



Evaluation of South Asia We Can Campaign to End Violence against Women: 'Light Touch' Review of Year 1

Full Report

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

March 2006

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB

Evaluators: Audrey Bronstein and Kate Bishop

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	Page 3
Section 1: Introduction	Page 7
Section 2: Findings	Page 8
Section 3: Recommendations/Conclusions	Page 24
Appendix - Terms of Reference	Page 29

We Can Campaign - 'Light Touch' Review of Year 1 - March 2006

Executive Summary

The first phase of the campaign is on the right track and represents a major achievement. Enthusiasm, commitment, courage and excitement are evident at all levels not least due to the campaign's tackling an issue of real concern to millions of people in their every day lives. The campaign message is getting through to thousands of people and groups (although not always fully understood or fully accurate). There is growing and significant commitment to challenge the acceptability of domestic violence where this awareness didn't exist before. Extensive training of change makers is happening, albeit some of questionable quality.

But most importantly, We Can is empowering people: in many cases, creating a sense of energy and power to take action on an issue of fundamental importance, while at the same time providing tools and a way forward. It is giving individuals the opportunity and means of making different choices in their **own** lives as well as the courage to try to influence the choices of others. For many people, awareness of the issue is not new, but most have been without an accessible vehicle for action. The campaign offers a positive message, an alternative vision and the necessary practical steps. This has created a sense of measured optimism and confidence about the possibility of creating incremental change.

The campaign is seen by most as inclusive and embracing of wide sectors of civil society providing Oxfam and partners with a mechanism for reaching out to men and women in new sectors. Most partners had not done this before, especially those which had worked almost exclusively with women. Traditionally, previous initiatives on domestic violence have focused on working with women's organisations and/or have had a primary focus on policy change working mainly from a middle-class urban base. For these latter organisations, We Can has provided a new and practical tool to work at the grass roots level. The positive message of the campaign is a key success factor so far in bringing in new people and organisations (especially from the non NGO world) to the issue.

Arguably We Can is breaking new ground, at least within Oxfam, in creating a distinctive model of grass roots popular campaigning - using programme development skills, tools and methods. This 'hybrid' model is a new approach for Oxfam with impressive results to date. Further organisational attention is needed to distil the learning from We Can model to understand more clearly:

- What is working and what isn't in effecting change in beliefs and practice (moving beyond anecdotes)
- how We Can could strengthen both the campaigns and development programmes.

The campaign materials are a huge success, well received and heavily used. They have enabled difficult messages to be widely accessible without being overwhelming - in spite of the complexity and sensitivity of the issues involved.

Working with rural and urban young people - a new constituency for Oxfam and most partners - is considered a significant innovation and success by all. A number of partners are already building on this and drawing young people into other development initiatives. In addition, a number of other donors and partners have now incorporated domestic violence into their wider programme priorities.

The decision taken by OGB senior managers to let countries take the campaign forward in a way appropriate to each context (rather than follow a rigid blueprint) appears to have been the right one. This has meant a different pace and forms in different countries:

- **Bangladesh** gives a very positive impression of what is going on at community and national levels. The campaign is a vibrant, living experience with much energy, commitment and optimism in spite of the challenges facing partners and change makers, particularly, the increasing threat of religious opposition. The strong, creative leadership role played by OGB staff in driving and shaping the campaign at all levels has been key to success. Partners and other social actors are clear about the broad purpose of the campaign. Good, solid steps have been taken towards building a national, independent alliance. Initial stirrings of alliances/networks at state level need more attention from the in-country We Can teams.

The campaign will still need careful nurturing for some years to come: understanding more clearly ‘what works’ in terms of influencing ideas and beliefs and changing practice is critical as is more systematic follow up for change makers. The creation of a wider over-arching public ‘campaign’ to support the grass roots work of the change makers was seen by many as a critical component which needs to be strengthened.

- **In South India** the strong commitment is evident of the Andhra Pradesh Women’s Network (APWN) – the single partner taking the campaign forward in AP.¹ While the partner is very clear on the broad aim of the campaign, there was more evidence of ‘task’ implementation (in terms of running trainings, getting the change maker kits distributed, holding events, etc) but less clarity on strategic thinking and future implementation of the campaign. Also absent was any sense of leadership and drive towards the future from the partner, but rather an assumption that this would come from Oxfam. OGB staff play a very effective support and accompaniment role to partner and are widely appreciated by the partner. This however is unlikely to be sufficient for moving forward and certainly not for scale up given the partner’s limitations and lack of strategic capacity.
- In addition there has been very little active thinking and no concrete work to date on local or state alliance building (other than a complex and abortive attempt of a few years ago). The partner is unlikely to be up to the task on its own, and it would be a high risk decision to invest in them as the key player in bringing the state alliance together.

Inevitably, in spite of the significant achievements of We Can to date, there are critical ‘fault-lines’ which need serious attention. Further recommendations are also outlined in Section 3, pp 24-28.

Alliance – building: The conceptual framing and thinking behind the campaign (change objective, framing the message, change makers strategy) is sound and excellent. There is, however, a corresponding gap in thinking about the organisational and external alliance framework needed to ensure that the campaign will be sustainable and successful in the long-term as an independent initiative. There is an urgent need to focus on design and a planning and implementation framework for alliance-building including:

- further clarity on what kind of alliances are needed to build a mass movement
- better analysis and understanding of the different roles required of Oxfam staff
- the different kinds of alliances appropriate to distinctive country and local contexts
- staff and partner skill sets needed to take this work forward
- milestones to be achieved within a reasonable time frame

¹ Comments and observations are based on visits to only two members of the multi-member network and as such may not be representative of the wider achievements of the APWN as a whole. While staff were concerned with much of the evidence from these two visits, they assured the Review team that experience was stronger with other APWN members.

Included in this process should be the essential step of staff's sharing more systematically the overall vision and strategy to date with key partners and actors, especially those playing a leadership role in the campaign. Without this, real buy-in for the future will be hampered as will the capacity of others to play a leadership role in building campaign independence.

Time frame: While the campaign has rightly established a long-term time-frame (2005-2011), it is likely that an even longer overall time-frame will be needed to achieve full independence and sustainability. Most partners buy in fully to the objective of independence but feel that more than a few years will be needed to achieve the spread, solid building blocks, ownership and capacity. It is likely that countries will differ in the time needed to get these building blocks for a solid independent alliance in place. Timeframes are also likely to differ for alliance building at district/state/provincial levels.

The Message: The timing and phasing of the carefully crafted campaign message needs to be reconsidered. It is clear that for many change makers it will take longer to consolidate the basic elements of the message on domestic violence while others are ready to move on to a more complex message, and indeed, some already have. There is a further danger of some change makers getting 'stuck' with a simplistic message about reducing family tension and creating greater harmony while not necessarily understanding or accepting the fundamental issue of women's rights and gender-based discrimination.

Change makers strategy: The change-makers strategy appears to be working but is hard to measure or identify what works most effectively. It was difficult get beyond the simple rhetoric and stories to identify clearly what works and what doesn't in influencing people's beliefs and practice.² In south India, it was difficult to assess to what extent the element of 'personal change' had been embedded versus the arguably easier task of trying to change the behaviour of others. The introduction of big target numbers was a surprise to some and the drive to achieve numbers might have had some negative impact on quality of campaign delivery, especially in south India, where the personal change element of strategy also appeared relatively weak.

Follow up with change makers is a serious problem for most partners with some more aware and beginning to think about it than others. Overall, change makers still and will meet a lot of resistance with family, friends, community; further thinking on alternative influencing strategies and how to overcome this resistance was asked for by many change makers.

Materials: A wide range of suggestions were made by partners and change makers about how to make the materials even more successful. These are outlined in Section 3, as are a series of suggestions for strengthening the campaign's capacity to mobilise, sustain and retain change makers.

Oxfam's role: A major challenge to Oxfam from partners focused on the organisation's failure to date to integrate We Can and the campaign issues into wider regional and in-country programming. While a number of partners have integrated domestic violence into other programme streams, Oxfam is still seen to be keeping We Can in a separate bubble.

A major strength of We Can is the very able people who make up the team. In order to ensure the team will be able to meet future challenges, greater priority is needed on:

- strengthening the leadership capacity of the team, ie. in addition to the strong focus on operational delivery
- being clearer about the changing and most appropriate role(s) for staff to play over time

² although the planned impact assessment work will begin to tackle this

- bringing campaigns-specific experience into the team which could be adapted to meet the distinctive We Can model
- establishing a clearer matrix management relationship between the centrally based We Can coordinator and the in-country leads.

It was reassuring to find that many of the issues identified in the Review process were already on the radar of some of the We Can team, or at least not far off. This team has the capacity and commitment to tackle the fault-lines.

Section 1: Introduction

Background to the Campaign

Nearly half the women in South Asia will experience some form of violence within their homes and communities at some time in their lives. Global advocacy efforts have resulted in legislative gains and some economic opportunities, yet for most women, the everyday and often life-threatening violence remains a private matter – a culturally acceptable expression of gender-based discrimination and power relations.

The South Asia regional campaign to end violence against women aims to reduce the social acceptability of violence at regional, national and community level in six countries of South Asia through a popular campaign to change ideas, beliefs and practice. The aim is to mobilise 5 million voluntary change agents (Change makers) who will work to influence a further 10 people each.

The initial phase of the campaign has focused on identifying the first of these change agents and developing their capacity to influence.

Purpose of Review

To provide Oxfam and the We Can campaign team with an assessment (based on a limited snapshot view) of the achievements, learning and challenges of the first year of the campaign.³

Approach and Methodology

The Review was carried out by Audrey Bronstein (International Division) and Kate Bishop (Campaigns and Policy Division) based on visits to Bangladesh and South India (over a two-week period).

The main aim was to form a view about how the campaign was going, rather than a specific evaluation of what was 'good or bad' and to feed these judgements and observations into the further thinking and planning of Allison Aldred, South Asia RD, Mona Mehta, Global Gender adviser and the wider We Can team.

Informal interviews, discussion, observation and further analysis of what people said...and what they didn't say have all contributed to the judgements and conclusions drawn. While we weren't collecting specific stories of change and success, inevitably people told stories all the time. It was often hard to get beyond the anecdotal stories to deeper thinking, especially with grass-roots change makers but also with partners (particularly in south India).

Many of the issues raised in this report were already being thought about by the We Can staff, in the central team as well as in country. This indicates that the campaign, in much of its thinking and delivery is on the right track. It is also clear that based on the work to date and the calibre of the team managing We Can, that they are well equipped to begin to tackle the new and urgent issues identified within this review as long as sufficient time is created to do so.

Our knowledge and understanding was always significantly enhanced by information and explanations provided by staff. Some of the observations and conclusions contained within

³ See Appendix 1 for Terms of Reference for the review

the report may not have a wider application for overall campaign, and indeed, may well be an inaccurate reflection of the wider reality in the areas we visited. This is an inevitable consequence of a quick snapshot of a complex initiative in a complex Region. Sincere thanks go to all the staff in Bangladesh and India who provided committed, knowledgeable and good-humoured support; equally sincere apologies in advance for any comments or judgements which are inadvertently based on limited information or understanding.

Who we met

Interviews and discussions were carried out with:

- Implementing partners in both south India and Bangladesh. Some were also members of loose alliances at state and/or national levels.
- National alliance members in Bangladesh. Although we did meet NGO alliance members who weren't Oxfam (funded) partners, we did not meet any non-NGO civil society alliance members, such as the Women's Institute.
- A wider range of change-makers, both very active and less active: young people (students and non-students), village women and men, teachers, rickshaw union leaders (Bangladesh), local civil servants, etc
- Other individuals involved and/or aware of the campaign: civil society actors (eg. teachers, lawyers, government officials, police; feminist organisation (Hyderabad) – mainly at district (India) and equivalent level in Bangladesh.
- OGB staff (We Can project/programme officers, Programme Managers).

Section 2: Findings⁴

Question One: The Strategy: to what extent have staff, partners, allies understood and adopted the key elements of the campaign strategy?

- ***communicating the overall strategy***
- ***phased campaign approach***
- ***communications and materials***
- ***change maker strategy and mobilisation***

Communicating the overall strategy

Within Bangladesh, clarity amongst partners and allies on the overall purpose of the campaign and the change maker strategy is strong alongside a clear understanding of the key element of personal change as first step in the process. In south India, it is not as clear whether the fundamental role of personal change for each change maker is as embedded within change maker practice.

The Campaign Strategy paper (internal document, not public leaflet) is not being used as a working document by partners; few have seen it and this limits their ability to understand, embrace and contribute to the overall strategy. As a result, for some the emphasis has been on the more practical and immediate delivery of training, distribution of kits and creation of initial group of change makers.

Those partners who had attended national meetings where the wider strategy was outlined did have a clearer sense of the big picture, but they had not shared that with other allies.

The campaign is likely to develop differently and organically in different country contexts, and the campaign strategy document will provide an essential framework for this to happen.

⁴ to avoid repetition findings from Bangladesh and India are combined with any specific differences highlighted

It is recommended therefore that the campaigns strategy document be shared as soon as possible with partners/allies, especially those playing a leadership role. This needs to be done with sufficient time for discussion and within a clear process for taking on board comments and challenges from partners/allies. Oxfam staff should be clear on whether there are any 'bottom lines' or non-negotiables.

Ownership and operationalising

Partners in Bangladesh showed a strong sense of independent buy-in and ownership clearly feeling that it is 'their' campaign although very much recognising and wanting to sustain Oxfam's strategic and 'mission critical' involvement for at least the next 5 years.

In south India, the operative principle appears to one of a more 'traditional' partnership approach with the partner 'delivering' the project. The local partner, APWN is some way off 'owning' the campaign as an independent operation, although they expressed a keen willingness to do so.

In south India, the review team had a concern about the operational delivery in terms of quality of training for change makers provided by a couple of members of the APWN. (This is dealt with in more detail in later sections on the overall change maker strategy).

Model of Change: is it working?

One of the most difficult questions for staff, partners, other actors and change makers was about what is most effective in changing people's ideas/beliefs and their practice, ie. what works? There were many anecdotal accounts of different ways that change makers use to make these changes happen (working in pairs, persistence, using positive examples of people who had changed, threats!) but very little systematic analysis within the training, discussions with partners or staff reflections on what really is working most effectively within the campaign.

It is clear just how difficult it is really to change what people think, let alone how they behave, and all the more extraordinary to witness the commitment of young and old to tackling the sensitive and deeply rooted issue of domestic violence. The long-term success and sustainability of the campaign will depend in large part how well the team and allies are able to begin to answer the question of what works in different contexts with different groups. This may well fit within the impact assessment process, but it is important that staff begin to draw out, share and use this learning as part of their daily planning and implementing of the campaign.

Phased Campaign Approach

The campaign strategy is based on a clear and timed phasing of the concept and messaging. Unfortunately, there is little awareness of this phasing amongst partners and other actors although there is agreement that the message will have to change as time goes on, if only to sustain interest. But they aren't clear how this would/should happen. Most partners were vaguely aware that the campaign is in the first phase but no one could remember what the phase 2 message was (including some staff!)

Those few partners who'd attended a meeting about the campaign strategy did have a sense of a bigger picture but with little detail. They appear not to have shared this to any great extent with others (at least in case of APWN)

Communication Strategy and Materials

The message

Further work is needed to get a better understanding of how partners and change makers are shaping and delivering the message. Given the ambition and scale up strategy of the campaign, message control will be neither possible nor desirable. However there is evidence that for a significant number of change makers, tackling domestic violence is about achieving peace and harmony in the family (ie. no shouting, being nice and respectful to each other). But it isn't necessarily about women's rights. The campaign strategy is clear and correct in wanting to move gradually towards a more rights-based message, but more attention is needed with partners and some change makers to ensure that the 'happy families' message doesn't serve as a block or a dead-end to a more challenging rights based approach.

The positive message of the campaign with the focus on individual choice is clearly an effective means of engaging people, despite it being a slow process. It would appear that the change comes about through reasonably in-depth engagement with an individual over extended period e.g. 4 or 5 one-to-one discussions, but the change does then appear to be deep and lasting. Again, this will be considered further as part of the impact assessment process.

There was evidence of very different levels of understanding of the different 'types' of domestic violence⁵, something the campaign has tried to emphasise in the training of change makers. Partners and change makers in Bangladesh were able to articulate this quite readily whereas this level of understanding was not in great evidence in south India.

The approach

'Personal change must come first' also appears key to the success of the approach, as leading by example avoids the more potentially aggressive approach of 'requiring' others to change. It also brings the issue more easily into the public arena showing it is possible and positive to behave differently.

The clear focus on personal agency, giving people tools and a way forward to take action in their own lives has been very important. Equally important however, and needing more attention (of which the We Can team is aware), is giving people support once they've taken first step i.e. for change makers more capacity building and analysis, and for those experiencing violence, where to go for shelter, counselling, and legal support.

There is systematic and growing challenge to the Campaign's message in Bangladesh from religious sectors of the community at both national and local levels. While partners, change makers, allies and staff are well aware of this and tackling in a variety of ways, there would appear to be, as yet, no clear strategy about how to tackle this more effectively in the future. Different strategies will clearly be needed for change makers working at the grass roots level who often are subject to personal abuse and harassment as well as for allies and partners working at the national level.

Materials – Successes and Challenges

Overall the materials have been very well received, are widely accessible and successful in communicating the first phase message. The booklets are being used successfully by young change makers as a legitimising tool for challenging violent behaviour in their own families

⁵ physical, sexual, mental, economic

(which is where many take their first influencing action). Change makers also leave booklets with other individuals in the extended family, workplace and community settings as an initial way of opening up the discussion on domestic violence.

The materials have been successful in keeping the message clear, and as a partial counter to the problem of clarity of message mentioned earlier.

The badge was repeatedly cited as useful as spreading the message and as a public expression of personal commitment, leading by example and opening up discussion

Community cultural events (theatre, music, poetry) have been very effective in Bangladesh as a good entry point to raise the issue and both attract people to become change makers but also to create a positive and legitimated context for change makers to work with others.

The work with media has been impressive with strong coverage of events, and potentially very influential initiatives, such as the proposed popular TV series on domestic violence in Bangladesh. Many partners and change makers believe that creating a wider public campaign or awareness (ie. TV, radio, billboards, press coverage, signs on village walls, etc) gives greater legitimacy and strengthen the acceptability of the change maker's work at community level. This is already being actively developed in Bangladesh and could provide much useful learning to the campaign in other countries where a broad-based media/communications strategy hasn't been developed.

There were mixed views about the importance of a policy change component as part of the campaign. A number of partners felt that they and others had been working on policy change for many years (especially in India) and that We Can shouldn't dilute it's strong grass roots focus by introducing a policy change focus.⁶ by broadening to work on policy. In Bangladesh however, a number of partners felt that creating a policy framework as part of the campaign would be important, not so much to change policy itself (although that is obviously important), but to provide greater credibility and support to grass roots change makers in making them feel part of a wider process. The key question for the We Can campaign team is about whether and how a policy component adds to the model of change We Can is working with. The answer is likely to be different in each country context as well as at different points in time in the campaign, but the important thing is to consider the question.

Partners and change makers had many ideas for making materials even more effective. These are important in the context of campaign spread where personal contact with the implementing partner or other organisation might be more limited and/or the intensive training of change makers may not be possible given scale and numbers. The materials may at some stage have to play a more 'stand-alone' role.

- At present change makers are given some guidance on how to use materials in the training. But a number of interviewees suggested that the next wave of materials should include a clear outline of what the objective or purpose of the booklet is and a set of user guidelines (eg. who is target audience, ways of using) to help change makers use them effectively.
- Change makers want more booklets (more than one each) as they see the strategy of leaving them with others to look over in their own time as something that is working. This will need a cost-effective way of scaling up quantity of material production without losing quality. One way to support this might be through considering sponsorship of materials by national brand name companies and/or by appropriate multi-national companies.

⁶ Indeed there are many 'good' which are not implemented policies in India on violence against women.

- resource centres⁷ for partners and change makers to deepen their analysis, strengthen messaging and capacity through to learning sessions to share materials from different countries and regions.
- Suggestions for different content included:
 - A specific focus on the more difficult issues of mental and sexual violence and other issues which provide a deeper exploration of domestic violence – but with careful thought so as not to push community/national tolerance levels too far too soon.
 - Materials which will be useful for different sectors of society (ie. what works in rural villages doesn't always work in the urban context) and for different target groups, eg. materials designed for use with men by male change makers
 - Incorporation of children's rights, responding to the experiences of young people/children experiencing mental and physical violence in the home for use with parents⁸.
 - Materials which reflect positive stories of change, case studies and best practice which make change seem possible...using local examples wherever possible
 - A questions and answers sheet (for both partners and change makers) to help respond to the very difficult challenges and questions that arise in the wider community and in 1-1 discussions
 - (from India): basic information about existing laws both to help women know their rights and change makers to tackle difficult issues
 - (from Bangladesh): content which communicates the reality of the fear and dependency in which many women live. This may be a way of bridging the gap between harmonious families and women's rights.
 - A stand-alone leaflet or kit for civil society actors (eg. doctors, lawyers, teachers) to explain what the campaign is about as a way of drawing them in⁹

Change Maker Strategy

Strengths

Change makers in great numbers are clearly convinced of the need for change both in their own lives and that of their parents, extended family and community. Many are working hard to find alternative influencing strategies: persistence; leaving materials in public places (health centre, electrical supply office) for people to see; working in pairs or groups; using theatre/stories.

In Bangladesh, there was clear evidence of male and female change makers seriously trying to make change in their own lives. In South India, it was harder to see whether change makers were taking this first step in their own lives, nor how actively they were working with others persistently through alternative strategies¹⁰.

All were very honest and open about how difficult it is to change their own behaviour, let alone that of others. When frustrated or overwhelmed by the difficulty of the task, they were sustained by stories of success of others or by seeing individuals beginning to change, even in small ways.

⁷ the We Can team is already thinking along these lines

⁸ (many young people talked about domestic violence as something experienced by both girls and boys, not just adult women)

⁹ this apparently is already in preparation in south India

¹⁰ the review team later learned that some of the groups interviewed were new to the change maker process

The connection with young people has been a huge success for the strategy with the strength of youth involvement and commitment clearly surprising a number of partners. Not only is this a new and active constituency for Oxfam and partners in south Asia, the campaign is clearly challenging and influencing the minds of the next generation of citizens and leaders in South Asia.

Challenges

Most change makers were honest about the strength of resistance they are still meeting from parents, extended family members, friends and others in the community through comments like: “why are you interfering in our family affairs”, or having the issue and their concerns trivialised and/or laughed at. Some also experienced serious personal harassment and physical abuse as a result of their challenging position.

In South India, the element of personal change was not strongly in evidence and arguably might have the long-term effect of weakening the change maker’s resolve to carry on. A number of change makers were less clear on the types of domestic violence and were also focusing on wider issues gender violence such as murder, dowry, and early marriage rather than violence in the home.

Change makers were about their often limited capacity to develop effective influencing strategies: in South India, some said that they now have an awareness of the issues, but don’t know how to influence others. All had concerns too about their ability to respond effectively and with confidence to the very strong challenges they were getting, including from religious sectors in Bangladesh.

The issue of engaging with middle class communities came up often in discussion with partners, student change makers and other actors. What is the role of middle class communities in the We Can model of change in both directly tackling domestic violence in those communities but also in contributing to wider change within the country? This was an area on which some partners and change makers wanted greater clarity. Materials have not been designed with these groups in mind, and appear not to work as effectively within these households. Change makers also said they felt there was less receptivity within middle class households, seeing the issue of domestic violence as one more relevant to poorer communities. The role of middle class communities within the campaign and the model of change is a strategic issue needing further consideration by the We Can team.

The change maker tool kit was almost always proudly displayed (at least the bag was much in evidence). But the question of the tool kit as means or end arose in a number of visits, particularly in south India. It appeared in some cases that the training had been so focused on ‘how to use’ the tool kit, that the wider issues and aim of the campaign had received less emphasis (personal change; longer term goals etc). While the campaign team has clearly conceptualised the tool kit as an instrument within a wider process, this hasn’t always played out in reality. In particular, the relatively sudden introduction of large target numbers (5 million etc) was cited by some as having skewed their work in placing greater emphasis on reaching the targets vs achieving an appropriate depth of understanding and personal change with change makers.

Follow up with change makers is a critical issue for the whole campaign, in terms of both support and monitoring; the We Can team is well aware of this:

- In South India, it is a critical issue at the most basic level. The Oxfam partner, APWN, admitted they did not know clearly what message change makers were delivering or how effective they were. “We’ve spent a lot of time and money on getting the

campaign moving (with kits, trainings, events etc) but have given much less focus on continuity of support and follow up”.

- Partners in Bangladesh also identified follow up as a key concern but are beginning to work on this - through review meetings with change makers. However, the basic issue of how to follow up is further compounded by the varied needs of change makers – due to their differing contexts, skills and experience and/or levels of commitment. It is already apparent that some change makers want to move forward in their own understanding and analysis, while others still need more support to operate even at the most basic level.

This raises the issue – of which some partners are beginning to be aware - about whether the more traditional accompaniment approach in development work (meetings with groups etc) is appropriate. It is unlikely to be sustainable, nor desirable, in human and financial resources to operate on the basis of small groups if the campaign is to go to scale. Partners mentioned that in all other projects they deliver, there is a followup/contact pattern built into project design; this needs more attention within We Can acknowledging that different, innovative and cost-effective ways need to be found. Finding cost effective ways of asking change makers what they need will be an important part of this process as will building follow up into any future planning with civil society organisations which engage as ‘deliverers’ with the campaign.

Mobilising and supporting change makers – What Works?

The report has already touched on what seems to be working well in mobilising change makers:

- Touching on real issues in people’s lives
- Creating agency: giving people choice about involvement, not preaching right or wrong.
- Cultural performances and community events as recruitment method

Young adults are clearly motivated by the possibility of creating a better environment for their children. Students are keen to make use of the large networks that exists in schools and colleges. Within local communities, involving influential figures or community leaders not only engages more people, it creates a positive environment for all change makers.

Partners and change makers had many ideas on mobilising more change makers and keeping them motivated. The review team has added further thoughts and proposals for consideration:

Mobilising more change makers:

- From change makers:
 - Cultural events at schools and colleges which mirror young people’s experience e.g. ‘eve-teasing’, domestic violence affecting children, early marriage. Getting the school principal on board helps to achieve wider spread.
 - Posters in schools/colleges, villages etc gets people asking what the campaign is about
 - Well advertised community level events, with committed change makers present, to raise awareness of domestic violence as an issue and the campaign as a response
 - Forming local change maker committees and developing individual, and joint, action plans.

Keeping them motivated:

From change makers

- Taste of success and real change: an improvement in the change makers own life, or changing one other person
- Building knowledge, analysis, confidence and courage especially for more 'advanced' change makers:
 - Further training on domestic violence and women's rights, including information on laws and support services
 - Further training on alternative influencing strategies, eg. role-play
- Increased respect and profile in the change maker's own community
- ensuring peer support by tackling tough issues in 2s or 3s and/or more collective change maker actions (eg district change maker events, village change maker forums)
- Providing regular contact with We Can partners or other actors (for both technical and moral support); could also be used for problem-solving group sessions
- Good materials in sufficient quantities that they can use, including advanced training materials those change makers who want to develop further
- Peer support structures (which some partners have established) for recruitment and support also provides recognition and respect for their work
- Reinforcement of legitimacy of their work: through TV or big public events, and use of celebrities, and use of popular media channels e.g. magazines

From the review team:

- Materials/tools:
 - A We Can change maker's diary: a student change maker keeps a daily diary of his own behaviour highlighting the positive changes and negative/no change.
 - Using e-mail (which clearly won't work everywhere): We Can e-greetings cards sent to networks of friends
 - Change maker newsletter – with success stories and ideas
 - Change maker t-shirts – could be entry point for conversation
 - Peer to peer materials – currently leaflet for students in on their family life, a peer to peer one could look at eve-teasing, brother-sister relations etc.
 - Materials which outline alternative and successful influencing strategies: a 'how to' booklet
- Learning and sharing:
 - Ideas bank for change makers – change maker newsletter full of recent stories of success and ideas for how to break down barriers – innovative things that change makers have done which have been successful
 - Buddy system for new and advanced change makers
 - School exchange programme including schools with no We Can
 - Inter-country change maker friendship programme through email or letter
- Other activities
 - Small grants fund for change makers to support small scale local events
 - Competitions: design poster/t-shirt for national college distribution; group project or essay.
 - In schools/colleges: inter-school debates; parents evenings with cultural team performing; positive feedback to parents by teachers on student change makers performance (recognition for student and to encourage parental support and engagement); a curriculum connection with We Can (We Can partners already run some regular sessions as part of school curriculum)

Issues re change maker investment and delivery strategy for further consideration by the We Can team¹¹

- Change makers need more help in tackling the specific forms of entrenched resistance (religion, family privacy) they are meeting. Some have the personal confidence and self-motivation but this is not true for all.
- Clarity on strategies for scale up:
 - will there be a stronger focus on student change makers as the key vehicle for scaling up. If so, will there be any knock on effects in working with marginalized communities where students might not be as present?
 - already mentioned is the need for greater clarity on the role of middle class change makers and communities
 - how far will the strategy of 1 person influencing 5-10 more go, and where is the investment needed? Some partners are working with the concept of 'primary, secondary, tertiary' change makers, but it might be more effective to focus change maker development and investment the levels of individual engagement, e.g. more valuable to support a tertiary but keen change maker who is clear and active than a primary change maker who has lost interest.
 - is it helpful to think of investing in 'advanced' change makers? Some active change makers talked about the strain of making time for becoming alienated from their friends and community. Is there a danger of burn out and/or is it more likely that the majority of change makers will operate at a basic level most of the time?
 - what is a reasonable drop off rate? Some partners were saying that only 20-25% of trained change makers stay active. Different strategies are needed if 25% is considered acceptable vs a decision to increase the retention rate. The We Can team needs to consider these issues and make decisions about future investment.
 - so far the work in some areas has been fairly labour intensive (partners supporting relatively small numbers of groups) while in others success in bringing wider civil society groups on board has meant a different way of working. More systematic team consideration of these issues, including the challenge this may represent for some more traditional partners and how to maintain minimal quality control of message will be important.
 - how can new technology support mass numbers of individuals? If not appropriate, what are the other mechanisms (inter and intra-country learning)
- One of the strengths universally identified is the involvement of men in all aspects of the campaign. It would be useful though to give more attention to identifying more clearly the personal benefits for men, given that the women's rights message is often framed in a way that at worst excludes men, or at best, is not very convincing.

Question Two: Alliance-Building: Examine the overall assumptions on alliance building and provide an independent assessment of whether it is the right approach; identify key learning on alliance building to inform future strategy.

The proposed independence of We Can is welcomed by all partners involved in the campaign, although there are real concerns that Oxfam will withdraw or change its role too quickly or too soon. The independent branding has been successful in that within a relatively short time frame, there are clear signs of actual or potential ownership by partners and other actors and very little feeling that Oxfam is playing too dominant a role. Given some past

¹¹ A number of these are already on We Can agenda but are recorded here as they arose from discussions with partners and changemakers

critiques of Oxfam's role in global and local campaigns, this is a clear achievement on the part of the We Can team.

The We Can team however will ignore at their peril the fact that the power dynamics at work between Oxfam and funded partners is very different to that between Oxfam and peer INGOs or national NGOs (as in other Oxfam global campaigns).

State of alliance development

While We Can has been hugely successful in getting the message out, and in beginning to create a mass of change makers, the present state of thinking and planning for the development of an independent alliance is relatively weak and is a serious gap in the campaign (except in Bangladesh). The overall gap in thinking about the alliance building strategy is first seen in the (internal) campaign strategy document itself. There is little written about the nature of the alliance, how to get there, what skills are needed or what role Oxfam should play. Most of the strategic thinking to date has focused on the phasing of the campaign in concept and message.

If the campaign is to achieve the stated target of a first phase independent alliance by 2008, work on a strategy, resourcing, skills development and communications with partners/allies must start now.

Bangladesh appears to be on a healthy and potentially fruitful track towards a first phase independent alliance, including plans to set up an independent secretariat. The alliance appears to have organisations and individuals representing a fairly broad base with a strong core group willing to provide leadership. Partners appear to have a very clear grasp of the challenges of working in alliance. Not only had they already identified some of these, but also they quickly understood and engaged with the new challenges presented in the course of the review discussions. While there is clearly much work to do to move the national alliance from its relatively informal state to a more formal structure (for decision-making, resource management, conflict resolution), it is a solid base on which to build. The strength of the national alliance, however, contrasts with the weaker embryonic district alliances which have been developing in a fairly ad hoc manner and with weak or no clear links with the national alliance (other than via a small number of partners).

The lead campaign staff person in Bangladesh has played a strong leadership role and is clearly in the driving seat of both the campaign and the alliance. He has ensured that partners and other allies are working within a longer-term vision, and has approached the task as a team-building exercise. Meetings with the core group of partners/allies have been used to tackle key issues, build shared understanding and create shared learning. He has also provided more focused 1-1 support and critical challenge role to lead organisations. Plans are also in place to begin to hand over certain lead roles (eg. materials development) to other organisations and individuals concentrating the Oxfam input on strategic and conceptual support for the overall campaign.

In **south India**, alliance building is a long way off, and will need significant staff thinking and input to get it going. The Oxfam partner does not appear to have the strategic thinking skills, organisational capacity, or sufficient experience in alliance building to serve as the core convenor for a state-wide alliance. They also have a very low profile with other potential member NGOs and social actors and are unlikely to have sufficient 'calling' power. APWN is a network with members of mixed abilities, a potentially serious limiting factor.

Oxfam's role has been one of excellent and essential support and accompaniment to the partner helping them deliver the We Can project. However if a strong and independent

alliance is to emerge, Oxfam and Oxfam staff will have to assume a more proactive leadership role, moving beyond accompaniment in the initial phase but with the sensitivity and skills required of an 'enabling' leadership role. Moving forward in Andhra Pradesh (AP) will also require an active, thought through and resourced programme of outreach to other NGOs, funders, civil society actors etc to begin to bring the alliance together.

One of the first steps will be to clarify what it means to be an 'alliance member': at present in AP at least, it would appear that any individual who attends a meeting, training or event is referred to as an 'alliance member'. However, it is clear that while these individuals do feel some commitment to the We Can campaign, they do not see themselves as part of any structure (informal or formal) to take the campaign forward in a systematic way over the next few to several years. While many might be willing to do so, these discussions have not yet taken place.

Partner-based alliances (or not) and involvement of change makers

While there was not much specific discussion in meetings in Bangladesh or south India, the We Can team needs to begin to focus on the complexities of the power dynamics involved as the We Can alliances grow. To achieve scale up, the alliances will, as planned, have to include many organisations, and most not funded by Oxfam. These are likely to be important civil society actors in their own right and may well see themselves in a peer relationship with Oxfam. Further challenges will arise if the alliances are built, as planned, with a membership base of small grass roots organisations alongside larger NGO and non-NGO civil society actors – clearly a huge potential strength for achieving change - but bringing complex dynamics to the table.

It is also clear that the We Can campaign will need to identify some kind of benefit or 'hook' to get potential non-partner alliance members engaged. Clearly where the We Can campaign offers a non-partner organisation some synergy and/or added value with the organisation's own objectives and agenda, this is likely to be easier and more transparent. Other issues however would need further thinking, and could benefit from discussions with OGB campaign's learning about working in alliance with non (funded) partners. One key and obvious issue is whether Oxfam's leadership role, however enabling it might be, would have to change from the outset. Non (funded) partner organisations arguably are more likely to want a more equal/peer relationship, with each player bringing different skills (as in OGB's other alliance building experiences).

The issue of change maker involvement in local and national alliances came up often, raised mainly by both partners and change makers. Generally the view was that change makers want and need to be involved actively in alliances in order to ensure that future We Can campaign direction and strategies were rooted in the day-to-day experience of change makers.

A smaller issue is that of language: We Can might want to consider revising its concept and use of the word 'partner', and begin to think of non-funded partners (as we have in other programmes) as well as funded partners¹². This would help We Can move away from the possibly unhelpful language of 'non-partner' based alliance. The campaign should create a positive but different sense of partnership, rather than work with a negative definition (of a non-partner).

¹² although the language of funded and non-funded has also been problematic in practice

Working towards alliance-building

Alliance or movement: While not wanting to introduce a semantic concern, discussions with staff and partners confirmed that most are working towards a mass movement. For a range of reasons, the word 'movement' is felt not to be helpful and so hasn't figured strongly. If the goal however is a mass movement, then clearly the alliance becomes the 'vehicle' rather than the end in itself. While this may appear to be stating the obvious, this will have an influence on the nature and form of alliances to be developed.

Structures: The overall approach of We Can has been to provide a solid and well thought through framework for the campaign with clear objectives and messages but leaving implementation to develop organically in different ways appropriate to each country/sub country context. While this inevitably brings challenges (of consistency, sharing learning etc), it appears to have been the right choice to date. Equally, it would be a mistake to create a single blueprint for country-based alliances (at national and local levels). As with the organic approach of the campaign roll-out, a clear framework with clarity of top line objectives, operating principles and guidance on roles and responsibilities is most likely to be the best way forward at this stage to support alliance development.

It will be important to include some guidance and/or examples as to how alliances might operate within countries at district or more local levels. This is a more urgent issue for Bangladesh, for example, where the active existence already of a loose but very wide grouping of about 30-40 people) in Dinajpur district will require some quick thinking on the part of Oxfam and the Bangladesh national alliance to ensure effective connections between district and national – however informal.

Staff skills/roles and partner capacity: A strong focus is needed now for the We Can team and partners to build up collective thinking and understanding of alliance development. In the same way that significant work was done in shaping the concept and strategy of the message and change makers, the right skills and similar energy must now be brought to thinking about and planning for alliance building. While there is key learning and experience within the team (eg. Bangladesh and other staff with this experience), the team should also try to learn from others, including CPD (notwithstanding the different nature of the experiences to date) and other organisations with extensive experience in alliance-building (successes and mistakes).

Specific issues for the We Can team to consider include:

- Structures:
 - Learning about different models and structures of alliances so that staff and partners have the tools and skills to move forward independently and appropriately within each country/sub country
 - Identifying key building blocks, milestones and route maps for moving forward
- Skills: identifying and building OGB staff capacity in particular, but also partner and ally capacity for the key skills set needed to grow and nurture a successful alliance
- Alliance members: working across civil society, including the corporate sector will be a key factor in achieving scale
- Roles and responsibilities: understanding the different roles Oxfam and other actors will need to play and how these will change over time. This is especially true if OGB is seen, in some countries as primarily a donor agency rather than a proactive campaigner.
- Resources: thinking through the resource requirements in advance and being clear what Oxfam's role will be in securing resources (either via direct provision or bringing in other funders)
- Challenges: anticipating the challenges for OGB, and the We Can team in particular, in working towards an independent alliance (power sharing; allowing for changing

messages and adaptations of the change maker strategy, etc) These issues are likely to arise well in advance of an independent alliance being set up, just as a parent has to begin to 'let go' of children and foster independence from an early age (including learning from mistakes)

- Success indicators: Identifying key elements for success in alliance building and outlining what those would be for We Can. Some examples of generic success indicators include:
 - Understanding, familiarity and ownership of big picture analysis and vision
 - Confidence/familiarity with different models and ability to adapt if problems arise
 - Awareness of challenges, adequate ways of working and plans to tackle challenges
 - Comfort and confidence with organic development but with clarity on the long-term and intermediate objectives
 - Participation from wide range of civil society including corporate sector if possible
 - Clear indicators for and evidence of building together with partners/allies
 - Clarity by all on leadership roles immediate through to long-term

Question Three: How is the campaign working? Comment generally on how the campaign is working and the diverse contexts that it needs to address

A number of issues about the overall development and delivery of the campaign are covered in previous sections. This section will concentrate on additional issues arising from discussions during the course of the review which, it is suggested, are critical for We Can to establish sound building blocks and further clarity for the future. As mentioned often in this report, it is reassuring to know that a number of these issues are already on the team's radar.

Oxfam's role: What could we do better?

There was a generally very positive perception of both Oxfam's role and staff. It was hard work to elicit any concrete suggestions for improvement other than more of the same for a long time to come! While this is probably inevitable given that most interviewees were funded partners, it is important that we encourage partners to think critically about our role. This is something that all staff should be building into their ongoing relations with partners, particularly if we are working towards a strong, independent alliance.

Some specific comments did emerge however especially when interviewees were pressed to provide feedback as essential for our learning how to be more effective:

- The biggest challenge to OGB, from Bangladesh and south India, was the critique that Oxfam is not integrating We Can systematically into the wider programme or staff team. Some partners went further in saying that the campaign objectives won't be achieved simply through the change makers strategy (and kits as part of We Can). They believe that greater impact will be achieved only through raising awareness of domestic violence through Oxfam's wider programming. Many of our partners are already doing this, and have influenced other funders to incorporate domestic violence as a priority. But the partners challenge Oxfam for not doing this and for not changing it's own ideas, beliefs and behaviour beyond the We Can team.

Senior South Asia managers accepted this valid challenge, and were aware of it already, although there were no specific plans to tackle this. It was interesting to see both the surprise and delight of the Bangladesh CPM when he discovered in our debrief that there were at least two change makers in the OGB Bangladesh office, neither of whom were part of the We Can team. It is suggested that this is

a critical issue to be raised and acted on by south Asia CPMs and the Regional Management Team.

- A number of partners were clear that they would like more proactive engagement of OGB staff at district/state level with two clear objectives:
 - to support the development of a more locally based long-term campaign strategy
 - to help build the alliance and infrastructure necessary to deliver at district/state level. They identified a danger of focusing only on alliance building at national level
- Partners would like to be involved more proactively and systematically in the overall design of the campaign. While this request may simply be the inevitable result of a challenge during the review as to how involved and aware they were, partners and other actors did demonstrate a genuine desire to engage at that level, emanating from their commitment and ownership of the campaign.
- Many asked for support in monitoring and measuring impact. Some were aware that this is in the planning stage and they were keen to take this forward as soon as possible, either as part of an overall We Can learning process, or to get specific help in developing systems to assess the impact of their own work. They also see great strength in Oxfam's inter and intra country links for learning purposes to support a future South Asia alliance.
- A number of partners were pleased that We Can had generated the review process and the change to consider strategic issues beyond daily operational delivery. They were keen to see some kind of critical self-reflection built into the work on a regular basis.
- There was still some concern about the sudden (to them) appearance of large target figures for the campaign. While most felt it was important and helpful to have ambitious targets, introducing these without much explanation was felt to have been unhelpful and may have even skewed some of the delivery of the change maker strategy (ie. focus on numbers rather than substance).

Campaign Time frame

There is widespread acceptance and support for Oxfam's setting out a longer-term time frame at the outset, but a number of partners feel that the campaign should be thinking, even now, beyond 2011. All partners are concerned that Oxfam might withdraw or change its role too soon. Even in Bangladesh, the view was that it will take at least 5 years before a wholly independent alliance will be able to function. The campaign would need to seek external funding so that Oxfam was not alone as funder. But most saw Oxfam's ongoing membership of the independent alliance as essential, and ideally, without a funding relationship.

Strengthening the We Can team

The need for a better understanding of the concepts, models and tools for alliance building in the team has already been identified.

As the campaign progresses and becomes more complex, the more likely it is to continue to need support, especially in human resources, albeit of a different and constantly evolving nature. This will need greater leadership from the We Can team as a whole (ie. those based centrally and in-country). It will be important to include clarity on establishing the We Can team as a leadership team over the next couple of years so that it is well placed to anticipate:

- how these support needs are likely to change over time (in different countries, at different levels, on different issues and with different skills required)
- and plan a human resource strategy to ensure the team is ahead of the game rather than caught unaware at a later stage.

Some changes are already underway in reconstructing the India We Can team with the aim also of strengthening the central team. Other ideas which arose in discussions with staff focused on strengthening the Regional/central team and providing more systematic support for the country teams. This would have the immediate effect of supporting more systematic learning in the short-term but would also strengthen the longer-term strategic capacity of the team to lead the campaign:

- Build on the model used by the review and have staff travel together in country at the time of We Can team meetings, using these group visits to meet partners and other actors and then to discuss findings for challenge and learning purposes.
- Generally ensure that team meetings are used for reflection/critical challenge and strategic thinking as well as operational planning. This will need careful planning of the agenda to ensure that reflection and learning time is protected.
- Create a system of quarterly reporting by all We Can country and central teams. These reports (separate from the Regional quarterly report) can then be shared/
- Establish official matrix management line between Mona and the country leads, using the quarterly report as a basis for a 1-1 between Mona and the country lead (including country/programme manager if possible). Both the CPM (Bangladesh) and PM (south India) were very supportive of this idea and felt it could bring clear added value to the work of We Can in-country
- Focus on ways of working to strengthen individual and team leadership as well as effective operational delivery

While it wasn't the specific brief of this review to consider resourcing issues, it does 'feel' like the team is under resourced for the scale and ambition of the campaign. There is a real danger of burnout for key members of the team who are carrying other programme responsibilities alongside We Can. It is suggested that a systematic analysis of resourcing requirements be carried out with a realistic assessment of the needs of We Can (with apologies if this has already been done!)

Engagement with OGB and other organisation's campaigns experience

The We Can team has achieved a huge amount over the last 2 years developing a ground-breaking initiative which is devoted to changing attitudes and beliefs as the first and fundamental step in challenging social acceptance of domestic violence in South Asia. There have been tensions in working with Campaigns staff in the past, and this would appear to have left a slight legacy of resistance to working closely with Campaigns teams and individuals. However, it became clear over the course of the visit that bringing campaigns

skills and experience **into** the We Can team could well bring an added dimension to the work in the future, particularly in the areas of:

- Finding ways – operating at scale - to stay connected with change makers, helping them to support each other; offering ideas and different approaches for public events
- Creating a wider context of awareness both to spread the message more widely and through different vehicles as well as to create a more supportive climate for c/m to operate.
- Alliance-building: while many staff and teams in Oxfam, including the International Division have experience of building alliances, over the last several years, campaigns staff have had extensive experience (positive and negative) of developing and sustaining alliances in a wide range of issues and contexts. There is significant learning to be had from both successes and failures of the past years.

We Can has the potential to change the way of working of many partners, introducing new approaches/methods (eg. media as a tool), which, so far, have been much welcomed by most partners. This is clearly part of OGB's future strategic change potential in South Asia as the campaigns and policy team begins to develop and as campaigning becomes a more integrated part of the South Asia programme. Closer informal working relations between the campaigns team and We Can are essential to strengthen the influencing potential of the South Asia programme and it's ability to help partners develop and use new skills.

It is recommended that someone with campaigns skills and experience (external or internal) be **brought into** the central We Can team, under We Can management. Ideally the individual would have experience of working in South Asia with fluency in a local language). Bringing these skills into the team would be the best way of ensuring that the campaigns experience is adapted to the specific and distinctive approach of We Can.

This should also:

- facilitate and strengthen capacity building on campaigning skills with partners
- build campaigning capacity in the overall We Can team – centrally and in-country
- help to establish a good working relationship and two-way learning with the Policy/Campaigns team in the RMC as well as in Oxfam House.

The Campaign Programme: is this a new hybrid model?

The We Can experience and way of working has much to offer to Oxfam's campaigns teams around the world, and particularly as campaigning begin to grow in the Regions. We Can is a personally empowering campaign: 'it generates a new awareness of a serious issue of oppression that has long laid dormant'¹³. It also takes individuals a step further, providing tools for taking action both as an individual and with others.

We Can is clearly aiming to combine key principles and ways of working from Oxfam's long-term development programme alongside the thinking and experience of popular campaigning to change ideas and beliefs and ultimately behaviour at the level of individuals in their own lives as well as the wider family and community. It hasn't been possible within the short time frame of this review to analyse fully the nature of this potentially new and 'hybrid' model.

There are a number of key elements of difference that this hybrid model might offer, one of which is a model of change based on the element of personal change (in one's own life) as a

¹³ quote from partner

critical factor in bringing about wider and sustainable change. Within Oxfam, arguably, our global campaigns do not give the same emphasis to this (more programmatic) sense of personal empowerment to make changes in one's own life (although there have been some elements of this in the Trade and Education campaigns).

Although we may be seeing more focus on southern campaigning over the next few years, most of Oxfam's global campaigning work (in the UK) to date aims to build awareness to take action but almost always for an external objective, usually for other people on the other side of the world. There is clearly, and ideally, a strong feel good factor (albeit relatively transient) for people taking actions, but this usually involves little risk or challenge to the individual taking the action, and certainly little chance of their making major changes in their own daily lives (based on shifts in attitudes and beliefs).

The opposite is true for We Can actors: they are taking big risks in a very localised context which directly affect their lives; the changes they are asking themselves and others to make are very difficult and generate hostility and resistance, often within their own families. These kinds of experiences are every day issues in our development work especially where we are supporting partners to achieve social and structural change. The We Can team is operating on a campaigning model of change that focuses on **personal change**, not giving money, or taking a one-off action in support of change affecting others. The campaign is a challenge to how individuals frame the world and how they conduct themselves in public and private. Again, much of this is embodied in our long-term development work which is focused on challenging and changing social and economic power relations in the home, community and wider world.

Further work is needed with Oxfam to understand fully what learning the experience of the We Can campaigning model of change holds both for our long-term development and our campaigns work considering questions such as:

- what are the different elements from development and campaigning that We Can has brought together in a 'campaigns programme'?
- what's working most effectively?
- what does it mean for increasing the impact of wider development and campaigning Programmes? How might we best apply this learning?
- what skills do we need in our teams to develop this further?

It is recommended that the We Can and South Asia team reflect more on this with others to develop a better understanding of the model we are developing, and that we work together as the International and Campaigns and Policy Divisions to get a clearer understanding of how we take our ideas and beliefs change work forward more effectively. Specifically it is recommended that Adrian Lovett and Phil Bloomer visit We Can and that we use their visit to the Region as the basis for a more systematic analysis of the wider implications of the We Can experience for Oxfam's Programme.

Section 3: Recommendations and Conclusions

This section is a summary of the main conclusions and recommendations. Other more detailed recommendations regarding materials are contained within the report.

Communicating the Overall Strategy

While some partners do have a sense of the overall vision, feel ownership and understand the phased development of the campaign, this was far from true for all. The campaign is likely to develop differently and organically in different country contexts. To build a solid base for the future, partners must be brought into the wider frame as soon as possible:

- sharing the internal campaign strategy document as an essential tool
- focusing on those partners and allies playing a leadership role, but with enough to **create** a critical mass for taking strategic campaign thinking and planning forward

While We Can has achieved significant success, it is also clear just how difficult it is to get people to change deeply rooted beliefs and behaviours. The long-term success and sustainability of the campaign will depend on how well the We Can team, partners and change makers know what works best in changing ideas, beliefs and practice. Most staff, partner/allies and change makers were unable to answer this question clearly. It is of the utmost importance therefore that the campaign team is able to develop more strategic analysis of 'what works', building on but moving beyond the stories of change.

Communications and Materials

The gradual move towards a message of 'women's rights' is probably correct, however there is a real danger that a significant number of change makers may stay with a non-rights based message about achieving family harmony. More attention with partners and especially new allies will be needed to ensure that the rights-based focus is incorporated appropriately at an early stage in the training and capacity building. Of equal importance is providing partners and allies with effective tools to 'keep an eye' on the message as the campaign moves to scale. This should be an integral part of the proposed impact assessment process.

Further support is needed for change makers and partners in enabling them to respond to the inevitable increase in demand for support services, counselling, legal advice, etc as awareness of the unacceptability of domestic violence increases. This could be done through providing information about available support services, networking with other organisations, etc.

The threat of religious opposition to the campaign is growing, particularly in Bangladesh. Further and more systematic work is needed by the We Can team to develop a range of strategies for managing this opposition and for supporting partners, allies and change makers who suffer hostility and attack within the family, community and at national level.

Materials have been universally welcomed and used effectively. A number of good and practical ideas were proposed by stakeholders to achieve even greater effectiveness (See pages 11-12 for specific recommendations). The We Can team's proposal for resource centres is a good idea worth pursuing.

Change Maker Strategy

The change maker strategy is clearly working and the report contains a number of proposals from stakeholders and the review team to strengthen the mobilisation, retention and effectiveness of change makers. (See pages 12-16). Strategic challenges identified in the course of the review and needing attention from the We Can team, especially for successful scale up include:

- providing more effective support via partners/allies or directly (eg through materials, alternative influencing strategies) to help change makers tackle entrenched resistance.
- more effectively embedding the concept of personal change as key to the change strategy with partners and allies in their training and support of change makers
- being clearer about how to use the 'quantitative targets' to achieve a true critical mass movement without skewing change maker's practice (ie. quantity at cost of quality)

- working in a more up front way with partners on cost-effective follow up with change makers, including:
 - building follow up plans into the work of new allies/partners, in particular,
 - challenging the thinking of some partners (working with more traditional development patterns of regular, small group meetings) which won't achieve the scale required
 - sharing learning on innovative, effective follow up in and between countries on self-sustaining change maker support models
- further thinking and understanding of:
 - the different 'tiers' of change makers emerging as many become more confident and want a deeper understanding of the issues alongside those who are new and/or will always operate at a more basic level of change
 - the extent and nature of the 'spread' strategy (ie. 1 change maker changes 5-10 other people). Is this working in most cases, or are the numbers reached smaller than anticipated? How long will change makers stay active?
- being clearer about:
 - what is a reasonable drop off rate of change makers who are trained. In some areas only a very small percentage of those trained appear to become active, raising questions about the cost-effectiveness of a mass training approach.
 - the role of middle class communities in the campaign either in terms of their own change and/or their role in local and national change
 - the role of adult men in the change process and the campaign and the different needs they may have for engagement, support, materials, etc.

Alliance Building

We Can has been hugely successful in getting the message out, and in beginning to create significant numbers of change makers. By comparison, the present state of thinking and planning on alliance building is relatively weak and is a serious gap in the campaign (except in Bangladesh).

To achieve the stated goal of an independent alliance, the We Can team needs to begin work now on a strategy for alliance building. (See pages 17-20). Key issues to consider include:

- structures and models (especially if working towards a movement)
- different power dynamics in relating to partners vs relating to civil society actors
- roles and responsibilities including different leadership styles for Oxfam staff
- alliance composition: mix of grass-roots organisations and large civil society organisations; change maker involvement; links between local and national alliances
- staff, partner and ally ways of working, resourcing and skills development
- Oxfam's ability to power share as independent alliances grow
- Agreeing milestones and success indicators to guide staff

Oxfam's Role: What Can We Do Better?

Oxfam is being correctly challenged by a number of partners to 'practice what it preaches' and integrate awareness of and commitment to the campaign in the wider programme in South India and Bangladesh. At present, partners see the campaign as mainly the concern of the We Can team and not the rest of OGB's staff or programme. For partners, this is not only not good enough, but also means a lesser chance of achieving the campaign objectives.

In addition, We Can should also be working towards:

- Engaging partners more proactively in campaign planning
- More support for alliance building at local level (ie. not just national)
- As soon as possible, providing partners and allies with the requested support in monitoring and measuring impact, including a regular process of self-reflection and critique
- Helping partners and allies understand the quantitative targets which have been set (origin, rationale, purpose)

Further consideration of the time frame is suggested both for achieving the independent alliance as well as OGB's long-term involvement in We Can, which is likely to extend beyond 2011.

We Can Team as a Leadership Team

Staff are keen to build the leadership capacity of the We Can team (which includes staff based centrally and in-country). A number of specific recommendations (p. 22) aim to ensure the We Can team can effectively assume its role as a leadership team within the South Asia region including:

- Ensuring time and support for team strategic thinking and critical reflection
- Establishing a formal matrix relationship between the campaign coordinator and country We Can leads, including country/programme managers in critical reflection
- Considering ways of working to ensure leadership as well as operational delivery

Bringing campaigns skills/experience into the team

The We Can team has demonstrated strong knowledge of campaigns techniques, use of media and other ways of spreading the message. However, the team's effectiveness could be significantly enhanced by bringing more explicit campaigns skills and experience into and under the management of the We Can team - ideally with some experience of the South Asian context. The aim would be to:

- adapt the specific campaigns experience to the distinctive needs and approach of We Can
- provide more direct support and training for partners and allies in campaigning and influencing
- ensure a two-way learning process for OGB's Campaigns and International Divisions in south Asia and globally
- strengthen Oxfam's longer-term influence in South Asia (and globally) as a campaigning organisation

The We Can Model

We Can is a relatively new experience for Oxfam: the up-front and primary focus on changing attitudes and beliefs and subsequently behaviour with an approach which combines development principles and skills with campaigning at a grass-roots level is also arguably a new model for Oxfam, and possibly other INGOs.

The model of change is based on the element of personal change (in one's own life) as a critical factor in bringing about sustainable and mass change in a poor country context. The We Can campaign challenges not just how individuals see their own lives as well as the wider world but also how they conduct themselves in private as well as public.

It is suggested that this differs from Oxfam's more traditional small scale development work and from the organisation's global campaigning.¹⁴

Further work is needed by the We Can team, as well as within the wider organisation to understand fully what learning the We Can campaigning model of change holds both for our long-term development and campaigns Programmes. It is recommended that CPD and ID work together to take this forward.

¹⁴ Further work is needed on these assertions about a new model: there are some similarities with the environmental movement in the north which also starts with personal change, and there may be similarities with Oxfam's planned growth of southern campaigning

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference

Review of the first year

South Asia Regional Campaign to end violence against women (We Can Campaign)

Background of the Campaign:

Nearly half the women in South Asia will experience violence within their homes at some time in their lives. There are over 50 million women 'missing' in South Asia, victims of social discrimination and violence from the cradle to the grave. Unequal sex ratios in population data reflect this growing crisis of violence against women in South Asia. There are only 94 women for every 100 men in the region. Women's efforts globally and regionally have resulted in breaking the silence around this issue of violence against women and yet for many South Asian women, the everyday and often life-threatening violence remains a private matter, a culturally acceptable expression of gender-based power relations.

Global advocacy efforts have resulted in legislative gains and some economic opportunities yet for most women the everyday and often life-threatening violence remains a private matter, a culturally acceptable expression of gender-based power relations. Even where acts of violence cross cultural boundaries and are recognised by the State as crimes, attitudes and biases act as mitigating factors reducing the crime to a lesser one or portraying it as provocation or an aberration rather than the rule. Despite more laws to prosecute violent crimes against women, there are fewer convictions than before.

Even as legal solutions are pursued, it is essential to recognise the critical role that the 'community' plays in perpetuating and promoting gender inequality and violence against women. Attitudes and biases that support violence against women are created, sustained and played out at the community level. The State itself is not a neutral institution and is ultimately responsive to the dominant interests, in this case dominant patriarchal interests that 'normalise' violence against women and offer impunity to offenders. Thus, even as states are being made responsible for the safety and integrity of all citizens equally, it is imperative that there is a simultaneous movement to achieve cultural and social rejection of violence against women at the community level. It is evident that without a change in the social and cultural perception of violence against women, state-level action will remain limited in form and reach. Oxfam believes that gender based violence is violation of women's human rights and is one of the significant mechanisms by which individuals, society and the state retain power over women's lives and choices.

The South Asia regional campaign to end violence against women aims to reduce social acceptance of violence at regional, national and community level in six countries of South Asia through a popular campaign to change practices, ideas and beliefs.

Main Strategy:

To engage 50 million ordinary women and men of all age groups over six years in the six target countries to take a stand against violence through popular education and community mobilisation using 5 million voluntary change agents that will work to influence 10 people each around them. For the proposed first phase Oxfam and its partners will focus on identifying the first of these change agents and developing their capacity to influence.

The Regional campaign will be implemented through specific regional and national activities in each of the six countries of South Asia region- Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Nepal and Afghanistan¹⁵.

Overall Purpose of the Review

The campaign represents a unique learning opportunity for Oxfam globally in many ways. Assessing processes and learning from campaign experiences is critical both for developing the campaign nationally and regionally as well as informing our global programme on ending violence against women.

The overall purpose of this internal review is to provide the Oxfam and more specifically the campaign team an assessment of the achievements, learning and challenges of We Can campaign over the last one year. We would expect the review to examine some of the key assumptions that have been informing the campaign strategy in order to be clear about these assumptions for further planning.

This review will be looking at the first year of the campaign. The key objectives for the year were to:

- Launch and establish 5 country level campaigns.
- Form and strengthen national and sub-national alliances.
- Initiate mobilisation of change makers
- Engage youth (10-20% of change makers).
- Update and get broad agreement to a regional strategy

The broad visible outcomes are effective launch of the campaign in each of the five countries, maintaining of partnerships (incl. with allies), conducting planned campaign actions, attracting new members, generating media attention, identifying opportunities for growth and establishing plans and ways of working for the longer period. The key stakeholders in these outcomes are our staff, campaign allies/partners, diverse community members, students, youth group members, some Government personnel and other eminent persons.

Specific Objectives

1. To help the We Can team with an fresh (an outsider's) assessment of the extent to which our staff, partners and allies have understood and adopted the key elements of the campaign strategy
 - a. Phased approach of the campaign
 - b. Communication strategy (especially approach)
 - c. Change maker mobilisation
 - d. Alliance building especially involvement of non-NGO entities.

Some questions to consider:

- Has there been adequate communication on the strategy?
- To what extent is there a sense of ownership of the campaign strategy? To what extent is it seen as Oxfam thinking?
- How comfortable are they to operationalise the strategy (based on experience of past year)?
- What is the level of comfort with the approach to communication on DV?
- Do key stakeholders feel that the events, materials (messages and style) are effective? What changes would they suggest?

¹⁵ The campaign in Afghanistan is uncertain due to the poor security situation.

2. Examine our assumptions on alliance building (as articulated in the strategy) and provide an independent assessment of whether it is the right approach. Identify some key learning on alliance building to inform future strategy for the campaign as well as Oxfam overall.

Some questions to consider:

- Is initiating from a partner-based alliance effective in developing a broad-based alliance?
- Has the existing presence of Oxfam in an area (State, province) supported the establishment of an effective campaign alliance or has it been an obstacle?
- Is an Oxfam partner ally more effective at campaign delivery than a non-partner ally?
- What is an effective implementation structure within a broad-based alliance?
- Which processes used to facilitate/build/consolidate alliances have been most effective?

3. Meet key members of the community (diverse change makers and others) to understand how the campaign is working and the diverse contexts that it needs to address.

Some questions to consider:

- What is the level of awareness of campaign (What is the campaign about? What are its aims?)
- What is the level of Awareness/ Understanding of key messages (This is Domestic Violence, This is a social problem not a private issue, DV affects everyone in the family, Violence free life is everyone's right).
- How willing are they to take up active engagement in the campaign?
- Do they feel that they can actively contribute to ending violence against women?
- How have they changed themselves and how are they talking to others?

Review Team:

Audrey Bronstein, Regional Director, UKPP
Kate Bishop, Campaigns Team
We Can team member (?)

Time Period

13th-28th February 2006

Methodology

The review report will be based on information and analysis from:

- Desk review of campaign strategy, PIP, campaign materials and other documentation.
- 10-12 targeted interviews in each of the two countries (partners; allies, Oxfam staff, other key stakeholders including community members).
- 1-2 Group meetings in each country (with partner staff, allies, change makers?). Country We Can staff for translations and arrangements will support the review team).
- Telephone interviews with We Can leads from other countries if relevant and required.

The We Can coordinator will make available all relevant material to the team via email and/or in hard copy.

Reporting and Timing

The review team will do a debriefing for the Regional Centre We Can team and Allison Aldred (RD) before leaving the region. A final report of up to 10 pages is expected.

Proposed Plan for the Review Team:

Dates	
13 February	Delhi RC- Overview of We Can campaign, Understanding role of regional centre, India We Can campaign
14- 18 th February	India We Can campaign - Time to understand campaign communications Meetings with We Can staff, alliance members, change makers and other stake holders
19 th February	Delhi RC -Time to write up notes on India
20 th February	Travel to Bangladesh
21 st –25 th February	Bangladesh We Can campaign -Meetings with We Can staff, alliance members, change makers and other stake holders - Time to understand campaign communications
26 th February	Travel to Delhi
27 th -28 th February	Draft report writing,
1 st March	Initial debriefing- RC
15 th March	Final report

Management

To be managed by Allison Aldred, RD South Asia with main support and coordination by Mona Mehta, Global Adviser (VAW).

© Oxfam GB 2006

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email publish@oxfam.org.uk

For further information on the issues raised in this document email phd@oxfam.org.uk

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

www.oxfam.org.uk