



EASTERN AFRICA
AGENCY, SOCIAL
& GENDER NORMS
LEARNING
COLLABORATIVE

In-Country Sensemaking Workshop Report

September 17–18, 2024 | BOMA Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We sincerely thank all participants and organizations for their contributions to the "Social Norms & Adolescents Evidence Review" In-Country Sensemaking Workshop held on September 17–18, 2024, in Nairobi, Kenya. Organized by UCSD's Center on Gender Equity and Health (GEH) in collaboration with the Eastern Africa Agency Social and Gender Norms Learning Collaborative (EALC), coordinated by the Impact and Innovations Development Center (IIDC), and supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), this workshop brought together experts and practitioners to refine findings from the evidence review.

We appreciate the insights and collaboration from representatives of KEMRI-Wellcome Trust, Akina Mama Wa Africa, APHRC, Faith to Action Network, Girl Effect, and many others. Thank you for your commitment to advancing this vital work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	iv
BACKGROUND	1
Workshop Objectives.....	1
DAY 1	3
1.0 Introduction to the Eastern Africa Agency, Social and Gender Norms Learning Collaborative (EALC) 3	
2.0 Introduction to Our Research	4
3.0 Presentation of Initial Findings Related to Faith and Cultural Champions	7
4.0 Introduction to the Deep Dive	12
5.0 Small Group Breakouts.....	12
6.0 Closing DAY 1.....	16
DAY 2	17
7.0 Taking stock of Day 1: What have we learned so far? What is missing?	17
8.0 Case Studies of Norms Shifting Approaches	18
9.0 Gender Norms Learning Agenda – Kenya Norms Diagnosis.....	20
10.0 Situating our Work within the Policy and Programmatic Landscape – The Next Steps	23
11.0 Reflections on what has come out from the Meeting	26
12.0 Closing Remarks.....	27
APPENDIX 1: WORKSHOP AGENDA	29
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	31

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AGYW	Adolescent Girls and Young Women
AMIU	Amref International University
APHRC	African Population & Health Research Centre
BMGF	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
CEFM	Child, Early, and Forced Marriage
EALC	Eastern Africa Agency, Social and Gender Norms Learning Collaborative
FCC	Faith and Cultural Champions
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GEH	Center on Gender Equity and Health
GNLA	Gender Norms Learning Agenda
IIDC	Impact and Innovations Development Centre
KELIN	The Kenya Legal & Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDS
RCT	Randomized Control Trials
SRH	Sexual and Reproductive Health
SRH	Sexual and Reproductive Health
SRHR	Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights
TICAH	Trust for Indigenous Culture and Health
UCSD	University of California San Diego
WEE	Women Economic Empowerment

BACKGROUND

University of California San Diego (UCSD) Center on Gender Equity and Health (GEH) has launched a project in collaboration with the Social Norms and Agency Learning Collaborative (SNALC) funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) to review and synthesize social norms evidence related to the health and livelihood outcomes of adolescent girls and young women in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. This project seeks to make the evidence widely accessible and identify critical research and programmatic recommendations to drive impactful interventions.

As part of the scoping review, GEH, in collaboration with the LC and coordinated by the Impact and Innovations Development Center (IIDC), hosted an In-Country Sensemaking Workshop on September 17–18, 2024, in Nairobi, Kenya. The workshop aimed to review and contextualize initial findings from the Social Norms & Adolescents Evidence Review.

Workshop Objectives

- To vet and contextualize initial findings of the Social Norms & Adolescents Evidence Reviews focused on social norms programming related to Faith and Cultural Champions and Entertainment Media.
- Identify learnings and garner insights to inform future work or further steps for analysis from the evidence review.
- Propose recommendations for any additional analysis or deep dives into the literature and suggest recommendations for knowledge products.
- Provide an opportunity for social and behaviour change implementers, multimedia entertainment groups, and faith and cultural champions to examine the results from a policy and programmatic perspective.

Getting to Know the Participants – their contributions to shifting social and gender norms

Participants shared diverse strategies for shifting social norms that impact the health of adolescents and young women. These strategies included leveraging media and storytelling, generating evidence on the intersection of gender norms with sexual and reproductive health (SRH) and economic empowerment, and using this evidence to fuel advocacy and activism for gender transformation. They also focused on establishing safe spaces for reflective discussions on norms, as well as building the capacity of young women and girls to amplify their voices, expand their choices, and strengthen their agency.

Participant's Expectations of the Workshop

The participants shared the following expectations:

1. *Understanding and Building on Existing Knowledge:* Participants expressed a desire to deepen their understanding of the existing knowledge around social norms, gaps in current evidence and new insights that they could incorporate into their work.
2. *Using and Translating Evidence for Decision-Making:* Participants aimed to learn how to translate existing evidence into formats that can be understood by different audiences. They also wished to explore how to sustain and translate evidence into meaningful scientific outputs.

3. *Collaboration and Engagement with Target Groups:* Participants were interested in understanding the contributions of other stakeholders in the field and exploring potential areas for collaboration.
4. *Effective Communication of Findings:* Another key expectation was learning how to package key findings from reviews and research in ways that can be communicated to a broad audience without marginalizing any group or gender.

DAY 1

1.0 Introduction to the Eastern Africa Agency, Social and Gender Norms Learning Collaborative (EALC)

By Aloysious Nnyombi – Coordinator, EALC

Focus: *Who are we, and how are we involved in the evidence review?*

The Eastern Africa Agency, Social and Gender Norms Learning Collaborative (EALC) was established in 2020 as a network for professionals dedicated to research and practice in social and gender norms. In 2024, EALC expanded its scope to incorporate the concept of agency, adding depth to its work in shaping and addressing social norms. It forms one of the five communities in the Social Norms and Agency Learning Collaborative.

The **vision** of EALC is to foster a world where partnerships, knowledge sharing, and thought leadership converge to sustain equity, social justice, and health for all. Its **mission** is to enhance research and practice around social norms, gender, and agency by connecting practitioners, researchers, evaluators, and advocates.

Membership is open to individuals and organizations from Eastern African countries, including Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and Ethiopia. Membership specifically targets those interested in agency, social norms, and gender norms research and practice.

EALC's core activities include documenting and sharing experiences, building the capacity of its members, improving practices through partnerships, and co-creating social norms, resources, and knowledge products that benefit its members and the larger community. The EALC also works to generate and document evidence around agency, social, and gender norms, ensuring that this information contributes to meaningful discussions on behaviour change.

The EALC has partnered with UCSD's GEH to coordinate the Country Deep Dive in Kenya to interpret the findings of the Evidence Review within the Kenyan context and build out and share user-oriented evidence specific to Kenya.

2.0 Introduction to Our Research

By Rebecka Lundgren, UCSD

Background and Context – why this evidence review?

Rebecka Lundgren stated that UCSD is currently conducting a Scoping Review, the “**Effects of Gender Norms on Health and Livelihood Outcomes in LMICs**” for the Gender Norms Learning Agenda Team (GNLA Team) of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

The purpose of the engagement is threefold:

- Inform the Gender Norms Learning Agenda (GNLA) at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF).
- Make synthesized evidence widely accessible.
- Identify research and program recommendations for the GNLA priority areas and beyond.

The BMGF investment concentrates explicitly on three geographic areas: Kenya, Nigeria, and India, focusing on adolescent girls and young women. The four main areas of investment are i) women's economic empowerment (WEE), ii) sexual and reproductive health (including family planning and HIV), iii) gender-based violence (GBV), and iv) child early and forced marriage.

The investment specifically looks at the evidence on AGYW in two areas:

- The relationship between social norms and key behaviours
- Effective program approaches, mechanisms of change, cost efficiency, and the potential for scale, including:
 - Multimedia approaches to shift social norms
 - Faith-based approaches to shift social norms

The program, she said, has two reviews. The first review, still in progress, addresses the relationship between social norms and behaviour, which is more abstract and theoretical. The second review, which was the focus of the Workshop, examined the following:

- Faith and cultural champions approach that shift norms related to AGYW outcomes
- Ways in which faith and cultural leaders uphold or form social norms
- Faith-based norms shifting interventions
- Potential for scale
- Ways in which organizations can support champions

Objectives, Focus Areas, Methodology

The methodology included an extensive search strategy across databases and grey literature. This involved searching for evidence, data extraction, analysis, and interpretation. The number of articles and grey literature reviewed relevant to the program's focus areas were as follows: i) entertainment media, 4323. Only 40 studies were selected for full-text assessment, ii) Faith and cultural champions, 3000. Only 43 studies were selected for full-text assessment.

Rebecka Lundgren outlined the following key learnings from the review:

- *Norms Addressed by Programs:* Programs tackle various norms, including child marriage, GBV, education, SRH, gender, and HIV norms. Most programs addressed more than one category of norms, such as GBV and SRH norms.
- *Gaps in Research:* Despite their significance, there is limited research on women's economic empowerment and education norms.
- *Cross-Sector Norms:* Norms, such as SRH norms, are relevant across multiple sectors (e.g., early marriage and gender equality), highlighting their cross-cutting nature.
- *Theoretical foundations of programs:* Some arguments state that programs based on solid theories are more effective. Entertainment media relies heavily on such theories, while faith-based programs are less theory-based.
- *Reference Groups:* Effective norm change requires engaging reference groups (e.g., community leaders, parents, health workers, and teachers). Faith and cultural champions engage these groups more, but media programs have room for improvement.

2.1 Plenary Discussions

The following were the key outcomes of the discussions:

Question 1: *Were their studies or literature reviews done that focused on boys/men?*

Response: There is a lack of clarity from the review team on whether there are studies that exclusively focus on boys. It was stated that studies primarily focused on men, such as those in India.

Question 2: *What is the average time taken to shift a norm?*

Response: Shifting social norms can take decades; short-term projects (e.g., three-year projects) may not adequately demonstrate such changes. However, some studies have demonstrated shifts in norms after two or three years.

Question 3: *What is the duration of an effective norm-shifting program?*

Response: This detail was not included in the current table; however, it is available in the results. Moving forward, the duration of projects will likely be included in future tables for clarity.

Question 4: *What criteria were used to define a well-designed program, and why are effective programs quantitative while promising ones are qualitative?*

Response: The distinction between effective (quantitative) and promising (qualitative) programs was made based on the belief that qualitative data has value, though many in the field favour quantitative measures.

Question 5: *On the language inclusion/exclusion criteria, why were English, Spanish, and French languages used and not any other?*

Response: The UCSD team had native Spanish and French speakers, so the decision was based on the language spoken by the team.

Question 6: *Is there an opportunity to challenge the current hierarchy of evidence, particularly the focus on RCTs as the gold standard?*

Response: There is that opportunity to challenge the hierarchy of evidence. The Gates Foundation has been open to different kinds of learning in this area. A key concern is that over-reliance on RCTs could result in missing valuable work that would have been effective but did not follow the RCT format.

Question 7: *Why did the evidence review focus on the four outcome areas of i) women's economic empowerment (WEE), ii) SRHR (family planning [FP] and HIV, iii) GBV, and iv) child early and forced marriage (CEFM):*

Response: These outcome areas are the investment areas for BMGF.

Comment on deeply rooted norms or attitudes: It is imperative to appreciate that there are some deeply rooted norms held in place by meta-norms. It is difficult for a program to bring about shifts in these norms; however, the faith and cultural champion partners can do so. Where a program chooses to intervene will be dependent on questions about who can be reached, how they can be reached, how much time is available, and the norms to be addressed. Efforts should focus on the subtle way norms may shift within a programmatic timeframe and recognize that the process is non-linear. The interplay between norms, attitudes, and behaviours requires sophisticated storytelling to explain how changes in one aspect can influence another.

Comment on community-led norm shifting: By engaging communities early and preparing them to lead, norm-shifting efforts can extend beyond the program's funding cycle, thereby ensuring lasting change.

Comment on documentation of outcomes: It is crucial to document the design of interventions, monitor the changes taking place, and identify ways to replicate the interventions to ensure sustainability and scalability.

Comment on engaging reference groups: Programs typically engage parents, community leaders, and religious leaders as reference groups but show less engagement with boys, peers, and potential marital partners. A more diverse engagement of reference groups could enhance program outcomes.

3.0 Presentation of Initial Findings Related to Faith and Cultural Champions

By Sohail Agha, UCSD/BMGF

Sohail Agha gave an overview of the insights and findings of the programs in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Below are the key highlights:

- *Regarding entertainment and media interventions*, approximately 15 of the programs are in South Asia, West, and Central Africa, while 19 are in East and Central Africa.
- The major outcome areas addressed by the programs have primarily been SRH (24 programs) and GBV (21 programs).
- *Targeted population*: Early adolescents and older adolescents are the two primary target populations that have been addressed by entertainment and media programs.
- *Types of approaches being used*: Mass media was used in every programme; social media was growing in relevance (including in 20 programs). About half of the programs included group activities.
- *Characteristics of entertainment and media*: Multiple approaches are used; the most popular level of the intervention is to the individual, followed by the community. The entertainment and media programs are trying to shift norms without group activities.
- *Duration of the interventions*: Most entertainment and media interventions are one year or less (27 out of 39 programs), 10 of them being less than a year. Nine interventions have no specific duration attached to them.
- *Multimedia approaches*: Slightly more than half of the programs used multiple media.
- *Episodes of programs (serial dramas)*: In sub-Saharan Africa, the programming was between six and thirty minutes long. Some were between 0 to 5 minutes. About half of them had zero to 25 episodes.
- *Pathways of change*: Three-quarters of programs essentially use a joint pathway with adolescent girls and reference groups. A few programs focused (six of them) solely on reference groups.
- *Strength of evidence*: Most of the programs or interventions essentially had quantitative evidence to show the strength of evidence, whether it was an RCT, cross-sectional survey, longitudinal survey, or pre-and post-test. The evidence for entertainment media was based on quantitative surveys. Only in two instances were qualitative approaches used.
- *Target population*: The interventions focused on early and older adolescents.
- *Effectiveness of the program*: About 25% of the interventions were effective. Hardly any interventions were completely ineffective.
- *Area of interest in the programs*: GBV is the predominant outcome of interest for faith and cultural champion interventions. For faith and cultural champions and entertainment media, there is very little on women's economic empowerment.
- *Characteristics of the programs*: Most faith and cultural champion programs operate at multiple levels. Most of the programs have a strong focus on the community.
- *Unknown*: The duration of the faith and cultural champions interventions.
- *Digital vs. social media*: social media means that there is a social interaction involved or some kind of networking aspect. In contrast, digital media could just be e-learning or other media, not necessarily with a social interaction component. Some social media interventions have been attempted within FCC programming.

Features of faith and cultural champion interventions:

- *Geographical distribution:* Interventions were more balanced across regions compared to entertainment media interventions. There were around 13 interventions in East and Southern Africa and about 15 in the other regions.
- *Target population:* Focus was on early adolescents and older adolescents, similar to entertainment media, but also a significant focus on young adult women.
- *Health Outcomes:* GBV was the predominant outcome of interest, followed by early marriage and HIV.
- *Men's economic empowerment:* In both interventions, there is very little on men's economic empowerment.
- *Community and social focus:* Out of a total of 35 programs, 31 were on faith and cultural champion interventions.
- *Focus on schools and institutions:* 10 out of 35 programs specifically focused on schools and institutions, as opposed to the entertainment media interventions, that did not focus on either of the two.
- *Duration:* 18 out of 35 programs did not have a clear time frame; they, therefore, were not conceptualized as time-bound interventions. Faith-based programs were found to have longer or unspecified durations.
- *Group activities:* 29 out of 35 programs involved group activities, making it a significant feature of the interventions.
- *Strength of effectiveness:* 15 qualitative studies were used to assess the effectiveness of faith and cultural champion programs, which is significantly higher compared to entertainment media programs (which had only two qualitative studies).
- *Effectiveness rate:* Approximately 20-25% of the programs were deemed effective in shifting norms.

Considerations for working with faith and cultural champions:

These are:

- *Engage Early and Build Trust:* Ensure faith and cultural leaders are included in program design and messaging. Establish trust by aligning health and gender messages with community values and religious teachings.
- *Leverage Religious Teachings for Positive Norm Shifts:* Use scripture and religious principles to support messages of gender equality and non-violence. Facilitate discussions that allow faith leaders to challenge harmful norms and advocate for protective behaviors.
- *Respect Cultural Contexts:* Frame interventions in ways that resonate with local traditions and values, ensuring respect for cultural identities. Empower local cultural champions who understand community dynamics to lead initiatives, enhancing legitimacy and impact.
- *Provide Training and Ongoing Support:* Offer resources and training on topics such as gender-based violence, family planning, and sexual/reproductive health to build leaders' confidence in addressing these issues. Maintain regular dialogue to ensure continuous alignment with program objectives and community values.
- *Be mindful of Unintended Consequences:* Avoid over-reliance on leaders who may reinforce harmful gender norms. Ensure that minority voices are not excluded by involving a diverse range of community leaders.

Best Practices in working with faith leaders:

- Bringing them in early in the program and generating trust with them.
- Building the program alongside them is essential.

- Creating opportunities for dialogues in the community and then bringing in faith leaders to support the positive norms (allowing them to engage in the community dialogue).
- Find commonalities between the program's structure and the message so that it can be accepted in the community.
- Taking the local cultural context into account.

3.1 Plenary Discussions

The following were the key discussion points of the discussions:

Question 1: What are the challenges of using entertainment media in schools?

Response: The limited focus of entertainment media in schools can be attributed to several factors. Large-scale interventions have traditionally relied on various forms of media, such as radio and television, to reach broader audiences, which presents challenges when trying to gain access to schools. Additionally, obtaining parental approvals has proven to be a significant barrier. However, with the growing influence of social media, there may now be an opportunity for greater interest and engagement with schools. The reasons why this same challenge does not apply to faith and culture champions remain unclear and will need further investigation.

Question 2: Why is there not much focus on schools for faith and culture champions programs compared to entertainment media?

Response: This can be attributed to several factors, such as large-scale interventions trying to use media of various kinds, such as radio and television, as well as the challenges of gaining entry into schools and parental approvals. With the onset of social media, there may now be more interest in schools. Why this is not the case for faith and culture champions will need to be determined.

Question 3: Why do entertainment media and faith/cultural interventions run parallel, and why don't they integrate more?

Response: Entertainment media, faith, and cultural institutions often operate in parallel to entertainment-based interventions. Many mass media initiatives prioritize entertainment as the primary intervention without fully integrating components from faith or cultural champions. This approach tends to overlook the potential for collaboration with these institutions, which could enhance the reach and impact of the interventions. Additionally, there is a need to specify the targeted age group of young people involved in these interventions to ensure a more tailored approach. Another important consideration is the method of reaching adolescents. While mass media, such as radio and television, have traditionally been used, adolescents today are more engaged with social media platforms. In contrast, rural Kenyan fathers are more likely to listen to the radio, which highlights the importance of understanding the different media preferences of target groups. For example, while young girls may not tune into radio as much as their fathers, they are more likely to engage with content on social media, emphasizing the need for a more diversified media strategy.

Question 4: Why do entertainment media programs report more quantitative results for effectiveness, while faith and cultural champions rely more on qualitative evidence?

Response: In terms of effectiveness, both interventions seem to have the same proportion. But in terms of ineffectiveness, there is a higher proportion of ineffective programs in faith and cultural champions. Reporting by entertainment media is more quantitative and precise than faith and cultural champions' intervention, which has more complicated pathways of change.

Question 5: *Are we comparing apples and oranges when discussing the effectiveness between faith/cultural programs and entertainment media, given the differences in duration and scale?*

Response: They are more challenging to evaluate. Faith and cultural interventions are often smaller-scale, community-based programs without clear funding timelines, making direct comparisons with large-scale entertainment media interventions difficult. Both types of programs are very different in terms of structure, approach, and measurement.

Question 6: *Should there be more integration between faith/cultural and entertainment media interventions?*

Response: There is potential for greater integration between the two approaches. Faith and cultural programs could benefit from more structured evaluations like those used in entertainment media. These programs are not bound by fixed durations, which presents challenges for evaluation. Integrating elements from both interventions could improve evaluation and effective tracking.

Question 7: *What age-related norms do the interventions focus on, and which age groups might be good to address when using reference groups?*

Response: It is important to be specific about the age groups being referred to. In Kenya, there are issues around access to media for young people, especially those aged 10 to 19. It's easier for the age 19 to 24 to access media, but for younger groups, it is more challenging. Programs need to consider how to reach these different age groups and navigate these challenges.

Question 8: *Why is there not as much well-documented work on faith and cultural champions compared to other areas?*

Response: Available documentation for faith and cultural champions is much smaller, with only 175 articles in the grey literature, compared to 4,000 articles for entertainment media. This smaller sample may mean that we don't have access to a lot of what's been happening with faith and cultural champions, making it less representative.

Question 9: *What norms were addressed by the program, and which were successful or unsuccessful?*

Response: This information is available, but the review did not get to that level of detail to extract it.

Question 10: *Were the messages in both multimedia and faith cultural champions programs rights-based, and did rights-based messages contribute to more or less effective norm shifts?*

Response: There were not enough projects to analyze this in detail. It would be practical to understand whether rights-based messages had a significant impact on effectiveness, but that data is not readily available in this review. It's something that could be looked at in future evaluations.

Question 11: *When you say entertainment, media, what do they come down to? The training and the outreach? Are they communicating information from various sources over time, or are they training people over time? What was the modality of it?*

Response: The review found that all of them used mass media. About half of them used social media, and about half of them were also doing work at the community level. The review did not get to the specific content, but the articles, mostly traditional articles, would have more information on the actual messaging.

Question 12: *What are the different ways of establishing effectiveness? Self-reporting is, for me, not so reliable. Were there other ways that interviews or assessments were measured to substantiate self-administered questionnaires?*

Response: Self-administered surveys do have limitations, but that's a common method used for evaluating entertainment media interventions. Most surveys ask about exposure, behavior, and the correlations between them. This is a general weakness in many evaluations of entertainment media. For this review, self-reported data was the most common method.

Question 13: *Was there research conducted on young people, specifically adolescents, and how were they targeted in the interventions?*

Response: There were several programs that targeted early adolescents, as well as older adolescents, 10- to 14-year-olds. The research shows that early and older adolescents are the primary target populations, and mass media has been used in every program. However, social media is growing in relevance.

Question 14: *What are the entry points or framing that make it possible for social norms to change?*

Response: The change in social norms often depends on identifying the deeply rooted norms and finding the right entry points in the community. Programs need to decide whether to focus on addressing deeply rooted values and attitudes, such as a girl's honor or focus on more immediate behaviors, like whether women can go out at night. It's not easy to shift these deeply rooted norms, but faith and cultural campaign partners often have the opportunity to work on these issues. Interventions also need to consider how long they have and whom they can reach, as norms take time to change.

Question 15: *What are the challenges that NGOs face when working with faith communities?*

Response: The challenge NGOs face in working with faith communities is trying to be at the same level they are in on issues, for example, being on the same level around sexuality education.

Question 16: *Were there any discussions on the unintended consequences of these interventions?*

Response: There was some discussion about unintended consequences, particularly around the risk of backlash when trying to shift deeply rooted norms. For example, interventions aimed at empowering women or addressing gender-based violence can sometimes lead to resistance from the community, especially if the norms being challenged are strongly held. Programs need to anticipate potential backlash and build strategies to mitigate these unintended consequences, such as engaging key community leaders and ensuring that the messaging is sensitive to the local context.

4.0 Introduction to the Deep Dive

By Sohail Agha, UCSD

Sohail provided an overview of the overall meaning of the Deep Dive, which, he said, is to help identify topics where further understanding of the scoping review results will be needed, specifically in India, Kenya, and Nigeria. The Deep Dives can have different possibilities that could include:

- Additional secondary analysis of available data (grantee data sets, CARE/UCSD Social Norms Diagnosis).
- Efforts to gather and analyze in-country evidence and grey literature.
- Deeper analysis into specific outcomes (SRH, Child, Early, and Forced Marriage (CEFM)), population (age/life stage, gender), or type of program.
- Informal interviews or consultations on the state of the evidence with program implementers and researchers.

The overall goal of the Deep Dive would be to identify how to deepen insights from these scoping reviews, so the results are helpful to funders, implementers, and researchers in Kenya. The Deep Dive will be based on what the participants propose, which will help make the evidence review more pronounced or 'come alive.'

5.0 Small Group Breakouts

Participants broke into five groups to discuss the following set of questions:

- *What do you find surprising in these results?*
- *How relevant is this to your work?*
- *What would you like to learn more about? Prioritize your top three to share in plenary.*
- *What information or perspectives are currently missing from the initial findings, and which key stakeholders or voices have not yet been represented?*

Group Feedback

Below are the responses by the various groups:

Group 1:

Questions	Faith and cultural Champions interventions	Entertainment media Intervention	Both
<i>What do you find surprising in these results?</i>	• The high rate of programs found to be ineffective	• The large number of interventions in this group • The number of interventions found to be effective against several activities and the short duration of these activities – how is the effectiveness measured? • The fact that mainstream media is being used to target young people when in Kenya, they are no longer consumers of the same and are more likely to use social media	• Concerning reference groups, the interventions appeared to target communities and rarely the individuals or peer groups

<i>How is this relevant to your work?</i>	• The importance of integrating research into programs/projects • About introducing interventions to an age group that is solely accessible through schools and institutions of learning, there is a need for advocacy toward the same • Prioritizing capacity-strengthening concerning research methods
<i>What would you like to learn more about? Prioritize your top three to share at the plenary</i>	• How do we strengthen qualitative research to measure change in norms • How best to integrate implementation research in programs • How best to engage the young people in charge of social norms as the lead changemakers
<i>What information or perspectives are currently missing from the initial findings, and which key stakeholders or voices have not been represented?</i>	• Local publications: university repositories • Cost-effectiveness of these programs • How are we documenting our gaps to inform donors where research interventions are best needed?

Group 2:

Question	Response
<i>What do you find surprising in these results?</i>	• Media programs ran for a year and yet were deemed effective • Minimal quality evidence - yet there has been a push for mixed methods evaluations (you need the two methods to determine effectiveness) • Most interventions aren't impactful, but they don't fail; the majority fall in the middle (emerging). It would be good to know what works and what doesn't
<i>How relevant is this to your work?</i>	The work was relevant to everyone at the table
<i>What three things would you like to learn more about?</i>	• What works and doesn't work to be effective? • Meta norms versus specific norms - what is the recommended approach for a specific program duration? Should we focus on specific norms or address the meta-norms from the start: ○ What norm measures were used in each study or included in grey literature? ○ Can we include examples of norm measures that are best for media or faith-based interventions? • Can we tease out the details for this 6 - 30-minute session? specifically, what was done for the effective interventions? • How do you trade off the power of the media (reaching many people) and managing expectations of what is achievable <u>Cost-effectiveness</u>

	• What were the budgets for the effective programs and the duration of those programs? • What is the evidence telling us to target? Where are the entry points for media or faith-based interventions? • How can we use local structures to localize media interventions, e.g., some programs aren't tailored to rural or hard-to-reach AGYWs?
<i>What information or perspectives are currently missing from the initial findings?</i>	• What is the specific dose for interventions for a specific setting, e.g., rural versus urban? • What aspects made effective interventions effective? What norms were measured for effective interventions? • For the effective interventions, was it because they were targeting low-hanging fruits, relatively easy-to-change norms, or the more resistant social norms? • Can we also think of meta-norms with a cultural lens? • The voice of adolescents is missing - we need to involve them in a meaningful way and not in a tokenistic or extractive manner • In media - there are very few male voices reflected in media programs, e.g., the male peers or male partners as the reference group
<i>Which key stakeholders or voices have not yet been represented?</i>	• NOT ANSWERED

GROUP 3:

Question	Response
<i>What do you find surprising in these results?</i>	• A lot is happening that we know of, but it has not been published • The amount of grey literature is surprisingly low, yet organizations are developing many reports • Education took note of the thematic areas into consideration (it misses all these interventions)
<i>How relevant is this to your work?</i>	• NOT ANSWERED
<i>What three things would you like to learn more about?</i>	• Partnerships with research partners to consider the approach around researching our programming intervention • How we can come together to learn from our respective expertise • The grey literature should be more accessible to researchers • Need for some kind of repository for all reports • Transitioning from data points to research • Research as an intervention • Measurement as part of the interventions • AGYWs do not live single handed lives; they live in a continuum from SRHR, GBV, WEE • How much agency can AGWY have over their lives when they are in survival mode? Choices!

<i>What information or perspectives are currently missing from the initial findings</i>	• Decolonize research, data, and statistics to look at citizen-generated data and lived realities • They drill down to stories that reflect data and research
<i>Which key stakeholders or voices have not yet been represented?</i>	• NOT ANSWERED

Group 4:

Question	Response
<i>What do you find surprising in these results?</i>	• Quantitative results are termed effective. It is easier to identify whether an intervention is changing people's lives qualitatively • Experience and expertise in EM research are minimal at the national level • Accuracy of articles. The literature does not accurately capture the effectiveness of our work, which is documented in reports for internal consumption or funder reports. • Research can be extractive or not collaborative. It is rarely fed back to the decision-maker • The use of billboards has declined. People, especially young people, are now looking at their phones more than at billboards
<i>How relevant is this to your work?</i>	• How interventions work • Identify gaps and how to apply them to our work • It is unclear how you can have an HIV or WEE program that doesn't address norms. You must ask yourself, who is designing these programs? How can you do one without the other?
<i>What three things would you like to learn more about?</i>	• Messaging – how to message effectively • What makes young people receptive to messages about norms, and how do they affect their social networks? • How do we package information, so it is acceptable to all? How will it affect young people in a way that is not harmful or not just another myth? • How can we be a trusted source in shifting norms? • What makes a program work? How long does it take? • How long do programs last, and how does this affect their effectiveness? • Are girls included in programming? Are their voices being heard in program design and research? I'd like to learn from young people what would work for them • Importance of focusing on reference groups. They can know where to go for services, but if the reference group is not supportive, they won't go
<i>What information or perspectives are currently missing from the initial findings</i>	NOT ANSWERED
<i>Which key stakeholders or voices have not yet been represented?</i>	NOT ANSWERED

6.0 Closing DAY 1

By Dr. Stellah Bosire

Bosire recognized the substantial investment in social norms work that implementers need to leverage effectively. Achieving these calls for well-documented and widely disseminated outcomes. This requires harnessing qualitative data and acknowledging the critical role of mixed-methods studies in advancing social norms initiatives.

DAY 2

7.0 Taking stock of Day 1: What have we learned so far? What is missing?

Moderator: Dr. Stellah Bosire

The following were the key issues that arose from participants:

- Questions about definitions of a 'well-defined study.'
- The distinction between effective and promising programs.
- There is a need for programs to have a built-in study/measurement component.
- The unpacking of the findings made it easy to understand how the activities were done and the different mediums used to disseminate the work. More interest would be in the role of influencers and how they can contribute to helping disseminate our work.
- More clarity on who exactly constitutes influencers: parents or church leaders?
- Use different mechanisms to disseminate work.
- Need to hear more of the voices of young people in the studies; they need to be seen as active agents rather than just beneficiaries of programs
- For programs to take on a holistic approach, all those involved in changing or maintaining the norms, from peer levels to the media, policymakers, and the influence of the digital space.
- Understand the varied definitions of influencers.
- Using the holistic approach in the programming – from the peer levels, media, digital influencers, communities, institutions, and policymakers.
- The involvement of the beneficiaries/community, including the community advisory board, is critical.

Key Questions

- Who defines the variables for assessment, and how are the variables agreed upon?
- How often are youth involved in programming?

8.0 Case Studies of Norms Shifting Approaches

By Sohail Agha, UCSD

Sohail provided an overview of two case studies from sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) to demonstrate how evidence review results can be applied.

8.1 Case Study 1: The Communities Care Programme in Somalia: Transforming Social Norms to Address GBV

Overview

The program was implemented in Somalia to tackle Gender-based Violence (GBV) by transforming harmful social norms into ones that promote gender equality and dignity for women and girls. It was implemented in two districts, Bondhere (intervention) and Karaan (control), focusing on shifting social attitudes around sexual violence, family honour, and gender roles.

The program utilized two approaches – community dialogues and capacity building.

The program evaluation found a significant shift in social norms, specifically, a substantial improvement in reducing norms that prioritized family honour over survivor safety and condoned violence by husbands. The specific results are as follows:

- **Family Honor:** The odds ratio indicates that participants in intervention districts were significantly more likely to reject the idea of protecting family honour over addressing GBV than those in control districts.
- **Husband's Right to Use Violence:** A significant odds ratio showing greater support for non-violent relationships in intervention areas.
- **Response to Sexual Violence:** Meaningful changes in attitudes toward reporting sexual violence, with odds ratio reflecting increased willingness to speak out against such acts in the intervention group.

Conclusion:

- Communities Care Programme in Somalia successfully engaged communities to challenge harmful social norms around GBV.
- While challenges persisted due to security issues and social resistance, the interventions demonstrated the potential to shift norms and increase confidence in GBV response services.
- The use of social norms measurement is crucial in evaluating a program's effectiveness, particularly in the sensitive context of GBV in conflict-affected settings.

8.2 Case Study 2: Tekponin Jikuagou: Reducing Social Barriers to Family Planning in Benin

Overview of the program

- *Duration:* Approximately 18-20 months.
- *Background:* Originally intended for implementation in Mali, the project was relocated to Benin due to a coup in Mali.
- *Funding:* The project was funded by USAID. The first year focused on qualitative ethnographic research to understand community norms and social networks.
- *Implementation Partners:* CARE International was the primary implementing partner.

- *Program Design and Execution:* Following the research phase, the program was designed and implemented over 18 months, focusing on reducing social barriers and promoting contraceptive use.
- *Dissemination and Adaptation:* The project concluded with a dissemination phase, where findings and methodologies were shared. The program has since been adapted and scaled, returning to Mali and being adopted by the government in 12 counties as a second wave change initiative.
- *Research and Measurement:* A companion qualitative study involved in-depth interviews with women in 12 experimental communities, conducted every six months, to understand the dynamic nature of contraceptive use and how they interacted.

8.3 Plenary Discussions

Question 1: *What do you mean by social network diffusion? Was this targeting people online or within their geographical community?*

Response: Social norms programs aim to reach a segment of the community but recognize that direct outreach alone may not change community-wide norms. Social norms programs aim to reach a subset of the community but require activities that encourage dialogue aimed at diffusing new ideas beyond the immediate participants to effect community-wide change. Activities are designed to encourage participants to discuss and disseminate new ideas within their families, social networks, and influential groups within the community, thereby fostering broader community dialogue.

Question 2: *How do people shift from norms related to family honour and cultural values?*

Response: Religious leaders played a crucial role in this shift by using scriptures to advocate for the protection of women, turning traditional values into progressive ones. Religious doctrines were reframed to support women's rights, using cultural and religious beliefs as a foundation.

Question 3: *What is the path to change for social norms, especially where is resistance to change?*

Response: Norms change gradually over time. It's about reducing the proportion of people supporting harmful norms through discussions and introducing competing norms. For instance, alongside the norm of male dominance, religious leaders propagated the norm of protecting women. Norms compete and influence each other, so change involves amplifying positive norms while de-amplifying negative ones. The program focused on creating a "tipping point" where enough people adhered to the positive norm, leading to broader social acceptance. Community radio was used to amplify positive voices and norms.

Question 4: *What are the implications for program strategies targeting deep-seated norms like family honor, which are difficult to change?*

Response: Deep-seated norms like family honor may not change quickly with short-term programs. Instead, it's about reframing these norms to make them align with healthier behaviors. For example, promoting the idea that family honor is preserved by ensuring children are educated and healthy rather than dismissing the concept of family honor altogether. Social movements and religious leaders can help frame these changes over time.

Question 5: *Do you see value in using case studies to track the pathway of social norm changes, even if the evidence is not as strong as quantitative research?*

Response: There is a growing recognition that quantitative and qualitative data are valuable in program evaluations, but qualitative research, especially case studies, often lacks adequate resources despite being powerful for communicating changes to practitioners, for example, how change happens. There is need to invest in case studies as a cost-effective way for smaller programs to communicate qualitative evidence and humanize the data. They are valuable for capturing lived experiences and translating research into a form that is accessible to policymakers and a wider audience.

Question 6: *What should we consider when transforming data into case studies, and when is it appropriate to use an RCT?*

Response: Use of RCTs should be reserved for well-established programs that have been running for several years and where there is confidence in the program's success rather than applying them to new or developing interventions. Starting an RCT too early, before the program is fully developed, is a waste of resources because RCTs are not flexible once started.

Question 7: *Should we consider ways to effectively combine qualitative and quantitative methods?*

Response: There is a growing trend towards mixed methods research, but qualitative and quantitative data integration is often imbalanced, with one typically dominating the other. Complementary use of the two is rare. There is a lack of good qualitative research, and many qualitative studies are of low quality. The process of change can only be fully understood through qualitative research, but it's often tagged onto larger projects without being given the necessary attention. Smaller, less-funded programs should apply qualitative research methods that focus on understanding the process of change (evidence of change).

Question 8: *How can we ensure that content creators use insights from research effectively, especially when designing content for social change programs?*

Response: The content creation teams, and research teams must collaborate closely. The process should involve researchers sharing insights from surveys or studies with the content creators, who can then use those insights to inform their work. This collaboration ensures that the content resonates with the community's reality. After creating the content, it should be tested to ensure it reflects the research findings and addresses the issues effectively.

9.0 Gender Norms Learning Agenda – Kenya Norms Diagnosis

By Rebecka Lundgren, UCSD

In her presentation titled "Gender Norms Learning Agenda – Kenya Norms Diagnosis, Rebecka provided an overview of the study conducted by CARE and UCSD. Its objectives were as follows:

- To identify reference groups of AGYW
- To identify which social norms influence key GBV, SRH, economic empowerment, and child-early and forced marriage behaviors of adolescent girls and young women (15-25).

- To examine how social norms influence key adolescent girls and young women's behaviors related to GBV, SRH, economic empowerment, and early child and forced marriage.

The study program utilized qualitative tools such as the Social Norms Analysis Plot (SNAP) and Social Norms Exploration Tool (SNET) to diagnose and understand the norms.

The results were segmented as follows: family planning norms insights, HIV norms insights, child marriage insights, GBV insights, and WEE insights. The Key findings include the influence of norms around SRH behaviours, where discussions about contraception are limited, especially for unmarried girls due to societal expectations of chastity. However, cracks in these norms, such as increased sexual activity among girls, present opportunities for progressive interventions. Additionally, financial instability sometimes challenges strict norms, creating space for more open conversations around contraception.

9.1 Plenary Discussions

The following were the outcomes of the discussions:

Question 1: Do you see reference groups in your program, particularly husband's peers?

Response: Men's behaviour, particularly regarding gender norms, is heavily influenced by their peers. Perceptions of ridicule or shame can deter progressive behaviour, like supporting gender equality initiatives. So, in certain contexts, the husband's peers are very influential.

Question 2: How should we think about programming for HIV and GBV, given the changing dynamics around these issues?

Response: Stigma and fear around HIV have decreased significantly compared to pregnancy, which remains a more significant concern. In some cases, the stigma of pregnancy and GBV is less, especially in situations where the man can provide financially. This poses a challenge in programming. Care needs to be taken to ensure the program does not reinforce such negative norms (assumption checks and contextual understating).

Question 3: What should programs consider regarding boys and men feeling excluded from gender programs?

Response: There's a strong sense from boys that programs focused on gender equality come at their expense. They feel excluded and see these efforts as dismantling their place in society. This can lead to resistance and non-cooperation. Programs need to consider how to engage boys and men by helping them see the benefits of supporting gender equality while acknowledging that they might feel they are losing power or status.

Question 4: How should programs approach shifting gender norms?

Response: Traditional relationships and family structures are rapidly evolving. Young people in rural and urban areas, particularly boys, show little interest in long-term relationships or marriage due to perceived burdens and changing societal dynamics. Programming needs to be re-adjusted to focus on the present-day youth who find little value in marriage, or religion and instead want a simple and easy life and have multiple relationships (groupings).

Question 5: *What is the role of community in programming, given that communities are changing?*

Response: Communities are no longer static; they are now becoming more fragmented and fluid, especially in urban areas, leading to a breakdown of traditional community structures and support systems. This raises the challenge of defining what community means in a shifting environment. The community might now be defined more by stability, such as people in the same school for six years, rather than by geographic location. In some rural areas, urbanization is changing the dynamics as well. Thus, the concept of community needs to be redefined because the traditional idea of community based on where you were born and raised is shifting due to mobility and urbanization.

Question 6: *How do we address changing norms and their impact on GBV, especially with shifting societal dynamics?*

Response: Norms around GBV are shifting, especially in how violence is perceived and justified. In programs geared towards preventing GBV, most focus is on the physical type and female point of view. Little focus is placed on the female as a perpetrator. For example, online bullying is worse for girls than it is for boys. Men also feel that while they may use physical violence, they experience emotional or verbal violence in return, which they see as justification for their actions. This is not being addressed.

Question 7: *How should we approach program design in a way that is sensitive to the local context and norms?*

Response: Program design should begin with a deep understanding of local norms and sanctions to avoid reinforcing negative behaviours or cultural missteps. Evaluation strategies should involve key groups like parents and consider local context in phrasing questions. Content creators should use locally relevant language and situations to make programs resonate with the community. It is important to incorporate language and narratives that resonate deeply with the local cultural context to ensure that messages are relevant and effective.

Question 8: *How do we engage men effectively in programs, especially when they feel excluded or believe the programs are coming at their expense?*

Response: To engage men effectively, it's crucial to understand their real-life experiences and the reasons behind their behaviours, such as motivations, norms, or issues around self-efficacy. Instead of making assumptions, we need to empathize with their context and provide support for sharing power without making them feel like they are losing control. By creating win-win situations where men gain something from changes (e.g., a more harmonious relationship or respect in the community), they are more likely to participate and support the program.

Question 9: *How do online communities and social media interactions influence social norms, and how do they impact community relationships and behaviours?*

Response: Online communities and social media profoundly impact reshaping social norms, particularly among younger generations. These platforms are accelerating changes in perceptions of relationships, marriage, and societal roles, with this shift being observed in both urban and rural areas. The rapid spread of information and new values through these online interactions is challenging traditional norms and making it difficult for conventional programming to keep pace. As a result, programs need to adapt and account for the significant influence of social media and online communities on shaping modern behaviours and social expectations.

Question 10: What challenges are youth from higher economic status facing, and how do they differ from those of lower socioeconomic groups?

Response: Youth from higher socioeconomic backgrounds face distinct challenges, such as easy access to drugs, unsafe sexual practices, and higher access to safer abortions; thus, fewer visible teenage pregnancies but a high rate of abortions and a disconnect from traditional family roles. They often lack parental engagement, with many being "parented by credit cards," leaving them to raise themselves. Tailored interventions are required that focus on this particular demographic and the specific challenges.

10.0 Situating our Work within the Policy and Programmatic Landscape – The Next Steps

Moderator: Dr. Stellah Bosire

Introduction

The session focused on gathering key information for a targeted evidence review in Kenya, with an emphasis on, among other areas, youth, shifting community structures, and the impact of online spaces on changing norms. The results are intended to support the design of more targeted programs that will be meaningful to implementers, researchers, and funders.

To achieve this, participants broke into groups to discuss the following set of questions:

1. *Is there a story your organization would like to share? With whom?*
2. *How might we share these stories (blog, video, commentary, brief case study)? Is there a policy story?*
3. *How might we engage youth?*
4. *Do we need to search /document more local examples?*

Group Feedback

Group 1:

Question	Response
<i>Is there a story your organization would like to share? With whom?</i>	• Technology-facilitated abuse, such as online bullying which, is more rampant among young women. • Profile the Kenyan adolescents and young people to tailor-make solutions for them • The Groove and Grow Fiesta Empowerment Programmes by Thriving Teens Foundation • Sharing the story with policymakers to sensitize them on the emerging issues, young people, religious leaders to repackage the message to their youth flock and to restructure their youth departments and capabilities of the people running these departments, whether they are knowledgeable around the needs of the youth
<i>How might we share these stories? Blogs, videos, commentaries, briefs, case studies Is there a policy story?</i>	• Social media spaces (how does the church adapt to this? Most churches have not explored the use of social media) • Movies • Digital content for policymakers and technical people • Case studies • Policy briefs

	• Regular publications • Policy stories can be told like the JMM story that was made into a movie (an example of how policies can be disseminated in interesting ways)
<i>How might we engage youth</i>	• Listen to them, really hear them out • Learn to speak their language • Co-create solutions with them
<i>Do we need to search/document more local examples?</i>	• Yes: also, find a way of publishing these in research journals – what format can be publishable?
<i>What should be the next big steps?</i>	• Ensure that policy frameworks for adolescents and young people are kept up to date with the changing adolescent and young people • Looking at the existing legal frameworks, such as the Marriage Act and its impact on social norms, such as property and inheritance • Being intentional in the design of programs • Co-create programs with adolescents and young people • Capacity-building in grant writing means speaking to donors in a language they understand • Having forums where feedback is given to donors and funders on the most appropriate mechanisms that should be embedded in calls that speak to the needs on the ground (in response to the adolescents and youth of today, not the past) also needs to demonstrate the changing demographic • Experience-sharing regarding best practices needed on the ground • Sufficient dissemination of the program to stakeholders and donors • Documenting existing challenges sufficiently during program delivery • Strengthen the M&E aspect, for example, by building a proper mid-term review through the program

Group 2:

Questions	Responses
<i>Is there a story your organization would like to share? With whom?</i>	• We need to group the stories thematically and develop questions to be answered from the stories. For example, what is useful when considering intersectionality? What is the story telling us?
<i>How might we share these stories (blog, video, commentary, brief case study)? Is there a policy story?</i>	• How are young people engaged online? • The men and boys' question and what this means, grounding it in representative data, and thinking about an approach, for example, testing the content on reference groups instead of just the target audience
<i>How might we engage youth?</i>	• Engaging the youth in programming: Representation of the youth is key (well-meaning organizations can be tokenistic unintentionally). Organizations need to be conscious of this • Developing thematic questions that can help in assessing the youth on issues (understanding the existing biases) • Online engagements of youth advisory panels – who are they? What are their interests? • Understanding the types of people that engage with similar exercises around the youth with the youth

<i>Do we need to search /document more local examples?</i>	• NOT ANSWERED
--	--

Group 3:

Questions	Responses
<i>Is there a story your organization would like to share? With whom?</i>	• Missing out on the unintended outcomes of social norm interventions, these stories need to be brought out • What concepts, such as definitions around agency, consent, etc., might stop people from understanding adolescent behavior – doing away with limitations might help in understanding adolescent behavior
<i>How might we share these stories (blog, video, commentary, brief case study)? Is there a policy story?</i>	• Community theatre – as some modern technological devices may not be accessible to youth in rural areas • Musicals <u>Other areas of interest</u> • The role of institutional norms that help strengthen the social norms, for example, the man going to police stations to report that a woman has beaten him
<i>How might we engage youth?</i>	• Customizing the language • Understanding how youth communicate through trends – such as challenges set in TikTok and Instagram. Youth can be spoken to through such challenges
<i>Next Steps</i>	• There is a need to focus on the changing demographics and what this means for programming • The positive deviance is people who have already taken on positive gender and age-equal attitudes and how to work with them to see that they can move adolescent programming forward
<i>Do we need to search /document more local examples?</i>	• NOT ANSWERED

Group 4:

Questions	Responses
<i>Is there a story your organization would like to share? With whom?</i>	• SRH programming – ensure that the programs in place are not gendered – to ensure men do not feel disadvantaged • Mental health and financial responsibility
<i>How might we share these stories (blog, video, commentary, brief case study)? Is there a policy story?</i>	• Listening to the youth.
<i>How might we engage youth?</i>	• Use of interviews as opposed to questionnaires; for example, street interviews, disco matanga's, football matches, leverage on social media, master the times and seasons so that information (positive messaging around social norms) is sent out at the most appropriate times that fit within their schedules

<i>Do we need to search /document more local examples?</i>	• Get our own data to facilitate our own research. • Using local examples to determine what works and does not work
<i>Next Steps</i>	• Afrenop should be used to collect data • Sensemaking from data being held by partners: There is a need for sensemaking of this data and determining how this data can influence programmatic operations strategically around social norms • Coordination: Many partners carry out similar activities in the same area. How effectively can partners be split so that results show the exploitation of separate variables? • Packaging the research: How best can the stories of change be packaged in ways that can be effectively used by other partners for programmatic scaling up? • What is the role of influencers in social norm change, and how best can they be leveraged? • How can we leverage intersectional conversations around mental health, economic inclusion, and SRHR, which are the causes or spark risky behaviors among young people, especially boys? • There is a need to disaggregate rural versus urban approaches and leverage them, for example, around disco Matanga's.

11.0 Reflections on what has come out from the Meeting

Moderator: Dr. Stellah Bosire

1. *Data Overload and Structure:* There is a significant focus on addressing data overload by organizing and structuring data to make it more practical and applicable in programs.
2. *Collaboration and Learning:* The potential for sharing insights and learning from each other and harmonizing actors from across frameworks for better coordination.
3. *Norms and Community:* A call for rethinking the concept of "community" and how norms are set within different community contexts, including evolving concepts like online communities.
4. *A broader engagement by the faith community:* Effectively engaging with the religious community in a safe space is crucial, particularly when addressing young people's issues. The faith community requires a "jolt" to broaden their perspective, enabling them to tackle concerns beyond security and improve their interactions with youth.
5. How can we effectively engage with the religious community, and how do they relate with young people?
6. *Youth Diversity in Religious Communities:* There is an emerging understanding that youth within religious communities are not homogeneous. This diversity must be acknowledged in programming.

7. *Unlearning and learning:* Programmers need to consider this approach. More effort is needed to strengthen collaboration and partnerships and learn from each other. All learnings and unlearning should be documented so others will not have to 'reinvent the wheel.'
8. *Feedback to donors:* At times, calls come in but do not address the needs on the ground. A meeting point that allows donor feedback needs to be in place.
9. *Capacity Building:* In areas such as grant writing in new areas such as climate and health to enable people to effectively understand how to respond to Calls in such areas and how this can effectively fit into their activities.
10. *Challenges in Norm Change:* Speakers expressed concern about the slow pace of normative change in some areas, such as GBV, and how this affects programming.
11. *When norms do not shift, and the challenges thereof do not change,* for example, more people would find it easier to work in the area of GBV because it is easier to shift norms compared to other areas. How does this affect programming?
12. *Systemic Change and Policy Legitimacy:* Discussions around systemic change, particularly in enforcing policies like anti-FGM laws, emphasized the need for social legitimacy and community buy-in.
13. *Diverse Causes of Adolescent Pregnancy:* A recognition that the causes of adolescent pregnancy vary by region and culture (there is a lack of understanding of local nuances), and thus interventions should be tailored to specific local contexts, "the messenger cannot be the same across the country." For example, young girls don't necessarily, it's not that they are not there, but they don't necessarily fear pregnancy or the outcomes of HIV as much as is imagined; on the contrary, there is more fear of contraception and its perceived permanent side effects.
14. *Role of Media and Messaging:* The importance of aligning the ambition of long-term change and tying it with the media and intervention methods. How can ambition be tied to the medium being used or the design of the intervention so that it is more logically framed rather than thinking that one size fits all?

12.0 Closing Remarks

By Sohail Agha

Sohail Agha stated that the key thing that came out of the meeting for him was the importance of capturing the realities on the ground to influence policy.

By Rebecka Lundgren

Rebecka Lundgren acknowledged that the meeting discussions produced numerous ideas on better presenting, analyzing, and supplementing the existing published evidence, ensuring it is meaningful to implementers, researchers, and funders.

She also took note of the need for a clear desire for more interaction between funders and the participants' work, viewing this as an opportunity to provide more evidence. She affirmed that she had learned a great deal and was rethinking their approach.

In closing, she assured participants that all materials from the meeting and new materials produced over the next year would be shared with them.

By Peter Munene, Faith to Action Network

Peter explained that the Faith to Action Network would implement an interfaith intervention to address SRH. The counties the intervention will be targeting are still yet to be agree on; however, what is currently being implemented are in the counties of Isiolo, Marsabit, and Mandera, as well as parts of Meru, Migori, and Kisii. He expressed the need to create linkages between all participants and the organizations they represent.

He stated that Faith to Action Network will call upon the participants for further dialogue to explore potential linkages and collaboration opportunities. He noted that, from the discussions during the workshop, he had picked up many issues raised that would be beneficial to the faith community in terms of broadening their perspective on engaging young people.

By Dr. Stellah Bosire

Dr. Bosire assured all participants that they would receive all the presentations from the workshop. She encouraged anyone seeking further information or wishing to share additional ideas that were not covered to reach out to her directly.

In closing, she stated she was looking forward to some concrete outputs in 2025, which she would share with the group.

APPENDIX 1: WORKSHOP AGENDA

Day 1 | September 17 2024

7:45 am– 9:00 am	Arrival Breakfast available 7:30-8:30. Program to start promptly at 9:00.
9:00 am– 10:00 am <i>Stellah Bosire</i>	Icebreaker and Get to Know You Activity Take time to get to know your fellow attendees
10:00 am - 10:15am <i>Aloysious Nnyombi</i>	Introduction to the Learning Collaborative Who we are, and how we're involved in this work
10:15am -10:35am <i>Rebecka Lundgren</i>	Introduction to our research - Brief overview of the project as a whole - Q&A on methods, limitations, objectives
10:35am-11:30am <i>Sohail Agha and Rebecka Lundgren</i>	Presentation of Initial Findings - To contextualize the Social Norms & Adolescents Evidence Reviews related to Faith and Cultural Champions and Entertainment Media in Kenya. - Initial open Q&A on results
11:30am-11:45am	Tea Break
11:45am-1:00pm <i>Rebecka Lundgren</i>	Group Working Session: Exploring the Results Participants will work in small groups to further explore the results and answer a number of guiding questions.
12:45pm-1:40pm	Lunch
1:45pm-2:30pm <i>Aloysious Nnyombi</i>	Group Plenary Discussion and Reflections Discussion to share insights from small group work
2:30pm - 4:00pm <i>Sohail Agha</i>	Introduction to the Deep Dive Discussion on next steps from the literature review, and places where further research is needed.
4:00pm-4:15pm	Closing What are our key take aways from today?

Day 2 | 18 September 2024

7:45 am– 9:00 am	Arrival Breakfast available 7:30-8:30. Program to start promptly at 9:00.
9:00am-9:30am	Welcome Back - Summary of where we ended yesterday - Icebreaker activity- turn to your neighbor and share one thing new you learned yesterday.
9:30am-9:45am <i>Stellah Bosire</i>	Taking stock: what have we learned so far? What is missing?
9:45am- 10:30am <i>Rebecka Lundgren</i>	The Influence of Social Norms an Adolescent Behaviors: Topline Results from the Kenya Social Norms Exploration Applying these results to our work
10:30am-11:45am	Tea Break
10:45am-12:00pm <i>Sohail Agha</i> <i>Stellah Bosire</i>	Case Studies of Norms-Shifting Approaches Applying these results to our work
12:00pm – 12:30pm <i>Stellah Bosire</i>	Group Report out in Plenary
12:30pm-1:00pm	Lunch
1:30pm-2:30pm <i>Rebecka Lundgren</i>	Situating our Work within the Policy and Programmatic Landscape - Presentation on next steps in our work - Group work to apply and situate results within local landscape
2:30pm-3:00pm <i>Stellah Bosire</i>	Gallery walk and tea break Individuals will walk around the room and observe and interact with posters from previous group work
3:00pm-3:30pm <i>Aloysious Nnyombi</i>	Recap, next steps and vote of thanks

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

No	Name	Organization	Telephone	Email
1.	Kui Muraya	KEMRI-Wellcome Trust	+254723957560	kmuraya@gmail.com
2.	Dr. Stellah Bosire	Africa Centre for Health Systems & Gender Justice	+254725883864	stellahbosire@healthsystemsgenderjustice.org
4.	Michell Oyuga	Akina Mama Wa Africa	+254726601880	oyuga@akinamamawaafrika.org
3.	Joyce Kinyua	AMIU	0721324926	tsonikinyua@gmail.com
5.	Beatrice Maina	APHRC	+254721456679	bmaina@aphrc.org
6.	Elizabeth Mwaniki	APHRC	+254722273507	emwaniki@aphrc.org
7.	Grace Njoroge	APHRC	+25470688238	rugurugrace@yahoo.com
9.	June Injete	Co-Creation Hub Africa		june@cchubcreativeeconomy.africa
8.	Newton Mutuku	Co-Creation Hub Africa	+254769084165	newton@cchubcreativeeconmy.africa
11.	Christina de Vries	Faith to Action Network		christinadevries@faithtoactionnetwork.org
10.	Peter Munene	Faith to Action Network	+254722443306	petermunene@faithtoactionnetwork.org
12.	Sohail Agha	GEH/UCSD		Sohailagha@gmail.com
14.	Caroline Wangeci	Girl Effect	+254706013416	Caroline.wangeci@girleffect.org
13.	Gerald Githinji	Girl Effect	+254723887323	Gerald.gatheri@girleffect.org
16.	Aloysious Nnyombi	Impact and Innovation Development Center	+256788713790	annyombi@iidcug.org
15.	Mary Thiongo	International Centre for Reproductive Health-Kenya (ICRH)	+254722364243	thiongom@gmail.com
17.	Esther Muraguri	Jesuit Justice & Ecology Network Africa	+254786450215	jena@jesuits.africa
18.	Allan Maleche	The Kenya Legal & Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDS (KELIN)	+254708389870	amaleche@kelinkenya.org
19.	Mithcelle Kimathi	MTV Staying Alive Foundation	+254724627821	mitchell.kimathi@paramount.com

20.	Rebecka Lundgren	UCSD		rlundgren@health.ucsd.edu
21.	Chantalle Okondo	Population Council	+254712268125	cokondo@popcouncil.org
22.	Fredrick Mandi	Rapporteur Consulting	+254723576175	fmandi@rapporteur.info
23.	Cindy Mose	Africa Centre for Health Systems & Gender Justice	+254720393926	cindymosea@gmail.com
24.	Bridget Deacon	Shujaaz Inc.	072652998	Bridget.deacon@shujaazinc.com
25.	Leah Mwai	Shujaaz Inc.	0798908849	leahmwai@gmail.com
26.	Dr. Nelly Bosire	Thriving Teens Foundation	+254729906906	n.bosire@thiningteensfoundation.org
27.	Sheilah Warindi	Trust for Indigenous Culture and Health (TICAH)	+254720816952	swarindi@ticahealth.org
28.	Esther Kimani	Zamara Foundation	+254723950825	e.kimani@zamarafoundation.org
29.	Nancy Baraza	Zamara Foundation	+254757839507	n.baraza@zamarafoundation.org