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Why this publication?

Despite the insights that models can provide to explain and – sometimes – predict behaviours, their application by social and behaviour change practitioners remains very limited. Theoretical foundations of behavioural strategies and interventions are often implicit rather than explicit (Sood and Cronin, 2019). There is a need to make behavioural models more practical and attractive to those who are supposed to use them in real life, filling this operational gap. Implementation science flags that most theories address barriers and enablers but provide limited “how-to” support for selecting relevant approaches to influence them (Nilsen, 2015). Others suggest approaches to guide implementation, but these are not directly and rigorously linked to the constructs that were used to build the models.

One of the consequences of this discontinuity between theory and practice is the frequent resorting to “go-to” default interventions, such as trying to solve any behavioural issue with a communication campaign, regardless of what may explain the practice of the behaviour. This brings into question the appropriate use of already limited resources, and the potential for programmes to have an impact.

To increase the uptake of theory by programme designers, we need to address two essential questions:

1. Why do people do what they do?  
2. How do we influence what they do?

In this document, we will try to make the explanation of complex phenomena more accessible, and systematically link every conceptual element to an approach that can influence it. In doing so, we hope to simplify the use of our model so that it falls into the “useful” category described by George Box’s above aphorism.

What is this publication?

This Conceptual Framework for Social and Behaviour Change Programming gathers in one place a wide variety of theories and presents the Behavioural Drivers Model which informs a set of research and programming tools recently developed and used by UNICEF, including Everybody wants to belong: Practical guide to tackling and leveraging social norms in behavior change programming and Measuring Social and Behavioural Drivers – Guidance Tool.

It offers a common reference and language for the study and practice of social and behaviour change (SBC), and can be used as a basis to conduct participatory situational assessments, design and operationalize strategies and programmes, monitor the extent to which interventions are being implemented, and evaluate effectiveness and changes in behavioural and social outcomes. It is part of a larger effort to promote evidence-based programming and guarantee the highest standards of SBC practice as a means to attain sustainability and impact in the protection and promotion of children’s and women’s rights.

The document begins by presenting the goals and core ideas of the framework; then explores how this conceptual framework ties together theories of change through the Behavioural Drivers Model; and concludes by explaining how the model can guide operationalization through programme design, selection of field interventions and measurement.

As with other applied theories, this conceptual framework is a living document that the wider community of allies and SBC partners can appropriate and help expand in a process of shared learning.
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<thead>
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<th>Acronym</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDM</td>
<td>Behavioural Drivers Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>early childhood development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>female genital mutilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>human-centred design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBAP</td>
<td>human rights-based approach to programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>intimate partner violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>social and behaviour change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Socio-Ecological Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY USE A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOUR CHANGE?
To maximize its chances of success, any effort to diagnose and analyse what drives a behaviour, design effective interventions targeting those drivers, and measure the achievements of such interventions in the field should begin with a conceptual framework of behaviour change followed through the stages.

Recent applied advances in behavioural and decision sciences (World Bank, 2015) and the evidence gap that persists among international aid operations and practice in the field (Learning Collaborative, 2018) highlight improvements and challenges, respectively, to the study and practice of social and behaviour change. It remains necessary to build bridges between different viewpoints in related fields of study (sociology, anthropology, psychology, behavioural sciences, communication studies, economics, marketing, political science and development studies) using a shared theoretical but field-oriented tool that can help advance clarity and congruence in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of behavioural interventions. This will contribute to enhancing the analytical capacity, rigor and sensitivity needed to understand a wide and diverse set of behaviours in their contexts. It will also serve an increasingly heterogeneous set of participants engaging in development and rights-promotion activities on the ground (Learning Collaborative, 2018), who might not always be equipped to grasp the complexity of social and behavioural sciences.

To meet these objectives, the following conceptual framework (henceforth, framework) builds on a comprehensive, rigorous and empirically grounded account of behavioural drivers. It reviews dominant theories of social and behaviour change (SBC), synthetizing key insights and gathering empirically significant constructs to develop a transtheoretical model that can guide pathways for a better practice.

There are three goals that guide the development of this framework:

- First, it serves to provide a common reference and language for the study and practice of SBC. A comprehensive taxonomy and suggested methodology will assist researchers and practitioners alike in developing tools for change, interacting and maintaining a level of conceptual rigor throughout their work.

- Second, the framework provides guidance on how to operationalize the Behavioural Drivers Model, linking SBC theory to practice while assessing and influencing a wide range of drivers. It also suggests the kind of tools that may be relevant to this goal.

- Third, the framework aims to contribute to the toolbox of UNICEF’s teams and SBC practitioners by complementing the Socio-Ecological Model that orients UNICEF’s work globally.
Because of the complexity of the field and suboptimal standards of practice still observed, the second goal, which is centred on operationalization, is the most important one. Members of the Maastricht’s School of Psychology and Neuroscience and the University of Texas’ School of Public Health conducted a mapping of behaviour change approaches (Kok, et al., 2016) building on previous studies (Bartholomew, et al., 2011), and concluded that “the dynamics of behaviour change are such that any taxonomy of methods needs to acknowledge the importance of, and provide instruments for dealing with, three conditions for effectiveness for behaviour change methods (...): (1) it must target a determinant that predicts behaviour; (2) it must be able to change that determinant; (3) it must be translated into a practical application in a way that preserves the parameters for effectiveness and fits with the target population, culture, and context.” The guidance provided to practitioners in Part III, chapter 10 of this document attempts to follow such principles by mapping readily usable interventions (gathered from behavioural taxonomies and the core set of UNICEF evidence-based strategies) against all behavioural drivers of empirical importance synthetized in the transtheoretical model.

In terms of data and evidence, using a behavioural framework as a starting point for programme design further orients decision-makers and practitioners away from a focus on outcomes (usually the prevalence of a behaviour) and towards a conscious analysis of the underlying drivers that lead to or stand in the way of those outcomes. Social and behaviour change monitoring efforts in the field often primarily focus on process and activities – such as conducting media campaigns, distributing information materials and engaging communities, recording results that may include number of people reached and number of social workers trained – which does not inform the impacts of the work.

We often largely ignore what lies in between the activities and the end goal of a programme, even though there are usually numerous milestones to be achieved on the way to changing the prevalence of a behaviour.

Accordingly, shifting the attention towards the various behavioural drivers that generate and sustain a practice creates an opportunity to introduce a more substantive, effective and sustainable approach to SBC programming.

Image 1 Opening the black box of behaviour change programming
The framework is oriented towards UNICEF’s teams and their partners, which include governments, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academic institutions, and private companies. It offers the building blocks for stakeholders interested in the epistemic foundations of social and behaviour change (SBC) programming. The framework’s empirical validity and its possible applications provide the means for tackling a wide range of behavioural issues in a diverse set of contexts and populations.

Following a transtheoretical and agnostic nature, the Behavioural Drivers Model derived from the framework is adaptable and intends to serve as a conceptual basis to tackle real-world problems. The model can also support engaging with non-expert audiences, including in capacity-building efforts.

The Behavioural Drivers Model incorporates the critical idea that the key to designing effective social and behaviour change programmes lies in an in-depth understanding of the elements that influence a person’s decisions and actions away from pre-conceived ideas and assumptions.

Starting from the considerations raised by a broad set of theories, concepts and techniques, the framework – and its resulting Behavioural Drivers Model – is oriented towards applications for the protection and promotion of children's and women's rights. SBC programming is key to preventing issues such as gender-based and sexual violence, violent discipline, female genital mutilation, child marriage, child labour, child recruitment, bullying, and various forms of stigma and discrimination (including against children living with disabilities). Nevertheless, the model model is not specific to the field of protection and applies to broader aspects of women's and children's wellbeing, including health, education, the promotion of positive parenting and caregiving across the life cycle, and processes of social change regardless of the development outcomes pursued.

As such, the framework and the model create a common reference to discuss SBC, collaborate and build capacity, and anchor various interventions and tools developed in the field. Through an incremental process of open collaboration with a growing network of partners around the world, this framework is designed to be adapted by evidence and critical discussions, informed by insights from users, and tailored to field work.
PART II

DESCRIPTION OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
Recent systematic reviews, such as Sood and Cronin, 2019, have shown that SBC interventions, from programming on preventing violence against children to measuring changes in social norms, lack consistent theoretical models. Out of 302 programmes addressing violence against children that were analysed, 43 per cent (129 manuscripts) did not reference any conceptual basis, and 25 per cent referred to individual cognitive approaches. Only 8 per cent (24 manuscripts) made reference to an ecological approach, and a worrying 3 per cent (8 manuscripts) specifically mentioned a human-rights or gender focus.

The present framework strives to fill this gap by increasing the use of theoretical foundations in programme design. It provides a basic guideline that is easily adaptable to most behaviour change efforts.

Traditional theories of behaviour change can be incomplete, focusing solely or primarily on individual behaviours. The assumption that individuals will act to benefit themselves provides a strong explanation for certain practices (such as why people try to spend less money for the same goods or drive in a coordinated way on the correct side of the road). However, these theories fail to encompass the wide range of behaviours that individuals engage in for social or collective reasons. The present framework incorporates them with a broader purview that acknowledges the role of social and structural factors in explaining behaviours and inducing change.

Conversely, other theories, including the Socio-Ecological Model (SEM), account for broader social and structural dimensions that may act as enabling or constraining factors that directly or indirectly influence behaviours. However, these theories tend to lack an explanation of the specific mechanisms driving a behaviour, making the link between theory and selection of appropriate interventions far from obvious.

The framework presented here incorporates the insights from each line of thinking and attempts to bring their conceptual building blocks together into a unified model.

The origins of the present framework can be found in seeking an answer to this pivotal question:

**Why do people do what they do?**

Addressing this question calls for unpacking the constructs underlying behaviours and mapping out their main drivers. This “theoretical map” (visualized as the Behavioural Drivers Model) can then be used as a checklist when trying to understand behaviours (research), influence them (programming) and track changes (monitoring). In any given situation, a practitioner could go back to this conceptual reference to challenge assumptions and make sure the various possible drivers have been explored. This would reduce the chances of over-focusing on an exclusive determinant or disregarding key factors.
The theoretical mapping helps to avoid blind spots that can emerge from a narrow conceptual approach that inevitably biases the analyst’s view and leads to incomplete evidence.

To address these pitfalls, the framework offers a systematic account of all behavioural drivers of empirical importance in the literature.

In many cases, the implicit models behind SBC strategies and interventions are too simplistic, centred around the idea that people do not change their practice because they are not aware and do not know: they are missing key information (the consequences, the alternatives, the risks, the benefits, etc.) and should be enlightened or educated. This expert-driven philosophy postulates that human beings are fully rational (they are not) and has even influenced the way some approaches are labelled, reflected in denominations such as ‘health education’ or ‘hygiene promotion’. This often results in an overreliance on communication campaigns that are not behaviourally informed and can be mapped as shown in Image 2.

**Image 2** The logic of traditional and dominant behavioural interventions and strategies

But human behaviours are much more complex. In many instances, people do not simply consider the benefits and costs of a choice and then make a rational decision on the best course of action. Making the public more aware of an issue can be important in creating an environment conducive for change, but running effective campaigns is quite difficult (Kahan, 2013; Lilienfeld and Arkowitz, 2014). Also, knowledge and awareness alone are poor predictors of behaviours, given the criticality of other cognitive, social and structural drivers, and the multiple effects between these (Ajzen, et al., 2011; Allen and Ferrand, 1999; Finger, 1994; Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002).

As such, providing individuals with the right information will rarely automatically translate into the ‘optimal choice’.

People are highly emotional and influenced by their environment, by those who matter to them and by others they interact with. What is happening around a person – in other words, context – matters as much as what she thinks herself.
As a result, social and behaviour change programming should always consist in multi-faceted strategies and tactics winning people’s hearts and minds, but also winning the crowd and shaping the environment to induce positive actions (Bandura, 2001; Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Golden et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2017; Pajares, 2002; Rogers, 2010).

Finally, because information-processing abilities are limited, humans rely on mental shortcuts, namely heuristics. These heuristics can break down in systematic ways leading to cognitive biases that may translate into ‘apparent’ flaws in judgement or ‘logical’ decision-making (Haselton, Nettle and Andrews, 2005; Laibson, 1997; O’Donoghue and Rabin, 1999a; Thaler, 1985). Eventually, people make most judgements and choices automatically, not deliberately.

Accordingly, at the core of our framework lies a theory of individual behaviour being driven by a wide range of factors, including social and structural ones. A variety of internal and external factors impact and influence what individuals believe, expect and prefer, and eventually, do. These factors come into the framework as enablers or constraints on human action.

**Endorsing such complexity for individual behaviour advocates for more evidence-based programming, since default and one-size-fits-all solutions are unlikely to address the right motives in the right way. Formative research is the critical condition for driving programmatic decisions and making efficient investments.**
A SYNTHESIS OF DECISION-MAKING AND BEHAVIOURAL THEORIES AND MODELS

This section offers an analysis of 25 perspectives, theories and models that focus on decision-making and behaviour. It aims to offer a straightforward overview of some of the most recognized, sound and tested contemporary approaches to human behaviour, and to identify the concepts and constructs that will constitute the drivers included in the Behavioural Drivers Model.

1 Attribution Theory
2 Behavioural economic theories
3 Communication for Social Change Model
4 Community engagement models
5 Complex Systems Theory
6 Decision-theoretic model of collective behaviour
7 Diffusion of Innovations Theory
8 Evolutionary theory of cognitive biases
9 Flower for Sustained Health
10 Social theories of gender
11 Health Belief Model
12 Ideation Theory
13 Integrated Behavioural Model
14 Media effects
15 Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour Model
16 Self-efficacy Theory
17 Social Learning and Social Cognitive Theory
18 Socio-Ecological Model
19 Social marketing and community-based social marketing
20 Social movements
21 Social Network Theory and orbits of influence
22 Social norms theories
23 Sociology of organizations
24 Theory of normative social behaviour
25 Transtheoretical Model (Stages of Change)

These theories and models are selected because of their importance in the literature, and because they offer the conceptual ground to explore a wide variety of behavioural motives. Some of them may only be used in an abstract manner, others have been directly applied in the field, and others are considered because they include a complex integration for a wide range of determinants.

1 Attribution Theory (Heider, 1959; Weiner, 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Attribution Theory builds on the fact that the human mind is inclined to making attributions about what causes an event. It theorizes that attributions are shaped by such factors as:</td>
<td>Attribution improves the general understanding of a behaviour: what causes it; what can prevent it. For example, if what happens in life is attributed to external forces and seen as an uncontrollable event (independent of efforts on the person’s end), then that person will fail to change her own situation.</td>
<td>Locus of control plays a role in several subsequent models and theories demonstrating the importance of the concepts of ability and efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• perception of locus of control (something happens due to an internal or external factor or both – e.g., one’s effort, or luck, or a combination),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• controllability (e.g., if a cause can be controlled or is beyond the person’s influence), and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• stability (e.g., if driving factors can be changed, or are permanent as is).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 **Behavioural economics theories** (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Laibson, 1997; O’Donoghue and Rabin, 1999; Rabin, 1993; Strotz, 1955; Thaler, 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural economics is a deviation from the standard model of rational agents in economics. It has roots in Prospect Theory (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979) as a descriptive theory of how agents make choices under uncertainty. People make choices based on the potential value of gains and losses, and these gains and losses are evaluated using heuristics and biases: this is the perspective of a quasi-rational actor. Other behavioural economic theories attempt to incorporate fairness into social preferences (Rabin, 1993), adapt Prospect Theory to other domains (Thaler, 1985), incorporate descriptive models of intertemporal preferences into economic models (Laibson, 1997; O’Donoghue and Rabin, 1999; Strotz, 1955), etc.</td>
<td>Behavioural economic theories are generally descriptive and thus carry few assumptions about behaviours. They often model heuristics and biases used by human beings in decision-making (see Kahneman and Tversky, 1979).</td>
<td>Findings by behavioural economic theories stress factors of limited rationality and cognitive biases. They are important to provide a realistic account of human decision-making and behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 **Communication for Social Change Model** (Figueroa et al., 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Communication for Social Change (CFSC) Model brings attention to the central role of a catalyst, either internal (e.g., stimulus from signs of an epidemic, toxic elements in the water supply) or external (e.g., a change agent, an innovation, policies, technology, mass media) to a community. This catalyst leads to dialogue and collective action within a community to tackle a concern or problem. The CFSC model lays out the influence that catalysts, external constraints, and individual and social changes each exert on community dialogue and collective action, which is the intermediate step to make a societal impact. Practitioners can use this layout as an informed tool to track their progress in facilitating community dialogue and collective action.</td>
<td>The model suggests that as a community undergoes dialogues and acts collectively, members learn to cooperate more effectively for future problem solving. This is partly because each successful dialogue and collective action process will enhance the community’s capacity to resolve other communal concerns by improving their leadership, participation, equity, collective efficacy, sense of ownership, social cohesion and social norms.</td>
<td>The CFSC model provides a detailed unpacking of all aspects related to community dynamics and external influences in a collective change process, listing critical drivers and conditions for collective change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 **Community engagement models** (Hashagen, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are many models that address how to engage communities using different processes (such as community planning). Users should be aware of two characteristics of these models. • First, they facilitate communication between an entity that initiates the engagement programme and a community, and vice versa. • Second, a good model would consider important components such as • capacity (support empowerment), • inclusion (include diverse, marginalized members), • resources (always start with what a community presently has), • community organization (encourage local groups for mutual care and interests), • listening and learning (ensure an interactive partnership with community members), and • effective participation (multilevel participation).</td>
<td>Engagement should be built and maintained by partners, the ‘governance system’ and the community. For behaviour change to result from community engagement, there needs to be a strong sense of community among those joining the movements. Once a strong relationship has been established, changes in behaviour will be retained even in no-action times.</td>
<td>Community dynamics and collective resources capture the role of group foundation as well as a strong sense of belonging for a successful community engagement. The role of institutions and governing entities is critical in shaping people’s lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Complex Systems Theory (Ladyman, Lambert and Wiesner, 2013; Wiesner et al., 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A complex system is an idea embraced by complexity science that, when satisfactorily defined and properly measured, can unify current branches of sciences under the same umbrella to “understand systems the behaviour of which has proved difficult to predict and control thus far, such as the human brain and the world economy” (Ladyman, Lambert and Wiesner, 2013, p.34). For example, a physical account of complex system would be “an ensemble of many elements which are interacting in a disordered way, resulting in robust organization and memory” (p.57). Such systems generate data series of high statistical complexity.</td>
<td>A complex system usually assumes non-linearity, feedback (received from neighbouring elements), spontaneous order (resulting from uncoordinated interactions among elements), robustness and lack of central control (resilient to internal and external perturbations), emergence (of elements from fundamental physics), hierarchical organization, and numerosity (i.e., consisting of a large number of elements that engage in many interactions).</td>
<td>The Behavioural Drivers Model should depict the complexity and embrace the multicausality, multidimensionality and interdependency of cognitive, social and structural phenomena. This demands an aware and open disposition to evaluate a number of variables when establishing what factors are driving behaviours in a given context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Decision-theoretic model of collective behaviour (Bicchieri, 2006; 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on decision theory, this model distinguishes diverse types of collective behaviours from one another by measuring factual beliefs, personal normative beliefs (prudential and moral/religious), empirical expectations, normative expectations and conditional preferences. Generally, when factual beliefs and personal normative beliefs are sufficient to drive an action, the behaviour is non-social (since the act depends only on what someone believes about or expects of herself). When empirical or normative expectations are necessary to drive a behaviour, it is social (since the act depends on beliefs about what others do or others think you should do).</td>
<td>The conditionality of a preference (whether the behaviour depends on beliefs about others) to act is really what sets “collective” behaviours apart. Compliance with customs and moral norms, for example, will happen regardless of social expectations. In contrast, descriptive and social norms are interdependent behaviours, and compliance with each depends on someone having the relevant social expectations.</td>
<td>This theory highlights the criticality of individuals’ beliefs and expectations regarding a practice, which might or might not be sufficient to drive behaviour. The motivational profile for each collective behaviour can vary, and can include strong social expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The theory of diffusion of innovations attempts to model the spread of innovations over time in a human group. The four main elements of this are: • the innovation in question, • the communication channels through which messages transmit from one individual to another, • time elapsed in various processes, and • a social system of interrelated units that are engaged in joint problem solving to accomplish a common goal. It creates a set of profiles, which follow a normal distribution (bell curve) from early to late adopters.</td>
<td>The theory’s major assumption is that the diffusion of all types of innovations is a general process, not bound by the type of innovation, who the adopters are, or the place or culture. Another assumption is that information actually flows and is mostly one-way (senders to receivers).</td>
<td>From a behavioural perspective, early adopters will often be positive deviants and innovations will constitute emerging alternatives spoken about in the communication space, which can be a starting point to influence change of a majority of people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8 Evolutionary theory of cognitive biases  
(Haselton, Nettle and Andrews, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evolutionary theory of cognitive biases explains the existence of “errors” in human cognition from an evolutionary viewpoint. Cognitive biases are inferences or beliefs that appear to lack sound evidence judging from a logical point of view. The evolutionary approach to cognitive biases assumes and hypothesizes that the human mind is domain-specific and that cognitive biases are “features” emerging to accommodate such specificity. Taken as part of human cognitive function as a whole, cognitive biases seem to be erroneous and harmful. However, each cognitive bias arises and evolves to serve as an efficient decision-making mechanism in some specific situation where it may be helpful. For example, heuristics such as stereotypes, and one-reason decision making exist because, from an evolutionary point of view, quickly forming opinions in certain circumstances can be advantageous.</td>
<td>When a bias exists, it can prevent a person from accepting a need to change the current practice and even make her reject others’ attempts to create change. Finding a way to shift the situation away from one that triggers the cognitive bias or highlighting how shortcuts in reasoning do not apply to a context may prevent the individual from using the shortcut and make her question if such a way of thinking is still valid for the current context.</td>
<td>Cognitive biases and their effects compound our understanding of the world as our brain filters information. But they can also reside in the social sphere. For example, heuristics explain why norms, customs and group examples anchor behaviours: they set out precedents that appeal as shortcut solutions to individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9 Flower for Sustained Health Model  
(Cislaghi and Heise, 2018; Institute for Reproductive Health, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Flower for Sustained Health Model is a representation of normative and behaviour change for adolescent sexual and reproductive health. Behaviour is driven by an interplay of several factors such as power relations, individual factors, institutional structures, resources available, social factors and gender dynamics. Health and gender outcomes are interconnected, with social and gender norms influencing health and gender outcomes, which in turn influence each other.</td>
<td>Power plays a central role in social and gender norms related to adolescent behaviours, with power relations influencing whether group members decide to comply with a norm, and some norms persisting because individuals who benefit from them enforce their compliance. The model also adopts the model of social norms used by Cialdini and others (Cialdini et al., 1990).</td>
<td>Power elements should be highlighted in various components of social and behaviour change, from community dynamics to social norms. The compliance with these norms is driven by a variety of reasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10 Social theories of gender

10A Gender, masculinity and femininity (Connell, 2013; Gardiner, 2005; Kimmel and Bridges, 2011; West and Zimmerman, 1987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender is a social structure constructed from the multiple relations that could arise between a man and a woman (or two men, or two women), such as economic power, and affective and symbolic relations. Conceptually, masculinity and femininity are like gender in that they are socially constructed; that is, time, place and context all play a role in creating what masculinity means. The same man or woman will have different conceptions of masculinity or femininity as they age; different cultures perceive different sets of attitudes and behaviours to be masculine or feminine; masculinity or femininity can be defined in two different ways in two different settings visited the same day by the same person (e.g., household vs. social event, sports club vs. family reunion, etc.).</td>
<td>Sex is about biological criteria (e.g., XX or XY chromosomes). Sex category alludes to membership with one category that is achieved through behavioural characteristics of that sex category (male and female).</td>
<td>Gender should be a central factor to any behavioural change model. It is crucial in two ways: • first, looking at how people’s own gender biases and beliefs are at play when making a decision in a given situation or context; and • second, how dominant gender views, inequities and their social enforcement may buffer or facilitate behavioural change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10B Gender norms (Marcus and Harper, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender norms are informal rules and shared social expectations that distinguish expected behaviours on the basis of gender. Gender norms are closely linked to dynamics of power in social relations between men and women. Women and girls are often disadvantaged by gender norms because of the distribution of power and resources that ascribe men authority (social/political power) and the role of the breadwinner (economic power).</td>
<td>Concepts of masculinity and femininity define underlying ideologies for unequal gender norms through the lifecycle of girls and boys.</td>
<td>The Behavioural Drivers Model, by applying a gender transformative lens, should consider the role of power in social relations, the importance of childhood socialization, how gender-related norms become embedded in institutions, and how gender norms are produced and reproduced through daily interactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10C Gender socialization (Witt, 2000, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender norms (socially acceptable ways of acting out gender) are learned from birth through childhood and adolescent socialization. We learn what is expected of our gender roles from what our parents teach us, as well as what we learn at school, within friend groups, through religious or cultural teachings, from the media, and from various other social institutions.</td>
<td>As gender is socially constructed, gender role development is a socialized process in which a child is oriented toward a specific gender, traditional or not.</td>
<td>Family, friends, institutions and media all exert a deterministic influence on a child’s (and future adult’s) gender role. The individual background of a person will have a significant influence on how gender is applied to her/his decisions and behaviours; and the overall socialization process will condition attitudes and multiple social norms. Responsibly transforming the preconceptions rooted in experience and exposure is a key aspect of change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11 Health Belief Model (Carpenter, 2010; Stretcher and Rosenstock, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Health Belief Model explores the role of beliefs – or one’s perception of various aspects of her wellness – in changing health-related behaviour. Health behaviour is influenced by the perception of seriousness, susceptibility, benefits and barriers. Knowledge and self-efficacy also affect how each individual perceives the probability of change of her own health behaviour.</td>
<td>For an individual whose behaviour may lead to health-related problems, the Health Belief Model suggests that knowledge and self-efficacy determines if the person will commit to a change in current behaviour. If two individuals share a similar perception of seriousness, susceptibility, and benefits of and barriers to change, it is likely that their self-efficacy will determine if they make a decision to change.</td>
<td>Self-efficacy, interest and cognitive biases can strongly influence an individual’s perception of the seriousness of a problem, her susceptibility, and the pros and cons of adopting a more protective behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 Ideation Theory (Babalola et al., 2008; Health Communication Capacity Collaborative, 2015; Kincaid, 2000; Kincaid et al., 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideation is the process by which new ways of thinking arise and diffuse. Most often, this process occurs via communication and social interaction among members of a community. Instructive and public communication, respectively, build the knowledge and environment that are needed for behaviour change. Directive and nondirective communication (e.g., promotion and entertainment, respectively) affect ideational factors such as beliefs, self-efficacy and personal advocacy. As communication changes knowledge, ideation and environment, these intermediate factors, in turn, influence intention and behaviour.</td>
<td>A compound score can be obtained for community members to measure their ‘readiness’ for change. For example, one is more likely to adopt and keep a new behaviour than others if she knows about the new behaviour, has a positive attitude toward it, believes others support it, talks to others about it, and feels good about doing it.</td>
<td>The Ideation Theory depicts the critical interplay between cognitive elements (e.g., beliefs, values, self-image), emotional elements (e.g., self-efficacy, emotional state), and the social and structural environment, through a sequence in which these various elements can be influenced by communications and lead to intent of behaviours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13 Integrated Behavioural Model (Kasprzyk et al., 1998; Montano and Kasprzyk, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Integrated Behavioural Model (IBM) is an expansion of the Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour Model (see number 15 following) that also incorporates constructs from other influential theories. The most important factor in the IBM is the intent to perform a behaviour. Intent is determined by attitude, perceived norms and personal agency. Four other factors also influence behaviours: • possessing the knowledge and skills to perform the behaviour, • salience of the behaviour, • environmental constraints, and • habits.</td>
<td>As with the Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behaviour, the most important assumption in the IBM is that intent to perform a behaviour is the primary determinant of a behaviour, since without motivation a person is unlikely to perform an action. Other assumptions are imported from other theories: the theory of social norms, the social cognitive theory, and self-efficacy theory, as well as various assumptions related to the factors themselves.</td>
<td>Some of the central factors to the IBM are attitude, intent, social norms, self-efficacy, governing entities, habits, structural barriers, personal characteristics, and salience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14 Media effects (Bryant and Oliver, 2009; Scheufele, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media effects result from means of communication that instigate cognitive biases in viewers, listeners and readers. Saturating the news with a topic leads the audience into thinking this topic is predominantly important over others (agenda-setting effect), causing availability and probably representativeness heuristics. Describing political landscapes in favour of one side causes a framing effect. Showcasing accounts of violence, gender-based standards, or ethnicity-based prejudice causes a priming effect – especially harmful for young viewers who can be more likely to mimic what they have seen prevailing in video games, movies, or in the news.</td>
<td>Media effects influence behaviours because of the particular way human cognition works. Agenda-setting and priming effects exist because the human mind is assumed to process information based on what it has ‘seen’ before; this previous input also forms certain attitudes toward what is being currently processed. The human mind is also assumed to use a ‘frame of reference’ when evaluating an option. It guides the mind in assessing the outcome of choosing to do one thing over another.</td>
<td>The communication environment from multi-media campaigns to face-to-face dialogues through marketing can set important media effects. While agenda setting, priming and framing have been exploited for personal or group benefits in any typical political, social, or economic battles, they are also important in determining the adoption of specific behaviours. People’s exposure to these effects is a key driver.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15 Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour Model (Ajzen, 2002; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour Model encompasses the cognitive roots of behaviour. It defines attitude as the centrepiece of human behaviours. Personal beliefs affect attitudes toward specific behaviours. These attitudes in turn influence intentions to carry out such behaviours.</td>
<td>Changes to beliefs will carry over to behaviours. For example, a belief that female genital mutilation is preposterous will form an attitude unfavourable of this practice, which will greatly decrease the intention to comply with such a practice.</td>
<td>The main takeaway for the transtheoretical model for social and behaviour change is the centrality of individual attitudes, and the link between individual beliefs and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16 Self-efficacy Theory (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy is a person’s own perception of what she is capable of doing given certain circumstances. Past experience, observed attempts by others, verbal persuasion, and physiological and emotional states determine self-efficacy.</td>
<td>As self-efficacy is assumed to hold the key to a person’s perception of what can and cannot be done, changes to one’s self-efficacy level can induce changes to intention and, thus, action.</td>
<td>Self-efficacy deserves a focal position in any model/theory that explores behaviour change, with subcomponents encompassing cognitive, emotional and physical attributes. There must also be attention to collective efficacy, i.e., what a group of people think they can or cannot do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 17 Social Learning Theory and Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 2001; Pajares, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandura’s Social Learning Theory serves as the foundation for the Social Cognitive Theory. The former theory adds the importance of social contexts to the process by which a person (especially a child) makes sense of the world around her. The Social Cognitive Theory posits that personal, environmental and behavioural factors impact each other as a person makes decisions. Personal factors such as knowledge and attitudes affect how the person interprets the environment, which then changes outcome behaviours. Carried forward, changes in behaviours also induce changes to the environment.</td>
<td>Both theories highlight the relationship between the cognitive realm and the social realm of a person. Changes to any component – personal, behavioural, or environmental – will trigger changes in the others. Behaviour change can be induced by changing how an individual processes input information perceived from the surroundings. In turn, a change in behaviour will bring about new perception of input information.</td>
<td>Both social and cognitive realms are at the interplay of the adoption of behaviours and their enforcement. Importantly, socialization processes play a central role in setting individual behavioural parameters. And individual behaviour change can be achieved by altering the physical and social environments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18 Socio-Ecological Model (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Golden et al., 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Socio-Ecological Model is a perspective that maps together several factors that shape a person’s behaviours. There are five concentric layers of factors, from innermost to outermost:  
- **intrapersonal** (e.g., beliefs, knowledge and skills),  
- **interpersonal** (e.g., family, friends and colleagues),  
- **institutional** (e.g., services, organizations and social institutions),  
- **community** (e.g., relationships among organizations and social norms), and  
- **societal** (e.g., national, state and local laws and policies).  | Assuming interconnection between the factors both within and across layers, the Socio-Ecological Model suggests that changes at any of the five levels can spread to any of the other levels and eventually induce changes in behaviours. | This theoretical guide highlights the interconnectedness between the individual and collective levels, and importantly puts forward the influence on behaviours coming from the policy sphere, the access to services and institutions, and the various concentric organizational levels trying to influence what people do. |

### 19 Social marketing and community-based social marketing (Andreasen, 1994; McKenzie-Mohr, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social marketing is a deviation from conventional mass marketing that targets specific behaviours to improve individuals and community welfare. Community-based social marketing is an alternative method to traditional information-dense marketing. It stresses carefully selecting a behaviour to promote, identifying potential barriers and benefits, strategizing behaviour change tools, testing in focus groups, and evaluating interventions after scaling up. This method focuses a great deal on the idea that longer formative research and higher short-term costs will be paid off with longer-lasting effects and lower long-term costs.</td>
<td>Practitioners need to understand that social marketing should only be used for the improvement of ‘social good,’ not personal or group purposes. Practitioners of community-based social marketing have to overcome reluctance to switch to a new technique – especially one that requires a great deal of attention to details through formative research, reviewing tools in use, and evaluating the results.</td>
<td>Personal interest and communication are two factors where practitioners of community-based social marketing would need to focus the most. Personal interests provide inputs for the customization of marketing strategies, and effective communication sets the foundation for testing and evaluation. The importance of formative research and localization of the process remains the main takeaway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 20 Social movements (Blumer, 1995; Eder, 2015; Nulman and Schlembach, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Social movements can be viewed as collective enterprises to establish a</td>
<td>Social movements occur at all levels – from small scale to large scale. Events</td>
<td>Social movements are important drivers, which can be leveraged to trigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new order of life” (Blumer, 1995). In general, a social movement starts</td>
<td>can trigger trends of mobilization for social movements. For example, the global</td>
<td>change or mobilize. Political, economic and social contexts embedded in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out as an increasing accumulation of individual acts that aim for similar</td>
<td>financial crisis of 2007/08 mobilized contemporary movements that are globally</td>
<td>community, governing system and structural factors also highlight important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end goals and nearly always face a challenge to sustain the action. The key</td>
<td>connected while leaving each sub-movement to lead the struggle in their own ‘space’</td>
<td>background elements for social movements to occur and expand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is to establish social relations to hold the members of a movement together</td>
<td>or ‘context’— e.g., the Greeks in Greece, the Egyptians in Egypt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even in times of no action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 21 Social network theory (Burt, 1987; Granovetter, 1973; Katz, 1957; Liu et al., 2017; Rogers, 2010; Scott, 1991; Valente, 1996; Valente and Pitts, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The social network theory attempts to model social structures made up of</td>
<td>Social networks can influence behaviour, even when ties are weak, or the network</td>
<td>The communication environment, community dynamics and social influences play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social actors, sets of dyadic interactions, and other social interactions.</td>
<td>relation is distant. Empirical data on network effects is often prone to issues</td>
<td>central roles in the creation and maintenance of a social network and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks can influence individuals when an individual is connected to others</td>
<td>of identifying causality, especially for observational studies. However experimental,</td>
<td>behaviours of individuals forming it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who engage in a particular behaviour, and who may persuade the individual</td>
<td>field and longitudinal studies have helped test network influence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to adopt a new behaviour. This can occur through various mechanisms such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as persuasion, modelling, dissemination of information, support, social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressure, etc. Specific concepts in the social network theory include network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thresholds (Valente, 1996), the theory of weak ties (Granovetter, 1973),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structural equivalence (Burt, 1987), the two-step flow of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Katz, 1957) and the diffusion of innovations (Rogers, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22 Social norms theories (Bicchieri, 2006 and 2016; Brennan et al., 2013; Cialdini et al., 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social norms are behavioural rules that individuals prefer to follow</td>
<td>Human beings can act against their narrow self-interest because of their beliefs</td>
<td>Conditionality of beliefs is central when thinking about how to identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional on believing that 1 others follow the rule (empirical</td>
<td>about others and others’ beliefs about them. Changing norms can lead to changing</td>
<td>norms. Social norms play an important role in the realm of social influence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations), and/or that 2 others expect the individual to follow the</td>
<td>behaviour in both positive and negative ways. For example, telling people that</td>
<td>sometimes with effects across numerous fields of work (overarching or ‘meta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rule (normative expectations).</td>
<td>other people don’t recycle may cause them to recycle less, while telling them that</td>
<td>norms’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Bicchieri’s work (2006 and 2016), social norms exist when both (1) and</td>
<td>others expect them to recycle may cause them to recycle more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) are satisfied. In Cialdini and colleague’s work (Cialdini et al., 1990),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) is called a descriptive norm and (2) is an injunctive norm. Other work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treats social norms as clusters of attitudes (e.g., Brennan et al., 2013),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but this is not applicable when individuals act against their self-interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of (1) and (2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23 Sociology of organizations
(Bernoux, 1990; Bernoux et al., 1996; Crozier and Friedberg, 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theorized within and for the business world, the sociology of organizations mobilizes key concepts for the study of collective processes: stakeholders, interests and strategies, relationships and power (exercised by constraint or legitimacy), and coordination for collective action. The actors of a system integrate the constraints of this system into their strategy or ‘actor’s logic’. Collective actions are built based on multiple individual behaviours and interests, which can be contradictory. Individual behaviours are social and need to be studied in relation to the environment and the norms produced by the group. The order that emanates from the ‘system’ remains a major constraint to action.</td>
<td>Behaviours result from a strategic intent of the individual and the possibility for her to make choices. Everyone tries to find a balance between their own objectives and the opportunities that the organization leaves them. Individual strategies are usually rational but of limited rationality. The actor opts for the least unsatisfactory strategy.</td>
<td>The ‘theory of the strategic actor’ is particularly relevant for the analysis of group processes, where individual interests and power plays are at the heart of choices and interactions. The theory also highlights the crucial role of institutions and governance systems in influencing individual behaviours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Theory of normative social behaviour (Real and Rimal, 2007; Rimal, 2008; Rimal and Real, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The theory of normative social behaviour (TNSB) attempts to better understand the conditions in which social norms impact behaviours. It models the underlying relation between normative perceptions and behaviour change by differentiating descriptive norms from injunctive ones, and attempting to explain the underlying cognitive mechanisms that moderate the relation between descriptive norms and behavioural intentions.</td>
<td>The TNSB is based on the premise that descriptive norms affect individual behaviour through interaction with three normative mechanisms acting as moderators: injunctive norms, outcome expectations, and group identity.</td>
<td>Group identity is an important reason for people to comply with what is perceived as the normal behaviour, showing that norms and social influence are enforced by a plurality of mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Transtheoretical model (Marshall and Biddle, 2001; Prochaska, DiClemente and Norcross, 1992; Sutton, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core ideas</th>
<th>Major assumptions</th>
<th>Key takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The transtheoretical model theorizes that an individual goes through different processes to move from one stage of behaviour change to another until they reach a desired outcome. Individuals are the most important agent of change; as long as an individual is able to move from one stage to the next, she will be able to work through the challenge and change her behaviour.</td>
<td>An individual might not recognize that she needs to change a behaviour when in the pre-contemplation stage; contemplation follows as one weighs the pros and cons of change. After deciding to change, the next stage is preparation when plans are made to realize the decision. In the action stage, change might or might not be observed, but attempts are made to reach the end goal. Maintenance occurs when efforts are consistently made to prevent relapses.</td>
<td>Agency is closely related to the core idea of the transtheoretical model: individuals are the carriers of willpower and action to change. Social influence is important in nudging an individual to recognize the need for a change, encouraging actions to change (especially needed following failed attempts), and building a supportive environment to maintain the desired behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1 Nature of the model and core structuring concepts

The development of the Behavioural Drivers Model (BDM) comes in response to a pragmatic need: the goal is not to enter the debate about which model or theory among those listed above is ‘the best’, but to create a tool to inform practical work on real life problems.

Rather than providing a new model, the BDM articulates research and theories that already exist, bringing multiple perspectives together (transtheoretical model). This is made easier by the fact that, fundamentally, none of the theories described in the previous chapter are mutually exclusive or contradictory. On the contrary, most can coexist from an applied perspective and enrich the way we analyse and try to influence behaviours.

According to the various components of the conceptual framework, the model considers behaviours to be the complex result of the influence of multiple determinants, in a socio-ecological approach. The BDM presents and defines concepts and suggests a representation of the relationship between the various forces that can affect behaviours. That noted, no constructs are prioritized because they have greater empirical or variance weight in driving behaviours – this prioritization is left for the work on concrete behaviours in specific contexts, through localized formative research and testing.

As a model, the BDM is voluntarily agnostic – not related to a specific topic area – therefore, it can be used as a single reference point across sectors of interventions and be applicable to a broad variety of situations. More specialized frameworks exist in the literature (e.g., for adolescent reproduction, family planning, community engagement, etc.).

The BDM starts by answering the fundamental question raised in chapter 5: why do people do what they do? As a first element of response, all drivers mentioned in the theories analysed in chapter 6 fall into three main categories:

- **Psychology**, gathering individual cognitive and emotional drivers;
- **Sociology**, for determinants related to interactions within families, communities, groups and society at large;
- **Environment**, for structural elements such as institutions, policies, systems and services, infrastructures, information, etc.

Under each category, the drivers can be organized according to **two levels of depth**:

- **Level 1 drivers**: the higher-level or main drivers, which we will call “factors”
- **Level 2 drivers**: each factor is unpacked into the several dimensions of which it composed
7.2 The main behavioural factors (Level 1 drivers)

Informed by the various theories that compose the conceptual framework (see chapter 6), the drivers of empirical relevance under each of the three categories are presented below.

**Psychology**

### Image 4 Psychological factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COGNITIVE BIASES</td>
<td>The information my brain is willing to consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST</td>
<td>What I want; how appealing change is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
<td>My opinion about a behaviour; how I feel about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EFFICACY</td>
<td>What I think I can do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENT</td>
<td>What I plan on doing; what I am ready for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITED RATIONALITY</td>
<td>The reasons why I don’t do what I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>Who I am.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sociology**

**Environment**
Cognitive biases
Cognitive biases refer to the use of mental models for filtering and interpreting information, often to make sense of the world around us. The human mind is lazy, and cognition requires all sorts of shortcuts to make sense of things. These shortcuts lead to errors: we make mistakes in reasoning, evaluating, remembering, and, as a result, choices are almost always based on imperfect information. Shortcuts are part of Automatic Thinking (as opposed to Deliberative Thinking), which is when someone draws conclusions based on limited information. Most of the time, people consider what automatically comes to mind to fill in missing information, associate the situation with what they already know, make assumptions, jump to conclusions, and eventually decide through a narrow frame depicting a biased picture of a situation. This brain process is widespread and implies less effort.

From a social perspective, these mental models are linked to ways of thinking, often passed down across generations, which include stereotypes and ideologies.

Interest
Interest characterizes how sympathetic people are to an alternative practice, how much they want to know about it, be involved in activities around it, or try it out. This combines some cost/benefit thinking with a dimension of appeal and desire on a more emotional level.

Attitude
An attitude is what someone thinks or feels about something. Mixing cognitive and emotional elements, attitude defines people's predisposition to respond positively or negatively to an idea, a situation, or a suggested change. It is one of the key drivers of an individual's choice of action, and probably the most crucial factor shaping behaviour change among psychological elements.

Socio-economic background, religion and other individual characteristics are important drivers of an attitude. When measuring attitude during surveys, the 'demographics' questions will help to cross-reference these respondents' characteristics and allow for a better understanding of their influence.

Self-efficacy
Self-efficacy combines a person's objective capability to perform a change and her belief about this ability. Positive self-efficacy is a necessary precondition to taking steps towards new practices. As with attitude, individual characteristics are usually a key driver of a person's self-efficacy. Poverty, for example, has a significant cognitive burden that makes it difficult for the poorest to think deliberately, see themselves as capable, have faith in the possibility of change and seize opportunities. On top of more classic empowerment efforts, interventions on self-perceptions can be powerful sources of change.

Intent
The readiness to change is the factor at the centre of the individual change process. When an individual is no longer reluctant to try a new practice, and more importantly willing to try it, the likelihood of change increases dramatically. But for intent to be converted into action, motivation is not enough: external and social factors must align in a supportive way.

Limited rationality
People do not always make decisions that are in their best interest. There are instances where we don’t really know why we do or don’t do things. A reason may be because it has always been done like this, even if it seems irrational. Several psychological traits (e.g., feeling more comfortable in a set routine, finding inaction to be easier, feeling overly positive about a choice previously made, etc.) are part of ‘human nature’ and can be used to explain why people don’t behave the way we would predict from a rational perspective. Limited or bounded rationality refers to this characteristic of human cognition that it is restricted in its resources (thinking capacity, available input information, and the amount of time allotted). As a consequence, people have a tendency to find simpler and easier ways to make decisions and act, regardless of intelligence. The concept of bounded rationality is very close to that of cognitive miser.
**Personal characteristics**
As a factor driving behaviours, personal characteristics involve the influence of a wide set of physiological and socio-demographical determinants, and relate to lifestyles. The main attributes include age, gender, ethnicity, life-cycle stage (regardless of age, certain moments in a person’s growth trajectory have strong influence on their behaviours, such as transitions from childhood to adolescence to adulthood), education level, social status (level of respect, competence, authority position, etc.), poverty level, religious affiliation, household composition, possible disorders and alcohol/drug use. These are overarching background elements with direct influence on all the psychological drivers, which we will unpack in the following sections of the document.

**Sociology**

**Image 5 Sociological factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL INFLUENCE</th>
<th>How others affect what I think, feel and do.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY DYNAMIC</td>
<td>The group’s collective capacity to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>META-NORMS</td>
<td>What defines and maintains the stratification, roles and power in a society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>The context in which I live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social influence**
Individual behaviours and decision-making are often driven by social factors. People are almost never fully autonomous thinkers, but rather influenced by, and concerned about others’ opinions and actions. We act as members of groups. How supportive a social environment is of individual change will sometimes condition the very possibility of change, in particular (but not only) when social norms are at play. Social norms are informal group rules influenced by the beliefs that members hold about what others in the group do and approve. Even in the absence of sanctions, which can be central to several norms, such beliefs usually exist and influence individual practices, because people seek to comply with the group’s identity. Norms can be both positive and negative.

**Community dynamic**
Community dialogue and collective action are key processes to produce change within a community. Members of a community acting collectively to deal with a shared problem and improve their lives will be a critical condition of success when issues to be addressed are social (in particular driven by social norms). The success of such processes increases the community’s collective capacity to solve future problems. The existence of such a dynamic (shared recognition of a problem with ongoing collective discussion or action), or in its absence, the collective capacity to engage in it, is a critical condition for social change. However, some groups or societies are more individualistic: there could be a social norm of staying out of other people’s business, and a low recognition of the existence and value of the ‘public good’.
**Meta-norms**

Meta-norms are underlying ideologies and unwritten rules, deeply entrenched in people’s culture and identity, cutting across sectors and conditioning a large number of behaviours. These meta-norms have a direct and strong influence on individual drivers (e.g., a person’s attitude or self-efficacy) as well as an indirect one as they are expressed through several derivative social norms and practices (e.g., gender inequity and patriarchy expressed through female genital mutilation (FGM), gender-based violence (GBV), child marriage, etc.) and structural elements (e.g., gender ideologies and power differentials institutionalized in laws and systems).

For the distinction between social norms and meta-norms, the Behaviour Drivers Model borrows the terminology and extends the concept from Robert Axelrod’s work in the 1980s on social cooperation (see Axelrod, 1986), in which he developed a theory that there is an upper norm ruling the fact that transgressors of lower-level norms are punished. In other words, a norm about norms. For him, this norm of enforcement is a ‘meta-norm’, and its existence is a condition for norms to emerge and remain stable. His work is still explored and improved by various scientists today (see for example Eriksson et al., 2017). In the BDM, following Axelrod’s idea, we extend this original concept to other second-order, deeper or overarching norms that also influence a range of social norms, but not simply by contributing to enforcing them (which is the case for the meta-norms related to the rule of law, the conflict resolution modalities and the decision-making patterns in families), but also sometimes by generating social norms (e.g., socialization processes, gender ideologies and perceptions of a child). So, we consider meta-norms as playing a role in both creating and maintaining social norms, and through these mechanisms, in preserving social organization, stratification, reproduction and power differentials among groups.

**Context**

Contextual factors include social, cultural and religious backgrounds; emergency and development contexts; migration and displacement conditions; and natural events and weather. These overarching situational elements will largely condition all other drivers: for example, being in humanitarian situations strongly impacts people’s decisions on a wide range of behaviours; similarly, socio-economic backgrounds partly explain the standard behaviours within given groups.

---

**Environment**

**Image 6 Environmental factors**

| COMMUNICATION ENVIRONMENT | The information and opinions I can be exposed to. |
| EMERGING ALTERNATIVES | Those who don’t think or behave like the majority; new things out there. |
| GOVERNING ENTITIES | How institutions influence what I do. |
| STRUCTURAL BARRIERS | Concrete things that prevent me from acting. |
| CONTEXT | The context in which I live. |
Communication environment
The information, opinions, arguments and stories we are exposed to have a significant role in shaping our attitudes and interests, and down the line our behaviours. This communication environment is formed by multiple channels and sources. Theories and analyses have long proven the influence of mass and social media on many aspects of our lives, but our views and beliefs are also conditioned by other sources such as the movies we watch, the songs we listen to, or the word on the street.

Emerging alternatives
People’s exposure to and awareness of those who have already chosen a different option, of voices carrying a different message and of influences which can trigger change is important, since dialogue in a community and personal action are rarely initiated spontaneously. The dynamic of change within a group usually starts with a catalyst or stimulus. Emerging alternatives can induce individual and collective actions.

Governing entities
Institutions, ruling bodies, socio-political or armed groups try to structure and organize society through various forms of peaceful or violent interactions with the population in an attempt to control them. As a result, these governing entities play a paramount role in shaping individual behaviours, through several institutional features (laws, systems, enforcers, etc.), and at various levels – from local authorities to international institutions through national governments.

Structural barriers
Structural barriers are bottlenecks that are not related to people’s willingness to change, or the legal and social environment, but often link to infrastructure, services and types of livelihoods, and are commonly consequences of poverty and underdevelopment.
**Behavioural Drivers Model Level 1**

When put together, these factors form the first level of the Behavioural Drivers Model. The psychological elements are organized along an individual decision-making pathway, influenced by the social and structural context in which these decisions are made. In the following diagram (Image 7), psychological drivers are shown in green, social ones in orange, environmental ones in blue, and overarching personal and contextual characteristics in grey.

**Image 7 Behavioural Drivers Model Level 1**

**7.3 Assumptions and limitations**

The Behavioural Driver Model is simplistic by nature, for multiple reasons.

First, it is focused on individual behaviour as the change objective. As such, the framework does not centre on social change nor does it focus on the community as the unit of change; however, these collective aspects are still paramount in the model. There are multiple elements influencing behaviours, including social ones, and despite this individual-centred approach, the BDM attempts to illustrate how humans think (mixing cognitive and emotional aspects) and how context shapes this thinking.

While not fully linear, the model indicates a general *reading direction* that suggests a sequence of events. There is a relation of anteriority and causality between certain elements: exposure to a new piece of information needs to happen before it can influence our attitude; a number of conditions related to interest and confidence usually have to be met before we intend to do something; a practice has to be tried out before becoming a routine; etc.

Nevertheless, we recognize that most of these behavioural drivers work simultaneously, and that there is more interplay between them and reciprocal influence than illustrated in Image 7. Drivers are entangled. Social norms, for example, are entangled in a web of beliefs, power relationships and structural factors. Applying a rigorous system-analysis approach to decision-making and embracing the complexity of these processes would produce a system map closer to a plate of spaghetti, as shown in Image 8.
This is why, when trying to capture such complexity, most authors use representations such as overlapping Venn diagrams: see for example the Flower for Sustained Health Model (Cislaghi and Heise, 2018). While acknowledging that this provides a more rigorous account of the various phenomena and their relationships from a theoretical perspective, we nonetheless choose to work with the simplified diagram presented in Image 7 to offer a more direct and easier link to operationalization and programming guidance (Part III).

Linearity is instructive for implementation, as it allows for planning and research exercises such as the development of ‘behavioural journeys’, behavioural pathways and theories of change, and allows for the identification of stages in the emergence and maintenance of behaviours. This will later guide the choice of activities, inform how to monitor implementation and the production of expected results before the theory of change can be improved in an iterative fashion.

Additionally, the representation of each driver in a separate box allows for mapping of specific interventions for each of them (see chapter 10), which helps make the model useful to practitioners and more directly applicable in the field.

For this reason, despite the shortcuts and approximations inherent in a sequence that tend to make things rigid when they are fluid, and siloed when they are interdependent, as a tool (and not as a theory) the BDM is of better help to our target audience if built with successive steps as depicted in Image 7. This is a trade-off with accuracy to help increase efficiency and the uptake of the model in programme design.
None of these factors operate in a bubble. However, not all factors will be important every single time. Often, a few factors will create critical bottlenecks or accelerators. When promoting positive discipline of children, for example, the main barrier could be the lack of self-efficacy of caregivers (not knowing how to use alternative forms of punishment, or being too stressed to be gentle and controlled), but in other cases, social influences and norms could contribute to perpetuating the collective behaviour, regardless of individual motives. The model remains a theoretical view that will likely never apply in full in a given situation or for a given behaviour. Formative research will always be necessary to:

- Identify which drivers are at play,
- Understand which of these are the most influential (the ‘weight’ of the drivers), and
- Try to find the real causality (if any) in the relationship between drivers.

As such, the user should not assume that the BDM is a blueprint of how behaviours unfold. Because human decision-making is very complex, successful behaviour change research and programming will require keeping an open mind to discoveries outside of models and being receptive to unexpected factors.

A diagram can be as sophisticated as possible, but will never be able to capture the complexity of real life. However, that does not prevent a good model from being the most helpful tool for trying to make sense of it.
7.4 Unpacking further into dimensions (Level 2 drivers)

When conducting formative research to understand why people do what they do, one will need to go deeper than the factors and analyse the various dimensions that compose each of these factors. In addition to informing programming with a more granular understanding of behavioural drivers, this will help measure the achievement of milestones, capturing how a programme may be making progress and successfully moving the needle on intermediary lower-level results before having an impact on behaviours, which can take much longer.

*Image 9  Behavioural Drivers Model Level 1*
Cognitive biases are some of the main biases described by psychologists as having a direct effect on our efforts to change behaviours. Trying to influence the way people process information (which is the result of evolutionary processes) can take significant effort. However, we need to make sure these biases are well considered and anticipated when designing communication programmes.

**Information avoidance**
Individuals might actively and/or unconsciously avoid information if this information can threaten their beliefs, or force them to act, or upset them, or simply because they are already overloaded with information. One can choose not to recognize and consider certain details about a subject matter, even when there is no cost to obtaining such details and there is a benefit to doing so.

**Availability heuristic**
We tend to overestimate the importance of information available to us. As a result, we refer to immediate examples that come to mind when making judgments, instead of acknowledging the need for more evidence.

**Anchoring**
Over-reliance on one trait of a subject or piece of information when making decisions. Anchoring often refers to people’s initial exposure to a piece of information (commonly a number) that serves as a reference point that influences subsequent opinions and judgements.

**Messenger effect**
The value we give to a piece of information is largely conditioned by its source. The level of trust, familiarity and credibility of a communication channel is a key driver of our receptiveness. An individual can be influenced in her judgement of a subject by the representative of that subject rather than by the subject itself.
Confirmation and belief bias
People easily ignore or criticize information that contradicts their existing beliefs and assumptions, and filter it in a way that supports their preconceptions and fits their thinking. This is an automatic process we use naturally to seek affirmation of our views, which can draw us to focus on details that are irrelevant in the larger picture.

Simplicity bias
We discard specifics to form generalities, reduce events and lists to their key elements, and favour simple-looking options over complex, ambiguous ones. We favour the immediate, reliable and tangible things in front of us, simplify probabilities and numbers to make them easier to comprehend, and think we know what others are thinking, as it tends to make life easier. We also simplify our vision of life by projecting our current mindset and assumptions onto the past and future.

Recency bias
Favouring the latest information, we tend to make wrong conclusions by emphasizing and overestimating the importance of recent events, experiences and observations, over those in the near or distant past.

Optimism bias
People tend to overestimate the probability of positive events and underestimate the probability of negative ones, including the risks they face in comparison to other people. Similarly, we notice flaws in others more easily than we notice flaws in ourselves (also referred to as self-serving bias). We also imagine things and people we are familiar with or fond of as better.

Representativeness heuristic
We fill in characteristics from stereotypes, generalities and prior histories. As a result, we make judgements about people and events based on how much they resemble others.

Cognitive dissonance
People experience psychological tension when they realize that they engage in behaviours inconsistent with the type of person they would like to be. The natural reaction is to reduce this tension, either by changing attitudes and behaviours or accepting a different self-image (which can be much harder).

Memory bias
What and how one remembers things is never objective. We edit and reinforce some memories after events, store memories differently based on how they were experienced (e.g., we better remember information we produce ourselves), are more likely to regard as accurate memories associated with significant events or emotions, and we notice things already memorized or repeated often. In summary, cognitive biases affect – both negatively and positively – the content and/or recollection of a memory.
Attention
We might or might not notice what is put in front of us. We often wrongly assume that people are properly informed about existing options because these options have been communicated to them. But making sure that people are informed and paying attention to what is suggested, or that promoters of behaviours manage to capture the attention of their audience, are key steps for a new behaviour to be considered. This is made harder by the fact that people tend to only listen to information that confirms their preconceptions (confirmation bias).

Feasibility
The extent to which the adoption of a new behaviour is perceived as feasible or not by a person in her actual situation (this is an individual self-assessment, non-objective).

Potential gains/avoided losses
The benefits that the person thinks she might get from change, especially in the short term (rapid gains tend to matter more in decision-making). These gains are not only material, but can be in terms of relationships, image, etc. Gains should also be understood as ‘avoided losses’, since a loss is often seen as much worse than its equivalent in gain is perceived as positive (human ‘loss aversion’).

Perceived risks
The possibility that something bad might happen as a result of an action or a change, including, but not limited to, in terms of safety and satisfaction of basic needs. People desire certainty even when it is counterproductive. Being overly risk-averse is a natural human bias.

Efforts needed
How practical and easy the change to a new behaviour is. The difficulty is not proportional to the likelihood of adoption: minor inconveniences (also known as ‘hassle factors’) might prevent us from acting in accordance with our intentions.

Affordability
The extent to which a person considers a change of practice to be within her financial means, combining costs and possible monetary incentives.
**Enjoyment**
How much someone likes or might like doing something, a cognitive and affective state that follows an activity where a sense of pleasure was experienced. This covers basic amusement as well as other forms of gratification and thrill, such as the feeling of power. Being passionate about something is a powerful driver for action. In economics, satisfaction and happiness are sometimes referred to as ‘utility’.

**Appeal**
Characterizes how attractive something is on a more emotional level. As understood in psychology, appeal is a stimulus – visual or auditory – that influences its targets’ attitude towards a subject. Many types of psychological appeals have been exploited by the advertising and marketing industry, such as fear appeal, sex appeal, genetic fallacy, or guilt by association.

**Desire**
A powerful feeling of craving something, or of wishing for something to happen. This sense of longing follows a variety of core human drives, such as the need to bond, to possess what we do not have, to love and reproduce, to dominate, etc. Desire can be both conscious and unconscious.

**Attitude**

**Values**
What we perceive as good, right or acceptable, including our inner convictions of right and wrong, and of what good conscience requires. These principles are strong drivers of standard behaviours. Individual values are directly influenced by moral norms, and can be liberal or conservative. Some powerful values include individual and collective honour, caring for the family, loyalty, authority and respect, sanctity and purity, and liberty.

**Aspirations**
Personal goals and dreams, vision for future-self and hopes and ambitions for achieving things. Examples of these include aspiring to be the best parent possible; to be an independent woman; to be a successful student; etc. It reflects what someone truly desires in life.
Awareness and knowledge
These concepts are interdependent but not interchangeable. Awareness is the consciousness of a fact (e.g., being conscious that violent discipline has negative consequences, and being cognizant that there are alternatives to it), whereas knowledge is associated with a deeper understanding of this information (e.g., understanding the reasons why violent discipline is hurtful, and being able to explain alternatives to it). It is important to keep in mind that people tend to ignore ‘negative’ information related to what they are doing, and can sometimes favour prior ‘evidence’ that reaffirms their actions. Perception is very selective.

Beliefs
Convictions of what is true. There are multiple types of beliefs influencing attitudes, the main ones being:
- Effect beliefs: considering a causality chain to be true (X leads to Y); e.g., physically disciplining a child will make her/him a good adult.
- Holding personal convictions about what ‘needs’ to be done in a given situation, e.g., if a woman is seen walking with a man who is not her husband or relative, she needs to be punished.
- Personal normative beliefs: beliefs about what should be, what should happen, e.g., men should be primarily responsible for the honour of the family; women should report intimate partner violence to the police, etc.

Beliefs are individual, but highly influenced by others. The probability of one person adopting a belief increases with the number of people already holding that belief.

Past experience
Researchers have shown that past experience helps form complex decisions. Memories of experiences, such as past failure and frustration with a behaviour, or negative experiences such as poor treatment by a service provider, will shape our attitude towards trying new things. At a deeper level, experiences as a child also drive behaviours of adults, including negative, violent or abusive behaviours. This replication concept is paramount in most psychological schools of thought. There is ample evidence of a link between perpetuating multiple forms of violence as an adult, and experiencing and/or witnessing violence, including domestic violence, as a child.

Intuitions
Instinctive feelings regarding a situation or an idea, often formed from past experience. Intuitions involve emotionally charged, rapid, unconscious processes that contribute to immediate attitudes or decisions that don’t stem from reasoning. In other words, our brain might have already decided what to do in a situation before analysing options. Intuitions are one of the elements of automatic thinking. Laws and rules target our rational brain, whereas many decisions are made intuitively. Hunches drive many of our actions and we often rely more on guesses than facts.

Emotions
Similarly, emotions are generated subconsciously and are designed to appraise and summarize an experience and inform action. It is a feeling process in which cognitive, physiological and behavioural reactions come together to respond to a stimulus. A number of decisions are informed by our emotional responses, which can constitute a barrier to rational thinking. Phobias and aversions, for example, are important mechanisms in everyday life. Another example of the power of emotions is that exactly similar information will trigger different attitudes if it is presented positively or negatively.

Mindset
A person’s way of thinking, a default attitude for addressing various situations that create a pre-disposition to adopt or reject certain behaviours, such as an innovative mindset, conservative mindset, a learning and growth mindset, etc.
Agency
The sense of control a person feels toward an action and its consequences. If the intention to perform an action appears to precede, guide and exclusively cause the action, an individual will have a sense of agency over what she has just done. If not, the resulting mismatch will prevent the individual from feeling a sense of control over what has just happened. Feeling of agency is the overall feeling of control without any explicit thinking about a specific action. Judgement of agency speaks to the conceptual level of control, when an individual explicitly thinks about initiating an action.

Emotional wellbeing
The emotional quality of someone’s everyday experience, the frequency and intensity of positive and negative feelings that make one’s life pleasant or unpleasant. High levels of stress can impair our ability to make choices and to perceive ourselves positively and as capable, and can paralyze change and adoption of positive practices, and, in some instances, result in adoption of negative coping mechanisms. Anxiety and mental distress are particularly frequent in emergency contexts. Trauma is a significant barrier to action.

Physical capacity
Strength and ability to perform essential physical actions.

Fatigue
Being tired (and hungry) depletes cognitive resources and significantly affects our decision-making.

Skills
Particular abilities and capacities to do something. Most skills are acquired through experience and/or deliberate learning. Examples of skills include parenting techniques and positive discipline, as well as life skills such as critical thinking, negotiation, conflict resolution and active citizenship.
**Decision autonomy**
The ability to make one’s own decision.

**Social mobility**
A socio-economic process in which an individual, family, or group move to a new position within a social hierarchy, from job to job, or from one social class or level to another. Social mobility is also understood as the movement of certain categories of people from place to place. In many societies, mobility is an issue for women, in both senses of the term: they are blocked from rising to positions of power, but might also not be free or able to leave the household, interact with certain people, or get access to commodities and services, for cultural or safety reasons.

**Support**
The availability of trusted relatives or friends to encourage, aid and protect someone when needed.

**Confidence**
A person’s belief that she can succeed in creating change; feeling of trust in one’s own ability.

**Self-image**
Many of our choices are impacted by the perception we have of ourselves and our role in our family, community and society. This perceived identity will often make us behave according to common stereotypes associated with our dominant identity (see meta-norms). This might prevent people from doing things that they are completely capable of, because they underestimate their abilities in accordance to the stereotype of their group.

**Emotional intelligence**
The ability to recognize and process one’s own emotions and use these to assist thinking.
Self-control/Willpower
Temptations and impulses affect our decisions and actions, including those that go against the path we had decided to follow and the goals we had set. We all face these struggles but we do not always have equal capacity when it comes to restraining or regulating these urges. When our mental resources are depleted (by stress, fatigue, etc.) our willpower goes down. Certain behaviours have a higher addictiveness than others.

Present bias
People generally favour a smaller gain in the short run over a larger gain in the future, even sometimes consciously when considering trade-offs. We overvalue immediate rewards, which impairs our ability to make decisions to pursue longer-term interests that would benefit us more. This has multiple consequences, including the need to create rapid and small gains for people on the way to what can be a deeper change of behaviour with bigger rewards – bringing pieces of future benefit closer to the present.

Procrastination
We can be as good at delaying positive actions as we are at indulging sudden negative impulses (“today is not the right day, there is still time”). Putting off decisions can be explained by the desire to use the present time for more satisfying actions, or by the complexity of making a change. In both cases, emotions are taking over and we forget about the longer-term plan, despite the cost of delayed action. Magnifying the consequences of action or inaction in respect to what will happen for our future-self is a classic programmatic answer to this problem.

Hassle factors
Minor inconveniences that prevent people from acting. Sometimes, a step that requires a little time, paperwork to fill out, or a small investment are perceived as major complications that can disproportionately prevent us from acting.
Habits and status quo
The default option for humans is usually the status quo. We often feel more comfortable in a set routine, find inaction easier, feel overly positive about a choice previously made, and are averse to change because it can be risky. Many of these feelings will drive us towards inertia even if it is not in our best interest. Also, a significant share of our lives is habitual, and related actions are often automatic and driven by specific parts of the brain, associated with a context or a moment, following a ritual, and the very purpose of these actions loses importance. Bringing novelty into these mental patterns doesn’t come without friction and disruption.

Heuristics
Heuristics are cognitive shortcuts or rules of thumb that simplify decisions. They are often grounded in similar cognitive biases our brains use to filter information (see cognitive biases), and make questions easier to answer. Since choosing can be difficult and requires effort, we use our intuition, make guesses, stereotype, or use what we describe as ‘common sense’ to avoid decision fatigue.

Inconsistent commitment
Behavioural consistency tends to make us feel compelled to stick to a decision we have made, and keep on engaging in associated actions to maintain a positive self-image. Inconsistency can result in negative feelings towards ourselves. Nevertheless, in many situations our commitment may fade for several reasons, including insufficient willpower, opposition from other people, or a low cost of breaking the commitment. The existence of a more public, official commitment often supports continuity.

Decision context/frame
The context in which a decision is made (including the physical place) as well as the way a decision is framed (e.g., how options are presented) have a strong influence on choosing a course of action, regardless of the rational analysis of these options. This concept is often referred to as ‘choice architecture’.
Social influence

Reference network’s attitudes and behaviours
Social influence is primarily based on the attitudes and behaviours of those whose opinion we value the most, who we consult regarding certain issues, and those whose perception of us matters. Members of this ‘reference network’ include family and peers as well as influencers and role models who exert some form of influence over us. People tend to imitate the behaviours of their reference network frequently, and sometimes automatically. But who are the members of the group will depend on the situation and the behaviour. For example, in a new situation or a foreign country, most would align their behaviour to what complete strangers are doing. People end up having several reference networks, such as their close family, groups of friends and colleagues, online communities, etc.

Injunctive norms
A rule of behaviour that people engage in because they think others in their group expect them to do so. This belief about socially approved behaviour is sometimes called ‘normative expectations’. There might be a silent majority of people disapproving of certain practices but still complying with them based on a widespread and wrong perception of what others think. This discrepancy between the majority of individual attitudes and a given practice is called ‘pluralistic ignorance’.

Descriptive norms
A rule of behaviour that people engage in because they think other people in their reference group do the same thing. This belief about what other people do and what are typical behaviours is called ‘empirical expectations’. This is often ground for misconceptions and similar ‘pluralistic ignorance’.
Social pressure, rewards, sanctions, exceptions
Several social norms exist because of the consequences of behaving in certain ways (anticipated opinion or reaction of others). What defines these norms is the social ‘obligation’ behind them and people’s belief that compliance will condition their acceptance or rejection by the group. On the negative side, sanctions can take many forms, such as stigma, avoidance, gossip, insults, violence, exile, etc. On the other side, when we follow the rules, we are socially rewarded (e.g., praised, honored). Exceptions are a set of circumstances under which breaking the norm would be acceptable.

Influence by powerholders/gatekeepers
Those who benefit from a norm which helps consolidate their position of power can be directly involved in enforcing the norm to maintain the social status quo. A typical example of that is men’s domination over women, and its multiple expression through socially accepted forms of violence enforced by males. The subordinate group might not have the resources, such as authority, credibility, visibility, money, strength, or relational network, required to challenge the norm and its enforcement.

Strength of the norms
The strength of normative influence is the result of multiple factors: how widespread a norm is, the importance of its social role, its alignment with personal attitudes, detectability, the consequences of non-compliance, the reference network structure (how dense and connected it is), etc.

Social identity, compliance and display
Complying with norms can be driven by an individual’s desire to belong to the group and manifest affiliation, even in the absence of actual sanctions. Adherence to the rules is then seen as a way to be recognized as a full member of the group. This can affect behaviours and other external signs such as ways to dress, to talk, etc.

Stigma and discrimination/societal views on minorities
The negative and/or incorrect collective views and beliefs regarding certain groups of people strongly condition their practices and the majority’s behaviour towards them, often for the worst, leading to rejection and deprivation; e.g., in some instances rearing practices for children with disabilities.

Sensitivity to social influence
Reflects the level of autonomy of a person. In a similar social environment, individuals are affected differently by the pressure coming from the group or the need to comply with collective identity and claim to membership.
Collective self-efficacy
The confidence of community members that together they can succeed. This includes the perceived capability of other community members.

Sense of ownership
The degree to which community members think the problem is important, perceive themselves as contributing to and responsible for the success of the collective change, and think they will benefit from the results.

Social cohesion
The sense of belonging and feeling part of the group; the extent to which community members want to cooperate to solve collective issues; the level of interconnection between community members (density of the social network); the level of division into factions; and the level of trust for other members.

Equity of participation
The degree to which marginalized members of the community (women, poor, ethnic groups, youth, elderly, etc.) can access spaces were issues are discussed, speak up and be involved in decision-making.

Quality of leadership
The existence of effective leadership is necessary to steer the group in the right direction and sustain the community development process. A ‘good’ leader will be popular and trusted, supportive of dialogue and change, innovative, and foster inclusion.

Trigger/stimulus
Community dynamics usually stem from a triggering factor, including the emerging alternatives we describe below, but also from more exogenic factors, such as the visit or interest of external agents of change, who can be from civil society, authorities or the international cooperation.
Meta-norms

Socialization process
The process of learning to behave in a way that is acceptable to the group based on societal beliefs, values, attitudes and examples, through which norms are learned and internalized by individuals. A person’s acquisition of habits, whether positive or negative, is due to their exposure to models that display certain traits when solving problems and coping with the world. Early gender socialization, for example, starts at birth and is a process of learning cultural roles according to one’s sex. Right from the beginning, boys and girls are treated differently and learn the differences between them, and between women and men. Parents and families are the initial agents who affect the formation of behaviours during childhood (children are told how to dress, which activities are for them or not, what role they should play as a boy or a girl, etc.). Peers are an additional source of influence during adolescence and play a key role in solidifying socially accepted gender norms: boys usually enforce toughness, competition and heterosexual prowess, whereas girls are pressured around appearance, proper behaviour and marriage, with an emphasis on their reproductive roles. This happens in home, school and discreet settings alike.

Socialization may also occur more passively through role modelling: as an example of negative behaviours, boys may adopt abusive behaviours after witnessing domestic violence, or lose respect for their mother (and women at large) after witnessing violence against her. These day-to-day interactions as children and adolescents are one of the key drivers of social norms reproduction. As they are learned in developmental stages and important milestones in the life cycle, norms become connected to feelings of shame and guilt that become triggers of appropriate behaviour. As a result, compliance with norms often becomes automatic, rather than the result of internal rational deliberation.
Gender ideologies
Gender roles are expressed at all levels and in all segments of society, and are reproduced through daily interactions. Concepts of masculinity and femininity are underlying ideologies translating into behavioural expectations for men, women, girls and boys. Manhood is sometimes used as justification for different forms of violent behaviours. Girls and women may be considered vulnerable and, therefore seen to need protection, which may translate into lower access to education, restrictions in travelling, and higher unemployment. Gender discrimination is often deeply rooted and perpetuated by leaders and communities, and can result in behaviours related to domestic violence, sexual harassment and abuse, child marriage, female genital mutilation and trafficking.

Power dynamics
Power is the ability to control and access resources, opportunities, privileges and decision-making processes. Power can be based on many distinctions including wealth, ethnicity, religion, class, caste, age or gender. Who controls or retains power over ‘subordinate’ family and community members dictates the practices of many in households and communities. Many protection and developmental issues are associated with male authority over women, and men’s desire to control women’s sexuality. Violence against women and violence against children often co-occur in families with a patriarchal family structure, featuring rigid hierarchies linked to gender and age. In other cases, positive relationships centred on listening, respect and empathy offer contexts in which dominance is not the governing factor.

Conflict resolution
Typical ways of solving family and community disagreements, from listening and trying to reach mutual understanding to practices of coercion.

Moral norms
Principles of morality that people are supposed to follow. They are learned socially. Human rights, for example, as a global doctrine, represent the moral norms that the United Nations is trying to ensure are supported universally. The important question here is what individuals perceive as women’s and children’s rights, as this will condition the classification of certain practices as being inherently immoral or not (e.g., beating a woman).

Decision-making patterns
How and by whom a course of action is selected in a family or a community will have a significant impact on people’s options for alternative behaviours. These processes can be simple or complex depending on who voices opinions, is consulted and valued, can oppose a decision, and who makes the final call. On certain issues, elder family members can play a significant role. In various religious and traditional societies, the preservation of the family’s reputation is seen as the responsibility of the man; but as a woman’s honour is directly tied to family honour, it is considered the men’s right to make important decisions about women’s lives, including controlling the access of their female kin to the outside world.

Family roles and relationships
Social norms related to what it means to be a grandparent, an elder sibling or a mother or father, and to how spouses communicate between themselves and interact with their children are important drivers of behaviours, in particular parenting practices and the provision of care, household chores and financial responsibilities, among others. These can impact girls and boys differently.

Perception of the child
Different societies will have different perceptions of when a human being starts and stops being considered a child, and what this means in terms of her/his rights and needs. The overall understanding and value of who a child is and what she or he requires drives practices at different stages of the life cycle (child labour, child marriage, participation of children in family and public life, child enrolment in armed forces, etc.).

Legal compliance
The enforcement of laws and regulations does not only rely on formal organisms: the respect of these rules requires a social norm of legal obedience. If the belief that nobody respects the laws is widespread, legal disobedience might be the norm. The term ‘meta-norm’ was created by Robert Axelrod specifically to designate the fact that there is an upper norm ruling the fact that transgressors of lower-level norms are punished: a norm about norms.
Factual/scientific information
The availability, accessibility and dissemination of accurate and unbiased knowledge about the issue and practices at hand; understandable evidence conveyed without feelings or opinions about it.

Media agenda and narrative
The way media outlets present what is newsworthy, and how the facts and stories are framed to cover a given topic. Narratives are rarely neutral, and considerably influence the audience's attitude.

Social media
Social media is an unpredictable and unregulated space where the audience is not only in a passive position, but can also be a content creator, and users can interact and collaborate with each other. Contrary to ‘mainstream media’, authoritative voices, previously unknown and sometimes without proven expertise, can emerge organically and generate large opinion trends and groups. Opinions relayed on social media fall within an individual's own social network (group of individuals within the user’s ‘bubble’), which can distort the perception of what the most prevalent opinion is.

Marketing, brand messaging
Companies promote messages and ideas in favour of their economic success, and develop campaigns to create more appeal. The most popular and trusted brands, with large audiences and benefiting from a positive image, can significantly influence the way consumers perceive certain products, ideas and situations, changing their decisions and behaviours.

Public figures, public discourse
The messages most commonly spread in the communication environment; the ongoing public debates; the position of persons that have a significant effect on influencing the opinion of the general public.
**Entertainment industry**
The roles played by characters in movies, books and radio shows, as well as the overall narratives of these entertainment pieces, affect the mental models of viewers. Entertainment can carry messages and values (sometimes purposively in the case of entertainment education, or ‘edutainment’) that influence the decisions made by the audience. This influence is based on how relatable and/or inspiring the characters and situations are, and what consequences these fictional characters face.

**Word of mouth**
In advertising and marketing, word of mouth refers to the phenomenon that occurs following the introduction and ascendancy of a product or subject matter that has attracted the attention of a certain number of individuals. In societies where word of mouth is the main means for transferring information (e.g., certain nomadic groups), it demonstrates how significant passing information from person to person by oral communication can be.

**Exposure**
The availability of information is not synonymous with access to it. Depending on the means of communication, coverage by mass media, penetration of technology and occupation, people will have very different levels of access to information. Campaigns are designed to proactively expose a target audience to certain content and narratives, but the success in reaching the target audience varies.

**Emerging alternatives**

**Image 19 Unpacking emerging alternatives**

**Publicized change and stories**
People’s achievements made public. Human-interest stories of transformation told to inspire and promote similar change through exposure to successes and failures.

**Innovations and opportunities**
A new vaccine made available, an agent of change visiting the community and offering support, a new method of contraception stimulating community discussion on family planning, or the renewal of political leadership, are examples.
**Opinion trends**
How people’s views on a topic are changing; new directions taken by general beliefs and judgments. Public opinion is evolving continuously, at different paces.

**Social movements**
Large-scale collective actions and campaigns based on shared identity and grievances, people engaged in a fight to change the social or political order (e.g., the early stages of the Arab Spring; Black Lives Matter in the Unites States; the #metoo movement; etc.).

**Positive deviants**
The existence of individuals or small groups who confront similar challenges and constraints to their peers but who employ uncommon yet successful behaviours or strategies that enable them to find better solutions. They can be important role models.

**Governing entities**

**Recognition of the issue**
The extent to which the authorities acknowledge the existence of a problem and are willing to act upon it.

**Policies and regulations**
Set of principles and rules established by the authorities to regulate how people behave in society, which may prompt the community and its members to act and change (e.g., law criminalizing marital rape). The rule of law might or might not exist according to the context.

**Enforcement/security apparatus**
System enforcing the observance of law and order (justice, criminal and police systems), and in conflict situations, elements of control and repression (e.g., administration by an occupying power). In some countries, policing of what people do (e.g., policing water usage, religious practices, etc.).
**Grievances against authorities**
Citizens who consider themselves in conflict with the government, who criticize the State’s capacity or willingness to deliver services, who criticize the authorities’ motives or legitimacy, who feel that their demands are not met or consider that the social contract has collapsed might all adapt their grievance practices accordingly (e.g., refusal to get their children vaccinated, refusal to vote, civil disobedience, violence, etc.).

**Fiscal measures and incentives**
The use of taxes, expenditures or direct incentives to influence people’s actions and achieve social, economic and political objectives (e.g., conditional cash transfers in development and humanitarian situations).

**Religious institutions**
Religious institutions are the visible and organized manifestations of practices and beliefs in a group or society. They are translated in structures with specific agendas, power and leadership, and areas of influence, and aim to maintain or spread certain patterns of beliefs and associated actions. They largely influence behaviours of individuals and groups following them.

**Education system**
The group of institutions (ministries of education and policies, schools and related associations, teachers, private and sometimes religious groups, etc.) that provide education to children and young people in educational settings, which can be public or private. The structure can vary significantly across contexts. Education systems are part of the group of entities influencing behaviours, including, in the longer term, as agents of socialization.

**Voice and participation**
The ability of all actors – particularly those that are poor, marginalized, underrepresented, or disproportionately affected by policies – to elevate their voices and contribute to dialogue and decision-making processes that affect their lives. This not only includes direct engagement but also links to political representation.

**Structural barriers**

---

**Image 21 Unpacking structural barriers**

![Diagram of structural barriers with personal characteristics, cognitive biases, limited rationality, action, and behaviour, as well as contextual factors like trust in service providers, traditional services, living conditions, infrastructure, cues to action, and other external factors.](image21)
**Trust in service providers**
A critical condition for people to use services is trust in the person or entity providing them. Trust can be measured based on how respectful, competent and compassionate the provider is perceived to be, but can also derive from her/his profile (right ethnicity, right gender, etc.). The quality of the relationship as perceived by the ‘client’ is also extremely important in driving the use of a service – measured by the ‘user experience’.

**Living conditions**
The circumstances of a person’s life, such as geographic isolation, living in an active conflict zone, in areas with high criminality rates or even being incarcerated amongst other factors, are often strong barriers to adopting new practices. Lack of access to a job market, to food supplies or other basic needs plays a similar role.

**Cues to action**
Factors or devices that activate readiness to change. When the environment or the structural context in which decisions are made or practices are reproduced is altered, it can often result in a change of behaviour.

**Traditional services**
Existence and accessibility of alternative and traditional services, where behaviours considered harmful could be practiced and even encouraged.

**Infrastructure**
Existence and usability of facilities, roads, water and sewage systems, electrical grids, phone, Internet, etc.

**Availability, access to and quality of services/technology**
The demand for services cannot always be appropriately met for several reasons regarding their provision or impaired access for reasons such as financial difficulties, lack of transport, language barriers, low capacity of service providers, etc.

**Other external factors**
As relevant to the problem at hand and local context (e.g., natural obstacles, age barriers, climate change, currency and market changes, etc.).

---

**From intent and action to a new behaviour**

**Image 22 Unpacking from intent and action to new behaviour**

---
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Behaviour
A behaviour defines the way a person acts. In the development and humanitarian worlds, it is often synonymous with ‘practice’.

Contemplation
Stage where a person is conscious of both the problem and option for change, and is considering switching to the new practice, but still has not acted.

Experience
When an individual is acting and trying a new practice out; a change of behaviour in the short term, with a risk to abandon it.

Relapse
When a person returns to the previous practice.

Reinforcement – celebration, praising, ritualization, public commitment
Events and actions to celebrate successes and cultivate pride (e.g., public pledges) to help create trust amongst groups, and provide opportunities for others to adopt the change. New positive behaviours need to be practiced to become usual or normative. These rewards are important to ensure the social context is supportive and reinforces individual choices.

Advocacy
When the new practice is fully adopted, and the behaviour is usual, some people start to promote it and convince others to adopt it as well.

Personal characteristics and contextual factors

Image 23  Unpacking personal characteristics and contextual factors
The full map – Behavioural Drivers Model Level 2

When completely unpacked, the model accounts for more than 130 possible drivers of behaviour, as identified across the spectrum of behavioural and social literature presented in the conceptual framework.

This mental construct, though it will never apply in real life, represents a deliberate push for embracing the necessary sophistication and local adaptation of social and behaviour change programming.

It reflects how sharp our framework and deep our local analyses have to be to do justice, at least at the conceptual starting point, to the complexity of human behaviours and the societies around us.
## The Behavioural Drivers Model

### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
- Age
- Gender
- Lifecycle stage
- Social Status
- Education
- Household composition
- Income/poverty level
- Religious affiliation
- Lifestyle
- Physiological attributes
- Alcohol/drug use
- Disorders

### CONTEXT
- Migration, displacement
- Emergency vs. development context
- Social, cultural and religious context
- Natural events and weather

### COGNITIVE BIASES
- Information avoidance
- Availability heuristic
- Anchoring
- Messenger effect
- Confirmation and belief bias
- Simplicity bias
- Recency bias
- Optimism bias
- Representativeness heuristic
- Cognitive dissonance
- Memory bias

### ATTITUDE
- Values
- Aspirations
- Awareness and knowledge
- Beliefs
- Past experience
- Emotions
- Intuitions
- Mindset
- Self-image
- Confidence
- Emotional intelligence
- Agency
- Emotional wellbeing
- Physical capacity
- Fatigue
- Skills
- Decision autonomy
- Social Mobility
- Support

### INTENT
- Contemplation
- Self-control/willpower
- Present bias
- Procrastination
- Habit and status quo
- Heuristics
- Inconsistent commitment

### LIMITED RATIONALITY

### SELF-EFFICACY
- Decision context/frame

### INTEREST
- Attention
- Feasibility
- Potential gains
- Perceived risks
- Efforts needed
- Affordability
- Appeal
- Enjoyment

### ACTION
- Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL INFLUENCE</th>
<th>META-NORMS</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>GOVERNING ENTITIES</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL BARRIERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength of the norms</td>
<td>Socialization process</td>
<td>Factual and scientific information</td>
<td>Fiscal measures and incentives</td>
<td>Access and quality of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to social influence</td>
<td>Gender ideologies</td>
<td>Media agenda and narrative</td>
<td>Religious Institutions</td>
<td>Trust in service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctive norms</td>
<td>Power dynamics</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>Educational system</td>
<td>Living conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive norms</td>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Marketing, brands messaging</td>
<td>Recognition of the issue</td>
<td>Cues to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social pressure</td>
<td>Decision making patterns</td>
<td>Public figures, public discourse</td>
<td>Policies and regulations</td>
<td>Traditional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>Family roles and relationships</td>
<td>Entertainment industry</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerholders</td>
<td>Perception of the child</td>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>Voice and participation</td>
<td>External factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference networks attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>Moral norms</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Grievances against authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma and discrimination, societal views on minorities</td>
<td>Legal compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY DYNAMIC</th>
<th>REINFORCEMENT</th>
<th>EMERGING ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective self-efficacy</td>
<td>Celebration, praising</td>
<td>Publicized change stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of ownership</td>
<td>Ritualization</td>
<td>Innovations, opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>Public commitment</td>
<td>Opinion trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive deviants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigger/stimulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>META-NORMS</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION ENVIRONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialization process</td>
<td>Factual and scientific information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ideologies</td>
<td>Media agenda and narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power dynamics</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Marketing, brands messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making patterns</td>
<td>Public figures, public discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family roles and relationships</td>
<td>Entertainment industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the child</td>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral norms</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNING ENTITIES</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL BARRIERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal measures and incentives</td>
<td>Access and quality of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institutions</td>
<td>Trust in service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational system</td>
<td>Living conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the issue</td>
<td>Cues to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and regulations</td>
<td>Traditional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice and participation</td>
<td>External factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Socio-Ecological Model (SEM) is an analytical tool that maps together several levels of influence and factors that can shape a person’s behaviour. There are five nested concentric layers, from inner to outermost: individual/intrapersonal (e.g., beliefs, knowledge, skills), interpersonal (e.g., family, friends and colleagues), community (e.g., relationships among organizations, social norms), institutional (e.g., organizations and social institutions, services), and societal (e.g., laws and policies). UNICEF Communication for Development (C4D) uses the SEM as its key programming framework, acknowledging that because of the multifaceted and interactive effects of personal and environmental factors that determine behaviours, sustainable change requires action and collaboration across multiple levels.

Table 1. Description of Socio-Ecological Model levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEM level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Characteristics of an individual that influence behaviours, including knowledge, attitudes, gender, age, self-efficacy, developmental history, religious identity, racial/ethnic identity, sexual orientation, economic status, financial resources, values, goals, expectations, literacy, stigma and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Formal and informal social networks and social support systems that can influence individual behaviours, including family, friends, peers, co-workers, religious networks, customs or traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Relationships among organizations and informational networks within defined boundaries, including the built environment, local associations, community leaders, businesses, transportation, as well as social rules applying to the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Organizations with rules, procedures and regulations to structure everyday life, including for operations that affect how, or how well, for example, services are provided for citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Enabling environment</td>
<td>Local, state, national and global laws and policies affecting the issue of interest, either as the promoters or barriers to interventions and changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://www.unicef.org/cbsc/files/Module_1_SEM-C4D.docx

It is important to emphasize that the Behavioural Drivers Model and its components are socio-ecological in nature. The factors depicted in the basic BDM (Level 1 drivers) spread across the various levels of the SEM (see Image 25).
The Learning Collaborative to Advance Research and Practice on Normative Change for Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health and Well-being (Learning Collaborative, 2018) has explored the theoretical gaps of most behaviour change theories when addressing transformation of norms. Their work resonates with UNICEF’s effort to find ecological and multi-level frameworks, reminding our field that although the development of scientific methodologies has relied upon reductionist approaches to isolate phenomena for investigation, many issues faced by society involve complex chains of interaction. This includes a broad range of environmental and human factors, spanning from global to local scales (Stojanovic et al, 2016), which calls for more multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to scientific investigation focused around real-world problems, and the emergence of the field of Sustainability Science (Kates et al., 2001, Turner et al., 2003).

Stojanovic and colleagues argue that a socio-ecological approach is appropriate because it takes into consideration the reliance that humans have on their environment. They clarify its advantages and restrictions and propose a reformulation that supports engagement with wider traditions of research in social sciences. They claim that further methodological advances are required for interdisciplinarity.
The BDM comes as response to these critical elements. It embraces a large array of psychological, social, organizational and behavioural research, and addresses factors and dimensions, which not only call for interdisciplinarity but also open paths for multi-sectorial interventions.

The BDM extends the insights of the SEM, acknowledging that wider engagement with the social sciences across the spectrum provides the best way to understand and influence behaviours. Maintaining the virtues of SEM by looking at mechanisms operating at several levels, the BDM also aims to serve as a pragmatic model enhancing this holistic approach by focusing on behavioural pathways and how, very concretely, a wide range of specific drivers can be identified. Practitioners can use it as a tool to help understand the type of system they are looking at, however, the model is not prescriptive.

Finally, and similarly to SEM, by considering the different kinds of mechanisms and influencers that may be relevant to behaviours at different levels, the BDM lays out a map which practitioners can use to think through levels of intervention, further identifying the appropriate stakeholders who need to be involved in a given social and behaviour change effort.
PART III

THE BEHAVIOURAL DRIVERS MODEL AND ITS APPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOUR CHANGE PROGRAMMING
Any social and behavioural change programme must build on a comprehensive, rigorous, empirically grounded and evidence-based account of behavioural drivers. As presented in Parts I and II, our conceptual framework addresses this by drawing on the review of the dominant theories of behaviour change, and synthesizing key insights into a transtheoretical model. Part III offers pathways for applying this model to programming activities.

**THE APPLIED LOGIC OF THE MODEL FOR SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOUR CHANGE PROGRAMMING**

As shown schematically in Image 26, an applied logic underlies the use of the Behavioural Drivers Model (BDM) for social and behaviour change programming. This focuses on evidence generation and use, and draws on a multi-phased approach.

Let’s consider a programme with a specific behaviour or cluster of behaviours as its goal, along with related focus areas for intervention. The BDM will be used as the conceptual reference and starting point. Through qualitative formative research in the focus areas, the process will move from a generic list (all possible drivers of a behaviour according to theory) to a narrower list to establish and prioritize the relevant drivers in the particular context for this specific behaviour. The value of starting from a long theoretical list is to reinforce the exploration of the many possible reasons behind people’s actions; doing so reduces our analytical biases, in particular the various assumptions we have about why people make certain decisions.

Eliciting these drivers is the key to making informed decisions for programming on the ground: they serve as the basis for strategy development and can be used to decide where to invest scarce resources.

The thinking is simple: one must investigate a behaviour to understand why it is happening, and then try to figure out what may influence these drivers no matter what they are. This problem-solving mindset is the key to moving away from pre-conceived ideas and go-to communication interventions, and instead approach behaviour change as a holistic effort addressing all possible psychological, social and structural factors that the diagnosis puts forward. Start by assuming you know nothing, make no assumptions, and then study the behavior to crack the code.

In parallel, to assess the results attained by the strategy (beyond monitoring its implementation), practitioners should undertake quantitative surveys to establish a baseline for all relevant behavioural drivers. Regular surveying – e.g., every two years – of the drivers of interest is necessary to track progress on the way to changing the prevalence of the behaviour (see Image 1: Opening the black box of behaviour change programming). This process invites organizations to collaborate with teams from specialized backgrounds in research design, measuring and monitoring. For advice on how to conduct such exercises one can refer to *Measuring Social and Behavioural Drivers – A Guidance Tool* (Petit et al., 2018).
Image 26 The applied logic of the Behavioural Drivers Model for Social and Behaviour Change Programming

Behavioral Drivers Model
(All possible behavioral determinants from the theory)

FORMATIVE RESEARCH
Desk review + additional collection

Relevant drivers identified and prioritized
(for the behaviour of interest, in specific areas)

Social networks and influences mapped

STRATEGY & PLANNING
Programming on the ground to influence key drivers

MONITORING SURVEYS
Baseline on key drivers and progress tracking
Formative research is the pillar of any SBC programme: strategy, interventions and monitoring should all stem from its findings.

The BDM model aims for application in formative research through community exercises and focus-group sessions that allow for establishing Level 1 drivers (identifying which of the main factors are relevant to the behaviour in the local context) and exploring more in-depth (Level 2) those that are the most important according to the community. This approach has been applied successfully in pilot countries, and concrete guidance combining successive collective participatory exercises will be released in the near future.

The BDM model also helps build a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the strategy. The factors identified as the most important during the formative research will constitute the SBC outcomes, with the dimensions of those factors establishing shorter-term results or milestones, at the output level.

In following this logic, practitioners will ensure that the entire SBC effort is underpinned by a consistent conceptual model. This allows for each phase to relate to the others, using a similar language and similar constructs throughout formative research, strategy design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, significantly increasing the rigor and evidence-based aspect of the programme.
The rich variety of potential behavioural drivers demonstrates that a single behaviour may be supported by a broad array of motives, some directly related to the individual decision-maker, some related to the groups in which the decision-maker lives and works, and some related to the more extended environment. However, for a given behaviour, some drivers will matter more than others. Identifying which drivers matter most, how they relate to each other and which are likely to change is a critical step towards intervention, and a key objective of formative research.

In most cases, resources are limited, therefore, it is wise for policy makers or programme designers to identify and sort the possible drivers by importance and causality, and intervene on the most influential ones insofar as it is financially and practically feasible.

Some factors may simply be beyond the budget or capability of the teams. For example, in the case of latrine ownership and utilization, some inhabitants may not have the physical space in or near their homes to construct a new latrine. Providing more space to such individuals may not be feasible, even if doing so would theoretically solve the problem.

The problem tree exercise is an effective means for identifying the optimal path to behavioural change, especially when a behaviour has multiple determinants (e.g., Snowdon et al., 2008). Several other exercises can also be used during community sessions to understand the relationships between factors and how they build on each other. Some tools oriented to exploring normative behaviours offer a series of activities that can be applied to any behaviour, even in the absence of social norms: Everybody Wants to Belong (Petit and Zalk, 2019), The Social Norms Exploration Tool (Institute for Reproductive Health, 2018), CARE’s Journey Piloting Social Norms Measures (Stefanik and Hwang, 2017), or the upcoming ACT Framework to be published by UNICEF.

Intervention mappings are an essential, yet often overlooked, step for translating formative research results into an intervention. Intervention mappings consist of identifying and employing techniques and activities that are specifically designed to address a factor of interest. Catalogues and taxonomies of behaviour-change techniques exist (Kok et al, 2016; Michie et al., 2013) and can be leveraged by programme administrators and designers. These have gained popularity as a result of the rigorous processes that went into developing them, including systematic reviews of the effects of the techniques as well as Delphi consultations. This mapping process is important for ensuring that appropriate intervention techniques are used as opposed to the most common ones, which may not be well designed to address the issue of interest.

In social and behaviour change programming, the go-to intervention is usually a communication campaign to raise awareness and influence attitudes, even in the absence of evidence that attitudes are the main or sole barrier to change, and that the campaign will influence it.

Image 28 offers a merge between the behavioural taxonomy that the BDM embodies and the intervention mapping that extends from it. It offers several examples of possible approaches, methods and activities that are more commonly adapted to each specific factor, extracted from behavioural taxonomies and the core set of UNICEF evidence-based strategies. In doing so, it provides the foundations for a catalogue of possible actions in the spirit of the COM-B (capability, opportunity, motivation and behaviour) framework developed by Michie and colleagues (2011).
This mapping is, exactly as the BDM, a simplification. The relationship between approaches and drivers is not as segregated. Certain interventions address multiple drivers (for example, parenting programmes can influence not only caregivers’ self-efficacy, but also their attitudes, and even the norms in a community); certain drivers might also change indirectly as a result of other factors (e.g., social norms shifting because of structural changes).

This simplified map has already proven a useful tool in guiding field practitioners to move away from standard default interventions towards actions more specifically aligned with the roots of the problem they are trying to solve. It offers an answer to the operationalization gap that limits the uptake of models and theories in social and behaviour change practice* and helps in visualizing what integrated programming might entail when addressing behaviours.

*See Why this publication? at the start of the document.
Image 28 Relationship between the main drivers, behavioural interventions and programming approaches
Social and behaviour change programming is far from being only a matter of communication. Very different types of interventions should be used depending on which behavioural determinants need to be influenced. The key to designing a programme, prioritizing investments and defining what to monitor is to first establish what the most important drivers are for a given behaviour.

Importantly, the design of an intervention consists not only of the intervention’s functions but also its implementation criteria. Therefore, a good design will clearly articulate several attributes including the timing of the intervention rollout, its level (e.g., community, specific group, household, individual), participants, specific delivery modality, etc. Concrete design should be participatory and involve local stakeholders to draw from their superior knowledge of the context, ensuring communities remain in the driver’s seat of their own development. Furthermore, when piloting activities in the field, programme participants must have a voice and be invited to provide feedback on the process, tools and tangibles that are deployed during the intervention. This typically takes place through Trials of Improved Practices (TIPs).

Following are short descriptions of the types of approaches presented in Image 28.

**Influencing the communication environment and leveraging emerging alternatives**

- **Multimedia campaigns**: consist of using a combination of traditional and non-traditional methods of communication to reach a target audience, deliver messages, educate, entertain, induce specific emotions, increase visibility, amplify the voice of communities and young people, leverage local creativity, or project transitional characters and role models in edutainment. When traditional financial education was not effective in South Africa, for example, a television soap opera was aired, in which financial messages were delivered through a central character. Following the show, there was a decrease in gambling and expensive installment purchases (World Bank, 2015, p. 4). Communication channels are very diverse and can include localized options such as community radio, community cinema via mobile audio-visual vans, street theatre, puppet shows, etc. Trans-media approaches are used to reinforce ideas and messages across multiple media platforms, and 360-degree strategies link multimedia engagement with community engagement (UNICEF, 2019).

- **Digital communication**: a specialized type of campaign that utilizes non-traditional media such as email, mobile phones, websites and online social hubs to reach different types of audiences. Tactics vary from leveraging the wide reach of social media and online influencers to using purposively created ICT platforms such as U-Report. In an experiment (Fertig, Fishbane and Lefkowitz, 2018) researchers sent emails, text messages and push notifications to certain Mexican bank users’ mobile phones, with the subject “your future self has a message for you.” The contents all contained a link to a selfie filter that simulated a future old-age picture of the users. Underneath the picture read, “How much would you like to save for him/her to live well?”, coupled with a link to a savings page. The combined use of emails, text messages, and mobile software resulted in increased contributions, both in quantity and quality, toward savings.

- **Face-to-face dialogues**: two-way communication in which partners respond to the concerns and interests of each other so that there is always a connection rather than a separation of unrelated monologues. This can happen in individual and group settings alike (e.g., listeners or viewers groups, community meetings, inter-generational dialogues, etc.). Exposition, perspective taking, perspective giving and feedback have important effects on behaviour change. During door-to-door activities, the quality of individual engagement can span from a simple standard message delivery to active listening approaches, and make or break the efficiency of the intervention (see World Bank, 2015).
• **Private-sector engagement**: building a strategic and systematic partnership with businesses for development purposes. These coalitions can help advance and sustain social and behaviour change initiatives with the double purpose of designing solutions to improve our programme delivery and tapping into the popularity and audience of brands that benefit from a trusted image and widespread positive appeal to enhance the visibility and impact of communications. A number of companies embrace heavy digital multi-channel campaigns to engage consumers, with important reach and visibility. A step worth considering for a government that wants to jumpstart such engagement is holding private-sector assessment sessions. Kenya held a Private Health Sector Assessment in 2010, followed by an engagement workshop attended by the Ministries of Health and Medical Services, Public Health and Sanitation, Finance, and Planning, as well as private health training institutions, for-profit health providers and development partners. Similar assessment sessions were held in Guatemala in 2007 and the Republic of Congo in 2012 (see World Bank, 2013).

**Anticipating and limiting cognitive biases**

• **Elaboration likelihood approach**: there are two main routes of information processing in human cognition. The central route is ‘persuaded’ by thoughtful elaboration of a topic, and the peripheral route is by quick, superficial ‘selling points’. The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) provides conceptual guidance on how to structure and present a message to attract attention and make it persuasive (see Angst and Agarwal, 2009). Multiple guidance tools exist on designing and framing communications so that they can appeal to both cognitive routes and not risk alienating either one, increasing the chances of bypassing certain cognitive biases.

• **Pre-testing**: implementation of an intervention on a small scale to identify pros and cons of that intervention and the use thereof. For example, Hartmann and colleagues (2018) recently ran a pilot test of a low-cost, scalable intervention that aimed at reducing alcohol consumption and intimate partner violence (IPV). The intervention consisted of a small incentive for sobriety and cognitive behavioural therapy. The idea is not new in that evidence generated elsewhere is tested in a new context; however, it shows that pre-testing remains critical for efficient development of social and behavioural change interventions. When it comes to communication specifically, given the complexity of perception and appeal and the multiple cognitive biases at play, strong pre-testing approaches with various audience segments are absolutely necessary to maximize the chance of a cognitive and emotional impact.

• **Human-centred design (HCD)**: an approach in solution development that focuses on the experience of users, e.g., what they need in a product, service or solution to a problem. For example, research on specific cognitive processes and abilities of pilots has led to dramatic redesign of the cockpits: information is now grouped and displayed in a manner that is most accessible for pilots, thus minimizing ‘friction’ in their decisions-making processes (see Wiener and Nagel, 1988). HCD has been increasingly used in the design of audience-driven communications to benefit from a better understanding of the people one is trying to reach, and the social groups and environments in which they live. Engaging communities in designing communications can not only improve the impact of communications but also put some critical voices (marginalized people, positive deviants, etc.) at the forefront. Before going to the public sphere, audience-centred communications will go through a number of quick trial and error iterations.

**Working more directly on attitudes**

• **Re-evaluation exercises**: cognitive and affective assessments of one’s self-image, with and without the current practice, to understand how much behaviours are part of one’s identity – usually followed by training to increase problem-solving ability and self-efficacy. There are mixed results of this technique. For example, Crutzen et al. (2017) found that self-re-evaluation and anticipated regret did not change attitude or perceived distance in an online context. Others highlighted the importance of such self-reflection exercises in facilitating addictive behaviour change (see for example Longmire-Avital et al., 2010).
Building self-efficacy

- **Life skills and empowerment**: personal development strategies to increase one’s ability to thrive in changing environments, e.g., by knowing how to increase autonomy, set realistic goals and fulfil personal potential. To improve the well-being of stigmatized or marginalized individuals (such as low-caste, minor, poor, or unemployed people), it has been found effective to focus on helping these individuals build and think about their own strengths (World Bank, 2015). In UNICEF, ‘life skills’ are defined as psychosocial abilities for adaptive and positive behaviours that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life. They are grouped into three broad categories:
  - cognitive skills for analysing and using information,
  - personal skills for developing personal agency and managing oneself, and
  - inter-personal skills for communicating and interacting effectively with others.

  These approaches have been successfully used to empower adolescent girls and boys, including helping them to cope with the challenges of humanitarian situations and build their resilience, increasing self-esteem, self-awareness and self-confidence (UNICEF, 2012).

- **Psycho-social support**: programmes provided to help “individuals and communities to heal the psychological wounds and rebuild social structures after an emergency or a critical event. It can help change people into active survivors rather than passive victims” (Psychosocial Support, IFRC). These programmes contribute to the provision of holistic support in humanitarian situations. In terms of parenting in emergencies, for example, psycho-social support and stress-reduction will be key elements for allowing parents to play their role and limit families uptake of violent and negative coping behaviours. Interventions vary from proper counselling and case management to provision and communication of advice, including self-care and self-coping mechanisms.

- **Direct capacity building**: activities that help individuals or organizations develop and retain skills, knowledge and tools needed to better their life or improve their performance. A field experiment on open defecation in Makoni and Tsholotsho Districts of Zimbabwe (Waterkeyn and Cairncross, 2005) set up Community Health Clubs and had trainers support community members with health knowledge and skills-building sessions. After two years, 2,400 latrines had been built by club members in Makoni, and 1,200 in Tsholotsho. Club members also reported practicing significantly better hygiene – including hand washing – than those not in the experiment.

- **Frontline workers training**: capacity building of frontline workers, such as health service providers, social workers, teachers, community volunteers, and many others, who are in direct contact with the population. These workers are often the backbone of service delivery outreach, and benefit from opportunities to engage with individuals and families during home visits, community group sessions, or at the point of service provision. Because of their critical role, frontline workers’ training focuses on strengthening their interpersonal communication, social mobilization and facilitation skills. When perceived as competent and compassionate, workers help improve trust in social services and capacity of communities for collective action, reinforce referral systems and influence the processes that lead to behavioural and social change. As an example, in 2011, UNICEF launched a community programme in Madagascar to train social health workers in interpersonal communication. These workers then came back to their communities to successfully engage members on the benefits of vaccination and latrine use for ending preventable under-5 child deaths (Timme, 2012).
• **Parenting programmes:** aim to provide parents with the skills, knowledge or resources to raise children to their full potential. They are multi-faceted, and include working with national and local media to get information and effective messages out; training professionals to visit homes; providing guidance to parents and/or caregivers; conducting health or social centre-based activities on a one-to-one basis or in groups; caregivers exchange and peer support; etc. A longitudinal study by Gertler and colleagues (2014) found that growth-stunted Jamaican toddlers earned 25 per cent more as adults than their peers if their mothers received weekly training from community health workers in parenting skills and methods that promoted cognitive and socio-emotional skills in the children.

### Addressing limited rationality

• **Behavioural economics:** a field that studies the effects of psychological, emotional, cultural and social factors on the economic decisions of individuals and how those decisions deviate from standard models. For example, with the understanding that human thinking works in two major lanes – fast or automatic, and slow or deliberative – researchers overcame a local challenge of short funding to buy insecticide-treated mosquito nets in Kenya by giving each household a metal box, a padlock and a passbook. While the funding was still short, mentally associating money for mosquito nets with ‘saving’ resulted in a 66 to 75 per cent increase in household investments in these nets (World Bank, 2015, p. 4).

• **Behavioural insights:** is defined by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as an inductive approach to policymaking that combines insights from psychology, cognitive science and social science with empirically tested results to discover how humans actually make choices. This field of work is based on human behavioural traits and intervention design experiments spread across multiple fields with successful results in education, energy, environment, finance, health and safety, labour, public service delivery, taxes and telecommunications (OECD, 2017). The term ‘nudging’ (borrowed from Thaler and Sunstein, 2008) is commonly used to describe the use of choice architecture and behavioural tools and levers (prompts, reminders, commitment devices, social influence, etc.) to overcome cognitive biases.

### Addressing meta-norms

• **Gender-transformative approaches:** specifically seek to address harmful gender norms and inequalities, and promote alternative roles and behaviours to achieve outcomes that enable women, men, girls and boys to have equal opportunities and exercise their rights. Such approaches go beyond raising awareness and focus instead on addressing underlying power relations and structural inequalities such as changing institutions and systems. ‘Gender-responsive programming’ is less transformative and refers to programmes in which the different needs of women, men, girls and boys have been considered, and measures have been taken to actively address them. ‘Gender-sensitive programming’ refers to programmes where gender roles and inequalities have been considered, and awareness of these issues has been raised, although appropriate actions may not necessarily have been taken (see UNICEF South Asia, 2018).

• **Education programming:** a vast array of programmatic efforts that aim at improving the accessibility and quality of learning opportunities through strengthening inclusive and equitable education systems. Interventions include the provision of quality learning materials, improvement of accountability systems, capacity development and training for quality teaching, community mobilization and training school management committees, provision of alternative education in emergencies, etc. Education is critical in changing societies not only because it is necessary for children to reach their potential and contribute to change, but also because a significant part of the socialization element, which underpins most social norms and future adults’ behaviours, happens in school where, it is hoped, children spend a large part of their lives.
• **Rights protection and promotion:** ensuring that the State and communities are able to identify the violation of rights of the most marginalized and enforce respect. A human rights-based approach to programming (HRBAP) is a conceptual framework that is built on international standards of human rights and strives to promote human rights, as well as fight practices that violate these rights. HRBAP is based on four key principles: empowerment, participation, equality and non-discrimination, and accountability. The main focus of the approach is rights-holders and duty-bearers, and their capacities to claim and fulfil their obligations to human rights (See HRBAP, UNICEF; see also HRBAP Portal, United Nations). In UNICEF, all programming follows the goal of realizing the rights of children and women as put forth in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), but more direct strategic interventions include the monitoring and active advocacy for these rights, and approaches addressing the root causes of inequity so that all children, particularly those who suffer the worst deprivations in society, can access services and protection that are responsive to their needs.

• **Adolescent empowerment:** the use of participatory interventions, interpersonal communication, digital innovations and media platforms to build the capacities of adolescents and their families to address harmful social norms and practices; support programmes which engage adolescents in identifying problems or issues which concern them and creating innovative adolescent-led solutions, working closely with adolescents and youth as partners (UNICEF, 2018).

• **Social cohesion programming:** refers to a combination of various processes, mostly peacebuilding (solidification of peace, prevention of the continuation or reoccurrence of conflicts, reconciliation efforts, and management of differences and divisions), strengthening democratic governance (support of social dialogue, representation, civic engagement and participation in decision-making, social accountability, transparency and trust), fostering social inclusion (fighting exclusion with inequity-sensitive policies and financing, and protection systems for poor and marginalized people), promoting social justice and mobility (improvement of the distribution of wealth and opportunities for individual growth and participation in the economy), building of social capital (community empowerment to strengthen resources allowing – and resulting from – people’s cooperation toward common ends; these resources include social networks, civil society and community-based organizations, collective ownership of issues, key influencers and positive leadership for change, collective self-efficacy, and capacity capacity to mobilize for action), and supporting access to livelihoods and basic services (efforts to contribute to minimum living standards and welfare and ensure citizens’ satisfaction with service provision).

At a more local level, social cohesion programming refers to the development of a response mechanism that can help the factions in a community who are undergoing tension caused by disagreements on a societal issue. With the overwhelming influx of about 1 million Syrian refugees in 2011, Lebanese society faced a petrifying challenge. Search for Common Ground executed a project to create opportunities for interaction between the Lebanese host communities and the refugees, and organized capacity building events to empower individuals and to work on social cohesion (see Ortmans and Madsen, 2016, for a case study; and Gercama *et al.*, 2018, for a retrospective study).

• **Stigma and discrimination reduction:** at a collective level, programmes to change discriminatory social norms or eliminate structural barriers faced by marginalized people; at a more individual level, activities to help people learn the facts about who is being stigmatized, grow aware of personal attitudes and behaviour, avoid insensitive expressions, focus on the others’ contributions and be more inclusive. UNICEF Syria has a cash transfer programme to support, on a bimonthly basis, Syrian families with children with complex disabilities (see Awad and Ourfali, 2017). Zimbabwe’s AfricAid, through its Zvandiri Programme, trains HIV-positive adolescents to deliver counselling, training and advocacy activities that aim to reduce stigma towards children with HIV and help them gain confidence and skills to cope with stigma (see Willis, n.d.).
• Early childhood development (ECD) programmes: aim at two objectives:
  - parents and caregivers practicing nurturing care, positive parenting, and stimulating and learning activities; and
  - all young children, from conception up to the age of school entry, having equitable access to quality child care, health, nutrition, protection and early learning services to address their developmental needs.

ECD involves the use of comprehensive multi-sectoral programming packages delivered through a range of platforms (see UNICEF, 2017) so children can achieve their full developmental potential. ECD helps mitigate the impact of adverse early experiences, which, if not addressed, lead to poor health, low educational attainment, economic dependency, increased violence and crime, and heightened risk of substance abuse and depression – all of which add to the costs and burden to society, and perpetuate cycles of poverty.

Working on and with social influences

• Positive norms promotion: leveraging the positive norms and values that exist in a group as a tool for change. When only framed as ‘elimination of harmful practices’, programmes tend to reflect this negativity into the content of engagement on the ground. But this is sensitive: telling people what they do is wrong is not the best starting point, as some of these practices are inextricably tied to their social identity and ability to fit into their reference network. The identification of collective alternatives based on how people might better live their values if things changed, including positive religious, cultural and family values, often offers a better chance of success.

• Positive deviants approach: strategies developed for a community to look for and learn from uncommon yet successful attitudes and behaviours. In 2010, a study was carried out in different villages in Ethiopia, in which individuals watched a one-hour documentary that showcased successful people who had come from similar (low) socio-economic backgrounds. Six months later, surveys showed that watching the examples of success had induced higher aspirations, improved savings, and increased spending on children’s schooling (see Bernard et al., 2014).

• Civil society alliances: civil partnerships and organizations that are founded to tackle local harmful conditions or behaviours, and cooperate on a national, regional or global level under the coordination of a broader organization. For example, the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement devises and exploits its multi-stakeholder platforms across multiple countries to fight malnutrition. It increasingly engages in high-level politics, involves more sectors and stakeholders, distributes attention according to severity, audits coordinating structures, and strives to maintain momentum (SUN Movement, 2017).

• Value deliberations and framing: discussion of local cultural and social values that can lead to individual and collective empowerment, increase collective efficacy, spark collective action and build local institutions. The organization of safe spaces for deliberations and debates is a key component of social norms interventions, given that norms shift at the group level. As an example, when simply preaching about the health risks that are related to female genital mutilation (FGM) cannot tackle the harmful practice from its roots, advocates should organize sessions to discuss how FGM violates human rights and local protective values such that communities could reassess social norms and local conventions within a broader context. Most importantly, this format of discussion allows communities to reflect on the individual and communal levels about the enduring yet harmful practice, which is most likely to facilitate changes (see UNICEF, 2010a).
• **Organized diffusion**: is a pillar of most strategies that aim at scaling up social norms change. Once critical reflection, collective commitment and change have been achieved “privately” within a core group, the results of the deliberation are shared more widely amongst people who did not participate in the initial debates and mobilization, to spread the change outside of the initial community. In cases when norms are particularly powerful (actively enforced through social pressure, with guaranteed and significant consequences for deviants), new behaviors are likely to be possible only once a critical mass of people ready to change is reached, AND these people know about each other’s intentions. Communicating the shift of attitudes and expectations outside of the core group, and later outside of the community, is instrumental in reaching this tipping point at different scales. The practice of public commitment can also serve as a catalyst for wider communications efforts that disseminate new beliefs and practices outside of the community, especially when it involves respected influencers. Its organized diffusion is a way of bringing local change to scale, conveying communities’ choices.

• **Gatekeepers’ engagement**: certain social practices are actively enforced by those who benefit from the social status quo, as the norm helps consolidate their position of power. Partnering with and reassuring these particular stakeholders is often a condition to make local change possible. In some cases, gatekeepers will literally condition the possibility of accessing and working with a certain community, and their involvement in activities: the recognition of their role and that of the positive aspects of authority systems will be necessary for activities to take place (see Bryld et al., 2017).

• **Bystanders training**: programmes and curricula purposed to restrain the bystander effect (i.e., the more witnesses there are, the less likely each witness is to take action), raise awareness of related behaviours, and teach skills to recognize and intervene in intimate partner violence, sexual assault or harassment, sexual abuse of children or peer violence. Examples of interventions include knowledge enrichment to increase understanding of why the bystander effect exists and how to identify implicit victims of covert crimes (for an example, see Te and Khiev, 2018). Bystander intervention techniques are one of the key implementation strategies to change social norms featured in the INSPIRE handbook to reduce violence against children (WHO, 2018).

• **Social comparison opportunities**: provide individuals with opportunities to assess one’s own abilities, opinions and behaviours against others. This process of self-evaluation relative to other people or groups happens automatically and implicitly, whenever we’re exposed to relevant information about others. But these opportunities can be created as a way to influence behaviours. Nudging through social comparison has a simple nature yet marked effect in changing practices. For example, Allcott (2011) and Allcott and Rogers (2014) report that giving individuals information about their neighbours’ energy consumption can reduce individual consumption by 2 per cent.

• **Resistance to social pressure**: training to develop skills to fight back compliance tendency, to commit to initial intentions and to anchor intended behaviour to personal values. Previous academic work (Thomas, McLellan and Perera, 2013) has found that programmes that combine social competence and social influence training yielded positive results in helping school students to resist pressure – from their peers or the media – to start smoking. Social competence trainings aim to improve students’ life skills, such as “problem-solving and decision-making, cognitive skills for resisting interpersonal or media influences, increased self-control and self-esteem, coping strategies for stress, and general social and assertive skills” (Thomas, McLellan and Perera, 2013). Social influence trainings aim to increase awareness of the social influences that promote negative behaviours and teach people how to handle high-risk situations, as well as how to effectively refuse persuasion from any sources.
Influencing and partnering with governing entities

- **Policy advocacy**: is an increasingly important function for many non-profit organizations. In the social and economic development context, the aims of advocacy are to create or change policies, laws, regulations, distribution of resources or other decisions that affect people’s lives, and to ensure that such decisions lead to implementation. Good advocacy and advice helps transmit the message to ensure governments, lawmakers, the media and civil society hear it and act on it.

- **Sectoral reforms**: campaigns and programmes to change the current state of one or several aspects of a society/nation, such as public housing, health, education, etc. There is no general formula for undertaking sectoral reforms; the process must start with a systematic analysis of the political economy and thus be case specific. For example, in around 2011, India went through radical changes to regulations of several sectors to address its pressing issues for national growth. For the financial sector, it increased the limits of authorized capital; for insurance, it invited more contractual savings institutions; for agriculture, it broke the state-level monopoly in regulation; for energy, it moved several regulated products to market pricing; for subsidy delivery, it transitioned from food, fertilizer and fuel subsidies to cash transfer and coupons; for foreign direct investment, it relaxed caps across the board; and for land management, it effected a national title registry to ameliorate real estate illiquidity (see Kishore, 2011).

- **Social mobilization**: focuses on uniting partners at the national and/or community levels for a common purpose. It is a process of dialogue, coalition-building and group organization to rally multiple forces around a specific cause, from the public, private and civil-society sectors alike. It emphasizes collective efficacy and empowerment to create an enabling environment (UNICEF, 2019).

- **Institutional partnerships**: action taken by civic organizations, governments and other entities to create relationships between them and increase access to available resources to fulfil goals related to social change. Specifically for social and behaviour change programming, partnerships can involve alliances between donors, academic institutions, practitioners, communities, private-sector entities, civil society and governments to diagnose, design, implement and evaluate interventions to change harmful behaviours. Partnerships are complex, diverse and increasingly vital to tackle development issues by mobilizing and unlocking the power of various stakeholders. Addressing the whole set of factors that drive behaviors can be quite overwhelming and not really fundable: social and behavior change can often only happen at scale through partnerships.

- **Participation and social accountability**: policies to engage citizens or their representative agents in a process in which they can question public officials and service providers about their decisions and actions. Examples include the Children’s Budget Clubs in Zimbabwe – an initiative that combined budget analysis, public hearings, and community scorecards to engage Children’s Clubs with policymakers; community scorecards in Kenya – an effort to inform service providers and rights holders of poor water quality; and the Cotton Campaign in Uzbekistan – a coalitional effort to stop forced labour (including children) by the Uzbekistan government in cotton harvesting that called for a boycott of Uzbek cotton (UNICEF, 2015).

Improving and leveraging community dynamics

- **Community-based approaches**: a local process that engages community members, raising their awareness of barriers and opportunities for development, developing a collective analysis of issues that affect them, and engaging them in critical reflection, participatory learning, collaborative action and joint assessment. It is a process of change coming from the community and driven by the community. These participatory problem-solving interventions have been central to a number of SBC initiatives including as core components of programmes implemented at scale, such as the Global Programme on Ending Child Marriage or the global approach to Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS). They have had significant measurable effects on outcomes related to health, nutrition, education and child protection (UNICEF, 2019).
• Civil society organizations (CSOs), community-based organizations (CBOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs): all keep close relationships with the communities and are critical partners that engage in development and humanitarian efforts. They exist organically within every community and have a strong influence over the local behavioural dynamics and social and moral orientation of their constituencies, thanks to the trust capital they have earned. They include faith-based groups, family and parenting organizations, self-help groups, women's support groups, savings and credit groups, farmers associations, trade unions and youth organizations. They can facilitate a level of dialogue and call to action that is unique to their communities and critical to implementing participatory research, planning, implementation, monitoring and social accountability processes. They also offer points of convergence to engage on issues spanning multiple sectors. For example, FBOs may play a key role by speaking out against child abuse and female genital mutilation while also promoting vaccination (UNICEF, 2019). As an example, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has collaborated with UNICEF to leverage the potential of partnering with CSOs and FBOs in the global programme to end child marriage (UNFPA-UNICEF, 2017). CSOs received master trainings to help adolescents (both in and out of school) to gain essential life skills, as well as to use participatory development tools to increase interactions among adolescents and their communities.

Addressing structural barriers

• Systems strengthening: any efforts that support an existing service structure, with actions to improve the provision, utilization, quality, efficiency and inclusiveness of services delivered through the system, and encourage the adoption of positive practices. For example, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has set goals to strengthen health systems in many developing countries by strengthening human resources, health finance, health governance, health information, medical products, vaccines, technologies and service delivery (USAID, 2015). In Bangladesh, USAID started a Program Monitoring and Management Unit to monitor evaluation and reporting processes. In Liberia, it started emergency operations systems and improved disease surveillance and quality control laboratories. In Zimbabwe, it helped with the transition from paper-based records to electronic logistics management.

• Equity interventions: aim to distribute resources and provide access to services to those who have not enjoyed an equal share and are marginalized. Vulnerability assessment and equity-focused data collection and analysis are the basis for developing programmes to meet the needs of people affected by poverty in order to close the attainment gap, but also to address the underlying drivers of inequity, which often appear even before a child is born.

• Social protection programmes: aim to support vulnerable populations and target marginalized groups as participants and beneficiaries of services, goods and activities. UNICEF (2010b) has found many benefits from using social protection mechanisms and approaches in reaching the Millennium Development Goals, i.e., tackling poverty, unemployment and hunger; bettering education and gender outcomes; and improving health care and reducing illness.

• Technological innovation: the development and use of new approaches and technologies to increase access to essential services, communicate life-saving information (e.g., U-Report and RapidPro), engage participants and connect them to institutions and opportunities. Examples include essential medicines, new communication mechanisms, improved WASH devices and agricultural breakthroughs.

• Market shaping: the attainment of development goals is inextricably linked to the marketplaces that deliver commodities, including life-saving products to low-income populations. Market shaping consists of influencing policies, manufacturers and distributors to produce and deliver enough high-quality and accessible products. UNICEF, for example, seeks to influence markets to achieve affordable prices, diversify supplier bases, build competitive market landscapes, and increase the availability of quality products, which are fit for purpose and appropriate for use by children. Significant focus has been placed on the sanitation and hygiene market, vaccine procurement (through an extensive market shaping effort with GAVI, the Vaccine Alliance) and nutrition markets. This is a highly strategic endeavour requiring an understanding of market forces, accurate forecasting and analysis, and engagement with various industries and players.
CONCLUSION

PART IV
If health services are decent and accessible, a newborn getting measles, a child infected by cholera or a mother dying during delivery at home are not medical issues. In many cases, the bottlenecks to accessing health care are matters of awareness, understanding, attitudes, power relations, norms, religion, cultural influences, rumours, etc. In other words, they are fundamentally behavioural and social. In all of our sectors, we have the capacity to help children and their families survive and thrive.

Nevertheless, we still struggle to see social and behaviour change programming consistently and adequately used across sectors and partners, including within UNICEF. The practice is often not up to standards: assumptions frequently drive programme design more than formative research; simplistic models are applied; standard interventions are put in place and replicated without necessarily questioning if they are logical, fit for purpose and can maximize the investment of our limited resources. This overall situation impairs UNICEF’s ability to deliver on its accountabilities. Behaviour change needs to be better understood, and the science behind it made more accessible.

The development of the Behavioural Drivers Model is an attempt to provide practitioners with a tool that can help improve this situation. On one hand, the BDM embraces the complexity of the various scientific fields which need to be explored and combined to successfully understand and influence people’s practices. On the other hand, it voluntarily cuts a few corners and offers practitioners a direct added-value in taking a more theory-based approach to their work: the BDM can be used as a checklist to avoid blind spots during formative research; it offers a menu of programmatic approaches and interventions that are more likely to be suitable to specific drivers; and it provides a way to build results frameworks and monitor intermediate achievement on the way to behaviour change.

The BDM is already being used as the conceptual anchoring for a series of formative research, quantitative surveys and strategy development processes conducted by UNICEF country offices in various regions. It is also referred to during capacity-building efforts with several partners. And it serves as the basis to develop standard measurement and programming tools.

The feedback from these applications on the ground will allow us to assess further how well the BDM helps in structuring research and programmatic processes; how suitable it is for capturing, organizing and presenting results; and how well it performs as a single conceptual reference point throughout the social and behaviour change planning and implementation cycle.

As a living tool, from this initial version onward, it will be refined and adapted through an incremental process of collaboration with a growing network of partners around the world, informed by evidence and learning-based discussions.
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Icons used for the Behavioural Drivers Model are based on icons from the Noun Project:

What drives a behaviour: Lorie Shaull, US
Psychology: b farias, CL
Sociology: Wilson Joseph
Environment: mohkamil, ID
Personal characteristics: Gan Khoon Lay
Cognitive biases: Shuaibu Usman Yusuf, Delwar Hossain, ic ons, and Vaibhav Radhakrishnan
Interest: Brad Avison, NZ
Attitude: Nick Holroyd, US
Intent: Gan Khoon Lay
Self-efficacy: Gan Khoon Lay
Limited rationality: Arthur Shlain
Action: Pham Thanh Lôc, VN
Behaviour: Keith Mulvin, US
Communication environment: Hans Gerhard Meier, Fredrikstad
Emerging alternatives: Nick Dominguez, US
Context: Iris Sun, GA
Social influence: Eliricon, FI
Community dynamics: Stephen Borengasser, US
Governing entities: Nick Abrams, US
Structural barriers: Gan Khoon Lay
Meta-norms: corpus delicti