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1. Introduction

The training program will take place in the context of UNICEF’s mandate to advocate for the protection of children’s rights, meet their basic needs and expand their opportunities to reach their full potential.

Violations of human rights, and of children’s rights in particular, have been traditionally analyzed primarily at the level of the individual, and remedial programs have sought to change behavior at the individual level. Examples are public education campaigns that provide information about the causes and consequences of a behavior, such as sexual exploitation of children or child marriage; or, more strongly, attempts at rewarding or punishing behaviors through subsidy or fine and imprisonment. Such standard strategies in some instances may be sufficient to advance change, but they may falter when the problem of interest is primarily *relational*, such as early marriage, female genital mutilation/cutting or honor killing. These practices have an enormous impact on the lives of women and children, and they embody norms that clearly violate their most basic rights.

The recently approved UNICEF Child Protection Strategy has social change as one of its crucial goals, and it is now recognized that social change usually involves collective action, since change must be organized in and supported by entire communities, not individuals acting alone. It is now acknowledged that many harmful practices are collectively shared and rooted in social practices widely followed in the target communities. Social norms are upheld because of a web of mutual expectations: individuals expect others to follow the norm, and in turn everyone believes he or she is expected to comply, and often each fears that negative sanctions, such as ostracism or loss of status, will follow transgression. The understanding and overcoming of relational problems thus requires an explicit analysis of social conventions, social norms, and other types of social practice, and the design of strategies of change at the group level.
Important examples of successful organized change of social norms include the Tostan program in Senegal and the KMG program in Ethiopia, which led to widespread collective abandonments of female genital mutilation/cutting; and in Colombia Bogota’s Capacity for Self-Transformation program, which succeeded in motivating large numbers of people in a major world city to reform a number of harmful social practices. Cristina Bicchieri and Gerry Mackie organized and led the first Learning Program on Changing Social Conventions and Social Norms in summer of 2010. Each has consulted with UNICEF on organizing change of social norms. Both attended the 2007 conference on Legal, Moral, and Social Norms, in Bogota, an international gathering of authorities on the topic who presented original research and discussed the theoretical underpinnings of the effective Bogota experience initiated by Antanas Mockus.

The purpose of the learning program is to build the capacity of UNICEF staff to stimulate and achieve social change for children in a variety of environments and cultures in order to advance the Millennium Development Goals. This program aims to be a shared experience between UNICEF and the University of Pennsylvania, in that both partners will provide, to the best of their capacities, experiences and material that should create an active learning environment. Whereas the academic side will provide simple, transferable methods and tools of analysis, the UNICEF partner will be expected to provide the analysis of practical experiences of organized change of entrenched social practices. The synergy between these two groups will be facilitated by the experience that Bicchieri and Mackie have consulting with UNICEF on social norms and change, and their theoretical understanding of several important practical experiences of collective norm change.

Evaluations of the 2010 program indicate that the basic design of the program is sound. However, the course organizers and UNICEF learned much from the 2010 program, and the 2011 proposal is revised accordingly.

2. Purpose

The course aims to provide basic principles, and the theoretical and practical knowledge needed to devise a variety of strategies and plans to organize group abandonment of harmful social practices, or group adoption of helpful social practices, in different social circumstances and cultures.

Changing social practices that are governed by social norms involves understanding the nature of social norms, and how norms are supported by collective expectations, both empirical and normative. By empirical expectation we mean the knowledge or belief about what others do or have done in the past. Normative expectations are beliefs about what others think one ought to do, and often such beliefs involve the expectation that transgressors will be punished.

It is also important to be able to recognize that norms do not function in isolation, but are instead part of a web of other norms and values that define the local culture. Such web of values, norms and practices is part of the cultural identity of a community; hence a collective, community-wide discussion of means to enhance such identity in a way that protects human/child rights is a crucial part of any
attempt at fostering positive change. Human rights are not just abstract concepts: they are embedded in a host of practices and values that should be enhanced and promoted, especially when they are in conflict with norms and practices that negate those rights. How to link rights, community values and practices is a goal that requires constant attention to both.

Social norms coexist with legal rules, and may be consistent or inconsistent with the latter. Often legislation has a signaling effect, by pointing to the importance of practices and norms that are already present. Legal reform (as opposed to preexisting legislation), however, is frequently aimed at curbing practices that have a long history and are quite widespread. It may create normative expectations that are in plain conflict with people’s empirical expectations of violations of the new legal rule, and we know that in such cases people tend to cast greater weight on their empirical expectations. Developing an understanding of the complex relationship between norms and legal rules is crucial for those who aim to implement social change.

The examples provided during the training will be a crucial part of the program, since they will offer illustrations of the manifold ways to engage communities, depending on how communities are structured and how communication flows within any particular structure. The capability of identifying such social networks is thus another target of the program. Indeed, if social change involves a collective change in expectations obtained through collective dialogue and participation, identifying social networks is not only relevant to enact such change, but also to make sure it can be permanently maintained.

A training participant would thus learn the following:

- How social practices (social imitation, social conventions, social norms, moral norms) differ from one another and how each type works. How different collective expectations support each of them, and the dynamics of such expectations. Simple game theory models will be provided to understand how individual decisions lead to collective outcomes and how simple changes of beliefs may lead to very different choices and final outcomes.

- How legal rules interact with existing social norms, and their role in signaling and supporting good practices. What happens when legal rules and social norms are in conflict, and how to act on peoples’ empirical expectations may be the first step in implementing social change.

- The latest experimental findings about how people make choices in relational contexts. The types of positive and negative social sanctions that motivate people to comply with social norms, and the characteristic emotional states associated with each type of social practice. In this context, participants will learn to identify which expectations matter, and how they can be manipulated.
• The various ways in which social practices can emerge. The various ways in which social practices can change. Why exclusively informational or exclusively legal strategies may not work for relational problems, and how to integrate informational and legal strategies with organized group change of social practices.

• The dynamics of change in social practices over time, and the importance of critical thresholds in attaining change. How to recognize differences in social-network structure, and how to take advantage of them in program design.

• Theory applied to field cases of remarkable change in entrenched social practices; and ongoing application to cases preselected by UNICEF and the organizers.

3. How the Learning Program Works

The course will be open to up to 50 individuals per year, and the second learning session will be held for two weeks in the summer of 2011 (July) at the campus of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA. Participants will be responsible for obtaining their own visa, accommodation and meals. Up to a certain deadline they may reserve housing or meal plans at Penn, and the university will be willing to reserve college space for the participants. Participants will have computer, Internet, and library access at the University. The University will provide classrooms for teaching and conducting seminars, as well as a computer lab for running experiments and simulations. Aside from the teaching faculty, the university will provide (a) continuing organizational help, and (b) graduate and postdoctoral student help in organizing and directing afternoon group seminars and discussion groups, help participants prepare final papers, evaluate and grade them.

UNICEF may provide personnel who will present on specific field experiences relevant to organized change in social conventions and social norms. In 2010, one UNICEF presentation, on Saleema in the Sudan, was well received. Two others were rated by participants to be Good (when the typical rating for various course components was Very Good), and were criticized for being either dated or not relevant to the content of the learning program. The parties will consult closely on the content of UNICEF presentations.

Before the beginning of the residential course, participants will be provided with the course outline, basic reading materials, and instructions for selecting and reporting on a field case study. The instructions will provide guidance on selecting a case that primarily involves social practices, and on writing up and sending in a one-page description of the case. Participants will also be asked to provide a short
biographical sketch. Program leaders will use these materials to help organize the course. Participants will be asked to do some basic reading in advance.

The program uses active learning methods. The students’ case descriptions will be a constant point of reference and deliberation. Generally, each morning will involve instruction and practical examples, with ample opportunity for question and answer; and each afternoon will include group work or exercises applying the morning’s material, often adapted to students’ case descriptions.

Participants will be assessed at the end of the program, since they are expected to apply the course material to the cases they brought, or another suitable case they are familiar with, and will write a 10-page plan for organizing group abandonment of a harmful practice or group adoption of a helpful practice. They will be graded, and a certificate of completion is contingent on satisfactory performance. The course will not carry credit at the University of Pennsylvania.

4. Proposed course content and format

Course Schedule

4.1 Addressing the UNICEF Proposal’s Five Themes

Theme 1: Approaches to Social Change. UNICEF leadership may discuss this theme on opening and closing the training program. Alternative approaches to resolving collective problems will be taught on the first Monday and Tuesday; the first Thursday on Organized Norm Change; and on the second Tuesday on Social and Legal Norms and Sanctions. Theme 1 will be further addressed in consideration of major case studies presented by UNICEF and outside experts on the first Friday and second Monday, and by students in their own case studies.

Theme 2. Social Dynamics of Norms and Conventions. The basic game theory needed to understand social practices will be presented on the first Monday afternoon and on the first Tuesday. Students will discuss and apply these concepts in plenary Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning, and in discussion session on Tuesday afternoon. Social imitation, social conventions, legal norms, and moral norms, and the importance of mutual expectations and public knowledge will be presented on the first Wednesday. Students will apply these concepts on the afternoon of the first Wednesday. The first Thursday is devoted exclusively to the dynamics of change of social practices. Exemplary cases presented by Mockus and Melching on the first Friday, and by UNICEF personnel on the second Monday will further illustrate social dynamics. Details of social dynamics -- Social and Legal Norms and Sanctions, Social Networks, Individual and Social Deliberations -- will be presented on the second Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.
Theme 3. Social Norms as they affect Child Survival, Development, Protection, and Participation. The proposers understand that the purpose of the course is to assist UNICEF practitioners to better promote the interests of the child, with respect to concrete problems such as gender practices, AIDS stigma, violence, age of marriage, anti-trafficking, and youth gang violence. The concrete problems will be used as examples as principles are introduced; in six out of ten days, invited UNICEF personnel, as well as two external field practitioners, will report on results of projects aimed at changing social norms. The course is designed so that each participant will bring a case study and work it throughout the course.

Theme 4. Communication for Effective Social Change. The first Thursday of the course will introduce the concept of mobilizing a core group to diffuse attitude change throughout the whole community; the second Wednesday will explain the efficient diffusion of credible information and persuasion through social networks; the second Thursday will present material on individual and collective persuasion and attitude change. Exemplary communication programs such as Saleema in Sudan, and Mockus’ Bogota practice will further spark new ideas.

Theme 5. Human-Rights Approach to Development Programming. This theme will be broached in the introduction on the first Monday, and in the major case studies presented throughout the training program. Additionally, the sessions on the first Thursday and second Thursday will discuss values deliberations as a method of change, which in good part are motivated by community discussion of international human rights principles.

4.2 Revisions of Second-Year Program in Response to Participant Evaluations of the First-Year Program

At the close of the program, the typical participant thought the course of Very Good quality, the amount learned as Very Good, and the difficulty as Medium. The evaluations indicate that the basic design of the course -- morning lecture, small afternoon discussion sections, and work on a case study -- is pedagogically effective.

The quantitative and qualitative evaluations, and collected observations of the co-directors and the facilitators suggest a few revisions to the curriculum. Some participants thought the balance of theory and practice was good in the first year, but more of them would like for concepts to be illustrated with more examples, especially UNICEF development examples. The training team lacked close familiarity with development examples on starting the first year program, but now is better able to reference them. The curriculum has been revised to emphasize development examples, and the Co-Directors will ensure that all instructors do so. Participants thought there was too much emphasis on the FGM/C case. To some extent reference to that case is unavoidable, as that is where these applications were developed; however, trainers were not familiar with other examples in the first year, and in the second year they will draw examples from a much wider variety of
development experiences. Participants would also like for instructors to pause and emphasize summary points. Although participants did not express a concern, the Co-Directors believe that the pieces of the course should be more explicitly integrated, with lecturers referring backwards and forwards to connecting points.

The training team observed that introduction to game-theoretic concepts in the first year was not effective, with participants confused about the concepts until the end of the course. We propose to remedy that in the second year by beginning with these concepts, redesigning the main presentation of them, and spending two days instead of one on them. We believe that this will reduce participant confusion and increase confidence, and allow for better understanding of later concepts dependent on a sound understanding of game-theoretic reasoning.

4. 3 First week program

Plenary sessions will be moderated by one of the facilitators, in rotation. Bicchieri and Mackie will moderate presentations and discussions by Melching and Mockus on the second Monday.

Monday: Introduction

9-10: A UNICEF representative will introduce the program and orient the participants. The UNICEF speaker may discuss different approaches to development, and how the social-norms approach is applicable to development problems.

10-12: Cristina Bicchieri - The course will be outlined and what participants may expect from the program will be reviewed in detail. Each participant comes with a case study to develop by application of course materials. The typical day will involve a plenary lecture in the morning with limited discussion; and small discussion groups in the afternoon allowing for close instruction, intense discussion, and application of material to case studies; Bicchieri, Mackie, and nonparticipant UNICEF personnel will regularly visit and participate in afternoon discussion session. Exemplary case studies from the previous year’s program will be noted, and learners will be assured that although the material may seem initially difficult, they will know enough by the end to complete a successful study. Co-Directors and facilitators will be introduced; facilitators will relate their positive experiences with learners in the prior year’s course.

2-5: Cristina Bicchieri. Plenary session. Game theory will be introduced in a participatory and intuitive fashion, especially games of coordination, trust, and the social dilemma. Bicchieri and Mackie will dramatically enact the desires, beliefs, and actions of players facing the incentive structure of a particular game, in order to familiarize learners with this method of analysis. The three games will also be related to development examples. A simple typology will be presented of various
ways to resolve coordination, trust, and social-dilemma problems. Participants, guided by teaching assistants, will take short quizzes on basic concepts, and revise their answers in small-group discussion. After much intuitive learning, matrix representation will be introduced.

7-9: Reception with food. Each participant will introduce himself to others, followed by informal exchanges.

**Tuesday: Basic Game Theory**

9-12: *Jason Dana.* Participants will be broken into arbitrary groups and will play mock games: 1. A simple coordination game with arbitrary equilibria, in one condition without communication, and in another condition with communication; 2. Some repeated social dilemma game. This exercise will be set up very carefully, with easy-to-understand instructions projected on screen, distributed in handouts, and orally reviewed with thorough question and answer. Results of the games will be reviewed, incentive structures of the games more formally presented in matrix form, and the results related by the instructor to development examples. Ways to resolve coordination and social problems will be presented and discussed in further detail.

2-5 Participants will go to their first discussion sessions, each led by a facilitator, where they will consolidate this knowledge and further apply it to their own personal and development examples. These games are stylized versions of common real-life situations which people know intuitively how to play. The goal is to make students explicitly aware of the strategic, interdependent component of their decisions, how collective outcomes are produced, and the type of expectations and emotions that are elicited in each situation.

**Wednesday: Understanding Social Practices**

9-12: *Cristina Bicchieri.* Beginning with personal and development examples from the prior two sessions, the various types of social practices will be introduced, at first in an intuitive fashion with simple definitions and examples (stressing the differences among social imitation, social conventions, social norms, legal norms, moral values, and religious commands). How social norms can transform the incentive structure of a game will be explored. Social practices are constructed from the desires and beliefs of individuals, especially individuals’ expectations about what others in the reference group do and expect others to do. Mutual expectations support social conventions and social norms, and changing social conventions and social norms requires coordinated change of individual expectations within the reference group: mutual expectations and public knowledge are crucial to changing social practices. Once intuitive foundations are established, understanding will be deepened with more formal definitions.
2-5: In afternoon discussion sections, participants will be asked to identify the various types of social practices that they know from personal and development experiences. In particular, with special reference to the field cases they have brought, they will be asked to identify and define: agents’ expectations, reactions to transgressions, and the nature of emotional responses elicited by transgressions. Compare their cases to cases discussed in the morning.

**Thursday: Organizing Norm Change Throughout a Community**

9-12: *Gerry Mackie.* How to mobilize a small core group that over time brings about changes in beliefs and in reciprocal expectations throughout a whole community, illustrated by the end of foot binding in China. Mackie and Bicchieri will dramatize the beliefs, desires, and actions of individuals inside a group caught in a harmful practice, and how they might change. The process will be intuitively illustrated with the handshaking game, and by a YouTube clip of group dancing behavior. These considerations will then be linked up to matrix representation of the incentives learned in prior days. Concepts of core group, revaluation of alternatives, organized diffusion, tipping point, and coordinated shift of reciprocal expectations (by public declaration or otherwise) will be introduced in narrative form, and illustrated by reference to effective FGM/C abandonment programs and other UNICEF development experiences.

2-5: Teaching assistants will review the material and encourage group questions and discussion. Participants will describe dynamics of organized norm change in their own personal and field experiences. They will examine their case study, and hypothesize how to form a core group, revalue alternatives, organize diffusion of changed attitudes, and effectively coordinate shift of reciprocal expectations.

**Friday: Organized Norm Change in Rural and Urban Settings**

9-12: Plenary session. Further illustrate and summarize prior course concepts with strong and effective field experiences. Presentation of major theoretical and practical results by *Molly Melching,* director of Tostan, winner of the Hilton Humanitarian Prize, on organizing collective abandonment of FGM/C, early marriage, and other harmful community practices, in Senegal and beyond in Africa. Mackie may at the end briefly summarize relevant points and connect them to course content.

2-5: Plenary session Presentation of major theoretical and practical results by Dr. *Antanas Mockus,* former mayor of Bogota, Colombia, and director of Corpovisionarios. He will present his concept, of the alignment of social norms, legal norms, and moral norms as basis for many effective municipal reforms in Bogota, Colombia. These talks will illustrate basic course concepts from the first week, and motivate the more particular course materials for the second week. Bicchieri may at the end briefly summarize relevant points and connect them to course content.
4.4 Second week program

Monday: Organized Norm Change in UNICEF Field Experience

9-12: Three field experiences will be presented by UNICEF personnel. The Saleema effort in the Sudan, part of an integrated program at national, urban, and rural levels, intended to change beliefs about the value of being uncut and reciprocal expectations in the community about whether daughters should be cut. Community-Led Total Sanitation worldwide, which actively changes beliefs and reciprocal expectations in the community on sanitation issues. An example of an attempt at organized community norm change in India, perhaps with respect to early marriage: the example should be of a more successful effort, or of a less successful effort with recommendations about how to make it better. Bicchieri or Mackie may at the end briefly summarize relevant points and connect them to course content.

2-5: Discussion sessions on three UNICEF experiences and participant’s prior field experiences and upcoming case studies.

Tuesday: Social and Legal Norms and Sanctions

9-12: Erte Xiao – Presentation on social sanctions, negative and positive, and the characteristic emotions of sanctioners and sanctioned. Types of sanctions and their effectiveness and consequences will be discussed. Relationships between social norms and legal norms, of the effects of changes in one on the other, and their respective type of sanctions, will also be analyzed.

2-5: Facilitators will review the material and encourage group questions and discussion. Participants will also start working with the teaching assistant and with one another on their case studies.

Wednesday: Understanding Social Networks

9-12: Ryan Muldoon. Presentation of social networks, social network analysis, and the flow of persuasion and attitude change in different network topologies. Depending on the structure of the network, information may flow freely or instead be thwarted, may spread quickly or slowly, and may be more or less credible. Diagrams of actual social networks from empirical studies will illustrate concepts. Network analysis guides identification and mobilization of key individuals and groups in the social network, which allows for efficient program design.

2-5: Facilitators will review the material and encourage group questions and discussion. Students identify different network topologies in their case studies and
analyze how information is transmitted in the network. They will be asked to name who they would first mobilize in the community they are targeting for assistance.

**Thursday: Individual and Collective Deliberations**

9-12: Hugo Mercier. How do individuals and groups change their attitudes? The importance of credibility of message; how credibility is assessed. Obstacles to attitude change: uniformity of a practice held in place by reciprocal expectations obscures knowledge of, and evaluation of, better alternatives; a single attitude is further entrenched by its location within a supporting network of attitudes, and thus the larger network neighborhood must be engaged; most attitudes are automatic rather than calculated, and it takes deliberative effort to examine old attitudes and automate new ones. Effects of group deliberation generally, and in the revision of reciprocal expectations within the reference group. How community deliberations elicit deeper values to motivate and justify change in more shallowly valued social practices.

**Friday: Participants Present Case Studies**

9-12: Facilitators will have sorted participants into four groups (assuming 50 participants), based on common field problems and other relevant criteria. Each participant will present her case study in her assigned group. Nonparticipant personnel, including Bicchieri and Mackie, will serially visit the four groups. (One of the four groups will meet in our regular plenary room.)

2-4 Case study presentation, continued.

4-5: Plenary Session. UNICEF leadership will close the session.

**5. Faculty and Institution**

**Institution:**
The program will be located at the University of Pennsylvania. UPenn, a leading research university, a member of the Ivy League, is the oldest university in North America. The university contains faculties in the arts and sciences, medicine, law, business, education, and nursing. Penn has a long record of intellectual collaboration with and training for international organizations such as the World Bank (e.g., a business forum on the Global Crisis and African Challenges), the United Nations, and international NGOS such as the Center for Political Accountability.

Penn prides itself on a tradition of interdisciplinary tradition and research. A major interdisciplinary program at Penn is the Philosophy, Politics, and Economics (PPE) program, which will administer the learning course. PPE has dedicated faculty and postdoctoral scholars, who work on interdisciplinary themes, prominent among them the study of social norms, from philosophical and scientific perspectives. The
learning course will be conducted by the PPE program, its director Cristina Bicchieri, and Gerry Mackie from the University of California, San Diego. Their qualifications will be stated below.

A particular strength of the proposers is that the PPE program at Penn contains an unrivalled collection of scholarly resources on the interdisciplinary study of social norms, not just the principals, but faculty within PPE and nearby in other units at Penn, and postdoctoral scholars and graduate students in the PPE program, who will be described in the next section.

The academic resources in place will be complemented by the inclusion of leading field practitioners from several parts of the world. These practical experts will inform us of the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to problems of change in social norms and practices.

**Faculty:**

_Cristina Bicchieri, Co-Director_

She is the Carol and Michael Lowenstein Professor of Philosophy and Legal Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, where she is also director of the Philosophy, Politics, and Economics Program. The author of many articles and books, including _Rationality and Coordination, The Logic of Strategy, The Dynamics of Norms_, and _Knowledge, Belief, and Strategic Interaction_, she has been fellow at Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin, the Swedish collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences, the London School of Economics (Leverhulme Trust), and the Institute for Advanced Studies at the University of Jerusalem. Her latest book is _The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms_. She a world authority on social norms, and has consulted with the UNICEF Child Protection Section on social norms and child sexual exploitation. She has designed, carried out, and published several human-subject experiments on social norms, trust, fairness and cooperation. She has pioneered techniques for the measurement of social norms, and has shown how the provision of information can change mutual expectations in a manner that induces shifts in social behavior. She also conducts agent-based simulation studies to isolate the variables that lead to stability or change in social norms. She was Co-Director of the 2010 Learning Program on Changing Social Conventions and Social Norms.

_Gerry Mackie, Co-Director_

He is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. A graduate of the University of Chicago, Mackie has held research fellowships at St. John’s College, the University of Oxford; and the Social and Political Theory Program, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University; he was Assistant Professor at the University of Notre Dame. His book, _Democracy Defended_, won the Gladys Kammerer prize in 2004 from the American Political Science Association for the best book on U.S. national policy. His main interest is contemporary democratic theory and the history of democratic thought, and he has
published on deliberative democracy, voting, and other methods of aggregation. He has published innovative work on foot binding and female genital mutilation/cutting as social conventions, and worked to apply his theories in the field, to the abandonment of FGM/C in Africa. He has since published three more essays on the subject, most recently a revision of his convention theory that accounts for the role of social and moral norms in the abandonment process, under contract with the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. He advised the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre on the production of Changing a Harmful Social Convention -- Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (2005), and the UNICEF Child Protection Section on the Coordinated Strategy to Abandon Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting. Most recently he (with Diane Gillespie and Beniamino Cislaghi) completed for UNICEF, an analysis of Values Deliberations and Collective Action in Rural Senegal. He was Co-Director of the 2010 Learning Program on Changing Social Conventions and Social Norms.

The directors are recruiting scholars such as Erte Xiao, (a Chinese national) and behavioral economist at Carnegie-Mellon University, to lecture on the effects of different types of punishment on norm compliance, and on cultural differences in response to punishment between American and Chinese subjects; Jason Dana, a psychologist at Penn and a member of the PPE faculty, who does laboratory experiments on how variations in the distribution of information lead to variations in pro-social behavior; Hugo Mercier, a PPE postdoctoral scholar at Penn is an expert on public deliberation, argumentation, and reasoning; Ryan Muldoon, a political philosopher who studies the emergence of norms and how different norms can coexist, as well as phenomena such as pluralistic ignorance and the persistence of damaging norms, and a postdoctoral scholar at the University of Western Ontario; Additionally, other PPE postdoctoral scholars and graduate students will be employed as group tutors/facilitators in daily discussions and exercises. Finally, the directors will recruit distinguished practitioners, notably Dr. Antanas Mockus, moral philosopher, former mayor of Bogota, Colombia, and a practical innovator in mass change in social norms; and Molly Melching, director of Tostan, organizer of collective abandonment of FGM/C in thousands of African communities.

6. Evaluation of the Program

The evaluation of the 2011 training program will use the same methods as the evaluation of the 2010 program. The evaluation has several components. One is the participants’ evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the teaching and materials presented. Another is the participants’ evaluation of how much and how far the instruction received helps them better understand the specific situations they come from and whether the tools they have acquired are in fact applicable to their jobs. A third component is the organizers’ assessment of the degree to which participants have absorbed and used the material presented in developing a better understanding of the case studies they have prepared prior to entering the program.
We propose to evaluate the program in two separate levels that by and large follow the Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation.

**Level One: Students’ Reaction**

The first level of evaluation will let us know how the participants felt about the training. It will point out content areas that trainees considered weak or missing, and tell us how engaged the participants felt by the training. The information and feedback provided can be used to improve future versions of the training program.

In this first level, students will be asked to *anonymously* evaluate the training after completing the program. We will use a Likert-scale questionnaire similar (but richer) to the ones used in the course evaluations at Penn. This questionnaire’s goal is to measure participants’ reactions toward specific components of the program, such as the instructors, the topics, the presentation style, the schedule, the relevance of the objectives, the ability of the course to maintain interest, the amount and appropriateness of interactive exercises, the perceived value and transferability to the workplace.

It is important in Level 1 evaluation to include some questions related to transfer of knowledge (e.g. “What is the likelihood you will use … on the job?”). Then ask the same questions in follow-up evaluations at six-month interval (e.g. “Rate the usefulness that … has had on the job”, “When was the last time you used … in your work?”). Analyzing this longitudinal data can help us understand what types of training experiences “stick” and what types just “melt away.”

It is also important to include, in this first level of evaluation, open-ended questions about perceived strengths and weaknesses of the program (“What were the three most important weaknesses/strengths of the program?”).

**Level Two: Learning Results**

This further level of evaluation determines what the participants actually learned during the training program. As we have specified in the rest of the proposal, the program’s goal is to provide participants with:

1. The ability to identify practices that are governed by social norms, and see how such norms are part of a complex network of values and norms/practices that buttress them;
2. The understanding of the dynamics of collective expectations, and how such expectations support existing norms, or can contribute to their demise;
3. The tools needed to analyze social networks, the flow of information through specific networks, and how they impact expectation formation and change;
4. The analytical skills necessary to design and implement programs that result in social norms change.
This level of evaluation measures what was covered in the training, and will be done immediately after the training program to determine whether the above listed objectives were met.

It should be noted that the learning of the material would be closely monitored during the entire program. As we specify in the instructional design, an important part of the training program is the afternoon review and application of the material learned in the morning instruction. Participants will be divided into small groups, and their understanding of the material will be closely monitored. In this way, we will make sure that – through exercises and practical applications – no participant will be “lost”. This type of control is meant to measure the incremental knowledge acquired by participants.

To show achievement, we will assess the case studies provided by the participants pre-and post-training. More specifically, each participant will be asked to prepare a case study before entering the program. During the program, participants will have to systematically review their case study in light of the instruction received. Finally, participants will present their prepared case studies, identifying several components that we have highlighted in the course. They will have to offer a final diagnosis and a remedy appropriate to their case study. This allows us to compare the quality of the final projects with respect to the goals of the program.

This final assessment measures not just the knowledge acquired, but also the skills taught in the training. For example, participants are not only expected to use the concepts and tools acquired to describe and analyze a given situation, but they are also expected to offer appropriate remedies and suggest ways to practically approach their specific problems. This level of evaluation helps us to assess whether certain learning objectives are/are not met, and suggests ways to improve the training program.

A very important goal of any training program is to enact a change in job performance as a result of having attended the program. It is thus important to assess whether there has been transfer of knowledge and skills from the training context to the field. Though we cannot evaluate this level of knowledge transfer, we can facilitate such learning transfer. By providing real world examples and using actual field experiences, making sure trainees understand the general concepts behind their experiences, and stressing practical ways in which behaviors can be changed we can make sure that learning is situated, and thus much easier to transfer.

7. Deliverables
The project will be managed by the University of Pennsylvania, its administrative units, and on all substantive matters by its PPE Program discussed above, and be co-directed by Penn PPE director Cristina Bicchieri and Gerry Mackie of the University of California, San Diego. The duties and hours of the current PPE clerical staff will be increased to manage administrative detail.

Project development will commence immediately upon final award, expected in February or March of 2011.

As soon as possible after award, UNICEF should comment on the instructional design of the course contained in the proposal, on its content, and on the level of desired detail for the final outline of the course. We will aim for UNICEF approval of final course outline no later than April 30, 2011.

The first substantive priority for the proposers after the award is to begin negotiations with PPE scholars, and subcontract negotiations with the scholars and practitioners we have identified in the proposal. We will aim for completed commitments and contracts with all no later than May 15, 2011, contingent on UNICEF approval of the instructional design of the course.

The first administrative priority for the proposers after the award is to determine the exact dates of the training session, and from UNICEF by February 28, 2011 the number of attendees and their expectations concerning accommodation. No later than March 15, the proposers will complete internal reservations of necessary instructional and other facilities at Penn.

We have already delivered a first participants’ manual, which should be provided to each participant. We will also provide a detailed outline of the curriculum, and a list of readings. We have set up a UNICEF/Penn web site, where participants can become acquainted with the course structure and download the course material. The participants’ manual includes preparatory materials, most readings, and lecture slides. The manual will be changed and refined after each year of training.

Co-Directors Bicchieri and Mackie are closely supervising a small number of facilitators, before, during, and after the training session. The Co-Directors and the instructors are authorities in their fields; they were able to devise and present a curriculum effectively in the absence of a formal facilitators’ manual, as evidenced by participants’ evaluations of the first year’s program. Evaluation of the first year’s effort caused the Co-Directors to make some revisions in the curriculum for the second year.

The course will be delivered in the first two weeks of July.

Additionally, immediate student and instructor evaluative material will be summarized, analyzed, and submitted to UNICEF by September 1, 2011.
UNICEF will, no later than October 30, 2011, present its requests for revision of instructional design. The parties will agree to a final revision of instructional design on January 1, 2012.

Commencing in March 2012, the proposers would begin preparation of the third offer. No later than April 1, 2012, the proposers would provide to UNICEF a summary and analysis of later evaluations. The administrative activities of the second offer would be repeated. Facilitators’ and participant’s new manuals would be then prepared and distributed.

The third offer would be presented in the first two weeks of July 2012. As in the first and second offer, most of the work of evaluation and revision would be performed in July and August, although UNICEF would approve on November 1, and a final would be complete by January 1, 2013.

Commencing in March 2012, the proposers would begin preparation of the third offer, and the cycle would repeat.

8. Budget

See the attached document

Budget justification:

1. The personnel unit rates for Professors Bicchieri and Mackie are based on their respective salaries. Their universities, being non-profit institutions, do not allow consulting fees, so the compensation is based upon their salary rates, which vary between associate Professor (Mackie) and Full Professor (Bicchieri). Note that the salary rates are significantly lower than the consulting fees each of them can command on a daily basis.

2. The international lecturers are well known experts in field work, and will stay a few days, to compare their experiences with UNICEF participants

3. The US lecturers salary includes preparation, teaching and evaluation work. Lecturers start preparing and coordinating their work with other participants at least two weeks before the training program starts, stay for the duration of the program, and usually spend a few days after the program’s end to sum up their experiences and evaluate them in the light of participants’ evaluations.

4. Facilitators start preparing a month before the program starts: read the material, read and organize the case studies sent by the participants, and see that there is coordination between the material presented in the course and the case studies allotted to them. In our experience, participants were very happy with small groups (no more than 7 participants), because the small size allowed for focused discussion and one-on-one participation. Facilitators are present every morning, and run 3 to 4 hour sessions in the afternoons. They regularly help participants to frame their case studies, and
are available for much requested one-on-one explanations and editing help. We have increased the number of facilitators because we now expect 50 participants. Facilitators read, review and correct participants final papers, and write detailed comments for each paper. They ‘grade’ the final papers and provide the co-directors with feedback on participants’ comments and requested changes, including statistics about evaluations and learning. Finally, facilitators administer the participants’ evaluations and prepare the further questions that are to be sent to participants after several months.

5. The increased expected number of participants means increased need for facilities and secretarial help.