



Women's Integrated Sexual Health (WISH) Programme for Results: independent verification, evidence, and learning

Evidence brief on rapid methods for measurement of social norm change

December 2019



Preface

The Department for International Development (DFID) has contracted the e-Pact consortium to undertake Third Party Monitoring (TPM) of Women's Integrated Sexual Health (WISH). Oxford Policy Management (OPM) and Itad are jointly implementing this project in collaboration with Forcier, AEDES, and ATR Consulting for in-country support. While TPM is the official name of this project and is used in the contractual documents, in order to better express the nature and dimensions of this work, we are referring to this project as Women's Integrated Sexual Health (WISH) Programme for Results: independent verification, evidence generation, and learning and dissemination for WISH (W4R in short).

This report was drafted by Philly Desai with inputs from the evidence and learning team.

We are grateful to all partners who took part in consultations to inform this evidence brief.

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by the e-Pact consortium for DFID, for services specified in the Terms of Reference and contract of engagement. The information contained in this report shall not be disclosed to any other party, or used or disclosed in whole or in part without the agreement of the e-Pact consortium. For reports that are formally put into the public domain, any use of the information in this report should include a citation that acknowledges the e-Pact consortium as the author of the report.

This confidentiality clause applies to all pages and information included in this report. This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies.

Executive summary

- This evidence brief was produced by WISH4Results (W4R), the Third-Party Monitoring team for the WISH programme. The purpose of this brief is to provide a review of rapid methods for measuring social norm change and make recommendations for WISH Implementing Partners (IPs) for how they might measure social norm change under WISH;
- At the time of writing this brief, there was no consistent definition of social norms used within the WISH programme, making it challenging to measure social norm change;
- There is a set of social norms which could form the basis for a common approach to measurement across WISH IPs and country level programmes; these included early marriage, early childbirth, valuing of large families, and stigma around use of family planning by adolescents and unmarried people;
- There is broad agreement in the literature on what to measure when assessing social norm change. Key indicators are empirical expectations (*what I think others do*); normative expectations (*what I think others expect me to do/what others approve of*); and sanctions for breaching the norm;
- CARE's Social Norms Analysis Plot (SNAP) offers a good framework for measurement of social norm change and could be adapted by WISH IPs;
- Rapid methods identified include integrating norm questions within existing surveys; using focus groups to explore norm change retrospectively; vignettes, either in qualitative or quantitative methods; and observation of programme activities;
- It is important to develop intermediate indicators ('stepping stones') to track progress towards norm change, as social norm change may not be achievable within the short time frame of some WISH interventions.

Table of contents

Preface	i
Executive summary	ii
List of abbreviations	iv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Approach to the Review	1
2 Defining Social Norms	3
3 Current Social Norm Programming within WISH	4
3.1 Where does social norm programming fit within WISH?	4
3.2 What social norm programming do WISH implementing partners carry out?	4
3.3 How is social norm change currently measured within WISH?	5
4 What to Measure	7
5 How to Measure Social Norms	9
6 Routine monitoring of progress towards social norm change	16
7 Recommendations	18
Works Cited	21
Appendix 1 – CARE’s Social Norms Analysis Plot	23
Appendix 2 – Sample Social Norm Measures for WISH norm areas	24

List of abbreviations

CEI	Client Exit Interview
DFID	Department for International Development
DMI	Development Media International
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FP	Family Planning
IDI	In-depth Interview
IP	Implementing Partner
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSI	Marie Stopes International
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
SBCC	Social and Behaviour Change Communication
SNAP	Social Norms Analysis Plot
SRH	Sexual and Reproductive Health
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
TPM	Third Party Monitoring
W4R	WISH4Results
WISH	Women's Integrated Sexual Health

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

As part of the Women's Integrated Sexual Health (WISH) Programme, WISH4Results (W4R), the Third-Party Monitor (TPM) is conducting discrete studies and developing evidence briefs to generate further evidence and learning on how the programme is achieving WISH outcomes and goals. Following consultations with WISH Implementing Partners (IPs), a need was identified to better understand "What Works" in measuring social norm change.

W4R has been tasked with conducting this work, which will result in two deliverables:

1. A map of social norms work taking place within WISH, based on an online survey of WISH IPs;
2. An evidence brief to review rapid and low-cost tools for measuring social norms;

This document is deliverable 2, the evidence brief on rapid approaches for measuring social norm change. Specific objectives for the brief are:

- To review current practices for measuring social norm change within WISH;
- To review external evidence and identify methods and tools appropriate for WISH;
- To recommend a set of tools for measuring social norm change across the WISH programme;
- To estimate the level of effort required to implement this approach.

This evidence brief aims to identify rapid, light-touch approaches which could be implemented without substantial resourcing. It does not address the question of attribution, i.e. whether shifts in social norms can be attributed to programme activities. The evidence brief provides recommendations at a programmatic level, which will need to be tailored to the contexts and objectives of specific WISH interventions.

1.2 Approach to the Review

The review involved the following processes:

- Key Informant Interviews with WISH senior staff, evidence and learning leads and technical advisors from Marie Stopes International (MSI), the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), Development Media International (DMI), ThinkPlace, and two WISH country teams (Sierra Leone and Zambia);
- Participating (remotely) in the social norms session of the Nairobi Learning Event organised by the W4R team in November 2019;
- Review of preliminary findings from the WISH social norms online survey among 31 WISH country programmes, which was administered by programme/SBCC employees.
- A review of documents which outline the WISH approach to social norm programming and measurement of these interventions provided by IPs; (Mafaku, 2019) (Development

Media International, 2019) (De Tucci & Palmer, 2019) (ThinkPlace, 2019) (Marie Stopes International Sierra Leone, 2017) (Marie Stopes International, 2018);

- A review of methods of measuring social norms change adopted by external organisations, drawing mainly on resources from ALIGN and the Learning Collaborative;¹
- A review of work conducted by CARE USA (Stefanik & Hwang, 2017) and Plan International (Hughes & Desai, 2019) on rapid tools for measuring social norm change.

¹ <https://www.alignplatform.org/learning-collaborative>

2 Defining Social Norms

Measurement of social norm change is made clearer if a precise definition of social norms is adopted. The scoping study (e-Pact, 2019) which informs this evidence brief found that only a minority of WISH IPs claimed to have a specific definition of social norms. The majority of respondents either said there was no such definition, or that they did not know. This was confirmed by interviews with stakeholders and our review of documents. Some IPs adopted a precise definition of social norms (ThinkPlace, 2019), which helped guide design and measurement. Other partners included a wider range of concepts within their definition of social norms – individual attitudes, knowledge gaps, religious beliefs, and moral principles (Mafaku, 2019) which made it more challenging to identify measurement approaches.

We suggest that WISH IPs adopt the definition of social norms proposed in Plan International’s recent review (Hughes & Desai, 2019), drawing on the work of recognised social norm experts (Cislaghi & Heise, 2017) (Bicchieri, 2016) (Marcus, 2018):

- A social norm is a pattern of behaviour that people conform to, because:
 - They believe most of the people in their network (their reference group) conform to the norm (*Empirical Expectations*), and...
 - They believe most of the people in their network expect them to conform to the norm (*Normative Expectations*).
- Social norms can be held in place by sanctions for breaching norms (such as social stigma, isolation or ridicule) and rewards for complying (such as social status and praise).

Gender norms are a subset of social norms which “express the expected behaviour of people of a particular gender, and often age, in a given social context” (Marcus, 2018).

3 Current Social Norm Programming within WISH

3.1 Where does social norm programming fit within WISH?

WISH is primarily a service delivery programme, providing modern family planning advice and services with a focus on poor and marginalised men and women, and younger people. Key performance indicators and log frame targets focus on numbers accessing and benefitting from family planning services.

Nevertheless, the theory of change states that social norms, especially gender norms, present a barrier to uptake of modern family planning. This has also been established by formative research conducted by WISH IPs in a range of locations (Mafaku, 2019) (ThinkPlace, 2019) (Marie Stopes International, 2018). For example, Mafaku states that social norms which inhibit young people's access to contraception result in high rates of teenage pregnancy in Tanzania; and ThinkPlace found that social norms encouraged men in Nigeria to have large families, without considering their household's socio-economic situation. It is therefore accepted that shifting harmful social norms is an important step to contribute towards increasing the uptake of modern family planning, and therefore norm change is an important component of the WISH programme.

Shifting social norms falls under two WISH output areas:

- Output 1 focusses on individual choices and decision making at the community level, namely that: *poor and marginalised women and men, and adolescent girls and boys, are accessing high quality family planning services and have the knowledge and community support to make informed SRHR decisions.*
- Pillar 2 of Output 2 focusses on: *creating and/or maintaining sustainable demand for integrated SRHR services by addressing barriers at the individual, interpersonal, community, and institutional levels.*

3.2 What social norm programming do WISH implementing partners carry out?

The scoping survey, review of documents outlining the WISH approach, and key informant interviews identify a range of activities carried out by IPs to shift harmful social norms. The main areas of programming identified were:

- Community-based activities, including public events, targeted dialogues and targeting of marginalised groups, such as people with disabilities (Mafaku, 2019);
- Youth-focussed activities, such as peer education, schools work, youth weekends;
- Working with couples to improve communications, challenge gender stereotypes, and empower women with knowledge, confidence and skills;
- Media interventions, including radio programmes, TV and digital media, with messages developed to address barriers to modern family planning (Development Media International, 2019);
- Working with religious and traditional leaders to promote the benefits of modern family planning (De Tucci & Palmer, 2019).
- Training of health workers to address stigma associated with accessing services among people with disabilities and young people.

WISH IPs have conducted formative research to identify barriers to the uptake of modern family planning/contraceptive methods (Kittle & Chekararou, 2019) (Mafaku, 2019) (Marie Stopes International, 2018) (Marie Stopes International Sierra Leone, 2017) (ThinkPlace, 2019). The findings of these studies, and of the scoping research conducted by the TPM, suggest a shortlist of social norms which WISH IPs are addressing. These norms can be expressed as follows:

Norms which directly influence modern family planning:

1. *Modern contraceptive/family planning methods should not be used by women/girls in my community/family*

Norms which indirectly influence modern family planning:

1. *A girl should get married early to avoid unwanted pregnancy/sex before marriage;*
2. *A new wife should have her first child soon after marriage to prove her fertility;*
3. *Men should not get involved in discussions about family planning;*
4. *Unmarried women/young people should not seek advice on family planning, because they should not be having sex.*

Rewards for complying with, and sanctions for breaching the norm:

1. *A man who has many children is more respected than a man with few children;*
2. *Women/girls who use family planning are considered to be promiscuous or prostitutes.*

This shortlist offers a useful basis for WISH IPs to prioritise which norms they want to shift, and to establish a common approach to measuring social norm change. This is discussed later in our recommendations.

3.3 How is social norm change currently measured within WISH?

The output statements referred to above are measured by Client Exit Interviews (CEIs). These are conducted annually and the results are used to for reporting against the log frame. The CEI is a comprehensive survey among clients who have accessed SRH services, and covers six areas:

- o Service use
- o Client counselling
- o Marketing
- o Demographics
- o Client Satisfaction
- o Poverty Index

Within the CEI, four questions are used to evaluate social norm change. Service users are invited to rank their agreement on a five-point Likert scale with the following statements:

- o In my community using modern contraception is accepted;
- o My friends encourage me to use modern contraception;
- o In my community, I hear positive stories about using contraception;

- o My partner supports my decision to come for services today.

Another approach used to measure social norm change was the use of proxy indicators. These might be individual attitudes or knowledge of an issue (De Tucci & Palmer, 2019), or the target behaviour itself. Some implementing partners argued that if they achieved increased uptake of modern contraception, then this could be taken as evidence of social norm change.

ThinkPlace, the design partner for WISH Lot 1 working in Northern Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo, conducted formative research in Kano and Jigawa in Northern Nigeria, to identify the drivers and barriers affecting male involvement in family planning (ThinkPlace Kenya, 2019). Following this work, they developed a framework to guide the measurement of social norm interventions, which includes measures of knowledge attitudes, and behaviours, as well as values, empirical and normative expectations. The framework has not yet been used in measuring norm change, although this is the intention.

A range of approaches are used to measure media campaigns undertaken as part of WISH. DMI conduct activities to pre-test their materials and to gather audience feedback through focus groups. Process evaluation is also conducted to ensure that the radio stations are broadcasting communications in line with the agreed schedule, frequency and intensity. Audience reach is calculated based on population data and the geographical reach of the stations. Direct audience data is not collected under WISH, and therefore it is not possible to assess the impact of media activities upon social norms, attitudes or behaviours. The CEIs do ask about the influence of media and communications upon the client's decision to visit the clinic, but the survey does not identify specific communications products such as adverts, radio programmes, etc.

Whilst these approaches provide indications of social norm change, they have their limitations:

- CEIs are conducted among those already accessing family planning services, who may have more positive attitudes than the wider community;
- CEIs are conducted annually, and cannot provide rapid feedback for testing new ideas;
- Current CEI questions do not fully capture the concept of social norms; they do not address sanctions or “empirical expectations”;²
- Proxy indicators, by definition, do not measure social norms; changed behaviour could result from a range of factors and does not in and of itself prove norm change;
- The measurement approach leaves two assumptions untested:
 - o That shifts in social norms are a result of programme activities;
 - o That social norm change drives behavioural change.

For the remainder of this brief, we propose practical tools to address these limitations, drawing examples from similar programmes, which can provide rapid feedback without massive investment in new resources. Note that in this brief we were not tasked with addressing the final limitation mentioned – the question of attribution – which would require a more extensive review.

² “What I think other people do”

4 What to Measure

The first stage in measuring social norms change is to identify the norms which influence the target behaviour. Diagnostic or formative research needs to be carried out to determine which norms are influential, how strong the influence is, whether the influence is direct or indirect, and which reference groups are important to the target audience (Shaw, 2019). This does not need to be a resource-intensive process. In areas where programming is well established, it may be sufficient to use existing staff knowledge and conversations with community members, combined with a literature review.

Measurement follows the diagnostic stage. Drawing on CARE's Social Norms Analysis Plot, the following are the key components to measure in assessing social norm change. We use the example of having large families in Table 1 below, to illustrate potential questions.

Table 1 Key components to measure in assessing social norm change (using the example of valuing large families)

Concept	Definition	Question options	Sample question
Empirical expectations	What I think others do	How many people in your community...? What proportion of people in your community...? How often do people in your community...?	<i>How many men in your community have over six children? (all, most, some, few, none)</i>
Normative expectations	What I think others expect me to do/ approve of	How many people in your community approve of...? Do people in your community approve or disapprove of...?	<i>Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Most people in my community approve of men who have a large family"? (strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree)</i>
Sanctions and rewards	What are the risks of breaching the norm, and rewards for complying?	Agree-disagree statements about potential sanctions and rewards	<i>Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "In my community, a man who decided to have a small family would be criticised by his relatives/ friends"</i>
Sensitivity to sanctions	What is the strength of the norm? How influential is the norm in driving behaviour?	Would someone change their behaviour as a result of the sanctions?	<i>If a man decided to have only two children and was criticised by others, would this make him change his behaviour?</i>

A good example of a survey which measures key social norm components is the evaluation of the GARIMA Project in Uttar Pradesh (Drexel University, UNICEF and NR Management Consultants, 2018),³ focussing on use of sanitary protection among adolescent girls. They ask a set of relatively simple questions, as follows, for each behaviour of interest:

³ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/girls-adolescent-and-reproductive-rights-information-management-and-action-garima>

Table 2 Example of survey questions which measure key social norm components

Component	Survey question
Empirical expectations	Do other girls in your village use sanitary pads? Yes/No.
Normative expectations	Do other girls in your village approve or disapprove of using sanitary pads? Yes/No.
Sanctions	What are some of the punishments for you from society of using a sanitary pad?
Rewards	What are some of the rewards for you, from society, of using a sanitary pad?

5 How to Measure Social Norms

Many of the approaches developed for measuring social norm change are complex, resource intensive and require advanced research skills. They require large scale, quantitative surveys and are designed to measure shifts in social norms over time, the relationship between norm change and behavioural change, and whether changes can be attributed to programme activities. Typical methods include randomised control trials or quasi-experimental designs (Denny & Hughes, 2017), longitudinal surveys among panels of respondents (Perrin, et al., 2019), or cross-sectional surveys conducted at baseline, midline and endline.⁴ These approaches may involve constructing scales or indices to measure norm change across a range of variables, such as the Gender Norms Scale,⁵ the Ipas Stigmatising Attitudes, Beliefs and Action Scale regarding abortion stigma,⁶ and the Gender Based Violence Scale (Perrin, et al., 2019). These approaches would not be suitable for WISH IPs, as they are expensive, complex and time consuming, therefore they are not discussed in this brief.

The scoping study which informs the evidence brief found that WISH IPs are already using a range of methods to evaluate their activities, including focus group discussions, individual interviews, baseline and endline surveys, Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice surveys (KAP), vignettes, and observations. Thus, a good way to implement social norm measurement in a rapid and low-cost manner might be to integrate it into existing M&E activities. We outline below a range of ways in which this could be achieved:

- **Include social norm questions in existing surveys, either the CEIs or other surveys which IPs may be conducting:** a bank of social norm questions could be integrated into existing tools at little additional cost. At minimum, this would need questions on empirical expectations, normative expectations, and sanctions for breaching norms. We would advise selecting one or two norms at first to avoid adding too many additional questions. By comparing data on actual behaviour with empirical expectations, and individual attitudes with normative expectations, the relationship between social norm shifts and changes in the target behaviour can be explored. Good examples of this approach are the Promundo Survey on Gender Based Violence in Tanzania (Singh, et al., 2018), and Oxfam's WE-CARE survey (Karimli, et al., n.d.).
- **Use focus groups and IDIs to explore norm change retrospectively:** qualitative methods can also be used to explore shifts in social norms and whether such shifts are influenced by programme activities. CARE's Tipping Point programme⁷ (CARE USA, 2018) used this approach to explore social norms relating to child marriage in Nepal and Bangladesh. The focus group tool asks whether a range of girls' behaviours are approved or disapproved of in their community (e.g. playing sports, riding a bicycle, moving about by themselves); whether girls who behave in this way are disapproved of; and what negative consequences would flow to the girl and her family if this was to happen. The tool then goes on to ask if any of these expectations have changed over the last few years, what caused any changes, and whether programme activities influenced the changes. Retrospective questioning can overstate programme effects, but it has the advantage of offering an insight into perceptions of norm change without requiring baseline data. FGDs could also be conducted at baseline and endline, to provide a

⁴ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/sasa-program>

⁵ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/growing-great>

⁶ <https://www.ipas.org/resources/the-stigmatizing-attitudes-beliefs-and-actions-scale>

⁷ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/tipping-point>

more robust measure of change.

- **Vignettes** can be used in qualitative and quantitative studies (CARE USA, 2018) (Singh, et al., 2018) (Stefanik, 2019). A vignette is a short story told to participants, who are asked to say how others in the story would react. Usually, the story involves a character breaching a social norm, to explore sanctions and the strength of normative influences. This approach can be more engaging, fun and easier for young people to understand than questions about social expectations. The Global Early Adolescence Study, Oxfam WE-CARE evaluation (Karimli, et al., n.d.), much of CARE's work (Stefanik & Hwang, 2017), and the Uganda HIV Risk Study⁸ (Stoebenau, et al., 2019) use vignettes to track social norm change. By using the same vignettes over time, in either FGDs or quantitative surveys, shifts in expectations, sanctions and strength of norms can be identified.

Sample Vignette on the norms around large families

Mark (35) and Jane (30) are married and have two children (11, 7). They discuss their future plans and both decide that they do not want any more children.

- 1. How many couples in your village would behave like Mark and Jane? (Empirical Expectations)*
- 2. Would other people in your village approve or disapprove of Mark and Jane's decision? (Normative Expectations)*
- 3. If other people in the village find out that Mark and Jane have decided not to have any more children, would they criticise or mock them? (Sanction)*
- 4. If other people in the village criticise or mock Mark and Jane, would this make them change their mind (sensitivity to sanctions/strength of norm)*

Sample Vignette on Modern contraception associated with promiscuity

Mary (18) is single and has a boyfriend James (20) with whom she is having sex. She decides to use a modern contraception method to avoid becoming pregnant.

- 1. How many unmarried girls in your village use modern contraception? (Empirical Expectations)*
- 2. Would other people in your village approve or disapprove of Mary using modern contraception to avoid becoming pregnant? (Normative Expectations)*
- 3. If other people in the village find out that Mary is using modern contraception, how would they react and what would they say about her? (Sanction)*
- 4. If other people in the village criticise or mock Mary for using modern contraception, would this make her stop using modern contraception? (sensitivity to sanctions/strength of norm)*

- **Observation** can be also used to identify signs of social norm change. For example, staff can observe whether young women attend meetings, how much they speak out, whether men listen to their views, and the extent of male resistance to women's empowerment. Although these shifts do not constitute social norm change in and of

⁸ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/uganda-hiv-risk-study>

themselves, they could be the early signs of such change. For example, SASA!⁹ have developed an outcome tracking tool for use by staff working to combat violence against women. The tool is used by staff to observe activities and rank the participants' knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviours, in terms of their acceptance or resistance to SASA! ideas.¹⁰ The tool does not aim to track social norm change directly, but could be adapted as a tool to track shifts in attitudes to social norms relevant to WISH.

- We found little evidence of the use of approaches such as **Most Significant Change**¹¹, **Outcome Mapping**¹² or **Outcome Harvesting**¹³, to evaluate social norm change directly, either within or beyond the WISH programme. These methods are participatory, flexible, sensitive to social contexts, and can be implemented without complex statistical techniques. These features suggest they might have potential for measurement of social norm change. However, they also have limitations in this context. Outcome Mapping focuses on behavioural changes, not changes in social norms. Most Significant Change and Outcome Harvesting only capture changes which participants are aware of, which may lead to norm shifts not being identified; and all three approaches require substantial commitment from programme staff for planning, implementation and review. Thus, IPs may wish to explore the potential of these approaches for measuring social norm change in adapted or simplified formats, but is unlikely that they offer rapid or low-cost methods in their complete versions.

⁹ SASA! is a community mobilisation programme developed by Raising Voices in Kampala, Uganda

¹⁰ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/sasa-program>

¹¹ https://www.betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/most_significant_change

¹² https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/outcome_mapping

¹³ https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/outcome_harvesting

6 Resourcing requirements

We outline here the resourcing requirements of the lower-cost approaches described in the previous section. The information derives mainly from CARE (Stefanik & Hwang, 2017) and Plan International (Hughes & Desai, 2019).

Key points which emerge from these reviews are:

- Some international level input is usually required, in addition to national resources. This might be to provide training, to undertake design and oversight of measurement tools, or to play a leading role in implementing measurement and analysing the results;
- The demands on in-house staff can be high in terms of training, supervising, implementing and analysing social norms data; a core group of programme staff need training in social norms theory, programming and measurement, which may then be cascaded to local teams;
- Time is required to design survey questions, vignettes, and focus group guides. The tools need to be piloted, fieldwork teams need time to become familiar with their use, and how to probe using the SNAP framework and vignettes. CARE suggest that this can take around a week;
- Staff need time to reflect on their own beliefs, social norms and biases, especially where gender norms may be a barrier to service uptake.

A rough estimate of resources required for the approaches discussed is as follows.

Incorporating social norms question into existing quantitative surveys¹⁴:

- Two days to design and test social norm questions;
- Two days to analyse norm data and compare with individual attitudes and behaviour data.

Using Focus Groups and IDIs to explore norm change, either retrospectively or at baseline and endline:

- Two-day briefing on social norms theory and measurement;
- One day designing question guide with social norms questions;
- Two days piloting and reviewing the tools;
- Two days to conduct four FGDs;
- Two days to review the data from the FGDs.

¹⁴ Note that these timings assume an existing quantitative survey which is adapted to measure social norms. It does not include time for overall survey design/ implementation, or for formative research for survey development.

Using vignettes to explore social norm change

- Two-day briefing on social norms and measurement, based on SNAP framework;
- One day designing vignettes and questions;
- Two days piloting and reviewing the tools;
- Two days to conduct four FGDs;
- Two days to review the data from the FGDs.

Observation/activity monitoring (assuming there is an existing theory of change)

- One day training on social norms theory and measurement;
- One day identifying key activities/outcomes to observe;
- Two days designing an observation tool, piloting, and training enumerators;
- Time spent observing activities, and recording data;
- One day reviewing data and trends, e.g. quarterly.

Fieldwork – interviews, FGDs, and observations – could be conducted by programme staff, health professionals delivering services, or external enumerators. In part, this will depend on available resources and the specific activities undertaken, and each approach has its pros and cons. Programme staff will understand the goals of the intervention, but will be taken from their usual duties to carry out fieldwork; health professionals are already on site and have contact with service users, but may have professional biases and lack time to participate; and external enumerators will have interviewing skills and time, but will require financial resources and briefing on the programme goals. In all cases, fieldwork teams will require training on social norms and on using the specific research tools.

Table 3 below summarises the pros and cons of the different methods, resources required to implement them, and points to further guidance on each approach.

Table 3: Summary of Rapid Approaches to Measure Social Norm Change

Approach	Strengths	Weaknesses	Suitable for...	Estimated Resources Required	Available Tools
Including norm questions in existing surveys	Tracks norms at population level Precision of quantitative measurement of norm change Requires limited additional resources	Can make surveys longer if many norms tracked Requires existing survey to add questions to	Interventions where baseline/endline surveys are already being carried out Tracking change among the wider population rather than specific beneficiary groups, e.g. mass media campaigns	2 days to design and test one or two social norm questions, assuming an existing survey 2 days to analyse norm data and compare with individual attitudes and behaviour data	ALIGN platform contains case studies and sample questions on social norms around contraception and family planning, particularly the Tekponon Jicnuagou evaluation ¹⁵
Focus Groups and IDIs exploring social norm change retrospectively	Easy to implement/low cost compared with quantitative surveys Suitable for specific beneficiary groups Can provide an indication of norm change without baseline data	Not representative of the wider population Can overstate programme effects Does not provide quantitative measures of change	Community level interventions among small beneficiary groups, e.g. peer education/youth safe spaces	2-day briefing on social norms and measurement, based on SNAP framework 1-day designing question guide with social norms questions 2 days piloting and reviewing the tools 2 days to conduct four FGDs 2 days to review the data from the FGDs	CARE's Tipping Point FGD evaluation tool ¹⁶
Vignettes and scenarios	Engaging and easy to understand	Takes time to develop vignettes	Children and young people	2-day briefing on social norms and measurement, based on SNAP framework	ALIGN platform contains examples of vignettes, e.g. CARE TEFSA, ¹⁷ CARE ABDIBORU, ¹⁸ Uganda HIV

¹⁵ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/tekponon-jikuagou>

¹⁶ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/tipping-point>

¹⁷ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/towards-economic-and-sexualreproductive-health-outcomes-adolescent-girls-tesfa>

¹⁸ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/improving-adolescent-reproductive-health-and-nutrition-through-structural-solutions>

Approach	Strengths	Weaknesses	Suitable for...	Estimated Resources Required	Available Tools
	<p>Can be adapted to explore how norms differ by age and sex</p> <p>Can be included in quantitative or qualitative methods</p>	<p>Needs local knowledge to ensure relevance</p> <p>Staff need training to ask the right questions</p>	<p>Less literate populations/those unaccustomed to surveys</p> <p>Diagnosis and measurement of social norms</p>	<p>1 day designing vignettes and reviewing questioning based on SNAP</p> <p>2 days piloting and reviewing the tools</p> <p>2 days to conduct four FGDs</p> <p>2 days to review the data from the FGDs</p>	<p>Risk Study, Global Early Adolescence Study¹⁹</p> <p>CARE's SNAP guide provides guidance and examples of vignettes</p>
Observation of activities	<p>Low resource and quick to conduct</p> <p>Can be implemented across a range of activities</p> <p>Can be integrated into routine monitoring</p>	<p>Requires training for staff to ensure consistency</p> <p>Can be impressionistic/less objective</p> <p>Needs a clear theory of change to decide what behaviours will be observed</p>	<p>Programmes where routine activity monitoring is already conducted</p> <p>Community level interventions including regular meetings/dialogues/etc.</p> <p>Programmes where there is a strong presence of staff at the grassroots E.g. women's or girls' clubs which meet regularly</p>	<p>1-day training on social norms</p> <p>1 day identifying key activities/outcomes to observe</p> <p>2 days designing an observation tool, piloting and training enumerators</p> <p>Time spent observing activities, and recording data</p> <p>1 day reviewing data and trends, e.g. quarterly</p>	<p>SASA's outcome mapping tool²⁰ could be adapted for SRHR</p>

¹⁹ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/growing-great>

²⁰ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/sasa-program>

7 Routine monitoring of progress towards social norm change

In addition to evaluating social norm change at baseline and endline, it can be useful to assess progress towards norm change on a more regular basis. WISH is a three-year programme, and not all activities will be implemented for the entire three years. It is not realistic for interventions to shift social norms within a few years as this can be a long-term process. Therefore, it is important to be realistic about what outcomes can be expected within the intervention timescale, and how those outcomes will be brought about by the activities.

Specific individual interventions therefore need a clear theory of change and results chain, showing how activities will lead to intermediate outcomes, and those outcomes will lead eventually to social norm change. When this analysis has been carried out, interventions can track intermediate indicators which are the “stepping stones” to social norm change. In this way, implementers can show that they are moving in the direction of social norm change, without being expected to achieve this in an unrealistically short time frame (CARE USA, 2018) (Hughes & Desai, 2019).

Examples of programmes which have developed intermediate indicators include SASA!,²¹ addressing Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in Uganda, and Tékponon Jikuagou,²² focussing on family planning in Benin. The SASA! evaluation identified community level outcomes within four impact areas (Abramsky, et al., 2014) based on the pathways of change identified in the programme’s logic model. The four impact areas were:

- Reduced social acceptance of gender inequality and intimate partner violence (IPV);
- Decrease in experience of IPV;
- Improved response to women experiencing IPV;
- Decrease in sexual risk-taking behaviours.

Tékponon Jikuagou, implemented by CARE and Plan International, asked about actions which might lead to norm change, as well as the target norms around modern family planning. The evaluation includes questions covering:

- Whether the women feel their birth family, in-laws, or social circle “would support my decision to use a modern method to delay or avoid pregnancy”;
- Whether women feel comfortable discussing family planning with their partner, mother-in-law, or social network;
- The quality of communication on family planning within couples;
- Whether women have heard religious or traditional leaders speak in favour of modern family planning;
- Whether women have shared positive knowledge, or corrected inaccurate information, about modern family planning.

This approach allows the programme implementers to measure social norm change regarding modern family planning, and progress towards that goal through intermediate indicators.

²¹ <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/sasa-program>

²² <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/tekponon-jikuagou>

The table below suggests intermediate measurement areas for activities carried out by WISH IPs designed to address social norms. IPs could develop specific indicators as relevant based on these measurement areas. These indicators should be used within an overall Theory of Change and Results Chain which explains how these steps are intended to lead to social norm change. In isolation, they cannot be taken as indicators of progress towards norm change.

Table 4: Intermediate measurement areas for activities carried out by WISH IPs designed to address social norms as part of routine activity monitoring

<i>Activity type</i>	<i>Suggested intermediate indicators</i>
Media campaigns/ SBCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people exposed to the campaign • Recognition of communications/brand/radio spots • Recall of key messages • Relevance and appeal of key messages • Improved knowledge and attitudes
Community outreach activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers attending the activity • Profile of those attending: age, sex, marginalised groups; • Participation of women/adolescents/marginalised groups • Increased discussion of family planning in the community/ among peers • Increased support for family planning among religious and traditional leaders
Interpersonal communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved quality of communication within couples • Women/youth feeling empowered to speak out • Men/older people listening to views of women and youth • Greater sense of self-efficacy among women and youth • Supporting others who want to use modern family planning
All activities – actions taken as a result of programme activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing family planning with partner • Discussing family planning in the community • Spreading positive information about family planning • Correcting someone providing inaccurate information • Seeking further information about modern family planning • Deciding to use trial modern family planning • Continuing to use modern family planning

8 Recommendations

The table below outlines our recommendations, in order of priority, to the WISH IPs.

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1. Adopt a precise definition of social norms, including social expectations, sanctions and rewards.	IPs and local teams use a range of definitions of social norms. Some have no precise definition or fail to differentiate between norms, attitudes and behaviours. A shared definition across the WISH programme would assist IPs and local delivery teams in programming to shift social norms, and offer a clear framework for the measurement of social norms.	WISH HQ teams and IPs, to be cascaded to country teams and local partners.	This would bring WISH into line with best international practice on social norms programming and measurement. It would require training on key social norm concepts, to ensure all team members have a shared understanding.
2. Create a list of social norms typically addressed by WISH programming and a set of questions to measure norm change.	Across the WISH IPs and country teams there is a set of social norms which are commonly addressed. Creating a list of norms and a sample question bank would assist country teams in selecting which norms they should address and how best to measure them. It would ensure comparability in measurement of norm change interventions, allowing meaningful comparisons across interventions and countries.	WISH HQ teams, followed by country teams to refine and contextualise the norms and questions	The scoping study and evidence brief suggest what this list of social norms might include and potential questions to measure norm change.
3. Prioritise those social norms which are most important to measure for each intervention.	Norm measurement can be complex and measuring a single norm requires several questions to be asked. In order to avoid over-burdening local delivery teams, or creating questionnaires which are too long, local teams should measure only those norms which are key barriers to up-take of modern family and against which they are programming	Country teams and local implementers.	Measuring a specific norm, or norms, against which programming is directed, is more likely to detect norm change to which programme activities are contributing.
4. Adapt CARE's Social Norms Analysis Plot	CARE's SNAP framework was developed for measuring social norm change without the need for complex and resource-intensive methods. The approach has been piloted in a range of geographical settings, and in	In country teams and local partners, supported by training and capacity building from IPs or WISH HQ teams.	Teams can build upon studies which have been already conducted using the SNAP framework, adapting existing questionnaires and vignettes.

Recommendation	Rationale	Responsibility	Comments
(SNAP) for measuring social norm change.	interventions which address gender norms. It can be deployed by local teams at relatively low cost, without extensive expertise in survey methods or statistical techniques.		
5. Include a small number of social norm questions within existing evaluation tools, such as KAP surveys, baseline-end-line surveys, focus groups or IDIs.	Adapting existing evaluation and monitoring tools is a cost-effective starting point for IPs to measure social norm change. The scoping study identified that WISH IPs use a range of evaluation and monitoring tools and therefore it would be a low-cost, quick win to include social norms measures within these existing tools.	Country teams and local partners	This approach will ensure that local teams have the capacity to implement the measurement approach and will allow measures of norm change to be integrated into on-going data collection.
6. Identify the “stepping-stones” towards social norm change which can be tracked as part of routine programme monitoring.	Social norm change can take many years, and it may be that norms will not shift within the timeframe of WISH funded interventions. Thus, it will be important to identify the “stepping stones” towards norm change, to assess whether the early signs of norm change are occurring. This would give confidence that attitudes, knowledge or practices were moving in the right direction, although norms might not have fully shifted within the timeframe of the intervention.	IPs, country teams and local delivery teams	This would require a Theory of Change which identifies how the intervention activities are intended to lead to norm change, and a Results Chain showing the steps along the path to change. Local delivery teams might require support in developing their Theory of Change for this purpose. In some cases, this could be integrated into existing programme monitoring, although more complex measures would require bespoke evaluation tools.
7. IPs should establish processes for measuring social norm change in their programming by Quarter 3 2020, with a view to sharing learning on the results of measuring social norms	Given the relatively short time scale of the WISH programme it will be important to establish measurement processes as soon as possible. The approaches recommended here are for rapid and low cost measures, so this should be feasible in the time available.	Implementing Partners, In country teams and delivery partners.	

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Comments</i>
with the WISH learning platforms.			

Works Cited

- Abramsky, T., Devries, K. & Kiss, L., 2014. Findings from the SASA! Study: a cluster randomized controlled trial to assess the impact of a community mobilization intervention to prevent violence against women and reduce HIV risk in Kampala, Uganda. *BMC Medecine*, Volume 12.
- Bicchieri, C., 2016. *Manual on Social Norms and Change*. UNFPA-UNICEF., s.l.: UNFPA-UNICEF.
- CARE, 2017. *Tipping Point: Phase 1, Outcome Mapping Report*, s.l.: CARE.
- CARE USA, 2018. *Assessing social norms change interventions: CARE's Tipping Point approach*, s.l.: CARE USA.
- Cislaghi, B. & Heise, L., 2017. *Technical brief: Measuring social norms. Technical Report*, London: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medecine.
- Denny, E. & Hughes, C., 2017. *Attitudes, practices and social norms: endline survey*, s.l.: Voices for Change.
- De Tucci, T. & Palmer, L., 2019. *Tackling Abortion Stigma*, Nairobi: IPPF.
- Development Media International, 2019. *Shifting Norms to Change Behaviours*, Nairobi: Digital Media International.
- Drexel University, UNICEF and NR Management Consultants, 2018. *Evaluation of the GARIMA Project in Uttar Pradesh India*, s.l.: UNICEF.
- e-Pact, 2019, *Findings from a scoping study of social norms work across the WISH consortium* [internal document]
- Hughes, C. & Desai, P., 2019. *Measuring Changes in Social and Gender Norms: practical solutions to a complex problem*, Woking: Plan International.
- Karimli, L., Samman, E., Rost, L. & Kidder, T., n.d. *Factors and norms influencing unpaid care work: Household survey evidence from five rural communities in Colombia, Ethiopia, the Philippines, Uganda and Zimbabwe.*, s.l.: Oxfam.
- Kittle, B. & Chekararou, R. D., 2019. *Barrier Analysis of Modern Contraceptive Use among Married and Single Women in Ethiopia*, s.l.: IPPF.
- Mafaku, C., 2019. *Changing the Social Norms: Umati Tanzania*, Nairobi: Umati Tanzania.
- Marcus, R., 2018. *The Norm Factor: recent research on gender, social norms, and women's economic empowerment*, London: International Development Research Centre.
- Marie Stopes International Sierra Leone, 2017. *"de mammy fo welbodi": reaching adolescents with family planning in Sierra Leone*, s.l.: Marie Stopes International.
- Marie Stopes International, 2018. *Reaching rural youth with voluntary family planning services in the Sahel*, s.l.: Marie Stopes International.
- Perrin, N., Marsh, M., Clough, A. & Desgroppes, A., 2019. Social norms and beliefs about gender based violence scale: a measure for use with gender based violence prevention programs in low-resource and humanitarian settings.. *Conflict and Health*.
- Shaw, B., 2019. *Making Sure They Are Really There: exploring social norms to inform programs*. [Online]
Available at: http://irh.org/blog/measurement_6/
[Accessed 2019].

Singh, N., Butt, A. P. & Canepa, C., 2018. *Shifting Social Norms in the Economy for Women's Economic Empowerment: insights from a practitioner learning group.*, s.l.: The SEEP Network..

Stefanik, L., 2019. *Up close and personal with the hottest trend in social norms measurement: Qualitative vignettes.* [Online]
Available at: http://irh.org/blog/measurement_7/

Stefanik, L. & Hwang, T., 2017. *Applying Theory to Practice: CARE's journey piloting social norm measures for gender programming*, Atlanta: CARE USA.

Stoebenau, K. et al., 2019. Developing Experimental Vignettes to Identify Gender Norms Associated with Transactional Sex for Adolescent Girls and Young Women in Central Uganda.. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 64(4), pp. 60-66.

ThinkPlace Kenya, 2019. *WISH Nigeria Insights Report*, Marie Stopes Nigeria.

ThinkPlace, 2019. *Designing for Social Norm Change in a Short Time Frame*, Nairobi: ThinkPlace.

Appendix 1 – CARE’s Social Norms Analysis Plot

Table 4: CARE’s Social Norms Analysis Plot (SNAP) Framework⁸

COMPONENTS OF A NORM	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE RESPONSE
Empirical Expectations (EE)	What I think others do	<i>“Once you have got the chance, you have to marry. Your friends are getting married.”</i>
Normative Expectations (NE)	What I think others expect me to do (what I should do according to others)	<i>“...everybody in the community expects adolescent girls...at the age of 13 to 15 years... to get married”</i>
Sanctions	Anticipated opinion or reaction of others (to the behavior) – specifically others whose opinions matter to me	<i>“If a girl is not married at age of 15 years, many adolescent girls in the community would insult her saying ‘haftu’, which mean the one who is not needed, or unattractive”</i>
Sensitivity to sanctions	Do sanctions matter for behavior? If there is a negative reaction from others (negative sanction), would the main character change their behavior in the future?	<i>Most girls would change their minds and marry after prolonged insults and isolation.</i>
Exceptions	Under what circumstances would it be okay for the main character to break the norm (by acting positively)?	<i>Girls can refuse marriage if they excel at school and their teachers convince their family to let them continue school.</i>

Appendix 2 – Sample Social Norm Measures for WISH norm areas

There are a range of options for questions about social norms and related sanctions. The most common are “agree/ disagree” scales, questions about numbers (“How many people ...?”) and questions about frequency (“How often do people ...?”). Examples of how these questions could apply to norm areas relevant to WISH programming are provided below.

<i>Norm area</i>	<i>Empirical expectations</i>	<i>Normative expectations</i>	<i>Sanctions</i>
Use of modern FP	Most women in my community use modern family planning methods (Agree/ Disagree)	Most people in my community disapprove of women using modern family planning (Agree/ Disagree)	If people in my community found out a woman was using modern FP, they would criticise her. (Agree/ Disagree)
	How many women in your community/ village use modern FP? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)	How many people in your village would approve of a woman using modern family planning? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)	How many people in your community would criticise a women if they found out she was using modern family planning? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)
	How often do women in your community use modern family planning? (very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).	How often do people in your community express disapproval of women using modern family planning? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).	How often do people in your community criticise women who use modern family planning? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)
Early marriage	Most girls in my community marry before the age of 15? (Agree/ disagree)	Most people in my community approve of girls who marry before the age of 15. (Agree/ disagree)	If a girl in my community does not marry by the age of 18, this would be a source of shame to her family. (Agree/ disagree)
	How many girls in your community get married before the age of 15? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)	How many people in your community approve of girls who marry before the age of 15?	How many people in your community would criticise the family of a girl who did not marry by the age of 18? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)
	How often do girls in your community marry before the age of 15?		

	(Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).	(All/ most/ some/ few/ none) How often do people in your community approve of girls who marry before the age of 15? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).	How often do people in your community criticise girls who do not marry by age 18? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)
Early childbirth	<p>Most women in my community have a baby within a year of getting married. (Agree/ Disagree)</p> <p>How many women in your community have a baby within a year of getting married? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do women in your community have a baby within a year of getting married? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).</p>	<p>Most people in my community approve of women who have a baby within a year of getting married. (Agree/ Disagree)</p> <p>How many people in your community approve of women who have a baby within a year of getting married? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do people in your community approve of women who have a baby within a year of getting married? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).</p>	<p>If a recently married woman does not have a baby within a year of marrying, other people in my community would say negative things about her. (Agree/ disagree)</p> <p>How many people in your community would say negative things about a woman who did not have a baby within a year of getting married? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do people in your community say negative things about women who do not have a baby within a year of marrying? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)</p>
Large families	<p>Most men in my community have over six children. (Agree/ Disagree)</p> <p>How many men in your community have over six children? (All/</p>	<p>Most people in my community approve of men who have over six children? (Agree/ disagree)</p>	<p>If a man decides to have only two children, his family and friends would criticise or gossip about him. (Agree/ disagree)</p> <p>How many people in your community would</p>

	<p>most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do men in your community have over six children? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never).</p>	<p>How many people in your community approve of men who have over six children? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do people in your community approve of men who have over six children? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)</p>	<p>criticise or gossip about a man who decided to have only 2 children? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do people in your community criticise or gossip about men who have only 2 children? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)</p>
Stigma for unmarried women using family planning	<p>Unmarried women in my community do not use modern family planning. (Agree/ Disagree)</p> <p>How many unmarried women in your community use modern family planning? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do unmarried women in your community use modern family planning? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)</p>	<p>People in my community disapprove of unmarried women who use modern family planning. (Agree/ disagree)</p> <p>How many people in your community disapprove of unmarried women using modern family planning? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do people in your community disapprove of unmarried women using modern family planning? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)</p>	<p>If an unmarried woman uses modern family planning and the community find out, people would criticise or gossip about her!. (Agree/ disagree)</p> <p>How many people in your community would criticise or gossip if they found out that an unmarried women was using modern family planning? (All/ most/ some/ few/ none)</p> <p>How often do people in your community gossip about unmarried women who use modern family planning? (Very often/ often/ sometimes/ never)</p>

Some general principles for tailoring to local context include:

- For younger audiences or those who are less literate, it may be best to use reduced response options (“Yes/ No”, or “Agree/ Disagree”), rather than more complex scales;
- For these audiences it may be preferable to use simple question wordings, rather than hypothetical questions which may be better suited to professional audiences (e.g., “Do people approve or disapprove of xxx?” rather than “What proportion of people in your community would disapprove if they found out that xxx?”)
- Frequency questions on sanctions may be less appropriate where norms are rarely breached (i.e., people may say they rarely criticise norm breaches because these do not occur, rather than because sanctions are not applied);
- If the team is confident in the sanctions which are applied in their context (for example, that someone would be refused entry to community events as a sanction), then this can be included in the question. If not, it is better to refer to generic sanctions, such as “people would say negative things or criticise” the person;
- Questionnaires will need to be translated into local languages and care should be taken to ensure that concepts have been accurately captured. Research tools should be piloted among the target audience to ensure they are clearly understood.