	-0.069	-0.029
	[1.007]	(0.026)	[1.021]	(0.031)	[0.990]	(0.027)
Social sciences score	-0.006	-0.043	0.011	-0.036	-0.023	-0.040
	[1.014]	(0.027)	[1.005]	(0.031)	[1.023]	(0.032)
N	86,998	63,879	44,659	32,273	42,339	31,606

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on test scores for all students (Panel A) and for secondary school students (Panel B). The sample includes all students in treated and control schools across all grades from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table 8 – Teachers Survey – Prevention Training

	Teachers		
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)
A team to prevent violence	0.904	0.040	0.384
		(0.045)	[0.616]
A designated teacher or assistant principal	0.882	0.046	0.391
		(0.054)	[0.616]
Work with student representatives to promote non-violent behavior.	0.820	0.121	0.111
		(0.075)	[0.304]
Programs/workshops conducted at the school	0.784	0.172**	0.020
		(0.073)	[0.113]
Participated in a workshop on violence prevention	0.729	0.090	0.284
		(0.083)	[0.616]
Consulted with the principal about violence prevention	0.542	0.071	0.449
		(0.093)	[0.618]
Helped organize educational activities due to a violent event at school	0.525	0.196**	0.047
		(0.098)	[0.174]
Consulted with the school's committee on how to prevent and manage violence	0.695	0.041	0.633
		(0.086)	[0.760]
Consulted with the Convivencia specialist on how to prevent and manage violence	0.339	−0.024	0.778
		(0.086)	[0.778]
Consulted with the school psychologist about how to prevent and manage violence	0.424	0.466***	0.000
		(0.082)	[0.001]
Discussed with the parents' association how to deal with school violence	0.424	−0.037	0.690
		(0.092)	[0.760]
N		116	

Notes: The sample is restricted to teachers who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for teachers in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a RPS program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table 9 – Teachers Survey

	Teachers		
	Control group mean	Treatment effect (ITT)	p-value [q-value]
	(1)	(2)	(3)
School Violence Prevention and Management	0.629	0.112***	0.010
		(0.043)	[0.067]
General Well-Being	1.963	0.035	0.714
		(0.096)	[0.833]
Job Satisfaction	3.583	−0.165**	0.034
		(0.077)	[0.121]
Self-Confidence in Teaching	3.322	0.002	0.979
		(0.085)	[0.980]
Confidence in Peers Hability for Teaching	2.977	0.074	0.483
		(0.104)	[0.676]
Teacher Self-Efficacy	3.302	−0.102	0.163
		(0.072)	[0.285]
Security and Disruptiveness	1.550	0.194	0.137
		(0.129)	[0.285]
N		116	

Notes: The sample is restricted to teachers who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for teachers in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a RPS program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

(For Online Publication)

Appendix to

Can Regular Psychological Support Reduce School Violence and Improve Students' Outcomes?

Jonathan Enriquez Peña, Stephanie Majerowicz, Clémentine Van Effenterre and Román Andrés Zárate

A Additional Tables and Figures

FIGURE A1. Students Origin by Treatment, Grade, and Year



Notes: This figure shows workshop implementation rates among treated and control schools (Panel A) and estimates of the effect of treatment assignment on the likelihood that each individual workshop was implemented at the school (Panel B). The list of workshops is in Table A20. The estimates in Panel B are from a regression of the outcome of interest on the RPS program indicator controlling for strata fixed effects. The 95% confidence-intervals cluster the standard errors at the school level. The vertical black lines in each plot indicate each year.

Table A1 – Balance Test for School-level Variables

	Treatment	Control	Difference	p-value	N
Panel A: Standardized Test Scores (2nd grade, 2018)					
Reading score	586.47	586.13	0.35	0.817	965
Math score	564.22	563.68	0.55	0.771	965
Panel B: Achievement Levels — Math					
Prior to start	0.281	0.283	−0.002	0.828	965
Beginning	0.420	0.425	−0.005	0.284	965
In progress	0.183	0.176	0.007	0.109	965
Satisfactory	0.116	0.116	0.000	0.968	965
Panel C: Achievement Levels — Reading					
Prior to start	0.087	0.087	0.001	0.888	965
Beginning	0.386	0.387	−0.001	0.868	965
In progress	0.349	0.352	−0.003	0.479	965
Satisfactory	0.178	0.174	0.004	0.562	965
Panel D: School Characteristics					
Approval rate	0.905	0.904	0.001	0.900	965
Dropout rate	0.026	0.026	0.000	0.931	965
Total students	742.43	735.85	6.58	0.813	966
Students per classroom	28.96	28.92	0.05	0.857	966
Total teachers	46.34	46.16	0.18	0.914	966
Student-teacher ratio	16.26	16.13	0.13	0.526	966
Computers per student	0.357	0.371	−0.014	0.381	916
Distance to UGEL (min)	13.94	8.43	5.51	0.022	966
School levels	1.914	1.912	0.002	0.960	966
Panel E: District Characteristics					
Extreme poverty rate	12.65	12.26	0.39	0.370	966
Adequate roof	0.789	0.802	−0.014	0.083	966
Adequate walls	0.884	0.897	−0.013	0.104	966
Electricity access	0.993	1.000	−0.007	0.070	966
Water access	0.933	0.948	−0.015	0.049	966
Overcrowding rate	0.111	0.111	0.000	0.988	966
Share female students	0.512	0.512	−0.001	0.411	966

Notes: This table reports mean values for treatment and control schools and the difference between them. The difference is estimated from an OLS regression of each variable on a treatment indicator with strata fixed effects and robust standard errors. The randomization was conducted by staff at the Ministry of Education and balance checks were performed at the school level. Test score data correspond to the 2018 national standardized evaluation for 2nd-grade students. N is the total number of schools with non-missing data for each variable.

Table A2 – Balance Test Student for Student-level Variables

Variable	Control		Treatment		Difference	p-value
	N	Mean	N	Mean		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Student enrollment variables						
Student is female	1,300,286	0.511	1,214,683	0.503	-0.008	0.547
Student is immigrant	1,300,286	0.017	1,214,683	0.015	-0.002	0.162
Student works	1,300,286	0.000	1,214,683	0.000	-0.000	0.873
Student 1st lang is Spanish	1,294,936	0.975	1,209,178	0.978	0.003	0.331
Student has a disability	1,300,286	0.002	1,214,683	0.002	-0.000*	0.056
Language grade	1,278,439	13.920	1,194,831	13.886	-0.035	0.243
Math grade	1,277,717	13.645	1,194,235	13.595	-0.050*	0.075
Behavior grade	927,394	14.685	854,101	14.632	-0.054*	0.054
GPA	1,281,440	14.341	1,197,830	14.292	-0.048*	0.062
Approved	1,300,286	0.770	1,214,683	0.765	-0.005	0.211
Failed	1,300,286	0.049	1,214,683	0.051	0.002	0.246
Remedial	1,300,286	0.174	1,214,683	0.177	0.003	0.263
Mother is alive	1,286,757	0.998	1,204,712	0.998	-0.000	0.343
Mother's age	1,277,941	40.599	1,198,141	40.620	0.020	0.854
Mother's 1st lang is Spanish	91,870	0.882	89,499	0.879	-0.003	0.742
Mother's education level	1,282,290	3.553	1,200,860	3.505	-0.047	0.217
Father is alive	1,196,765	0.995	1,122,827	0.995	-0.000	0.217
Fathers's age	1,186,765	44.392	1,114,495	44.643	0.251*	0.052
Father's 1st lang is Spanish	53,890	0.927	52,502	0.923	-0.004	0.661
Father's education level	1,188,990	3.752	1,115,874	3.698	-0.054	0.155
Mother is the main guardian	1,300,286	0.757	1,214,683	0.762	0.005	0.388
Father is the main guardian	1,300,286	0.223	1,214,683	0.218	-0.005	0.353
Test of joint significance	F-stat: 1.100 (p-value: 0.369)					
B. Student test scores variables						
Math test scores	190,686	0.031	179,808	0.000	-0.030	0.117
Reading test scores	190,786	0.030	179,894	-0.002	-0.032	0.102
Social sciences test scores	67,653	0.020	65,613	-0.006	-0.026	0.219
Natural sciences test scores	133,785	0.001	128,797	-0.019	-0.020	0.219
Socioeconomic index	172,913	-0.006	164,270	-0.041	-0.035	0.161
Peer-related violence	132,734	-0.025	128,126	-0.010	0.015	0.341
Teacher-student violence	132,412	-0.010	127,818	0.002	0.012	0.394
Discrimination	68,765	0.003	65,885	0.010	0.006	0.733
School climate	68,765	0.009	65,885	-0.014	-0.024**	0.047
Belonging	63,928	-0.030	61,573	-0.023	0.007	0.438
Test of joint significance	F-stat: 0.800 (p-value: 0.626)					

Notes: Columns 1 and 2 show the average value for students in the control and treatment groups, respectively. Column 3 reports the coefficient from the regression of each variable on the treatment group indicator, with the p-value reported in column 4. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata, and standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). The F-statistic is from a test of the joint significance of the coefficients in a regression of the treatment group indicator on all student characteristics.

Table A3 – Summary statistics – Psychologists

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Women	0.787	0.410	1,018
Years of General experience	6.237	4.101	1,475
Years of Specific experience	3.656	3.042	1,474
Bachelor	0.921	0.270	1,484
Master	0.077	0.266	1,484

Notes: The table presents summary statistics of the characteristics of psychologists hired through the RPS program from 2020 to 2023.

Table A4 – Sample Selection

	Math Standardized Test	Language Standardized Test	Social Sciences Standardized Test	Belonging Index	Education Level ASP
Panel A: All schools					
Treatment	-0.029	-0.037*	-0.042	-0.020**	-0.033**
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.026)	(0.010)	(0.014)
In survey sample	0.049	0.048	0.004	0.011	-0.010
	(0.035)	(0.031)	(0.102)	(0.023)	(0.027)
In survey sample × Treatment	0.015	0.006	-0.016	-0.008	-0.005
	(0.047)	(0.044)	(0.113)	(0.027)	(0.032)
Mean control	0.215	0.264	0.182	0.068	0.072
N	147,511	147,440	28,800	106,673	77,350
Panel B: Schools in Lima					
Treatment	-0.019	-0.040	-0.098*	-0.027	-0.031
	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.056)	(0.018)	(0.022)
In survey sample	0.016	0.007	0.015	-0.016	-0.013
	(0.041)	(0.037)	(0.074)	(0.021)	(0.029)
In survey sample × Treatment	0.012	0.017	0.036	0.007	-0.006
	(0.056)	(0.052)	(0.104)	(0.029)	(0.036)
Mean control	0.177	0.233	0.189	0.057	0.072
N	45,351	45,339	4,332	36,957	32,536

Notes: The table compares the characteristics of the selected sample for the survey compared to the overall experimental sample, separately by treatment and control status. The estimates are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator, a survey sample indicator, and an interaction term. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school).

Table A5 – Student Post-Treatment Survey: Response Rates

Variables	Control Group	Treatment Group	Difference	*p*-value
Survey response rate	0.766	0.671	-0.095	0.002
Number of schools	60	60	120	
Number of students	1,440	1,257	2,697	

Notes: The table presents the average response rate in control schools (Column 1) and treated schools (Column 2), as well as the difference survey response rate between treated and control schools in the sample of schools selected for the survey (Column 3) and the corresponsing p-value (Column 4). The estimates are obtained from a regression of the response rate on a school program indicator. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school).

Table A6 – ITT Effects on Reports of School Violence for Students in Secondary School

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Victim status						
Victim	0.294	0.081***	0.335	0.090***	0.252	0.072***
		(0.019)		(0.023)		(0.021)
Victim physical	0.135	0.043***	0.100	0.039***	0.171	0.041***
		(0.011)		(0.010)		(0.015)
Victim psychological	0.102	0.034***	0.130	0.042***	0.073	0.030***
		(0.009)		(0.013)		(0.009)
Victim sexual	0.062	0.007	0.110	0.012	0.012	0.003
		(0.005)		(0.010)		(0.003)
Victim peers	0.205	0.077***	0.208	0.085***	0.203	0.068***
		(0.017)		(0.019)		(0.019)
Victim adults	0.091	0.005	0.129	0.007	0.051	0.005
		(0.008)		(0.011)		(0.007)
B. Aggressor status						
Aggressor	0.277	0.104***	0.191	0.058***	0.365	0.138***
		(0.022)		(0.018)		(0.032)
Aggressor physical	0.152	0.053***	0.103	0.036***	0.204	0.065***
		(0.013)		(0.012)		(0.019)
Aggressor psychological	0.105	0.045***	0.088	0.025**	0.122	0.062***
		(0.011)		(0.011)		(0.017)
Aggressor sexual	0.027	0.010**	0.003	0.001	0.052	0.016**
		(0.004)		(0.001)		(0.008)
N	1,157,481	1,108,982	587,135	554,446	570,346	554,536

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on the likelihood of being reported in the *SíSeVe* as either a victim or an aggressor for students in secondary school. The sample includes all students in treated and control schools across all grades from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table A7 – ITT Effects on Reports of School Violence for Students in the Questionnaire Sample

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Victim status						
Victim	0.354	0.213***	0.339	0.255***	0.369	0.148*
		(0.066)		(0.098)		(0.083)
Victim physical	0.159	0.128***	0.086	0.107***	0.234	0.145**
		(0.041)		(0.039)		(0.066)
Victim psychological	0.105	0.091**	0.091	0.175***	0.120	0.003
		(0.036)		(0.055)		(0.044)
Victim sexual	0.095	-0.000	0.167	-0.010	0.021	-0.003
		(0.031)		(0.062)		(0.018)
Victim peers	0.233	0.231***	0.187	0.265***	0.281	0.190**
		(0.057)		(0.076)		(0.076)
Victim adults	0.121	-0.013	0.152	-0.005	0.088	-0.037
		(0.033)		(0.060)		(0.033)
B. Aggressor status						
Aggressor	0.315	0.188***	0.167	0.103*	0.468	0.248**
		(0.071)		(0.055)		(0.120)
Aggressor physical	0.149	0.077*	0.091	0.025	0.208	0.122
		(0.041)		(0.034)		(0.074)
Aggressor psychological	0.126	0.134**	0.071	0.105**	0.182	0.149*
		(0.053)		(0.042)		(0.085)
Aggressor sexual	0.041	-0.002	0.005	-0.007	0.078	0.000
		(0.017)		(0.007)		(0.033)
N	39,002	36,125	19,758	18,105	19,244	18,020

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on the likelihood of being reported in the *SíSeVe* as either a victim or an aggressor for students who responded to the additional test score questionnaires. The sample includes students in 2nd grade of secondary school in 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table A8 – Violence by Teachers Against Students

	Girls			Boys			Difference
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)	Control group mean (4)	Treatment effect (ITT) (5)	p-value [q-value] (6)	p-value (7)
Sexual from teachers: ever	0.002	−0.001	0.301	0.006	−0.003	0.298	0.548
		(0.001)	[0.839]		(0.003)	[0.636]	
Sexual from teachers: in the past year	0.000	0.000	0.895	0.003	−0.002	0.550	0.405
		(0.001)	[0.934]		(0.003)	[0.708]	
Sexual from teachers: in the past month	0.000	0.001	0.310	0.002	0.001	0.698	0.799
		(0.001)	[0.839]		(0.002)	[0.718]	
Psychological from teachers: ever	0.029	−0.004	0.449	0.028	−0.003	0.718	0.927
		(0.005)	[0.839]		(0.008)	[0.718]	
Psychological from teachers: in the past year	0.018	0.001	0.849	0.022	−0.007	0.238	0.187
		(0.004)	[0.934]		(0.006)	[0.636]	
Physical from teachers: ever	0.015	0.000	0.934	0.046	−0.020*	0.060	0.118
		(0.006)	[0.934]		(0.011)	[0.539]	
Physical from teachers: in the past year	0.007	−0.002	0.466	0.023	−0.008	0.232	0.722
		(0.003)	[0.839]		(0.007)	[0.636]	
Physical from teachers: in the past month	0.003	0.001	0.670	0.016	−0.006	0.353	0.334
		(0.002)	[0.934]		(0.006)	[0.636]	
Serious problem of violence from teachers	1.543	0.043	0.402	1.544	0.035	0.497	0.797
		(0.051)	[0.839]		(0.052)	[0.708]	
N	1,361			1,341			

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table A9 – ITT Effects on the Perception of Violence

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Peer-perpetrated violence						
Peer violence index	-0.017	0.001	0.008	-0.001	-0.043	0.001
	[0.994]	(0.016)	[0.984]	(0.019)	[1.004]	(0.017)
Threats/intimidation	1.753	0.009	1.721	0.006	1.786	0.007
	[0.924]	(0.013)	[0.913]	(0.015)	[0.935]	(0.014)
Physical assault	1.887	0.001	1.877	0.003	1.897	-0.004
	[0.980]	(0.014)	[0.983]	(0.017)	[0.976]	(0.015)
Mocking/insults	2.301	0.010	2.317	0.002	2.283	0.013
	[1.112]	(0.016)	[1.110]	(0.020)	[1.114]	(0.017)
Theft/damage of belongings	2.112	0.003	2.095	-0.002	2.130	0.001
	[1.103]	(0.019)	[1.106]	(0.023)	[1.099]	(0.020)
Rumor-spreading	2.323	-0.003	2.447	-0.004	2.196	-0.001
	[1.093]	(0.014)	[1.089]	(0.017)	[1.082]	(0.016)
Public shouting	1.973	-0.012	1.983	-0.017	1.963	-0.011
	[1.062]	(0.014)	[1.069]	(0.018)	[1.055]	(0.016)
Non-consensual contact	1.352	-0.001	1.324	0.005	1.380	-0.010
	[0.762]	(0.010)	[0.734]	(0.012)	[0.788]	(0.012)
Online harassment	1.838	-0.001	1.929	-0.002	1.745	0.006
	[1.068]	(0.019)	[1.100]	(0.023)	[1.027]	(0.018)
B. Adult-perpetrated violence						
Teachers violence index	-0.008	0.012	-0.080	-0.002	0.065	0.019
	[0.992]	(0.016)	[0.912]	(0.016)	[1.063]	(0.018)
Threats/intimidation	1.242	0.004	1.201	0.000	1.284	0.005
	[0.582]	(0.007)	[0.543]	(0.007)	[0.617]	(0.008)
Mocking/insults	1.457	0.011	1.410	-0.006	1.506	0.023*
	[0.794]	(0.010)	[0.758]	(0.011)	[0.825]	(0.012)
Physical punishment (body)	1.264	0.008	1.211	0.004	1.319	0.007
	[0.645]	(0.012)	[0.589]	(0.012)	[0.694]	(0.013)
Physical punishment (object)	1.239	0.016	1.194	0.014	1.285	0.013
	[0.616]	(0.012)	[0.562]	(0.012)	[0.664]	(0.013)
Humiliating punishment	1.491	-0.009	1.505	-0.014	1.476	-0.003
	[0.806]	(0.011)	[0.812]	(0.013)	[0.799]	(0.012)
Non-consensual contact	1.076	-0.001	1.063	-0.002	1.090	0.000
	[0.372]	(0.004)	[0.334]	(0.005)	[0.406]	(0.006)
N	39,002	36,125	19,758	18,105	19,244	18,020

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on students' perceptions of peer-perpetrated violence (Panel A) and adult-perpetrated violence (Panel B). The sample includes all students in treated and control schools in 2nd grade of secondary school in 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table A10 – Perception of Violence

	Girls			Boys			Difference
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)	Control group mean (4)	Treatment effect (ITT) (5)	p-value [q-value] (6)	p-value (7)
Conflict Management	3.028	0.012	0.722	3.122	−0.030	0.369	0.537
		(0.034)	[0.722]		(0.033)	[0.999]	
Security and disruptiveness	22.529	−1.314	0.291	17.825	0.301	0.801	0.581
		(1.239)	[0.722]		(1.190)	[0.999]	
Other safety Concerns	7.828	−0.574	0.583	2.987	0.002	0.998	0.301
		(1.043)	[0.722]		(0.717)	[0.999]	
N	1,361			1,341			

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table A11 – School Climate

	Girls			Boys			Difference
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)	Control group mean (4)	Treatment effect (ITT) (5)	p-value [q-value] (6)	p-value (7)
Relationship between students	2.879	−0.035	0.246	2.962	−0.055*	0.061	0.471
		(0.030)	[0.737]		(0.029)	[0.183]	
Relationship between students and teachers	2.949	−0.011	0.751	3.035	−0.032	0.385	0.685
		(0.034)	[0.968]		(0.037)	[0.579]	
Relationship between adults at school	3.138	−0.001	0.968	3.215	−0.003	0.909	0.792
		(0.032)	[0.968]		(0.029)	[0.910]	
N	1,361			1,341			

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table A12 – Help Seeking and Responses

	Girls			Boys			Difference
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)	Control group mean (4)	Treatment effect (ITT) (5)	p-value [q-value] (6)	p-value (7)
Asked for help: Teacher	0.194	−0.003 (0.024)	0.914 [0.999]	0.221	0.006 (0.027)	0.807 [0.999]	0.814
Asked for help: Director	0.044	0.000 (0.011)	0.998 [0.999]	0.077	−0.019 (0.015)	0.206 [0.999]	0.304
Asked for help: Other school staff members	0.134	0.042** (0.019)	0.030 [0.152]	0.164	−0.003 (0.022)	0.903 [0.999]	0.150
Ignored me or didn't believe me.	0.107	0.091** (0.037)	0.016 [0.152]	0.139	−0.027 (0.035)	0.447 [0.999]	0.020
Advised me.	0.837	0.071* (0.039)	0.075 [0.185]	0.822	0.009 (0.039)	0.824 [0.999]	0.638
Spoke with my parents.	0.399	0.113** (0.057)	0.049 [0.163]	0.485	−0.040 (0.056)	0.479 [0.999]	0.068
Spoke with the student who assaulted me.	0.730	0.001 (0.046)	0.983 [0.999]	0.718	0.030 (0.052)	0.564 [0.999]	0.427
Punished the student who attacked me.	0.326	0.007 (0.054)	0.895 [0.999]	0.460	−0.020 (0.068)	0.770 [0.999]	0.774
Wrote in register	0.388	0.057 (0.058)	0.335 [0.558]	0.569	0.106* (0.055)	0.058 [0.579]	0.278
It was reported on the SíSeVe website.	0.028	0.044* (0.026)	0.092 [0.185]	0.084	0.000 (0.030)	0.998 [0.999]	0.238
N	1,361			1,341			

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table A13 – Reporting of Violence Between Students

	Victims			Non-Victims			Difference
	Control group mean	Treatment effect (ITT)	p-value [q-value]	Control group mean	Treatment effect (ITT)	p-value [q-value]	p-value
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Sexual: ever	0.107	0.004	0.899	0.083	0.010	0.254	0.829
		(0.031)	[0.999]		(0.009)	[0.641]	
Sexual: in the past year	0.076	−0.015	0.587	0.060	0.004	0.608	0.802
		(0.027)	[0.999]		(0.007)	[0.796]	
Sexual: in the past month	0.049	−0.009	0.696	0.035	0.002	0.669	0.927
		(0.024)	[0.999]		(0.006)	[0.813]	
Sexual: frequency in the past month	0.094	−0.005	0.934	0.054	0.008	0.415	0.726
		(0.058)	[0.999]		(0.010)	[0.641]	
Psychological: ever	0.308	0.021	0.605	0.254	0.033**	0.018	0.954
		(0.040)	[0.999]		(0.014)	[0.207]	
Psychological: in the past month	0.147	0.009	0.791	0.106	0.020*	0.052	0.822
		(0.035)	[0.999]		(0.010)	[0.240]	
Psychological: in the past year	0.217	0.002	0.951	0.178	0.028**	0.024	0.701
		(0.040)	[0.999]		(0.012)	[0.207]	
Psychological: frequency in the past month	0.241	0.075	0.389	0.186	0.031	0.146	0.317
		(0.086)	[0.999]		(0.021)	[0.496]	
Physical: ever	0.167	−0.011	0.818	0.096	0.010	0.365	0.942
		(0.048)	[0.999]		(0.011)	[0.641]	
Physical: in the past month	0.072	0.000	0.999	0.039	0.007	0.405	0.974
		(0.032)	[0.999]		(0.008)	[0.641]	
Physical: in the past year	0.114	−0.030	0.498	0.062	0.010	0.325	0.709
		(0.045)	[0.999]		(0.010)	[0.641]	
Physical: frequency in the past month	0.135	0.002	0.980	0.064	0.010	0.452	0.890
		(0.068)	[0.999]		(0.014)	[0.641]	
Serious problem of violence among students	2.345	−0.012	0.926	2.181	0.015	0.751	0.517
		(0.125)	[0.999]		(0.048)	[0.823]	
Familiar with the SíseVe Portal	0.216	−0.003	0.962	0.213	0.032	0.421	0.848
		(0.069)	[0.999]		(0.039)	[0.641]	
All cases can be reported on SíseVe	0.164	0.066	0.295	0.161	−0.004	0.822	0.249
		(0.063)	[0.999]		(0.019)	[0.823]	
Anyone can report a case on SíseVe	0.833	0.183**	0.011	0.880	0.007	0.783	0.007
		(0.070)	[0.185]		(0.026)	[0.823]	
Anyone can report a case on SíseVe - Doesn't know	0.431	0.062	0.359	0.496	−0.055*	0.056	0.241
		(0.068)	[0.999]		(0.028)	[0.240]	
N		218			2,484		

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

TABLE A14 – HELP SEEKING AND RESPONSES

	Victims			Non-Victims			Difference
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)	Control group mean (4)	Treatment effect (ITT) (5)	p-value [q-value] (6)	p-value (7)
Asked for help: Teacher	0.328	−0.082	0.141	0.197	0.004	0.838	0.345
		(0.055)	[0.471]		(0.020)	[0.932]	
Asked for help: Director	0.155	−0.080	0.128	0.053	−0.007	0.466	0.270
		(0.052)	[0.471]		(0.010)	[0.777]	
Asked for help: Other school staff members	0.233	−0.002	0.970	0.142	0.019	0.200	0.944
		(0.063)	[0.970]		(0.015)	[0.668]	
Ignored me or didn't believe me.	0.156	0.106	0.214	0.119	0.021	0.410	0.922
		(0.084)	[0.475]		(0.025)	[0.777]	
Advised me.	0.800	0.032	0.749	0.833	0.055**	0.048	0.974
		(0.101)	[0.833]		(0.027)	[0.485]	
Spoke with my parents.	0.289	0.173	0.250	0.466	0.019	0.570	0.042
		(0.149)	[0.475]		(0.034)	[0.815]	
Spoke with the student who assaulted me.	0.756	0.105	0.403	0.719	0.027	0.452	0.870
		(0.124)	[0.576]		(0.036)	[0.777]	
Punished the student who attacked me.	0.400	−0.061	0.667	0.397	−0.002	0.969	0.723
		(0.141)	[0.833]		(0.045)	[0.969]	
Wrote in register	0.467	0.134	0.285	0.487	0.073	0.129	0.803
		(0.124)	[0.475]		(0.048)	[0.644]	
It was reported on the SíSeVe website.	0.022	0.131*	0.065	0.063	0.009	0.651	0.087
		(0.070)	[0.471]		(0.019)	[0.815]	
N		218			2,484		

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

Table A15 – ITT Effects on Educational Outcomes for Secondary School

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Language grade	13.505	-0.042	14.029	-0.022	12.963	-0.062
	[3.414]	(0.051)	[3.327]	(0.055)	[3.419]	(0.052)
Math grade	12.839	-0.064	13.152	-0.082	12.515	-0.051
	[3.522]	(0.050)	[3.447]	(0.055)	[3.570]	(0.050)
Behavior grade	14.424	-0.074	14.993	-0.063	13.833	-0.078
	[3.915]	(0.062)	[3.790]	(0.065)	[3.955]	(0.064)
GPA	14.017	-0.046	14.486	-0.044	13.533	-0.041
	[2.881]	(0.047)	[2.797]	(0.049)	[2.886]	(0.048)
Approved academic year	0.760	-0.006	0.797	-0.006	0.721	-0.005
	[0.427]	(0.005)	[0.402]	(0.005)	[0.448]	(0.005)
Remedial academic year	0.169	0.004	0.144	0.005	0.194	0.003
	[0.375]	(0.003)	[0.352]	(0.003)	[0.395]	(0.003)
Failed academic year	0.049	0.000	0.038	-0.000	0.060	0.001
	[0.215]	(0.002)	[0.191]	(0.002)	[0.237]	(0.002)
School transfer	0.047	0.000	0.049	0.000	0.044	0.000
	[0.211]	(0.001)	[0.217]	(0.001)	[0.206]	(0.001)
Permanent dropout	0.031	0.002	0.029	0.002	0.033	0.001
	[0.173]	(0.001)	[0.167]	(0.001)	[0.178]	(0.002)
Partial dropout	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	[0.020]	(0.000)	[0.022]	(0.000)	[0.019]	(0.000)
N	1,157,481	1,108,982	587,135	554,446	570,346	554,536

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on educational outcomes for students in secondary school. The sample includes all students in treated and control schools in secondary school grades from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table A16 – ITT Effects on Victims and Aggressors Selection

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Victims						
Male	0.456	0.019	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000
	[0.498]	(0.019)	[0.000]	(0.000)	[0.000]	(0.000)
Immigrant	0.009	-0.001	0.009	-0.000	0.010	-0.003
	[0.097]	(0.002)	[0.097]	(0.003)	[0.098]	(0.003)
Mother's education level	4.017	-0.091	3.948	-0.077	4.100	-0.123
	[1.756]	(0.065)	[1.724]	(0.073)	[1.791]	(0.079)
Student has disability	0.017	-0.001	0.011	-0.006	0.025	0.004
	[0.163]	(0.004)	[0.130]	(0.004)	[0.195]	(0.007)
Student worked 2019	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000
	[0.016]	(0.001)	[0.000]	(0.001)	[0.023]	(0.000)
Lang baseline grade	14.575	-0.015	14.741	0.100	14.371	-0.160
	[2.885]	(0.069)	[2.810]	(0.094)	[2.962]	(0.099)
Math baseline grade	14.426	-0.039	14.507	0.022	14.326	-0.112
	[3.060]	(0.070)	[2.934]	(0.098)	[3.206]	(0.104)
Behavior baseline grade	15.057	-0.114**	15.150	-0.010	14.943	-0.181**
	[1.951]	(0.053)	[1.950]	(0.072)	[1.947]	(0.072)
Baseline GPA	14.807	-0.058	14.917	-0.012	14.671	-0.105*
	[1.704]	(0.044)	[1.646]	(0.059)	[1.762]	(0.060)
N	12,117	14,019	6,595	7,307	5,522	6,712
B. Aggressors						
Male	0.666	0.044**	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000
	[0.472]	(0.021)	[0.000]	(0.000)	[0.000]	(0.000)
Immigrant	0.009	-0.001	0.007	0.000	0.010	-0.002
	[0.093]	(0.003)	[0.083]	(0.005)	[0.098]	(0.003)
Mother's education level	3.678	-0.041	3.710	0.003	3.662	-0.050
	[1.616]	(0.065)	[1.621]	(0.081)	[1.613]	(0.074)
Student has disability	0.007	0.007**	0.001	0.006	0.011	0.008*
	[0.095]	(0.003)	[0.024]	(0.004)	[0.115]	(0.005)
Student worked 2019	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.003
	[0.010]	(0.002)	[0.000]	(0.001)	[0.012]	(0.002)
Lang baseline grade	14.169	-0.057	14.559	-0.007	13.971	-0.080
	[3.116]	(0.082)	[2.764]	(0.112)	[3.262]	(0.104)
Math baseline grade	13.991	-0.050	14.148	-0.104	13.911	-0.041
	[3.247]	(0.084)	[3.074]	(0.133)	[3.329]	(0.103)
Behavior baseline grade	14.823	-0.024	15.049	0.008	14.708	-0.054
	[2.033]	(0.056)	[1.883]	(0.091)	[2.095]	(0.073)
Baseline GPA	14.513	-0.046	14.751	-0.043	14.393	-0.047
	[1.841]	(0.049)	[1.609]	(0.068)	[1.937]	(0.063)
N	10,389	12,809	3,471	3,896	6,918	8,913

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on the baseline characteristics of reported victims (Panel A) and aggressors (Panel B). The sample includes all students reported in the *SíSeVe* portal as victims or aggressors in treated and control schools from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table A20 – List of Workshops

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main Topic	Target audience
2020	1	S.1	Socio-emotional development of the school community through the recognition of emotions (one's own and others') and their regulation	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.2	Socio-emotional development of the school community through positive communication (assertiveness), active listening, and empathy	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.3	Promoting self-care practices among school staff, with a focus on socio-emotional support for students (empathy, recognizing and managing stress, promoting healthy self-care practices, etc.)	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.4	Promoting self-care practices among school staff, with a focus on socio-emotional support for families (promoting empathy, learning to cope with stress, creating a warm and respectful environment, and managing conflicts at home).	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.5	Promoting self-care practices among school staff, with a focus on educational personnel	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.6	Joint development of community rules for coexistence and their dissemination	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.7	Timely intervention with students in situations of social risk, providing guidance to prevent and address cyberbullying (students and families), a protection and response system for cases of family violence, and the course "Stop Cyberbullying"	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		S.8	Strengthening the capacities of the school community for the prevention of and response to violence, through the provision of advice and recommendations from the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations (MIMP) and the dissemination of the Guidelines for school coexistence management, the prevention of and response to violence against children and adolescents, and the SíseVe platform.	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
	2	S.1	Socio-emotional skills development for school leaders and teachers, with a focus on respect for others and conflict management in the current context	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.2	Socio-emotional skills development for students, by raising awareness of their importance—especially given the current context—and promoting effective communication (assertiveness, active listening, and empathy) by teachers	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.3	Promoting the practice of rights-based discipline through guidance on the application of corrective measures during the period of distance learning	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		S.4	Strengthening the capacities of the school community for the prevention of and response to violence, through guidance on: (i) identifying risk situations linked to violence against students in virtual environments; (ii) preventive and promotional interventions with students in situations of risk in the event of violence; (iii) appropriate management of virtual environments in teacher–student and teacher–parent interactions; and (iv) guidance related to the new violence response protocol in the current context	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		S.5	Promoting student participation and autonomy, with a focus on children and adolescents as rights-holders; providing guidelines on how to promote active participation and student engagement in learning during distance education	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
2021	1	T.1.1	Workshop on coexistence rules for remote education.	School leaders and teachers.
		T.1.2	Self-assessment and improvement of participation.	School leaders and teachers.
		T.2.1	Workshop on teacher self-care.	Teachers.
		T.2.2	Self-care guide.	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		T.3.1	Workshop on addressing violence.	School leaders and RCE.
		T.3.2	Workshop on household self-care practices.	Families.
		T.3.3	Workshop on identifying risk factors.	Families.
		T.3.4	Workshop on discipline with a rights-based approach.	Teachers, assistants, school leaders, and RCE.
		T.3.5	Guidance for the formation of the well-being management committee in schools (IIEE).	Teachers, assistants, school leaders, and RCE.
	2	T.1	Socio-emotional skills development session for students.	School leaders, teachers, and RCE.
		T.2	Workshop on self-control techniques.	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		T.3	Technical assistance for addressing violence from the school.	School leaders and RCE.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		T.4	Workshop to disseminate positive discipline materials to strengthen socio-emotional skills (HSE) at school.	Teachers and RCE.
		T.5	Workshop to identify risk factors and refer cases of violence involving children and adolescents.	Teachers.
2022	–	T.1.1	Impact of the pandemic and school closures on socio-emotional health and how to address it.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.2.1	Promoting student and family participation in organizing adequate conditions for returning to in-person education.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.3.1	Protective factors against sexual violence.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.3.2	Prevention of violence driven by xenophobia.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.3.3	Prevention of school bullying (bullying and cyberbullying).	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.3.4	Suicide prevention in the school community.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.4.1	Tools for addressing situations where children's and adolescents' rights are being violated in their family environment.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
		T.4.2	Guidelines for positive parenting with a rights-based approach.	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		T.4.3	Review of the implementation of the School Coexistence Strategy in schools (IIEE).	School leaders, teachers, assistants, and family members.
2023	–	T.1.1	Technical assistance to school leaders and the coexistence lead in setting up the Well-being Management Committee (CGB).	School leaders.
		T.1.2	Awareness-raising workshop on discipline with a rights-based approach.	Teachers.
		T.1.3	Technical assistance to the CGB to update classroom coexistence rules.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB).
		T.1.4	Session on using the Socio-emotional Well-being Kit.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB) and teachers.
		T.1.5	Technical assistance to the CGB to implement the violence prevention and response campaign in schools, "We act to prevent school violence with the SíseVe Brigade."	Well-being Management Committee (CGB).
		T.2.1	Training session for teachers on risk identification (supported by the CGB).	Well-being Management Committee (CGB), teachers, and assistants.
		T.2.2	Collegial work for implementing the Tutoring Learning Experiences (EDAT) of the Socio-emotional Well-being Kit.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB), teachers, and assistants.
		T.2.3	Self-care strategies session.	Teachers.
		T.2.4	Session on violence response protocols and on using the SíseVe Portal for school leaders and teachers.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB) and teachers.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		T.2.5	Awareness and case-identification session, and strengthening a reporting culture with families.	Families.
		T.2.6	Session for teachers on student participation in issues of interest as a strategy to prevent violence.	Teachers.
		T.2.7	Technical assistance to develop the classroom tutoring plan that reflects socio-emotional skills needs.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB) and teachers.
		T.2.8	Session to identify institutions and key actors for violence prevention.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB).
		T.3.1	Sessions to develop a diagnosis of violence and school coexistence with school actors.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB), teachers, and assistants.
		T.3.2	Training session on strategies for collective care and well-being of the teaching staff.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB), teachers, and assistants.
		T.3.3	Awareness-raising session on the importance of Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) in preventing school violence.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB) and teachers.
		T.3.4	Session on the use of corrective measures to strengthen self-regulation in the classroom.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB), teachers, and assistants.
		T.4.1	Sessions to identify problems and activities to include in violence prevention and school coexistence in the 2024 PAT.	Well-being Management Committee (CGB), representatives, teachers, and families.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		T.4.2	Technical assistance to implement a group tutoring activity on risk identification and reporting culture.	Tutor teachers.
2024	–	T.1.1	Session to strengthen classroom coexistence rules.	Teachers.
		T.1.2	Session on the development of discipline: strategies to apply in the classroom.	Teachers.
		T.1.3	Technical assistance to incorporate PREVI into the TOECE Plan and Classroom Tutoring Plans, as well as to develop students' socio-emotional skills to prevent school violence.	TOE Coordinator, School Coexistence Lead, and Inclusion Lead.
		T.2.1	Session to strengthen student participation through tutoring and educational guidance.	Tutor teachers.
		T.2.2	Training session on violence response protocols and on using the SíseVe Portal.	School leaders, teachers, and assistants.
		T.2.3	Training session on preventing violence in virtual spaces.	Teachers.
		T.2.4	Family workshops and meetings to strengthen parenting competencies.	Tutor teachers.
		T.2.5	Session to strengthen socio-emotional skills (growth mindset and self-care).	Teachers.
		T.3.1	Group tutoring sessions to prevent sexual violence and early pregnancy through Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE).	TOE Coordinator and tutor teachers.
		T.3.2	Technical assistance to promote democratic participation in school.	Tutor teachers.
		T.3.3	Session to update the participatory diagnosis of violence and school coexistence with school actors.	Student representatives, teachers, families, and the Well-being Management Committee.

Year	Part	Workshop - Session	Main topic	Target audience
		T.3.4	Meeting to systematize the updated diagnosis of violence and school coexistence.	Well-being Management Committee.
		T.4.1	Session to strengthen reporting culture in group tutoring.	Tutor teachers.
		T.4.2	Session to prioritize issues for violence prevention and school coexistence.	Well-being Management Committee.
		T.4.3	Session 2 to identify activities to include in violence prevention and school coexistence in the 2025 PAT.	Well-being Management Committee.
		T.4.4	Session to strengthen the School Institutional Educational Project (PEI).	Teachers.

Table A20 – Workshops - Sesions by year: main topic and target audience.

Table A17 – ITT Effects on Victims' and Aggressors' Educational Outcomes

Outcome	All students		Girls		Boys	
	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT	Control mean	ITT
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A. Victims						
Lang grade	13.615	-0.091	13.868	0.035	13.312	-0.214*
	[3.318]	(0.084)	[3.301]	(0.098)	[3.314]	(0.110)
Math grade	13.024	-0.128	13.149	-0.060	12.875	-0.197*
	[3.480]	(0.087)	[3.433]	(0.102)	[3.528]	(0.117)
Behavior grade	14.381	-0.171*	14.719	-0.078	13.976	-0.219*
	[3.595]	(0.094)	[3.555]	(0.105)	[3.601]	(0.127)
GPA	14.075	-0.095	14.318	0.012	13.785	-0.176*
	[2.736]	(0.075)	[2.709]	(0.084)	[2.741]	(0.100)
Approved academic year	0.788	-0.006	0.796	0.007	0.778	-0.019*
	[0.409]	(0.008)	[0.403]	(0.009)	[0.416]	(0.010)
Remedial academic year	0.161	0.006	0.156	-0.003	0.165	0.015*
	[0.367]	(0.007)	[0.363]	(0.008)	[0.372]	(0.009)
Failed academic year	0.043	0.001	0.039	-0.003	0.048	0.005
	[0.203]	(0.003)	[0.193]	(0.004)	[0.213]	(0.005)
School transfer	0.116	-0.002	0.122	-0.004	0.108	0.001
	[0.320]	(0.003)	[0.328]	(0.005)	[0.310]	(0.004)
Permanent dropout	0.014	0.000	0.014	-0.002	0.014	0.004
	[0.118]	(0.002)	[0.119]	(0.003)	[0.117]	(0.003)
Partial dropout	0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.000
	[0.016]	(0.000)	[0.017]	(0.000)	[0.013]	(0.000)
N	12,117	14,019	6,595	7,307	5,522	6,712
B. Aggressors						
Lang grade	12.401	-0.103	13.014	-0.128	12.092	-0.051
	[3.582]	(0.103)	[3.432]	(0.147)	[3.616]	(0.115)
Math grade	11.901	-0.234**	12.290	-0.386**	11.705	-0.155
	[3.692]	(0.107)	[3.545]	(0.152)	[3.749]	(0.121)
Behavior grade	13.272	-0.163	13.986	-0.216	12.911	-0.090
	[3.995]	(0.126)	[3.779]	(0.160)	[4.052]	(0.151)
GPA	13.009	-0.147	13.562	-0.171	12.731	-0.095
	[3.046]	(0.098)	[2.860]	(0.129)	[3.099]	(0.113)
Approved academic year	0.678	-0.018*	0.723	-0.030**	0.655	-0.008
	[0.467]	(0.010)	[0.448]	(0.015)	[0.475]	(0.012)
Remedial academic year	0.213	0.014*	0.198	0.024*	0.221	0.006
	[0.409]	(0.007)	[0.398]	(0.013)	[0.415]	(0.008)
Failed academic year	0.092	0.003	0.063	0.004	0.107	0.001
	[0.289]	(0.006)	[0.242]	(0.008)	[0.309]	(0.008)
School transfer	0.105	-0.005	0.109	-0.000	0.103	-0.005
	[0.307]	(0.004)	[0.312]	(0.007)	[0.305]	(0.004)
Permanent dropout	0.029	-0.008**	0.024	-0.011*	0.031	-0.007*
	[0.167]	(0.003)	[0.154]	(0.006)	[0.174]	(0.004)
Partial dropout	0.000	-0.001**	0.001	-0.001	0.000	-0.000*
	[0.022]	(0.000)	[0.024]	(0.001)	[0.021]	(0.000)
N	10,389	12,809	3,471	3,896	6,918	8,913

Notes: This table reports intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates of the effect of the intervention on educational outcomes for reported victims (Panel A) and aggressors (Panel B). The sample includes all students reported in the *SíSeVe* portal as victims or aggressors in treated and control schools from 2022 to 2024. Odd columns report the mean and sample size for students in control schools, while even columns report the ITT estimates and the sample size for students in treated schools. Standard deviations of the outcome for the control group are reported in square brackets in the odd columns, and standard errors are reported in parentheses. All specifications include strata × grade × year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at the school level.

Table A18 – Violence by Teachers Against Students

	Perpetrators			Non-Perpetrators			Difference
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)	Control group mean (4)	Treatment effect (ITT) (5)	p-value [q-value] (6)	p-value (7)
Sexual from teachers: ever	0.011	−0.004	0.236	0.004	−0.002	0.267	0.190
		(0.004)	[0.556]		(0.002)	[0.600]	
Sexual from teachers: in the past year	0.006	−0.001	0.369	0.001	0.000	0.693	0.277
		(0.001)	[0.556]		(0.001)	[0.891]	
Sexual from teachers: in the past month	0.001	0.002	0.419	0.001	0.001	0.618	0.882
		(0.002)	[0.556]		(0.001)	[0.891]	
Psychological from teachers: ever	0.063	−0.039**	0.027	0.025	0.000	0.997	0.057
		(0.017)	[0.124]		(0.004)	[0.998]	
Psychological from teachers: in the past year	0.055	−0.037**	0.025	0.016	0.000	0.963	0.030
		(0.016)	[0.124]		(0.003)	[0.998]	
Physical from teachers: ever	0.051	−0.016	0.476	0.029	−0.009	0.164	0.681
		(0.022)	[0.556]		(0.007)	[0.600]	
Physical from teachers: in the past year	0.031	−0.011	0.510	0.014	−0.004	0.222	0.518
		(0.017)	[0.556]		(0.004)	[0.600]	
Physical from teachers: in the past month	0.027	−0.013	0.374	0.008	−0.001	0.689	0.315
		(0.015)	[0.556]		(0.003)	[0.891]	
Serious problem of violence from teachers	1.634	−0.056	0.555	1.535	0.049	0.210	0.120
		(0.095)	[0.556]		(0.039)	[0.600]	
N	219			2,483			

Notes: The sample is restricted to students who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for students in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a school program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).

TABLE A19 – TEACHERS ENLA SURVEY

	Teachers		
	Control group mean (1)	Treatment effect (ITT) (2)	p-value [q-value] (3)
Perceptions of problems at school: Relationship with Student (Index)	0.268	0.142**	0.040
		(0.069)	[0.040]
Perceptions of problems at school: Lack of Resources (Index)	0.273	0.186**	0.013
		(0.074)	[0.027]
N		5,156	

Notes: The sample is restricted to teachers who completed the ENLA questionnaire. Each row corresponds to a different linear regression performed separately by gender, with the dependent variable listed on the left. Columns 1 and 4 report the average value for teachers in the control group. Columns 2 and 5 report the ITT (Intention-to-Treat) estimates. They are obtained from a regression of the outcome of interest on a RPS program indicator. The regression controls for strata fixed effects to account for the fact that randomization was stratified by strata. Standard errors (shown in parentheses) are adjusted for clustering at the unit of randomization (school). Columns 3 and 6 report the cluster-robust p-value of the estimated treatment effect and, in square brackets, the p-value (q-value) adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing, using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) control method. Specifically, we use the sharpened two-stage q-values introduced in Benjamini et al. (2006) and described in Anderson (2008).