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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFE</td>
<td>Action for Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Action Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Criteria Scoring Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF</td>
<td>Equal Community Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Foundation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEQ</td>
<td>Key Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – they have set standards for evaluation that are widely accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Participatory Learning for Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAI</td>
<td>RAISE – a project to build capacities of organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDE</td>
<td>Research Development and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHG</td>
<td>Self Help Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFE</td>
<td>Utilization Focused Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Equal Community Foundation

Equal Community Foundation (ECF) is based in Pune, India and has been working towards the singular goal of raising every man in India to end violence against women since 2009. ECF positions violence against women as a man’s issue. ECF’s Theory of Change is “If young men study and practice gender equality with others they trust, and if these men are supported by influential parties including peer groups, parents, teachers and health workers, then they will change their own abusive behavior and challenge others to end their abusive behavior too.”

ECF structures itself in a way that reflects the two key roles it sees for itself: the development of tools, methodologies, evidence and expertise, and the dissemination of this knowledge through partnerships in order to influence widespread adoption of the approach. ECF’s organisational structure reflects these roles through two programmes:

1. Action for Equality (AFE) is a community led program and works in Pune’s low-income communities. The program is aimed at adolescent boys aged 14-17 years old; mentors work intensively with groups of these young men using a structured curriculum.
2. Project Raise (RAI) builds capacities of NGOs interested in working with boys and men to end violence and discrimination against women.

The Research Development & Evaluation (RDE) function cuts across these programmes regularly and systematically gathers program evidence primarily for AFE to demonstrate if and to what extent to engaging boys and men contributes to reducing violence against women.

Till May 2015, 3478 young men have enrolled for the AFE program, with 1683 graduating (with at least 60% attendance) and of which 750 continue to be involved in various capacities as volunteers.

Project Raise has raised funds for a three year programme to support twenty community based organisations who work well with women and girls, integrate the AFE programme into their existing work. The first eight partners have been inducted into the programme in July of 2015.

ECF identified an independent external reviewer to take stock of ECF as an organization and assess AFE program achievements in order to provide recommendations for the way forward. In other words, the evaluation was commissioned by ECF with the support of Savitri Waney Charitable Trust, the intent being to learn from the evaluation process as well as to have an independent, objective evaluation using the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. ECF had not been independently evaluated since it started its work in 2009.

Evaluation

The evaluation approach was developed through a review of program documents, discussions with ECF and a review of the initial Terms of Reference developed by ECF.

The intent was to design an evaluation process, which though steered by an external evaluator, provided an opportunity for ECF staff to learn and build evaluative capacities, to own and use the evaluation.

---

1 http://ecf.org.in/
2 Organization and Program Summary, ECF
3 http://ecf.org.in/
A hybrid evaluation approach was used to frame the evaluation and principles from Feminist Evaluation, Utilization Focused Evaluation and Developmental Evaluation (UFE-DE) were incorporated in the evaluation design. A gender transformative lens was used to frame the inquiry, gathering the data, and in anchoring the interpretation of the findings. This framing was critical since ECF’s work was related to transforming traditional engendered concepts of manhood and power relationships towards a more equitable relationship that results in addressing gender discrimination and violence. Along with a gender transformative evaluation approach (some call this “feminist evaluation”), both Utilization-focused and Developmental evaluation approaches were used. Developmental evaluation helped to develop exploratory outcome related questions as ECF’s approach was an innovative one and pathways of change were emergent. Use and Users of the evaluation were identified from the beginning.

ECF identified that the USERS of the evaluation were first and foremost ECF Staff, but that the review would also be used for potential donors and funders. The USE for the evaluation was for program improvement as well as to provide evidence to potential donors to inform their investment decisions. The following key questions were identified by ECF:
1. Does our programme work? (i.e. Do we do what we say we do?) . The scope of the evaluation was negotiated to evaluate the AFE program.
2. Is ECF a learning organization?

As USERS were donors and the USE was to provide evidence for funding, it was important to include quantitative as well as qualitative methods and tools. Secondary data analysis and the Attitude Survey provided quantitative data whereas the interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and Participatory Learning for Action (PLA) tools provided the qualitative data. The use of mixed methods was useful to triangulate the data. The UFE and Developmental Evaluation design ensured the active participation of ECF management in this process. Human rights and gender equality principles guided the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders for the design, planning and implementation of the evaluation. Stakeholders included the main target for the AFE program – the adolescent boys and their mothers/sisters. Others were senior management of ECF, field mentors, RDE team, mentors as well as others such as trainer specialist for mentors and one of the partners.

The following data collection tools were used: questionnaire with ECF management, questionnaire with ECF co-founders, questionnaire with key informants, FGD guide for mothers, PLA tools for managers and mentors (Timeline with Force Field Analysis, SWOT (Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats analysis), stakeholder analysis and sphere of influence, theory of change, criteria scoring and analysis), adolescent friendly PLA tools for adolescent boys (communication map, body map) and an attitude survey with adolescent boys.

In all, data was collected from 106 persons using various methodologies. The interviews were with the ECF staff (8), key informants (3), PLA and FGD (38) and attitude survey (66). The total time for the evaluation, including report writing was 20 days. For the attitude survey, a purposive random sample of boys was used. The attitude survey was piloted and statements analyzed by Cronbach’s Alpha (710) showing high reliability. Ethical guidelines were followed and consent forms completed from guardians.

There were challenges in data collection. The evaluation was collaborative and had to be paced according to the scheduling of both the evaluator and ECF. Also, the tools were developed in tandem so that the findings from one tool informed the development of the other, keeping in mind the UFE and Development Evaluation approaches used. So, although ECF learned in real time, there were delays in execution. Sampling for the attitude survey took time as boys who had previously attended AFE had moved out of the community.

Findings
In terms of **relevance**, ECF’s work of engaging boys to be part of the solution to prevent gender violence and discrimination is very relevant for communities in India and internationally. Boys’ needs are being addressed and include the development of critical thinking and communication skills, seeking knowledge and safe spaces for discussion. Most low income communities are preoccupied with poverty related life struggles and addressing gender inequality is not a priority. However, there is a growing awareness about gender equality and men’s role in preventing violence against women in the communities that ECF works in. Action for Equality’s expectation that boys take action so that the number of women experiencing violence is reduced is relevant and ambitious.

Changing attitudes and behaviours amongst adolescent boys to prevent violence and create an enabling environment are prerequisites to the prevention of violence against women and girls.

The AfE programme positively changes adolescent boys’ gender attitudes and behaviour. It also helps to develop boys’ communication and advocacy skills, increases their understanding of gender equitable norms and improves relationships with their members of their household.

Among the participants in AfE who attend 60% or more training events, 50% have demonstrated a positive change in attitude related to gender equality. On specific issues such as dowry and domestic chores, 90% have demonstrated they have gender equitable attitudes after taking part in the programme. Also, boys with 90% attendance have expressed more change related to communication and relationship. There is also concrete evidence from women and girls, specifically mothers and sisters experiencing a positive change in their relationships with the programme participant and reporting their son or brother had showed an increased level of respect since he joined the programme. As shown by the secondary data, 80% of the participants’ relatives declare that participants have become more respectful in the sense they value their opinions and actions.

These changes in adolescent boys’ attitudes and behaviours open opportunities to develop alliances between men and women to challenge issues related to gender equality. By supporting adolescent boys over a period of 18 months (total duration of the AfE programme) in developing gender equity/fairness along with community mobilization skills, ECF creates an enabling environment for significant changes to happen.

It is likely that the extent of the outcomes reach beyond what ECF has measured. ECF has the capacity and intention, but not the resources, to measure outcomes in more detail at the individual and family level, and to start to measure those at the community level.

What is evident is that, **effectiveness** was being measured against the AfE goal of reducing gender violence. However, by working with young men whilst their attitudes and behaviour in regards to gender and sexuality are still being formed, the AfE programme could be more accurately measured against what was actually changing in boys’ lives related to prevention of violence. I.e. their knowledge on gender, better relationships at home, increased gender equitable attitudes and behavior. Such a finding vindicates the use of a UFE-DE approach, which was able to deliver a nuanced analysis.

Age and dosage are important factors that affect change. Enrollment age of boys is younger than expected and the younger ones are most likely to continue in the program; all castes, ethnic groups attend but some boys remain resistant to enrollment efforts so there is scope to increase reach. Boys attend sessions and participate but are not actively involved in planning, monitoring and evaluation of the program. Further, there is better interpersonal communication in the families but families themselves can also, unintentionally, create barriers. Mentor’s role is critical to the success of the program, the better their communication and facilitation skills the better is the response from the boys. Quality of the curriculum has improved but is more challenging to deliver and is not tailored
towards a younger age group. Monitoring and evaluation is a strong component of ECF work and evidence is shared with managers and field staff to make program changes.

**Impact** has been assessed in terms of impact on boys’ attitudes as well as impact of ECF’s work. Survey findings indicated that age was significantly linked to better attendance. Survey findings indicate that some attitudes are particularly resistant to change and there is no difference among very high and high attendees. Therefore certain desirable attitudes and behaviours amongst adolescent boys have not been realised. ECF’s mentors and managers had already identified many of these, and have developed programme strategies that seek to realise them in the future such as increasing the number of sessions and intensify the level of reflection and initiative required to graduate from the programme.

There were many tangible changes in boys’ behavior towards the goal of preventing violence that were recognized but considered as ‘unintended’. The ‘unintended outcomes’ indicate a variety of changes in boys’ behavior and recognition by society of the changes that have started to be visible. Managers and mentors label improvement in education or improvement in relationships as ‘unintended’ but these are real changes possibly because of the critical thinking that is encouraged in the AFE sessions. This skill spills over in other areas of life.

Mentors and managers felt it was too early for sustainability i.e. that the program could function on its own with the support from the community. The plan to include Community Committees was a step towards sustainability but it is in the initial stages.

ECF’s budget of $400,000 over 6 years is very efficient considering the body of knowledge and resources developed and mobilised thus far. ECF’s strategy for scaling AFE through Project Raise is also efficient. By building the capacity of women’s organisations to integrate AFE core principles into their existing programmes with women, ECF leverages the existing organisational infrastructure and senior management capacity of existing community based organisations across India. Funding however continues to be a challenge because of a lack of strategic investment in this space, and because of a lack of organisational capacity and resources. Despite this, ECF’s programs are completed on time.

ECF values innovation and this is evident from the reflexivity shown in revising the curriculum, use of research and evaluation, investment in training and the flexibility in changing plans due to changed circumstances. The top 5 strengths were monitoring and evaluation, leadership, dedication and loyalty of staff and organizational culture. Key informants stated that the monitoring and evaluation, emphasis on capacity building, spaces for reflection and understanding of the issue and challenges on hand were unusual for a small NGO. The challenges were a realistic assessment of where ECF wants to go and in this sense is an example of its innovative and transparent way of doing business. It has already identified the gaps and wants to work towards addressing them.

Change in patriarchy and deep-seated gender discriminatory attitudes and behavior requires the sensitization of families, communities and local level authorities to ensure that enabling environments are created for young boys. The AFE program of ECF has contributed substantially to understanding what it takes to bring changes in boys’ knowledge, attitude, skills and behavior to ensure a more gender equitable attitude and behavior, challenging notions of masculinity and manhood to prevent violence against women. ECF is exploring how boys and men can be part of the solution. Whereas most organizations working on gender equality target women, ECF is among the few to work with adolescent boys. Due to ECF’s efforts, thousands of boys (and their families, peers and community) have been exposed to ideas of gender equality and have taken action towards it. ECF has practically demonstrated how to implement programs that are committed to bringing behavior change (and not just awareness) and has shown a willingness to adapt and learn from the field. The work with boys draws attention to the critical role that NGOs like ECF, grounded in local realities, can play to inform
on masculinity related issues that are complex and very little is known about. ECF has demonstrated that it has the capacity to build and improve programmes to change boys gender attitudes and behaviours towards women. ECF must now resource the further development of this work to deepen the programme's impact, and spread the evidence and practice through civil society and government.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested:

1. ECF review its mission and goals of the AFE program to reflect the work it is actually doing.
2. Theory of Change be developed that captures the change in knowledge, attitudes, skills and behavior of the boys in the program
3. ECF recognize and value the different changes being observed in boys, families and communities as a result of their intervention and document learnings to inform their own implementation and further research.
4. ECF reviews its dosage(minimum number of training sessions attended) criteria for the Foundation Program and consider dosage as seamless including all programs – Foundation, Action and Leadership.
5. Align the curriculum with the age, dosage and goal of the AFE program and be informed by research, observations and findings at the field level. This will be a valuable contribution of ECF towards knowledge building.
6. The Foundation program be reviewed to ensure that good facilitation takes place and develop strategies to increase retention of adolescent boys in the program.
7. Capacity building of mentors continues to be strengthened and recruitment be informed by which communities (language, ethnicity, status) ECF wishes to work in.
8. ECF reviews its strategic partners and other community stakeholders, including families, and their contribution towards realizing their mission and goal.
9. The emphasis on RDE continue, baselines be included and monitoring and evaluation continue to inform implementation and future planning.
10. ECF look at how internal efficiency can be improved through increased numbers of skilled staff, review targets at the field level.
11. Continue to use creative ways of tapping Indian and international funders including CSR.
12. ECF management culture continue to be developed in its current and future projects.
13. ECF develop its advocacy strategy and strategically network with civil society, donors and key influencers to promote its model of engaging men in the prevention of violence against women.

A result validation meeting was held with the ECF team and seven boys who participated in the FGDs. The findings of the evaluation were accepted by the team and the boys. As part of the evaluation, ECF management team responded to the recommendations suggested. It is important to note here that even before the final report was ready to be published, the ECF team began work on some of the recommendations.

ECF has demonstrated it is a learning and innovative organization, committed to bring real change in gender equitable behavior, proven that boys can be part of the solution and has developed a model that is willing to learn from field experience and contribute to a better understanding of manhood, masculinity and preventing violence against women.
1. Introduction

1.1 Background: Equal Community Foundation

Equal Community Foundation (ECF) is based in Pune, India and has been working towards the singular goal of raising every man in India to end violence against women since 2009. ECF positions violence against women as a men’s issue. ECF’s premise is that if men understand human rights, question existing gender norms in their own life, improve their leadership skills, take collective actions on gender equality together with women, then they will:

1. recognize the value and justice of gender equality
2. take personal and collective action to prevent violence against women in their lives and communities
3. advocate ending violence and discrimination by their peers and others in the community.

ECF structures itself in a way that reflects the two key roles it sees for itself: (a) the development of tools, evidence and expertise, and (b) the dissemination of this knowledge through partnerships. ECF’s organisational structure reflects these roles through two programmes:

1. Action for Equality (AfE) is a community led program and works in Pune’s low income communities. The program is meant for young men between the ages of 14-17 years. Mentors work intensively with this group using a structured curriculum
2. Project Raise (RAI) builds capacities of NGOs interested in working with boys and men to end violence and discrimination against women.

The Research, Development & Evaluation function cuts across these programmes regularly and systematically gathering evidence from the program primarily to demonstrate if and to what extent engaging men contributes to reducing violence against women.

ECF identified an independent external reviewer to take stock of ECF as an organization and assess program achievements in order to provide recommendations for the way forward. In other words, the evaluation was commissioned by ECF, the intent being to learn from the evaluation process as well as to have an independent, objective evaluation using the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. ECF had not been evaluated since it started its work in 2009.

1.2 Project Rationale

1.2.1 Project Mission

ECF’s mission “is to ensure that every man in India has the opportunity to study and practice gender equitable behavior to end violence and discrimination against women.”

1.2.2 Theory of Change

ECF’s Theory of Change is “If young men study and practice gender equality with others they trust, and if these men are supported by influential parties including peer groups, parents, teachers and health workers, then they will change their own abusive behavior and challenge others to end their abusive behavior too.”

---

4 http://ecf.org.in/
5 Ibid
6 Ibid
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1.2.3 ECF: Scope of Work

ECF’s AFE works in 20 low-income communities in Pune. (See Attachment Two for names of communities)

Program

ECF runs two strategic programs to execute its mission: Action for Equality (AFE) and Project Raise (RAI). In AFE, ECF works directly with adolescent boys in communities whereas with RAI, ECF works with organizations to build their capacities to work with young men.

a) Action for Equality: This is the flagship program of ECF that focuses on adolescent boys in the age group of 14-17 years from low income communities in Pune. AFE comprises three programs – Foundation, Action and Leadership. Adolescent boys first enroll in the 15 week Foundation Program, and then proceed to a 15 week Action Program and then to a 10 month Leadership Program.

The Foundation Program - Adolescent boys attend a series of participatory sessions facilitated by “mentors” where they learn about gender violence and discrimination. The curriculum has been reviewed and revised since 2009, the latest with the most comprehensive overhaul being implemented in 2014. The Foundation Program has three implementation ‘cycles’ in a year. This means that, every four months, a new group of boys enroll for 15 weekly sessions to learn about men’s role in gender equality and inequality. Only those with 60% attendance and above become ‘graduates’. There is no restriction on enrollment – a boy is able to re-enroll if he drops out of the Foundation program.

Action Program – is the next step after the Foundation Program. Graduates from the foundation programme can enroll into the Action Program where they volunteer on a weekly basis to plan and implement various action events in the community on issues related to gender equality. The Action program went through major strategic changes. Earlier the program was not time bound and all graduates from the Foundation program were invited to become a part of the Action Program. The program is now time bound. There are 15 sessions, broken up into 3 mini cycles with each mini cycle culminating in an action event. Those participants who attend 60% of the sessions, are invited to join the next programme.

Leadership Program - ECF wants to nurture leaders from the Action program in the hope that when ECF withdraws, these leaders will be competent to plan and implement activities related to the overall mission of ECF in the communities. Earlier, program mentors selected active volunteers to become leaders, with the objective to mobilize and motivate adolescent boys to become leaders for gender equality. Now, all active volunteers are eligible to become part of the Leadership Program which is a 10 month program. In this program, the leaders have access to monthly training that focuses specifically on development of skills in the context of advocating the principles of equality.

Community Committees (CC)- Community Committees is a pilot that ECF is running as an extension to the AFE Program. ECF is currently exploring how the formation of these committees can contribute to the sustainability of the practise of gender equality principles in these communities. Members include leaders Adolescent boys (who have completed the Foundation and Action program and joined the Leadership Program), anganwadi workers, interested parents, the local social leaders – about 10-12 members. These members meet every 15 days to discuss issues related to gender discrimination and violence such as street sexual harassment of girls,
dowry, child marriage and girls’ education. In the formation stage the activities of the community committees focused on identification of problems in the community and discussion of potential actions for these problems. There were some practical problems in that the timing for the CC meeting did not coincide with men and women’s free time. About seven community committees are under development. Till May 2015, 3478 young men have enrolled for the AFE program, with 1683 graduating (with at least 60% attendance) and of which 750 continue to be involved in various capacities as volunteers.

b) Project Raise: ECF intends to build capacities of 100 organizations across India over 5 years building on the experiences from the AFE model. ECF has collaborated with the Hummingbird Foundation, in phase one, to build capacities of 20 organizations over three years, in West Bengal. The AFE curriculum and materials will be used to build capacities of selected organizations to work with boys and men to end violence against women.

Research

The Research Development & Evaluation (RDE) programme cuts across the Action for Equality and Project Raise Programmes. It regularly and systematically gathers evidence to demonstrate if and to what extent engaging adolescent boys contribute to reducing violence against women.

In the context of Action For Equality, RDE maintains a database of all boys enrolled in the AFE program and monitors and evaluates each cycle. The methodology and tools used have evolved with the program and learnings from the data are fed back for program improvement. (See Attachment Four for the evolvement of the M&E framework from Cycle 1 to Cycle 12)

1.2.4 Changes in Implementation

The following changes took place in the AFE program:

- **Foundation Program**
  - From January to July 2010: Action for Equality was being tested in 1 community
  - From August to December 2010: Action for Equality was being implemented in 3 communities
  - In December 2010, 6 new mentors and 1 supervisor were recruited and a month long intensive training was organised for them.
  - In January 2011, ECF launched AFE in 20 low-income communities (16 in Pune and 4 in Mumbai) with the new team.
  - From Cycle 1 (1st January - 31st May 2011) - Cycle 11 (20th September 2014- 10th January 2015), the Foundation Program was called the Graduate Program.
  - The name Foundation Program (previous Graduate Program) was used for the first time during Cycle 12 (27th January - 9th May 2015)
  - The Graduate Program became 15 weeks from Cycle 5 (1st July 2012- 31st October 2012)

- **Action Program**
  - The Action Program started during Cycle 2 (1st June 2011- 30th September 2011). The Action Program was known as the Alumni Program from Cycle 2 to Cycle 11 (20th September 2014- 10th January 2015) This Program was an ongoing program till Cycle 10 (12th May 2014- 28th August 2014). Once the participants graduated from Foundation Program they joined the Action Program which functioned as a members

---
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club, and there was no termination date for participation in it. From Cycle 1- Cycle 11, the adolescent boys of the Action Program were called volunteers.
- The Action Program became a 15-week program during Cycle 11 (20th September 2014- 10th January 2015). These 15 weeks consisted of 3 mini cycles of 5 weeks each. For the first time in cycle 12, boys enrolled and graduated from the Action Program.

- **Leadership Program**
  - During Cycle 3 (1st October 2011- 29th February 2012), mentors identified potential leaders from Cycle 1 Foundation Program. These boys joined what was then called leadership training. This training happened once every month.
  - From Cycle 11 (20th September 2014- 10th January 2015), the leadership training became open to all the participants who successfully completed the Action Program.

## 2. Evaluation Methodology

### 2.1 Evaluation Approach - Hybrid

The evaluation approach was developed through a review of program documents, discussions with ECF team and a review of the initial Terms of Reference (TOR) developed by ECF.

The intent was to design an evaluation process, which though steered by an external evaluator, provided an opportunity for ECF staff to learn and build evaluative capacities, to own and use the evaluation. Hence principles from Feminist Evaluation, Utilization Focused Evaluation and Developmental Evaluation (UFE-DE) were incorporated in the design of the evaluation. The external evaluator provided expertise and objectivity to the evaluation but was also a facilitator, pacing inputs according to the readiness of ECF staff. The evaluation process was therefore longer, spread over six months. ECF was involved in decisions regarding TOR revision, evaluation design, tools for data collection and secondary data analysis ensuring a collaborative process.

A gender transformative lens\(^9\) in principle does not necessarily exclusively concentrate on women; however, examples of its use while working with boys and men are limited. This evaluation used a gender transformative lens to frame the inquiry, gather data, and anchor interpretation of the findings. This framing was critical since ECF’s work was related to transforming young men’s traditional engendered concepts of manhood and power relationships towards a more equitable gender relationship that results in addressing gender discrimination and violence. Along with a gender transformative evaluation approach (some call this “feminist evaluation”), both Utilization-focused and Developmental evaluation approaches were used.

Developmental evaluation helped to develop exploratory outcome related questions as ECF’s approach was an innovative one and pathways of change were emergent. Use and Users of the evaluation were identified from the beginning and helped to focus the evaluation using key questions. In other words, a hybrid approach to evaluation was used with the use of Utilization focused evaluation and Developmental Evaluation, and framed by a gender transformative lens. The following table analyses how a gender transformative\(^10\) lens was used:

---

\(^9\) Gender transformative lens is used as a synonym for feminist lens as this definition specifically addresses discrimination and power in gender relationships. It is different from a) gender blind evaluations that do not assess change in gender relations b) gender instrumental that only explore how traditional gender roles have contributed to achieve program objectives c) gender specific which do address the specific needs of men and women but do not question the power relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Transformative Concept</th>
<th>Position in the Evaluation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Inquiry implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central focus on inequities</td>
<td>Gender discrimination cuts across class, ethnicity, caste and other social cleavages</td>
<td>How do these intersectionalities affect program reach, attendance, transition to advanced program levels and change in boys’ gender transformative knowledge attitude and change in behavior?</td>
<td>Disaggregated data by age, open and scheduled castes, socioeconomic level, ethnicity informs who benefits and who does not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequities are structural</td>
<td>Understand changes in discrimination, boy preference, question patriarchy and institutionalized male preference, critique men’s lived experiences and expression of masculinity</td>
<td>How has boys’ concept of masculinity changed? What factors supported or hindered the change? Which areas of gender discrimination were particularly resistant to change? What changes in behavior were unexpected? How has boys’ change in gendered power relationships affected families and communities? What is role of female and male members of family and community in effecting structural changes?</td>
<td>Use participatory tools with boys to assess changes in power relationships and one’s self concept of being male; assess change in boys’ behavior through inquiry with female family members; role of community leadership to challenge inequities; understand what inequities are resistant to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation is political</td>
<td>Trust building is critical to probe changes in traditional patriarchal engendered attitudes, behavior and institutionalized power structures</td>
<td>What are accepted traditional practices for gender inclusiveness and how do families and communities challenge them (or not)? What are the power issues within families that build barriers? To what extent can deep-rooted gender inequities be addressed by boys and what is difficult? Who are the</td>
<td>Involve a range of stakeholders to understand program realities including boys themselves (with ethical guidelines), other groups working on the issues, female members of family, community leaders, mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is value in different ways of knowing</td>
<td>Recognize a variety of data collection methods are important for deep and authentic engagement with stakeholders</td>
<td>What are personal changes that boys experience regarding their masculine role and how do they express them? What new ways of knowing and expressing have boys learned? How do mentors innovate to enable boys to learn?</td>
<td>Variety of interactive tools used to express feelings, attitudes and behavior; tools enable group learning while co-generating data, adolescent friendly tools enable creative expression of thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds value to those who are marginalized and to those implementing programs</td>
<td>Reflexivity is important for those implementing programs as it affects the quality of intervention. Those who are marginalized require targeting.</td>
<td>What is the role of program mentor in bringing change in boys’ attitude and behavior? Which boys are the low ‘scorers’ on gendered attitudes in comparison with higher ‘scorers’ and what causal inferences can we make? Who, among boys and families, are likely to enroll and benefit and who are excluded? What efforts are made to involve the marginalized?</td>
<td>Understand how program has transformed gender attitudes of mentors; how marginalized boys are targeted (or not) and challenges; barriers to enrolment by marginalized boys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Using the principles of Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE)**<sup>11</sup>, ECF managers at the outset were encouraged to articulate the use of the evaluation and the key questions that needed to be answered to ensure use. ECF identified that the USERS of the evaluation were program staff, potential donors and funders and partners. The USE of the evaluation was for program improvement as well as to provide evidence to potential donors and partners to inform their investment decisions. The following key evaluation questions were identified by ECF:

1. Does our programme work? (i.e. Do we do what we say we do?) The scope of the evaluation was negotiated to evaluate the AFE program.
2. Is ECF a learning organization?

---

<sup>11</sup> UFE developed by Michael Quinn Patton, is an approach based on the principle that an evaluation should be judged on its usefulness to its intended users. In Patton's view, in order to ensure that evaluation findings contribute optimally to operational change, they must focus on learning and improvement. Patton, M.Q. (1997). Utilization-Focused evaluation: The new century text (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
Developmental evaluation principles\textsuperscript{12} were used since ECF’s work was innovative and the program had been evolving since inception. For example, curriculum design and mentor training had been through several changes based on evidence from the ongoing monitoring and formative evaluations. Evaluation tools were designed to capture the evolving nature of ECF’s work and included creating a Theory of Change (TOC), Timeline Analysis, Stakeholder Mapping and SWOT (Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats) analysis. A number of PLA tools were designed for adolescent boys. These tools among others are described in the section below.

The scope of the evaluation was large, but the number of days for evaluation was limited. That is why collaborative evaluation approaches such as UFE and Developmental Evaluation were adopted to frame the evaluation. The following decisions were collaboratively made before the evaluation was started:

1. **TOR** – The original TOR intended to assess ECF as an organization, AFE Program and Project Raise. It was agreed to revise the TOR to realistically tailor the number of days available for the evaluation. The focus of the evaluation would be two fold: 1) Assessment of ECF as a learning and innovative organization and 2) Assessment of the AFE program.

2. OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) DAC criteria – based on the reconstructed TOC, a set of questions were designed to measure the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. They were formulated with a gender and human rights perspective and were shared and validated by ECF prior to commencing the evaluation.

3. **Theory of Change** – ECF had only a basic theory of change (see 1.2.2). A TOC was constructed to review the logical chain between inputs, activities, outcomes and goals. Guided by this TOC, the evaluation assessed whether the change expected was realized. ECF had been innovating, learning and adapting strategies while doing. The TOC approach was considered appropriate as it provided an opportunity to unravel what ECF was actually doing.

4. Use of Mixed Methods – as USERS were donors, partners and the program team and the USE was to improve the program and to provide evidence for funding and widespread adoption of the approach, it was important to include quantitative as well as qualitative methods and tools. Secondary data analysis and the Attitude Survey provided quantitative data whereas the interviews, FGD and PLA tools provided the qualitative data. The use of mixed methods was useful to triangulate the data.

5. **Secondary Data Collection** – ECF has extensive secondary data that could be tapped for the evaluation. It included a) a database of all its AFE participants b) periodic ongoing evaluations of AFE cycles. c) database on the communities where the programme is implemented with demographic data. The evaluator shared an analysis plan for the secondary data and ECF’s RDE cell took the responsibility to group the data according to suggested variables.

6. **Primary Data Collection** – The evaluator collected and analyzed all the qualitative data – interviews, FGD as well as participatory tools with staff and adolescents. The evaluator designed the Attitude Survey and revised them with input from ECF staff. ECF field staff was trained to collect survey data.

### 2.2 Theory of Change

ECF’s vision, mission and goals for the projects are as follows:

**Vision:** A world free from violence and discrimination.

\textsuperscript{12} Developmental evaluation aims to meet the needs of social innovators by applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use. Developmental evaluation focuses on what is being developed through innovative engagement. See http://aea365.org/blog/michael-quinn-patton-on-developmental-evaluation-applying-complexity-concepts-to-enhance-innovation-and-use/
Mission: To ensure that every man in India has the opportunity to study and practise gender equitable behavior to end violence and discrimination against women.

Project Raise goal: To increase the number of CBOs in West Bengal who work with men and boys to reduce gender based violence and discrimination.

AfE goal: To reduce the number of women experiencing gender violence and discrimination in 20 low income communities in Pune

The Theory of Change was developed in a workshop with ECF managers and mentors to construct what the program was actually doing – in other words, what were the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and goals. Three levels of outcomes were identified – expect to see, like to see, love to see.

“Expect to see” identified changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills that were initial changes and a reaction to activities. “Like to see” particularly looked at changes in behavior and practice that indicated ownership and initiating activities on one’s own. “Love to see” represented deep transformation, attempts to change the environment conditions and increasing partnerships which suggest sustainable action. Participants were also asked to list unintended outcomes.

The TOC workshop took place on 4th June, 2015 when defining the scope of the evaluation was under negotiation. As a result, the TOC for both Project Raise and AfE were constructed and the major stakeholders identified. The evaluator used the concept of Spheres of Influence from Outcome Mapping to plot all stakeholders and enable ECF to understand whom they were influencing or not. The final TOR identified only AfE for the evaluation and for this reason, only AfE’s TOC is analyzed below. Please see Attachment Three for Project Raise TOC and Sphere of Influence.

ECF listed all the AfE stakeholders: boys 14-17 years, parents, municipal corporators, persons in charge of venues where the program sessions takes place, local NGOs, CBOs (community based organizations), youth mandals (groups), SHGs (Self Help Groups – savings and credit women’s groups), mentors, donors, anganwadi (preschool) teachers, and program staff. The Sphere of Influence exercise enabled ECF staff to understand which stakeholders were part of the program, who they had direct and indirect influence and who were the strategic partners. This exercise helped to make a realistic TOC.

AfE’s core work and influence was with adolescent boys aged 14-17 (including boys who went on to the leadership program). AfE’s sphere of control are its mentors. The boys (with whom AfE directly worked) were in AfE’s sphere of influence. AfE could measure change in boys as they worked directly with them. The boys in turn worked primarily with parents, and somewhat with youth groups and community. For AfE, these groups were out of their sphere of influence or control. Any change was dependent on what the boys did in their interactions with them. The planned Community Committees could be either in the sphere of influence indicating AfE’s direct work with them or could be at the boundary where adolescent leaders would in turn work with them. The strategy was under consideration. ECF staff understood clearly the difference between strategic partners (corporators, youth mandals, SHG) and the stakeholders they influenced directly. Based on this understanding, the TOC was constructed. See below.

---

13 Outcome Mapping identifies three levels of outcomes or changes in behavior. Please see www.outcomemapping.ca
**Inputs** for the AFE program include M&E, Research, training and curriculum development indicating the importance given to learning and development.

The **activities** outline clearly how each of the activities and sub-tasks take place in the AFE program. It is to be noted that most activities are related to Curriculum development, M&E and graded activities for adolescent boys at Foundation, Action and Leadership programs. Field implementation activities are related to the boys (please see above, sphere of influence). Only one activity – conduct meetings with community members is at the community level. This activity is relatively new since ECF is exploring how to go beyond working with boys and encourage greater community ownership for the program.

The **outcomes** as defined by three levels, indicate changes expected in the adolescent boys depending on whether they were in the Foundation Program (FP), Action Program (AP) or Leadership Program (LP).

Under FP, changes in the adolescent boys are at personal and household level. Here they become aware of gender issues ("expect to see", level one of outcomes), participate in household chores and share new knowledge of gender equity ("like to see", second level outcomes) and are expected to challenge more entrenched gender norms that exist in the households only at the third level or "love to see". There is recognition that some deep-seated gender attitudes are difficult to change and may take time. The scope of influence for boys in FP is at the household level.

AP outcomes are related to the household and peer (level one outcomes) and begin to challenge gender equality at household and with peers with small actions (level two and three outcomes). AP is a community action oriented program but the TOC recognizes that challenging gender norms continues at the household level and with peers.

LP too recognizes that change in households is not easy and begins from households and then moves to peers and more community action. Once again, there is recognition that the process of gender awareness and equity initiated at FP is not easy and that even at the household level, leaders will continue to sensitize and change family behavior.

The Community Committees at first are expected to meet regularly, then influence who they interact with closely – family, friends and other linked community associations and only then move to discussing violence at the community level.
**Unintended outcomes** of being respectful, better aspirations and education and less loitering are significant changes but were placed as unintended outcomes by ECF.

Overall, the TOC clearly indicates who does what. The TOC distinguishes between what adolescents do and the role of community committees. Adolescent boys will learn about and share knowledge about gender equity at home, with peers and to some extent with the community. In terms of action, boys will contribute to household chores and do awareness building events in the community. The TOC indicates that it is the community committees (now being formed) that will advocate for action against violence in the community. This is a draft TOC and will surely be modified once data from the evaluation and evidence from RDE is analyzed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated AFE Goal</th>
<th>TOC suggested Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the number of women experiencing gender violence and discrimination in 20 low income communities in Pune</td>
<td>To enable young men (adolescents) to challenge gender norms and social constructs of masculinity, demonstrate gender equitable behavior, and advocate to peers, family and community about gender equity and discrimination with the aim to have a gender equitable society and prevent gender violence in communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘new’ TOC reflects what is happening in reality. The TOC articulates that AFE’s **core work** is with adolescents to build greater gender sensitivity, redrawing what it is to be a ‘boy’, question hegemonic masculinity and gender role stereotypes and encourage young adolescents to construct a more sensitive male identity that communicates well and has healthy relationships. AFE does not directly prevent abusive behavior of boys (because boys who enrol are not necessarily abusive in the first place) as indicated in the earlier TOC (see section 1.2.2). What AFE is doing is unique and not to be undermined, but what the ‘new’ TOC clearly demonstrates is that AFE curriculum and program is primarily helping boys construct their male identity. Considering that young boys below the age of 18 years (and some as young as 12 years) enrol in the program, this is evident. Adolescent boys' sphere of influence is the home and to some extent their peers. That is why gender sensitive action is related to greater participation in household chores and communicating gender equity at home and with peers. Boys’ community level activities are likely to be awareness building rather than any action against violence. The AFE is about prevention of violence and not about working with the perpetrators of violence as the goal suggests.

The **assumption** is that if boys are gender sensitive and challenge gender norms during adolescence, they themselves are less likely to be abusive when they grow up, will be able to prevent abuse at home and advocate to prevent violence against women in the community. These assumptions need to be tested over the long term. ECF is therefore contributing to the emerging theories of how male identity is constructed, the influence of family, society and culture, the pathways for male empowerment and gender sensitization. The strong M&E and Research components of ECF should continue to contribute to this growing understanding as implementation strengthens. Practically, ECF may consider revising its TOC to better reflect what it is actually doing so that the M&E develops indicators that assess what is being implemented rather than assessing what is not being done.

---

14 Hegemonic masculinity is a concept popularized by sociologist R.W. Connell of proposed practices that promote the dominant social position of men, and the subordinate social position of women.
2.3 Management of Evaluation

ECF designated the RDE Program Manager to liaise with the evaluator to coordinate the evaluation process – revision of TOR, choice of evaluation approaches, methods and tools. The RDE Program Manager in turn liaised with ECF staff to reach consensus and to ensure their participation in the learning process. The RDE Program Manager provided inputs on the evaluation planning documents including questionnaires, agenda for meetings, coordinating the various documents and reports, ‘cleaning’ the secondary data, planning the field mission and identified informants for the interviews and focused group discussions. The evaluator’s liaison and interaction with the RDE Program Manager allowed staff to express their information needs, to participate at each stage of the evaluation and enhanced the ownership and learning of the evaluation findings. Learning took place while the evaluation was in process and is likely to lead to enhanced use of evidence from the evaluation.

2.4 Field Mission

The following meetings and field visits to Pune took place:

a. Two meetings with Co-founder and RDE Program Manager in Mumbai to understand the terms of reference – April, 2015
b. Scoping – Introduction to all staff – management, field staff and trustees to introduce the evaluator, scope of evaluation and tentative evaluation plans – April, 2015
c. Workshop with all staff - The purpose of this visit was to develop an evaluation design. ECF participated in the following activities a) Identifying KEQ (Key Questions) and USES, Timeline Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis, Theory of Change, SWOT - May 2015
d. Data Collection – FGD and Interviews with ECF Staff - June 2015
e. Data Collection – FGD with mothers and PLA with boys – July 2015

2.5. Stakeholder Participation

The UFE and Developmental Evaluation design ensured the active participation of ECF management in this process. Human rights and gender equality principles guided the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders for the design, planning and implementation of the evaluation. The various tools were discussed with the ECF RDE Team and modified according to inputs received. Both rights holders and duty bearers provided responses and data.

Stakeholders included the main target for the AFE program –adolescent boys- and their female relative (namely mothers and sisters). Other internal stakeholders were senior management of ECF, field mentors, and the RDE team. External stakeholders also consulted were a training specialist for mentors, and one of ECF’s donors. Stakeholders were involved in workshop/meetings, FGD and consultations providing in-depth information. A number of PLA activities were used to elicit discussion with the ECF staff. In order to ensure the participation of boys, adolescent friendly participatory tools were specially designed.

2.6. Data Collection and Analysis

2.6.1. Type of Data

The evaluation use (see 2.1) guided the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data included the enrolment of boys, graduation rates, age groups of boys attending, coverage and reach of boys in the communities, knowledge and behaviour change as a result of attending the program. A survey to assess attitudes of boys graduating from the program also provided quantitative data. Qualitative data were scored quantitatively to assess the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of the program. FGDs, semi-structured interviews and a variety of PLA tools
provided in depth, qualitative data complementing the quantitative data, providing a more comprehensive assessment of the project and lessons learned.

**Stakeholder consent**

Boys and their mothers signed consent forms and were informed about the FGD and the PLA activities. Boys were also told that that they could withdraw from the evaluation activities at any time.

### 2.6.2. Data Collection method

Primary and secondary data were collected. Secondary data was obtained from documents and files maintained by the RDE Programme Team. Primary data include information from various stakeholders (see Attachment Programme Five). In all, primary data was collected from 106 persons using various methodologies. The total time for the evaluation, including report writing was 20 days.

### 2.6.3. Data Collection Instruments

The following tools were used:

1. Questionnaire with ECF Management
2. Questionnaire with ECF co-founders
3. Questionnaire with Key Informants
4. FGD Guide for Mothers
5. PLA Tools for Managers and Mentors
6. Adolescent friendly PLA tools for boys
7. Attitude Survey with Adolescent boys

The questionnaires were prepared by the evaluation expert and refined with inputs from RDE Programme Manager. Most questionnaires, were conducted orally. Most were face to face except for four on Skype with the co-founder, RDE Programme Manager, a donor and the trainer expert.

**For ECF staff**

The evaluator designed the PLA tools for managers and mentors and they helped to design the evaluation. The tools were designed to answer the two key questions: a) To what extent was ECF a learning organization (see 1,2 below) and b) To what extent did the AFE program achieve what it intended to do (see 3, 4).

The PLA tools were:

1. **Timeline with Force Field Analysis:** The purpose was to give a timeline of activities as well as know what sort of learning organization ECF is. Key events are plotted in the history of the organization and for each selected key event, major factors that contributed to it or counteracted are detailed. Assessment of these factors is made through a score of 1-5 depending on whether the change is a driving one or counteracting one.

2. **SWOT:** The purpose was to understand what were the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the organization from the perspectives of the management and the field staff. Once they were identified, both groups provided a score of importance, which were then consolidated to create a consensus.

3. **Stakeholder Analysis and Sphere of Influence:** The purpose was to find out which stakeholder groups could be consulted for the evaluation and for what. All stakeholders of AFE and Project Raise were listed. Boundary partners or individuals, groups, institutions were identified to find out with whom ECF works directly and is trying to encourage change to contribute to its overall vision. The Sphere of influence and control are based on Outcome Mapping principles which categorize stakeholders depending on whether the project has a direct control or merely influences them. **Sphere of control** of the project identified those over which the project has control, the **Sphere of influence**
identified where there was only influence and others were those with whom the project had little control. *Strategic partners* (also a term borrowed from Outcome Mapping) i.e those who help ECF to achieve its mission and whom ECF may tap to influence were also identified.

4. **Theory of Change:** The purpose was to assess what outcomes ECF was trying to achieve and how. A TOC was prepared separately for AFE and Project Raise so that ECF understands that implementation strategies were very different and could come to an evidence based decision regarding narrowing the scope of the evaluation. The long-term outcomes for AFE and Project Raise were identified, activities – what ECF does and with whom were identified (see Stakeholder Analysis) and three levels of outcomes were identified borrowing from Outcome Mapping concepts. These are:
   a) *Expect to see* or initial changes as a reaction to the activities; such as changes in awareness, knowledge, attitude, skills, motivation, behavioral intent, aspirations.
   b) *Like to see* or the second level of change expected such as taking ownership, doing different things, out of context of ECF planned activities; usually changes in behavior and practice.
   c) *Love to see* or the third level of change indicating deep transformation, contributing to the goal of project; changes in conditions – civic, environment, social well-being and increased community partnerships, sAFety for women.

5. **Criteria Scoring and Analysis (CSA):** Mentors and managers participated in discrete FGDs to analyze the evaluation criteria for the relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of AFE activities. For each of the questions related to the evaluation criteria, each participant scored on 1-5, with 5 being the ideal score for AFE. These scores were then aggregated to give a common score. In order to ensure that the perspectives of both managers and mentors were captured, separate FGDs were held with each group. After the scoring, further discussion helped the evaluator to understand the reasons behind the scoring. After both FGDs were completed, findings were shared to both groups following the principles of UFE and Developmental Evaluation.

**For Adolescents:**

1. **PLA Tools:** The evaluator designed a set of adolescent friendly PLA tools to understand the perspectives of programme participants regarding the change they had experienced as a result of participating in AFE.

   **Communication Map:** The purpose was to understand how boys communicated AFE and their learnings, the degree of communication and the extent of change as a result of their communication. This was a complex PLA tool with three different stages of execution. It was modified for participants with low literacy.

   **Body Map:** The purpose was to have an in-depth understanding adolescent boys’ perspective of the changes that had taken place in terms of knowledge, attitude and behavior. Boys were asked to make their own body maps and, through discussion, these were consolidated.

2. **Attitude Survey:** The evaluator designed an attitude survey for adolescents. Statements were identified through extensive literature searches, including the GEM scale (Gender Equitable Men scale)\(^\text{15}\) which were vetted with the help of ECF mentors and the RDE Team. Thirty-five statements were selected for piloting. About 30 boys participated in the pilot and results were analyzed using the Cronbach’s alpha. Thirty-three statements indicated high reliability and, from these, ten statements were selected for the final survey.

---

\(^{15}\) The GEM scale a commonly admitted tool for organisations working with men on gender. It was first developed by Promundo. For further details see: PULERWITZ, Julie and BARKER, Gary, 'Measuring Attitudes towards Young Men in Brazil. Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the GEM scale', published in *Men and Masculinities*, Volume 10 number 3, pp.322-338, April 2008
2.7. Sampling

All mentors and available management staff were included in the FGD and PLA activities. Key informants were selected on the basis of their availability as well as their involvement with ECF for the AFE program or as an organization. One key informant was dropped because of scheduling problems.

The selection of boys for the Attitude Survey was as follows:

Step One
Selection of communities:
The Action for Equality program works in 20 low income communities in Pune. For the external evaluation seven communities from the 20 were selected. The criteria for selection were as follows:
- The selected community needed to be implementing AFe for 11 cycles
- The selected community needed to have a high representation of Muslim and OBC population to ensure that we were addressing the most vulnerable and marginalized.
- Twelve communities fulfilled these criteria and from these seven communities were randomly selected for the external evaluation.

Step Two
Selection of Participants:
Once the seven communities were selected, the participants were divided into two categories.
Those with 90% to 100% attendance in Foundation Program
Those with 60% to 70% attendance in Foundation Program

The reason to have these two categories was to understand whether dosage (the total number of training events attended by the participant) made a difference in outcomes. The assumption was that boys require sufficient inputs if transformative changes in gender attitudes and behavior are to be achieved. The definition of 60%-70% attendance for the evaluation was different from ECF’s definition. Included in the 60% programme attendance required by programme participants to successfully complete the Foundation Programme, ECF includes attendance at the introductory game events. However, as these sessions are game activities, with the objective of raising awareness of the programme and with no curricular content, attendance at these sessions was excluded in calculating the participation of individual participants.

Comparison between calculation of dosage for ECF records and for the purpose of this evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECF Calculation of Participation Dosage</th>
<th>Calculation of Participation Dosage for the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP runs for 15 two hour training sessions</td>
<td>FP runs for 13 two hour training sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This includes:</td>
<td>This includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 game events</td>
<td>13 training events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 training events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% attendance is equivalent to 9</td>
<td>60% attendance is equivalent to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions out of 15</td>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% attendance is equivalent to 9</td>
<td>70% attendance is equivalent to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% attendance is equivalent to 12</td>
<td>90% attendance is equivalent to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% attendance is equivalent to 13</td>
<td>100% attendance is equivalent to 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
<td>sessions out of 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Step Three**  
*Pilot Attitude survey*

Out of the 266 participants who had 90% to 100% attendance, 50 participants were randomly selected from the seven communities selected by the criteria above. Every fifth boy was selected from the list. However, the pilot survey was completed by just 33 participants, due to migration of families and from the programme communities.

**Step Four**  
*Final Survey*

A total of two hundred boys were selected for the final survey. Here again the participants were divided into two groups: (1) Those with 90% to 100% attendance (2) Those with 60% to 70% attendance. Each group had 100 participants who were randomly selected from the seven communities. Here, every third boy was selected from the lists.

Some boys were not traceable as they had left the community. The final list of participants was as follows (1) Those with 90%-100% attendance (43 participants) and (2) Those with 60%-70% attendance (23 participants).

**The selection of boys (and mothers) for the Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and PLA was as follows:**

For the FGDs and PLA, participants were purposefully selected. There was also a need for equal representation of Hindu, Muslim and SC/ST/OBC boys. Furthermore, even though the boys were purposefully selected the additional criterion was that one of the parents would participate in the parents FGDs.

Altogether there were four FGDs, which included the following participants:
- Participants with 90%- 100% attendance at FP
- Participants with 60% - 70% attendance at FP
- Parents of participants with 90%-100% attendance at FP
- Parents of participants with 60%- 70% attendance at FP

As it was difficult to get the participants and their parents from the seven communities to attend the FGDs in one selected area, only three communities (B001, B004 and B009) were selected. The selected participants and their parents from these areas met in their own community or the neighboring community for the FGD.

Attendance for the FGD and PLA were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Discussions</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants with 90%- 100% attendance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers of participants with 90%-100% attendance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants with 60%- 70% attendance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers of participants with 60%-70% attendance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.8. Data Analysis**

The evaluation blends quantitative and qualitative analysis, facilitating the triangulation of data and increasing both validity and reliability. The quantitative data analysis used descriptive statistics such as percentages and frequency and counts as well sophisticated statistical tools.
The data has been analyzed according to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact using a equity and gender lens (see 2.1 Evaluation Approach).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relevance:** The extent with which the objectives of a program are consistent with the needs of adolescent boys | 1. To what extent are the priorities of the adolescent boys and the communities been met by AFE activities?  
2. How relevant is what ECF does in the context of what other organizations are doing in India? With government priorities? What gaps does ECF fill? What features are particularly important nationally? Internationally?  
3. How is the demand for the work ECF does? Increased or not?  
4. Are the activities and outcomes consistent with the objectives and overall goal? What is missing? What needs strengthening?  
5. Is the structure of the program – Foundation, Action, Leadership appropriate to the changes in Knowledge Attitude and Practice (KAP) that you would like to achieve to meet your goals? Any changes?  
6. Did ECF assess needs of the community? Were boys involved? |
| **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the objectives of the AFE program have been achieved | 1. What real difference has it made in the lives of boys and their families?  
2. Were targets met? Who were left out and why?  
3. What external factors have contributed to achieving intended outputs and outcomes? How and to what extent?  
4. To what extent were boys involved in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating?  
5. To what extent has monitoring and evaluation been used to improve effectiveness, improve outcomes?  
6. To what extent has mentors/ staff capacity development trainings led to change in facilitation? How has that contributed to better outcomes?  
7. What is the quality of AFE/Action curriculum materials? How has it affected change in boys’ behavior? |
| **Efficiency:** Extent to which the resources have delivered results | 1. Does ECF use the resources in the most economical manner to achieve its objectives? Also compared to other alternatives?  
2. Is funding roughly adequate to meet project needs?  
3. Were activities cost-efficient? Is the relationship between program costs and program outputs reasonable? Any cost constraints that affected the implementation?  
4. Were objectives achieved on time? Outputs delivered within time and cost? |
| **Sustainability:** The probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing for the long-term | 1. How likely is it that the benefits from the program will be maintained for a reasonable amount of time if the program was terminated? To what extent are people motivated and have the resources to continue? Are sufficient conditions in place to ensure sustainability? Explain.  
2. To what extent has the project advocated for the need to empower boys on policy agendas at the national level? |
| **Impact:** Long term effect of the program | 1. To what extent will the AFE program have long-term impact with the boys and communities? |
2.9 Challenges regarding the Evaluation Process

The evaluation was collaborative and had to be paced according to the scheduling of both the evaluator and ECF. Also, the tools were developed in tandem so that the findings from one tool informed the development of the other, keeping in mind the UFE and Development Evaluation approaches used. So, although ECF learned in real time, there were delays in execution. Secondary data was used but during the analysis, it was realized that it needed ‘cleaning up’ which took more time than anticipated but it also meant that data for future work was readily available. Sampling for the attitude survey took time as boys who had previously attended AFE had moved out of the community. Some data related to caste was incomplete and had to be dropped for analysis. The ECF field staff carried out data collection but community activities and availability of boys delayed the process. Remote key informant interviews by the evaluator had to be rescheduled because of unavailability of key informants, delaying the data collection process.

3. Findings

3.1 Relevance

1. **ECF’s work of empowering boys to be part of the solution to prevent gender violence and discrimination is very important for communities, India and internationally.**

In the FGDs and interviews, mentors and managers felt that the issues related to violence and discrimination against women were of critical importance for the nation as well as internationally. In India, there are very few organizations working on masculinity and male involvement although there are many that work with women’s empowerment. India’s response leans towards protecting women rather than addressing the root causes of patriarchy, manhood and masculinity cultural and social constructs. ECF too has learned – from talking about ‘empowering men to empower women’ to talking of women’s empowerment as a basic right. Internationally there is greater recognition of masculinity and its role in violence against women and gender discrimination. Many international funders accept integrating work with men as part of the gender related portfolio.

Key informants also recognized the importance of ECF’s work nationally and internationally. There is an increased demand nationally with organizations who conventionally work with women and some who are becoming interested in the area of working with young men. The work of Project Raise in West Bengal is testimony to recognition of ECF’s work with funders and NGOs. Through Project Raise, ECF will explore if their approach can prevent the trafficking of girls.

The participatory CSA with mentor and manager groups scoring was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Culture and Management</th>
<th>1. How innovative is ECF? What are its strengths and weaknesses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How has ECF evolved in its work? What were the milestones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How well is it managed and administered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What well does it plan its work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managers felt that the ECF's AFE program is relevant because it goes beyond short term or one off sensitization and engages boys for a longer period and intends to change knowledge, skills and leadership. A lot of opportunities are provided for boys to learn and apply that learning over a fairly long period of time.

What is unique is ECF’s investment in boys’ skills development, particularly critical thinking. ECF has invested in changing the curriculum, re-training the mentors towards more facilitation knowing that it is more difficult but will lead to better learning by boys.

2. Boys' needs are being addressed by ECF and include acquiring critical thinking and communication skills, seeking knowledge and sAfE spaces for discussion; felt need to learn about gender equality and men's role in preventing violence against women is slowly emerging.

In the FGDs, mentors and managers expressed that gender violence and men’s roles were not a felt need for adolescent boys since they enjoyed many privileges being male and so maintaining the status quo as far as gender inequality was concerned was of greater ‘benefit’ to them. But boys are in a ‘pre-contemplation’ phase, i.e. that they are now understanding the need to learn about gender equitable attitudes and behavior. However, ECF would like to put the issue ‘on the table’.

Many needs of boys are being satisfied – to have sAfE spaces to meet, to develop friendships and to learn new skills – communication and critical thinking. The new curriculum includes discussion on sexual and reproductive health, which was a need that boys expressed. The fact that so many boys enroll and are retained for the AFE program is an indicator that boys’ needs are being addressed.

"Biggest reason why boys attend because they respect the mentor, enjoy being with friends, learning skills and while doing so they learn about gender."

“We need to identify better how to introduce the program and communicate the goals to the program when they join. Currently we communicate it is fun, interesting, help to develop yourself, still general."

‘We attract boys through games – then we talk of gender – we have to develop the interest as boys do not come willingly. There is no demand from families that discrimination between boys and girls needs to reduce. Families’ priorities for their children is education and job related.’

*ECF Management and Mentors*

According to the managers, some information on violence in the communities was gathered and boys were consulted while designing the program so consultation did take place but was informal. Boys were asked how they spend their day rather than about the need to have a program like AFE. Currently, there is continuous, though informal feedback on boys’ needs because mentors interact with them, their families and communities on a daily basis.

The participatory CSA with mentor and manager groups scoring was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were the priorities of</td>
<td>3.5 – boys in ‘pre-contemplation’ stage; needs for sAfE spaces,</td>
<td>2.4 – not a felt need as boys benefit from the privileged status quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Community is preoccupied with poverty related life struggles and do not question gender inequality.

In the FGDs, mentors and managers felt that at the community level, the material needs of housing, electricity, water and livelihood were of far greater importance for impoverished families. Communities’ needs for boys are education; Safety and not getting into trouble Gender inequality is NOT a priority for most families. Besides it is difficult to question tradition and culture that promotes gender inequality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were the priorities of communities met by AFE</td>
<td>2.7 – communities consider education, safety and not getting into trouble as priorities. Give preference to boys</td>
<td>2.1 – Material needs – housing, livelihood-more important than gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Foundation, Action and Leadership program expectations from boys to take action are high considering the difficult issue at hand and time available by mentors to interact with boys.

Managers and mentors felt that the activities at the three levels are overall relevant to achieve the AFE and ECF goals, but there are some gaps. The overall goal of preventing (more so than reducing) gender violence is fine but needs more break-up at different levels according to the age and capacity of the boys.

Expectations for outcomes are for older boys (15 years plus) whereas younger boys tend to attend (12 years plus). The structure, curriculum and action expectations will need to be reviewed since younger boys (ages 12-14) are enrolling in the Foundation program. According to the funder, this is the most well thought out level compared to the other two levels – Action and Leadership. The ECF management is aware of the gaps and is in the process of revising the Action and Leadership Program curricula.

It is important to have a moderated progress through the levels. Earlier, boys graduating from the Foundation program entered the Action or Alumni program which was open-ended. This program has been changed to mini-cycles in the community so boys get a chance to practice and then they get to go to Leadership Program. Currently the boys in the Leadership Program are not taking the initiative expected. Earlier mentors would select leaders – there are 36 boys on the list and only 19 are active. But at meetings, different leaders come and most work individually and not as a group. In order to ensure relevance of the structure, ECF has begun curriculum change for the Action and Leadership Program from 2014.

Mentors mentioned that it is difficult for young boys to practice what they have learned because of their age and the issues surrounding violence against women. According to the mentors, the Action Events are difficult to execute because issues surrounding gender equality and discrimination is not a priority in the community. After all, who will listen to young boys in a hierarchical, traditional society? In the time available for the foundation/graduate program, it is very difficult for boys to internalize and take action against deep-rooted issues on gender inequality. Traditions, culture and society expectations have to be discussed in depth to change deep-seated attitudes or challenge societal norms.
5. The activities of the AFE are relevant but alignment with the stated goals of AFE to reduce the number of women experiencing violence is ambitious.

Senior managers expressed that on one hand ECF says that its goal is to provide knowledge and skills to boys so that in the future they do not become violent. ECF also says that boys must learn about ending gender discrimination – there is a gap in these statements and it is important to capture what is really going on.

Mentors mentioned that expectations of the role of the adolescent boy to be a social change agent (on their own) may be too ambitious, particularly for the younger boys who tend to enroll into the Foundation Program.

Managers expressed that a number of benefits were very visible in terms of increase in self worth and some action by boys. However greater involvement of communities through articulated appreciation of what boys are learning and a greater involvement of the Community Committees would enable a greater alignment of the program to ECF’s and AFE goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How relevant are the activities to reach the goals of the AFE program?</td>
<td>3 – Relevant but needs more community involvement; steps to start Community Committees in progress</td>
<td>3 – goal of reducing violence against women difficult because boys are too young to take action against deep entrenched social norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectations of outcomes should be more realistic, and not expect a great deal at the end of the Foundation Program alone. Also, most of the emphasis in curriculum development has been at the Foundation Program whereas the onward journey also needs to align with needs at Action and Leadership levels. It may be relevant to assess changes in boys’ attitude and practice at the end of Foundation, Action and Leadership Programs. This has been acknowledged and addressed in more recent iterations of the M&E framework.

3.2 Effectiveness

Effectiveness of the program was assessed through interviews, FGDs and use of PLA tools. What is evident is that, effectiveness was being measured against the AFE goal of reducing numbers of gender violence whereas effectiveness should have been measured against what was actually changing in the boys’ lives related to prevention of violence – their knowledge on gender, better relationships at home, increased gender equitable attitudes and behavior. Such a finding vindicates the use of a UFE-DE approach, which was able to get a nuanced analysis.

A summary of findings from different stakeholders – mentors, managers, key informants, mothers and boys evaluate the effectiveness of the AFE program.
1. There is concrete evidence of change in adolescent’s communication and relationships, knowledge of gender equitable norms, attitudes and behavior as well as a positive identity and goal setting. Age and dosage are important factors that affect change.

Mothers express better communication and relationships at home. For example, boys have empathy for the mother, ‘listen’ to them, do not ‘talk back’ or use abusive language, share information and so the ‘atmosphere’ in the home is very pleasant. Mothers also say that boys share in household work (making tea, washing dishes, marketing, fetch water, pick up plates after meals, sweep the floor). However, it must be said that some boys did work in the home especially if the parents were working. But mothers report there is greater willingness to work and better value of time. They also see change in boys’ better attention for studies, wiser choice of friends, less loitering and street sexual harassment. Mothers report that boys do not hit their sisters or fight with others or eat ‘gutka’ (an addictive food substance).

Boys in the FGD in two communities said they learned about a) Gender issues such as violence against women, gender discrimination, helping mothers, against street sexual harassment b) sexuality as well as c) giving respect to elders and not believing in superstitions. Boys with higher attendance had better recall of gender related issues.

Boys, from two communities, participated in a PLA activity “Body Map” to identify
changes as a result of the AFE program. The responses were coded into three categories:
  a) Improvement in communication and relationships,
  b) Better gender equitable attitudes and behavior and
  c) Positive Identity and Goal setting.

**Improvement in communication and relationships included:**
Now we all sit together and have dinner with all family members
Since I joined the class, I started listening to my teachers, my parent and also my sister
I stopped back answering, using abusive language

**Better gender equitable attitudes and behavior included:**
Now I have started helping in house chores
Everybody should contribute to house chores
Now I feel that both men and women should have equal rights on the house (property)
I stopped teasing girls

**Positive Identity and Goal setting included:**
I dropped my ‘ego’
I stopped being selfish, now I think of others too
I now return home before dark
I attend college regularly now

*From the Body Map, Boys Group*

![Changes Expressed by boys](image)

The boys with 90% attendance have expressed more change related to communication and relationship. On the other hand, boys with 60% attendance mention somewhat fewer changes for gender equitable attitude and behavior and communication & relationship. This indicates that there is more change in communication and relationships as compared to gender equitable attitude & behaviour. This is validated with the FGD from the mother’s group.
Boys are most likely to communicate about what they learned in the AfE classes to their mothers, sometimes fathers. Communication with brothers and sisters was moderate with greater communication with their friends, school friends taking precedence over community friends. In the Communication Map here, although boys had sisters, they have not been mentioned. Overall, it appears that communication by boys in the family is poor. Perhaps that is why, the greatest change noticed by mothers and boys is better communication and relationship in the family.

The H diagram tool was used with the boys (with attendance of 90%-100% and 60%-70% respectively) during the FGDs, with the aim of assessing the strengths and challenges of the AfE program. The tool also provided an opportunity for the boys to provide suggestions for improvement of the program.

Strengths:
- Curriculum: The topics covered in the AfE curriculum were important and good as they helped to clarify misconceptions and misunderstandings on various issues. Through the program the boys reported that they had learnt about gender equality (for example: sexual harassment of girls and women and respect) and about their body-sexuality.
- Facilitation skills: Boys reported that facilitation skills of the mentors was a strength of the program. They liked the manner in which the mentors answered their questions and explained the various issues to them
- Change in behaviour: Boys reported that the program brought about a change in their behaviour

Challenges
- Program is restricted only to adolescent boys
- Many boys in the community are not aware of the program
- Less number of session as a result less time is spent on a particular topic
- Pictures and videos are not used during sessions
- More information needs to be provided on the topic of addiction
- Program does not assist boys with their studies

Suggestions:
- The program needs to have more number of sessions (to give in depth knowledge about the subject)
- The events and the program material needs to be people friendly and the language needs to be easy to understand
- The sessions should have more information on the rights and laws governing women
- More information needs to be provided on the subject of addiction as it is a problem in the communities
- The program sessions should be more practical and include problem solving activities, role-plays and information on real-life events
- The program should make provisions for a fixed venue/hall
- Boys from the age of 10 as well as girls should be included into the programme.
- Information about the programme should be given to community members parents etc, so that they become aware about this issue.
**Mentors** report concrete instances of changed behavior such as helping with marketing and outside household chores, respectful language, better communication with the mother, willingness to help mother, less loitering with peers and less street sexual harassment. These are very important changes but the mentors view them as ‘symbolic’ changes and expect actions such as advocating for girls’ education or resisting child marriage or changing peers’ attitudes and behavior towards girls (street sexual harassment) or challenging social norms of menstrual pollution and fasting by girls in the name of religion. But boys face many barriers – it is difficult to change friends, mothers often prevent boys from doing household work and boys may not have the courage to advocate against discrimination and violence.

The participatory CSA with mentor and manager groups scoring was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What real difference has it made in the lives of boys?</td>
<td>2 – boys share learnings with family, do household work, care for siblings, verbal communication better, more confident. But not sure what gender and violence related changes have taken place</td>
<td>2 – increase in knowledge evident, some change in behavior at home, with peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low score is because of the expectation that change should be primarily about decreasing violence against women, addressing cases of violence and advocating against perpetrators. The low score is also because there is no moderated outcome for the different levels – Foundation, Action and Leadership Program. The TOC developed for the evaluation (which needs further revision) indicated that mentors and managers know that change in gender attitudes and behavior is resistant at the family level since the first outcome, “expect to see” is stated for all three levels. A far more nuanced unpacking of ‘changes in gender equitable behavior’ is needed for each level.

**Secondary data** obtained from the mothers from outcome surveys and FGD of 500 participants indicated that mothers of boys aged 12 and 13 were most likely to report positive outcomes. These are related to shared learning, prevention of violence against women, respecting mothers, more willing to do household chores and overall more equitable behavior. It is possible that boys are more amenable to communication and behavior change at a younger age compared to older adolescents.
who may have more independent thinking.

If FP graduates from two categories are compared, one with 60 to 70% attendance and the other group with 90-100% attendance, we see 15% more boys from the 90% plus attendance group demonstrating positive outcomes. This clearly indicates that dosage is very important.

Compared to the 70% attendance group, in the 90% attendance group we find:
- 30% more likely to share their learning with their family
- 36% more likely to influence their mothers
- 30% more likely to demonstrate more gender equitable behavior at home

In fact, we find that higher attendance in the Foundation and Action programs, the more likely the transition to the next course of learning and action.

Foundation graduation requires 60% attendance (minimum 8 modules) - without the game events.

The findings are:
- FP Graduates with 90-100% (12-13 modules) attendance are 3 times more likely to transition to AP
- AP participants with 90-100% attendance at FP are 3.5 times more likely to transition to LP

In other words, the higher the attendance, 90-100% at Foundation, the more likely that boys are going to move to AP and then LP. We have seen a direct link between number of sessions attended and change in gender equitable behavior.

Secondary data from the Scenario-based Gender Attitude Survey (GAS)
survey administered by ECF at the end of Cycle 12 Foundation and Action program was analyzed. The GAS comprises 10 scenarios, based on the widely used GEMS scale - that measure violence and tolerance towards it, manhood and masculinity, and gender roles and responsibilities. Participants respond openly by writing a response to each of the 10 scenarios. Further each response to the scenario is rated as either 1, 2 or 3 where
1  = low gender equitable score
2  = moderate gender equitable score
3  = gender equitable score.
These scores are then summed to give the participant a total score. The GAS is given to participants on the 13th week of the 15-week Foundation program. (See Attachment Six for the Gender Attitude Survey)

Secondary analysis of data from the Gender Attitude Survey (GAS) administered to Cycle 12 graduates of the Foundation program indicated that out of 78 boys who participated in the GAS in Cycle 12 (the new curriculum), about a third had low gender equitable scores. Most scored moderate and some scored high. It appears that change in gender attitudes does take place but more sessions are needed to convert the low to moderate and move the moderate scorers to high.

Participants that moved from Cycle 11 Foundation program to Cycle 12 Action program were also administered the GAS. About 13 boys participated after 15 weeks of interaction and it is evident that more dosage of sessions has an impact on gender equitable scores. However, boys continue to score moderately and need to move into higher scores for impact and sustainability.

18 There were 98 participants, however due to comprehensible, missing and incoherent responses, the survey of 20 participants could not be included in the analysis.
In the Foundation program, an analysis of scores on the GAS on different scenarios indicated that the lowest scores relate to ideas of manhood and masculinity and violence and tolerance. Boys score better on household chores and responsibilities.

The following table compares how Action Program participants fared on each of the scenarios. There is a marked decrease in low gender equitable behavior and more of moderate and higher scores. It is
important to note that in most categories, the dominant scores are moderate pointing that in order to get higher scores, **more dosage, an emphasis on certain gender attitudes or other complementary interventions are needed.**

2. The family environment is more conducive and there is better interpersonal communication but families themselves create unintended barriers.

This may be one of the most important outcomes of the AFE program. Families have told mentors that the environment at home is more conducive, boys use less bad language and are willing to listen. Clearly, the sessions are helping boys learn empathy, to take responsibility of studies and household work, be gentler with their sisters, and show respect for mothers. These are the first steps towards more gender equitable behavior.

In terms of gender equitable behavior, mentors report that often families do not support the ‘small’ behavior changes by boys. They do so: by not appreciating the change or stopping boys from for example, washing clothes/dishes, sweeping the floor, cutting vegetables, cooking. Some behaviour changes are more acceptable than other such as boys doing marketing (“outside”) work.

In the FGD, mothers reported that there was no need for boys to do any household work if the mother or older sister was present. They expect the boys to help out only if the female members of the household are not present. Boys are younger – less than 14 – and in some cases were helping out at home even before the AFE sessions.

Boys reported that they talk to their mothers and fathers about how to stop violence but had only some communication with their siblings.

Managers believe that it is a matter of relevance – mothers do not see any problems related to engendered behavior (“my son was always good”) and so do not report change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What real difference has it made in the lives of boys families?</td>
<td>3 – parents are attending action events, neighbors and community are aware of gender inequalities, participating in Community Committees but not sure whether root issues being addressed</td>
<td>1.5 – boys communicate better, use less bad language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentors and managers acknowledge many changes in boys’ families but this needs to be ‘valued and celebrated’. Boys’ changes are compared with the AFE goal of reducing gender violence and hence these changes mentioned above pale in significance.

3. Enrollment age of boys is younger than expected and the younger ones are most likely to continue in the program; all castes, ethnic groups attend but some boys remain resistant to
Secondary data analysis indicates although the program is meant for 14-17 years old, younger children enroll into the program and progress well through it.

Boys aged between 12 and 13 are most likely to enroll and graduate from FP and the average age of a graduate is 13.62 (1 year younger in Cycle 11 than Cycle 1). It is important to note that boys aged 12 and 13 are most likely to transition to AP and LP.

Mentors state that older boys are busy with studies or jobs and do not attend. Some boys who are violent are resistant in spite of a lot of efforts by mentors. Mentors mention that they have to sensitize and network with the community extensively to seek enrollment such as talking to religious leaders, community/political leaders, self help groups, youth groups, tuition class teachers. Mentors mention that there is some dropout after the games sessions because boys expect that fun and games will continue for the other sessions.

Managers were aware that primarily low-income Hindu boys attend the sessions and there is a need to target Muslim boys as well as higher income boys as all need to understand gender equality and practice. There were challenges in involving Muslim boys as mixed groups with Hindu boys. Another group not being reached was the migrant population (because the language that boys understand is different from what mentors know) and older boys.

The following table indicates that there is scope to reach out to more boys. In the table below, the estimated population for boys is calculated for 14-17 years old\(^\text{19}\). However, if one widens the eligible age to 12, the estimated population or pool is likely to go up. The average size (4 to 10) of the groups indicates that much more needs to be done by mentors to recruit boys. They may need to go beyond the usual ‘suspects’, and target boys from all castes and ethnicity and mobilize

---

19 ECF estimates
through the existing social structures in the community – school, youth mandals, other community groups.

Table showing community name, approximate number of boys between 14-17 in the community, number of cycles, number of participants graduated from FP and average number of boys per community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Name</th>
<th>Approximate number of boys between 14-17</th>
<th>Number of cycles</th>
<th>No of participants graduated from FP</th>
<th>Average number of boys per community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B001</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B002</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B004</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B005</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B006</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B007</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B008</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B009</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B010</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B011</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B013</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B014</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B016</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B021</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B023</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B026</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B027</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B028</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B029</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Boys attend sessions and participate but are not actively involved in planning, monitoring and evaluation the program

Mentors and managers agreed that this is one area of work that needs strengthening. Mentors mention that more time with the boys is needed to plan for the action event that ends the graduate program. Boys are not confident to perform in a public space, often asking their mothers and sisters not to attend. In some instances, boys have been challenged and not appreciated by neighbors or family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were boys involved in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating?</td>
<td>2 – boys were informally consulted, not planned systematically</td>
<td>1.5 – one area that needs improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managers mention that boys are involved in planning action events with mentors, leaders are encouraged to form Community Committees but a more structured participation plan needs to be built in.
5. **The mentors’ role is critical to the success of the program: the better their communication and facilitation the better is the response from the boys.**

Mentors acknowledge the change in curriculum and training but need more group facilitation skills as they are used to culturally a more didactic approach. More information is needed on how boys form constructs of masculinity. Trainings are regularly implemented– weekly internally and periodically with an expert, with greater emphasis on facilitation skills.

Managers have sought more facilitation skill building by mentors, understand how valuable it is but progress has been uneven, some mentors are better facilitators than others. Facilitation skills are very important as they impact how much boys learn, their attendance and retention in the program. The emphasis on facilitation is supported by regular and expert training, changes in recruitment qualifications and enhanced on site supervision, which though present needs strengthening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has mentor trainings led to change in facilitation</td>
<td>3 – made a difference but the impact is uneven, some are better at facilitating than others, although lot of investment in training</td>
<td>3 – mentors changing from didactic to facilitation so some success; need in-depth knowledge of masculinity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key informants find the efforts made by ECF to train and value a more facilitative approach by mentors “exemplary”. They have seen very few organizations invest so much in the quality of mentoring boys. Mentors need high skills as they work with boys with very little concentration and to engage them for two hours every session is challenging. Plus mentors work in tough learning climates – doing sessions at night, with poor electricity, lot of noise and dingy rooms. Key informants feel that good facilitation takes time to learn and that mentors are young and willing.

6. **Quality of the curriculum is better but more challenging to deliver and needs to be tailored towards needs of younger children.**

The Foundation program curriculum was thoroughly revamped based on the evidence from M&E from various cycles and went through a year of consultative revision. It has been developed on good evidence.

It has been difficult for some mentors to adapt because the sessions require more facilitative skills. Also boys are expected to write and express, which is difficult to manage. Mentors believe that more in-depth discussion on patriarchy and masculinity is needed for boys to understand cultural and social values. Also simple activities at family level, use of case studies and real life examples would situate and simplify the learning on gender rights and equality.

The curriculum is meant for older boys and the section on the reproductive system is difficult to teach with younger boys so realignment is needed for the age and the corresponding needs of the boys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of curriculum especially the Graduate program to affect change in boys' behavior?</td>
<td>3 – new curriculum for the foundation program is better; action and leader curriculum is under revision</td>
<td>3 – better but needs more in-depth discussion on masculinity; tailor make to younger boys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentors themselves have learned a lot about gender, masculinity, violence and norms.

The Action and Leadership program are in the process of change – the previous program did not have a defined curriculum being more action oriented but considering that changing gender norms requires consistent discussion and understanding, mentors feel that these programs should include learning sessions and not be confined to only action events. The Management is aware of these problems and has constituted an advisory group for curriculum revision for the Action and Leadership program, involving the mentors. Lessons learned from the curriculum revision of the Foundation program indicated that mentors need to be deeply involved right from the start to ensure ownership and speedy rollout.

The trainer expert believes that the curriculum of the Foundation program is good with its emphasis on critical thinking but that has placed huge demands from the mentors who were used to information giving.

7. **Monitoring and evaluation is a strong component of ECF work and evidence is shared with managers and field staff to make program changes.**

Monitoring and evaluation has been a consistent component of ECF’s work. It has been challenging as male engagement, male constructs of gender and their roles to promote gender equitable attitudes and behavior are a new field of research. ECF has tried various ways to ensure that boys do not provide socially acceptable answers and compared various instruments (including the popular GEM questionnaires) before selecting a scenario based evaluation to track changes in boys’ attitude and behavior. This of course has also thrown up challenges such as difficulties in administration and interpretation because of boys’ poor handwriting and expression, a testimony to the poor educational standards.

Session Observation forms were revamped to better capture boys’ participation but require mentors to work through several choices. There is greater emphasis on capturing ‘small changes’ which are in fact quite significant as well as to document stories of change. The use of FGDs has revealed new information that ECF had not captured earlier and which is very valuable. So the TOC needs to be revised to reflect this reality.

Key informants commended the emphasis on monitoring and evaluation, very unusual for NGOs of ECF’s size. ECF’s M&E has the potential to identify what has improved, enhance the understanding what it is being achieved and what to do next. Efforts are on to integrate M&E with program planning.

ECF has consistently reflected on its tools, what data is being captured and the testimony is the many changes in M&E tools that ECF has experimented with in order to authentically capture changes in boys’ lives. Most of the M&E emphasis has been on the Foundation program and it needs to be extended to the Action and Leadership program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of monitoring and evaluation to improve outcomes</td>
<td>3 – very good contribution to understand, needs more interpretation and application</td>
<td>3 – very useful in reviewing the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3 Potential Impact**
Impact has been assessed in terms of impact on boys’ attitudes as well as impact of ECF’s work.

To assess the impact on boys’ attitudes, the evaluation conducted an Attitude Survey of boys who had attended the AFE program. Cronbach’s alpha for 32 statements was .710, very high showing good reliability of the scale. Two statements with poor scores were removed from the list. The Split half reliability for the final 32 statements was also high corroborating the scale’s reliability.

Details of the sampling and the selection of the ten statements based on the above reliability ensured that the tool was rigorous.

One of the limitations is that there was no baseline so results from the survey could not be compared. However, a quantitative tool such as this survey triangulates data from the qualitative tools used, adding rigor to the findings.

1. **Survey findings indicated that age was significantly linked to better attendance**

This finding corroborates with the secondary data findings (see Effectiveness) that younger children attend more sessions. Other data in the same section also points out that outcomes are better with more sessions.

### Table 1: Current Age + Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Age</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Current Age Group</th>
<th>60-70%</th>
<th>90-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.780</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.765</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>6.750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.009 is <0.05, hence there is a significant association between age and percent of attendance in sessions.

---
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Younger children have attended more sessions than the older children.

Key informants, managers and mentors have also mentioned that not just attendance but more number of sessions are needed to see changes in deep-seated gender attitudes and behavior.

2. Survey findings indicate that some attitudes are particularly resistant to change and there is no difference among very high and high attendees.

The ten statements have been scored as Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree and depending on whether the gender equitable answer is positive (When a wife comes home from work, her husband should make tea for her) or negative (Women are naturally better at looking after children than men – should score as ‘strongly disagree’) – the appropriate coding has been done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9. A man who helps his wife in household chores is weak and not a real man</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. It is ok to take the dowry, if the boy is educated</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Men are better at making important decisions in the home such as major expenses, marriage and education</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Girls who wear revealing and Western clothes invite harassment</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. A woman who is unfaithful to her husband deserves to be beaten</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. If a boy believes in equal rights for women and girls, he only has to help with domestic chores</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. When a wife comes home from work, her husband should make tea for her</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Women are naturally better at looking after children than men</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Girls should ask permission before going out</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Money should be spent on continuing a girl’s education rather than a boy’s if she is the better student</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores are in descending order, with the higher mean indicating a better / positive attitude. Boys have got the highest mean on statements 9 and 8, and lowest in 7.

It means boys have positive attitudes on ‘helping wife in household chores’ and ‘not taking dowry’. It is quite possible that not taking dowry is socially acceptable or a socially acceptable answer.

What is revealing is that all other statements have scored poorly indicating that deep-seated changes in gender attitude have yet to take place.

The attitude is poorest in terms of spending money on girls’ education if she is a better student. Boys have not understood that there needs to be equality in education for boys and girls. Statements 9 and 10 are interesting since no. 9 indicates when stated positively that ‘a man is not weak if he does household chores’ but in no. 10, the score is low for ‘husband making tea for his wife after work’, indicating that attitudes have not really changed.

For the purposes of the evaluation (for both primary and secondary data), 60 to 70% attendance omitted the games sessions, which is not how ECF interprets to ‘graduate’ the boys in the Foundation course. In spite of the higher number of sessions being represented by 60 to 70% and the inclusion of 90-100%, it is interesting that not even these numbers increase the number of boys scoring appropriate change in gender attitudes.

Attendance of 60% or 90% has no significant impact on scores. It is important to note that at best, change is visible in 50% or fewer boys indicating the need for continuous interaction with boys. This
finding corroborates with the secondary data analysis that indicated that gender equity scores on GAS were mostly moderate with very few high scorers.

The following tables were tested for significance depending upon the attendance. The question was: ‘Did 90 to 100% attendance make a difference in gender attitudes?’ The Fisher’s Exact Test was used and none of the statements showed a significant difference. Each statement is analyzed below on what percentage of boys agreed or disagreed. The four categories of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree were divided into two categories Disagree and Agree for ease of comparison.

**Q1. A woman who is unfaithful to her husband deserves to be beaten (Strongly disagree) * Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1. A woman who is unfaithful to her husband deserves to be beaten (Strongly disagree)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .873 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

About 48% boys from both attendance groups believed that the woman should be beaten.

**Q2. Girls who wear revealing and Western clothes invite harassment (Strongly disagree) * Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2. Girls who wear revealing and Western clothes invite harassment (Strongly disagree)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .256 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

About 50% of the 60% attendance group and 40% of the 90% attendance group believed that girls who wear revealing and Western clothes invite harassment.

**Q3. If a boy believes in equal rights for women and girls, he only has to help with domestic chores (Strongly disagree) * Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3. If a boy believes in equal rights for women and girls, he only has to help with domestic chores (Strongly disagree)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .200 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Only 46% and 57% from the 60% and 90% attendance groups disagreed with the statement that only doing domestic chores indicates that a boy believes in equal rights.

**Q4. Girls should ask permission before going out (Strongly disagree) * Group**
Q4. Girls should ask permission before going out (Strongly disagree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .101 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Surprisingly, 88% and 77% (of the 60% and the 90% attendance groups respectively) believed that girls should ask for permission before going out.

Q5. Women are naturally better at looking after children than men (Strongly disagree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .852 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Again, 75% and 77% (of the 60% and the 90% attendance groups respectively) agreed that women are naturally better at looking after children.

Q6. Men are better at making important decisions in the home such as major expenses, marriage and education (Strongly disagree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .626 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Less than half (of the 60% and the 90% attendance groups respectively) agreed that men are better at making major decisions.

Q7. Money should be spent on continuing a girl's education rather than a boy’s if she is the better student (Strongly disagree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fisher's Exact Test .547 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Only 18% and 22% (from the 60% and 90% attendance groups respectively) disagreed indicating that true gender equality – where both boys and girls are considered the same has not been understood.

Q8. It is ok to take the dowry, if the boy is educated (Strongly disagree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8. It is ok to take the dowry, if the boy is educated (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .614 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Almost 90% agreed from both groups that it was not acceptable to take dowry.

Q9. A man who helps his wife in household chores is weak and not a real man (Strongly disagree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9. A man who helps his wife in household chores is weak and not a real man (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .808 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

About 87% from both groups believe that doing household work does not make a man look ‘weak’.

Q10. When a wife comes home from work, her husband should make tea for her (Strongly agree) * Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10. When a wife comes home from work, her husband should make tea for her (Strongly agree)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Test .481 (2-sided) – difference between attendance groups is not significant

Only 66% and 72% (of the 60% and the 90% attendance groups respectively) believed that a husband should make tea for his wife after her work.

3. Mentors and managers assessed the impact of AFE against the goal of reducing violence against women and felt implementation needed more time to see changes; many tangible changes in boys’ behavior were towards the goal of preventing violence and were recognized but considered as ‘unintended’.

Managers and mentors understand that many deep-seated gender attitudes need time for change and that it is too early in implementation. But the yardstick for change is the goal – there is need to clarify whether the AFE goal is reducing or preventing violence against women. The Theory of Change recognizes that there is graded change towards the goal, and ECF is recognizing the slow change
happening. If ECF maps these changes, the expectations regarding outcomes from the boys are likely to be more realistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Management Score</th>
<th>Mentor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term impact with boys and communities</td>
<td>2.8 – too early but some leaders have shown initiative even in an evolving program</td>
<td>2.5 – some changes are visible with children and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With other organizations and government</td>
<td>2.2 – receive requests for training but ECF wants to strengthen its model before advocating to others; received international attention</td>
<td>2.2 – mentors liaise with other organizations to canvass adolescents and they recognize mentor’s expertise. Formal channels to share not initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended</td>
<td>3.4 – education aspirations improved, school attendance better, more protective to girls, are being teased by other boys, politicians want to mobilize adolescent for rallies, father’s decisions related to gender challenged and boys were reprimanded, considered ‘expert’ on gender</td>
<td>3.4 – boys are teased by friends because they behave better with girls, studies are better, behavior more respectful, mothers and older sisters prevent boys from doing household work believing it is a woman’s prerogative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘unintended outcomes’ indicate a variety of changes in boys’ behavior and recognition by society of the changes that have started to be visible. Managers and mentors label improvement in education or improvement in relationships as ‘unintended’ but these are real changes possibly because of the critical thinking that is encouraged in the AFE sessions. This skill spills over in other areas of life. Boys are being challenged or teased or acknowledged as expert indicating that boys are communicating to family and peers which is what AFE encourages through its emphasis on action. The unintended outcomes also identify ‘barriers’ – mothers, sisters and fathers challenging the changes in boys’ attitude and behavior. This means that an enabling environment must be created for boys to try out their new behavior.

4. **ECF prefers to concentrate on its program currently and later invest its time with organizations and networks.**

Although ECF is part of formal and informal networks, this is not its priority and is working on strengthening its own work and believes that the work will speak for itself.

According to the ECF Director, ECF formally participates in the Maharashtra Men and Masculinities Practitioners Network chaired by MAVA and Samyak. ECF is also a member of international networks such as Men Engage and Engaging Men Network. ECF is active in a number of informal networks. In India they are Dasra Social Impact, UnLtd India Alumni Network, Pune CSR Network, Ashoka Network and one of their co-founders is a member of the World Economic Forum Change Makers network. ECF is building its own network in West Bengal with 20 community partners who work well with women, and whose capacity to work well with boys is being built.
3.4 Sustainability

With relation to Program
Mentors and managers felt it was too early for sustainability i.e. that the program could function on its own with the support from the community. The plan to include Community Committees was a step towards sustainability but it was in the initial stages.

Key informants felt that the model that includes intense group work over a fairly long period of time with a group of boys is sustainable once there is a critical mass of empowered leaders.

A strong relationship with local organizations such as Deep Griha Society is one way to coordinate efforts for sustainability. Gender equitable behavior requires an enabling environment of both men and women. ECF’s management is realizing that it is important to engage women directly in ECF’s work because women (mothers and sisters) are creating barriers for boys. Mothers are not aware of their rights or not demanding them or not reinforcing healthy gender norms in their families and communities.

Project RAISE is an attempt to expand ECF’s expertise in working with boys and create models of practice that could lead to greater sustainability regarding the importance of working on issues of boys’ empowerment, masculinity and prevention of violence against women.

With relation to Finance
Women’s organizations and corporates see the value of ECF’s work and have asked for capacity building and in this way created a new funding stream. Funders nationally and internationally are also showing interest in ECF’s model of working with boys. ECF has instituted “Ambassadors’ who are volunteers that link ECF with potential donors. As demand for ECF’s expertise increases there should be different avenues to raise funds for its program.

With relation to Personnel
According to the senior management, there is a planned attempt to recruit locally for management positions. The senior team already consists of 50% local persons, up from 30% 18 months ago.

3.5 Efficiency

1. Given that ECF is trying to build knowledge with a small skilled staff with an intensive program for boys which can then be scaled through knowledge transfer (Project Raise) – it is quite efficient.

ECF’s budget of $400,000 over 6 years is very efficient considering the body of knowledge and resources available.

ECF has invested heavily in RDE and linking evidence from it to curriculum and training. About 5% of the total budget of 2014-15 is for RDE and management costs are about 22%, which is reasonable. ECF aims to build knowledge around issues of masculinity which is India-centric but also contributes internationally to the fairly new knowledge base about working with boys.

ECF management feels it has demonstrated why it is necessary to start young with boys, how to shift attitudes of masculinity, the need for ongoing programming to sustain this behavior, how important it is to create curricula that are relevant to boys as a first principle to drive attendance and need to increase dosage. ECF has in house created a comprehensive database, experimented with tools to track changes in boys and their families – and has been efficient in the use of its human resources to do so.
Key staff is paid nominally or below market standards and that is of concern once the program expands. Also cost constraints delays recruitment because of cash flow. There is no over run of time and cost for field implementation although it may be so for research and curriculum development.

**ECF may need to look at efficient use of mentors’ time by placing a minimum number of boys per group so that reach and coverage is efficient.**

The implementation cycles are completed on time in spite of the various difficulties in the field.

2. **Funding continues to be a challenge for various reasons.**

ECF’s work is niche and not all funders are interested in funding this area of work. Indian funders are being tapped but ECF does not want to move away from its core work – working with boys in communities. Some funders are willing to give funds if ECF moves into schools or adds on other components of work. ECF is tapping the corporate world for their gender sensitization programs and in this way support its core work in communities.

**3.6 Organizational Culture and Management**

**3.6.1 Innovation**

ECF values innovation and this is evident from the reflexivity shown in revising the curriculum, use of research and evaluation, investment in training and the flexibility in changing plans due to changed circumstances.

Two PLA activities – the SWOT and Timeline – provided information regarding the innovativeness of the organization.

**SWOT**

The Program team, managers and the RDE team separately identified the strengths and challenges of ECF. A consensus building exercise then identified the top five strengths and challenges. The top 5 strengths and top 5 challenges were:

**Strengths:***
1) Monitoring and Evaluation  
2) Leadership  
3) Dedication and Loyalty of staff  
4) Organizational culture  
5) Niche Recognition

**Challenges:**
1) Building a sustainable project  
2) Participatory youth friendly M&E to tackle change  
3) Communicating benefit to target boys  
4) Communicating about ECF to stakeholders  
5) Partnerships and Networks
Key informants stated that the monitoring and evaluation, emphasis on capacity building, spaces for reflection and understanding of the issue and challenges on hand were unusual for a small NGO. The challenges were a realistic assessment of where ECF wants to go and in this sense is an example of its innovative and transparent way of doing business. It has already identified the gaps and wants to work towards it.

**Timeline Analysis**

This PLA exercise identified the **milestones** (see in color in the chart that follows) that ECF felt were turning points. It is clear that there has been a consistent push towards relevance, reflexivity to learn from field lessons and program improvement. The strong use of evidence was clear from the start with the emphasis on RDE.

The first milestone (see chart below) was moving the issue from awareness raising through cinema and discussion to working with men or young boys in communities. The second was recruiting and training mentors to work in communities within one year of the change in focus. The third critical change came in 2014 where ECF realized the need to build critical thinking, communication skills and facilitation of mentors to realize its goal. In six months, a draft curriculum was underway to pilot this focus. Other key highlights include the new perspective in working with men in 2011, the launch of RDE in 2012 and change in the terminology of working on gender issues in 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No.staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Solar Cinema office opens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>First engagement with men as Solar Cinema</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2009</td>
<td>Pivot from cinema to men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Working with men pilot while continuing to use the medium of cinema</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>First mentor – Bibwewadi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Rujuta Teredesai joins ECF; Programme expands into 3 communities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Large team of mentors recruited; Mentor training and recruitment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td>Launching of AFE in 20 communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>New perspective on men’s needs (introduced by the former Program manager Aditi Tembe); Alumni Programme launched; Leader’s training started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-Sept  2011</td>
<td>Second line management started forming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
<td>First version of AFE curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec 2011</td>
<td>UnLtd India investment; ECF UK Registered; ECF India registered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jan to Aug 2012 | Four new mentors recruited; Stop showing films and start games event during FP mobilization
---|---
2012 | ECF featured on national TV; ECF internship programme (former participants acted as interns at office for several months); Research Development and Evaluation programme launched
Oct 2012 | Lessons learned feature in newsletter started
2013 | Terminology changed from ‘Empowering men to empower women’ to ‘Raising men to prevent gender violence and discrimination’
March 2013 | First intranet published
Sept – Oct 2013 | Participated in Footsteps Good Marathon; Will Muir selected as Ashoka Fellow; Will Muir presents at TedX Pune and Barcelona
Nov 2013 | Organization structural changes
Feb 2014 | First 1,000 graduates
Mar 2014 | Shift to from knowledge transfer to skills based approach, emphasizing active participation and critical thinking
Mar 2014 | Restructuring working group / committee
Aug 2014 | First corporate training delivered; 80G certificate obtained
Sept 2014 | Pilot of new FP curriculum
Sept 2014 | Project RAISE; Piloting of Community Committees (CC)
Oct 2014 | Transition from RAD (Research and Development) to RDE (Research, Development and Evaluation) marks more emphasis given to M&E
Nov 2014 | Presented poster, participated at MenEngage Global Symposium, New Delhi
Feb 2015 | Piloting of new M&E tools
April – May 2015 | Leaders for Equality Programme developed for corporate partners; Progress of FCRA prior approval; 10 CBOs selected in West Bengal to participate in Project Raise
2015 | ECF USA Registered
| Secured FCRA

Key informants who knew the organization corroborated that it was a learning organization, the evidence being the recurring theme of reflection, discussion and change to contextualize implementation according to feedback and evidence from the field.

3.6.2 Management

ECF has a legally functioning board of trustees who believe in their work but for transition to a larger program, ECF management is planning to introduce an influential think tank (and an expanded Board) to guide their work. According to the ECF co-founder, there are about 30 to 40 ambassadors who promote their work.

A basic administration system is in place and ECF recognizes the need for specialist accounting personnel and better systems. Weekly mentor meetings, weekly program meetings, bi-monthly senior management meetings and annual retreats are part of the organizational culture.

Key informants and management believe that ECF has a transparent and flat management structure that supports staff reviews, transparent recruitment procedures and transparent decision making.

One of the problems is recruiting skilled senior staff at competitive rates as the program expands.
Although strategic and operational plans are available – there needs to be greater emphasis and follow through on both such as how to reach hard to reach population of boys, three year forward planning and so on.

4. Overall Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The AFE program of ECF has contributed substantially to understanding what it takes to bring changes in boys’ knowledge attitude, skills and behavior to ensure a more gender equitable attitude and behavior, challenging notions of masculinity and manhood to prevent violence against women. ECF is testing how boys and men can be part of the solution. Whereas most organizations working on gender equality target women, ECF is among the few to work with young men.

Due to ECF’s efforts, hundreds of boys (and their families, peers and community) have been exposed to ideas of gender equality and action towards it. ECF has practically demonstrated how to implement programs that are committed to bringing behavior change (and not just awareness) and has shown a willingness to adapt and learn from the field.

The work with boys draws attention to the critical role that NGOs like ECF, grounded in local realities, can play to inform on masculinity related issues that are complex and very little is known about. There is much to be done to ensure that the knowledge and reach of ECF is valued and spread through civil society and government. Change in patriarchy and deep-seated gender discriminatory attitudes and behavior requires the sensitization of families, communities and local level authorities to ensure that enabling environments are created for young boys.

Due to the intensive community based and long term facilitation by mentors, who become role models to young boys, there is tangible change in the attitudes and behaviours of boys who participate in the AFE program. Because there is no benchmark and little research on how perceptions of manhood, masculinity change and evolve in traditional patriarchal societies, it was up to ECF to document the change and then seek answers to understand in what circumstances the change occurred, what changed and what did not.

4.1 Lessons Learned and Recommendations

A small NGO by choosing a very important, relatively unexplored area of work can demonstrate that change is possible in deeply entrenched gender attitudes that prevail in India and that boys can be part of the solution. The recommendations for future programming include:

1) The goal of working with boys to influence gender violence needs clarity and should be realistic. ECF must question whether the ultimate goal is prevention of violence against women or reducing violence. The latter would mean finding out perpetrators of violence, have strategies to address the victims, laws and procedures to report perpetrators and so on. The evaluation has highlighted that this is not the case. Prevention of violence against women refers to awareness building, challenging gender norms, advocating gender equity and human rights.

   *It is recommended that ECF review its mission and goals of the AFE program to reflect the work it is actually doing.*

2) A theory of change was developed for the evaluation as ECF’s theory of change required more detail. It is clear from the evaluation findings that different levels of outcomes are needed to reach the goal of prevention of violence against women. These outcomes are at the individual, family, peer and community. However, a more nuanced understanding of what outcomes are
possible at what age needs further reflection. The evaluation tools and the new M&E framework indicate what attitudes and behavior have changed and what have not and these findings can be used to develop the curriculum that is aligned with what change is expected.

*It is recommended that a TOC be developed that captures the change in knowledge, attitudes, skills and behavior of adolescent boys in the program.*

3) Various outcomes are being observed and recorded in the new M&E framework. There is considerable change in communication and relationships, critical thinking and empathy that is unique. These are not ‘unintended’ but core changes that are tangible and visible. It is commendable that after various attempts, ECF has been able to identify clearly these changes in attitude and behavior. The definition of the goal – reducing violence is one reason for this confusion in identifying outcomes. ECF is missing out on the small changes that are the stepping-stones to larger change. The other is that ECF is working in uncharted territories and learning on its feet. These findings are valuable, and need to be reported and incorporated in the TOC and the wider thinking around working with boys. Also, what is resistant to change is also becoming clear.

*It is recommended that ECF recognize and value the different changes being observed in boys, families and communities as a result of their intervention and document learnings to inform their own implementation and further research.*

4) Dosage (minimum number of training events attended) has emerged as a critical feature impacting change. Dosage is not just the extent of attendance in the Foundation program but extent of exposure in the Foundation program itself. This may require a review of whether one needs three cycles in the Foundation program or two longer cycles. Dosage is also about progression to Action and Leadership programs. The greater the attendance at Foundation, the more likely those boys will continue to Action and Leadership. This is not surprising considering that gender attitudes are age old, entrenched in the culture and society. Therefore, the greater the interaction of boys with mentors and more structured the programs at all three levels, the greater likelihood of change that has a chance of being sustainable. It appears from the findings that attitudes are resistant to change and in the current program, at best, impact only 50% boys.

*It is recommended that ECF reviews its dosage criteria for the Foundation Program and consider dosage as seamless including all programs – Foundation, Action and Leadership.*

5) Age of the target group according to ECF was meant to be 14 to 17 years. However, data indicates that boys as young as 12 years are attending and doing better in terms of attendance and outcomes. It is quite likely that the young age also makes them more compliant. This could be an advantage in that boys construct a more empathetic and equitable male identity rather than unlearn patriarchal models of manhood. The curriculum however, is designed for older boys and does not factor the needs of boys according to age nor how gender equitable attitudes can be developed in a systematic manner at different ages. There is some research on how social constructs of masculinity and manhood are developed which could be used to adapt the curriculum by age. It is important to note that age will determine how the goal, the prevention of violence is addressed. If younger boys are interested in the AFE program, it provides an opportunity to start with small basic steps towards gender equity. For older boys, the knowledge, skills and behavior expected is quite different. If ECF considers dosage as seamless through all its programs (Foundation, Action and Leadership) then, the change plotted for the different ages needs to be carefully reflected in the curriculum.

*It is recommended that the curriculum is aligned with the age, dosage and goal of the AFE and is*
informed by research, observations and findings at the field level. This will be a valuable contribution of ECF towards knowledge building (one of its expressed aims), theory and practice of working with boys towards gender equitable behavior.

6) The structure of the AFE is important for boys to stay in the program. However the Foundation level is the most critical as high attendance in the Foundation course ensures retention at Action and Leadership levels. There is however dropout after enrollment and all attempts are needed to continuously strengthen the Foundation program.

It is recommended that the Foundation program be reviewed to ensure that good facilitation takes place and develop strategies to increase retention of adolescent boys in the program.

7) AFE works intensively with groups of boys and the mentors play a critical role in enrolling and retaining boys. AFE has invested heavily in the capacity building of mentors towards a more facilitative approach, which is commendable. Some hard to reach populations will require mentors to be from that community and with a certain skill set and this should influence the recruitment of mentors.

It is recommended that capacity building of mentors continues to be strengthened and recruitment be informed by which communities (language, ethnicity, status) ECF wishes to work in.

8) A change in engendered attitudes is not easy. Although ECF’s core work is with boys, findings indicate the need to have an enabling environment that encourages boys to test out new skills, attitudes and behavior. If not, then the first changes in boys’ behavior can be quashed early. Findings indicate that boys’ communication at home is limited. ECF may need to think about working with girls and women, women’s organizations, older men to ensure that boys’ attempts to socially construct an empathetic model of masculinity receive adequate encouragement. Community committees are one way to do so but not necessarily the only way.

It is recommended that ECF reviews its strategic partners and other community stakeholders, including families, and their contribution towards realizing their mission and goal.

9) Research and development has been a core area of work and has proved to be extremely useful in increasing understanding about change processes in young boys’ attitude and behavior towards gender. The tools developed in the new framework have captured what is really changing (and what is not) on the field. These tools and those used in the evaluation may be used to create baselines so that change can be systematically plotted at different levels – at Foundation, Action and Leadership program.

It is recommended that the emphasis on RDE continue, baselines be included and monitoring and evaluation continue to inform implementation and future planning.

10) ECF has a lean management and administrative structure and creatively employs volunteers or skilled staff at nominal rates. For better efficiency as the program grows, not only will more local staff be needed (as recognized by the management) but a fund flow that will enable hiring of specialists that contribute to the quality that ECF demands. Expansion will need new hiring for efficient implementation.

It is recommended that ECF look at how internal efficiency can be improved through increased number of skilled staff, review targets at the field level.
11) Core funding could stabilize ECF’s work and its attempt to do corporate training in gender related work is perhaps one way forward. ECF has secured FCRA in August/September (a government of India permission to receive foreign funds) and this should ease accessing international funds. Efficiency also means reaching out to more boys with the same personnel – some community groups have smaller numbers and the mentor: boys’ ratio may need to be addressed.

It is recommended that ECF continues to use creative ways of tapping Indian and international funders including CSR (corporate social responsibility funds that are mandatory under Indian law to be spent by corporates on social causes).

12) ECF has a flat and transparent management culture that has been appreciated by its entire staff.

It is recommended that this management culture continue to be developed in its current and future projects.

13) ECF has been inward looking to strengthen its programs but it may want to consider as the demand for their expertise grows and they add to the body of knowledge to strategically network with and advocate for the work they do nationally and internationally.

It is recommended that ECF develops its advocacy strategy and strategically network with civil society, donors and key influencers to promote its model of engaging men in the prevention of violence against women.

ECF has demonstrated it is a learning organization, committed to bring real change in gender equitable behavior, proven that boys can be part of the solution and has developed a model that is willing to learn from field experience and contribute to a better understanding of manhood, masculinity and preventing violence against women.

5. Validation of the findings

5.1 Meeting with the ECF team

A result validation meeting was held on the 13th October, 2015 with the ECF team. The validation meeting adopted the same participatory method that was used throughout the evaluation process. Following a presentation on the process and results of the evaluation, the main concerns were clarified and suggestions and recommendations were proposed.

Facilitation skills vs caste and religion of the mentor:
The ECF team felt that facilitation skills were more important than a mentor’s caste or religion. It was clarified that good facilitation skills were very important as it helps in retention of the boys in the program and in the transfer of knowledge. However, during enrollment it was suggested that having someone from the community assist the mentor, would make a difference, as this person understands the culture of the place.

Gender attitude change:
Results demonstrated that the main changes were seen in boys undertaking household chores and improvement in the boy’s communication and relationship skills. With regard to gender equitable attitudes the changes were not significant, however, for these changes to happen it was recommended that more sessions and inputs were needed at the FP and AP level.
**Age- Can a 10-12 year old take action in the community?:**
Challenges in younger boys taking action in the community were pointed out during the validation meeting. To overcome this challenge it was proposed that the curriculum be age appropriate and actions expected from each age group be clearly defined.

**Supportive environment and meeting with parents:**
The evaluation informed the ECF team that boys could take action in their homes or community up to a certain point, beyond that it was difficult without an enabling and supportive environment. Hence it was suggested that more informative meetings during the mobilization and training event periods needs to be conducted with parents. Further, it was recommended that just providing information to the parents was not enough but encouraging them to ask questions to the mentor about the program was also important.

**Baseline and curriculum**
It was suggested that conducting a baseline was important as it would give ECF a starting point with regard to knowledge, behaviour and attitudes of the boys.
With regard to the curriculum following suggestions were proposed to the ECF team:
1) the curriculum needs to be age appropriate, i.e. it needs to be adapted for different age groups.
2) every training event should provide variations in activities, this will give mentors an opportunity to select an activity according to the age and needs of the boys.
3) for attitudes to shift, the AP curriculum needs to have more inputs i.e, more learning/knowledge sessions.

**Action events and Community Committees (CC):**
It was proposed that action events during FP or AP should not be just a presentation but should involve more creativity of the boys. For this, more time needs to be allotted for organizing and planning of action events.
In the validation meeting it was reported that the AfE program had few active leaders and it was a high expectation for these young leaders to start and lead the CCs. It was suggested that CCs should be initiated and lead by the ECF team with the support of the leaders. This would need to take place till the CCs are mature to run on their own. It was also proposed that one of the goals of the CCs should be to support the AfE program in the future.

**Efficiency:**
For better program efficiency it was recommended that:
1) Cluster wise breakup of participants in the AP need to be reconsidered as retention in the program is low.
2) The ratio of boys to the mentors should be monitored. For example 6:1 is not efficient while 10:1 is considered efficient.

**5.2 Meeting with the boys**
A result validation meeting was held with seven boys from both categories (60%-70% & 90%-100%) who attended the FGDs All seven boys agreed with the results and provided explanations for a few:

**Less communication with fathers as compared to mothers:**
Reasons the boys communicate less with their fathers on gender equality and discrimination is because:
they are scared of them,
they feel they are going to hit them
they do not know how to talk to their fathers on issues of gender equality
they feel this information is not important for the fathers

Less communication with sisters:
Reasons for this were,
● not knowing how to discuss topics such as sexuality, or
● how to start conversations with them on topics related gender violence and discrimination

Less communication about the AfE sessions with community friends as compared to school friends:
The boys stated that their community friends:
● Did not listen to them, showed no interest in the sessions and did not engage in discussion on gender violence and discrimination
● Had no faith in the classes and felt that the AfE classes taught inappropriate topics

6. Management response

Informing our work based on robust primary evidence and analysis is a founding principle at Equal Community Foundation. We are pleased that this component of our culture has been recognised as being particularly strong in the evaluation process.

The evaluation was commissioned to help us understand what is working and what isn’t working on our core program - Action for Equality. The findings from the report would inform program improvement decisions; and current and potential investments by funders. We aim to make this report accessible to all, so that organizations who wish to start working with or are already working with boys and men towards gender equality can learn from it too.

The process of evaluation designed by Sonal Zaveri was participatory and helped us as a team to learn along the way. It is worth mentioning that the primary recommendations in this report have ratified our own assertions based on the internal analysis of AFE and Research, Development and Evaluation team. Even before the final report was ready to be published, the ECF team began work on some of the recommendations.

We would like to thank the participants of Action for Equality Program, their families, our funders and our team for all their contribution.

Recommendation 1: ECF review its mission and goals of the AfE program to reflect the work it is actually doing.

We accept this recommendation. We recognise that the stated mission of the AfE program (to end violence) is not aligned with the intended outcomes (prevention of violence and discrimination). Also, outcome of ‘prevention’ is a more realistic expectation considering the age of participants and the fact that not all participants demonstrate violent or discriminatory attitudes and behaviors. Going forward, ECF will ensure that focus on ‘prevention’ is reflected in ECF goals and mission statements.

This will bring forward the challenge of managing expectations of our team members, partners and funders. However, the findings from this evaluation clearly provide the justification. The updates will be completed by end of December 2015.
Recommendation 2: Theory of Change be developed that captures the change in knowledge, attitudes, skills and behavior of the boys in the program

We accept that the Theory of Change needs to be re-written. We have started drafting the new version. It will include the changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, skills and behavior along with the influence of the program at individual, peer and community level as process indicators towards the expected outcome of prevention. It will also articulate the expected outcomes at every stage of Action for Equality program and not just at the end. The new Theory of Change will be published by end of February 2016.

Recommendation 3: ECF recognize and value the different changes being observed in boys, families and communities as a result of their intervention and document learnings to inform their own implementation and further research.

There are certain indicators of change that are being captured through the M&E framework such as improved communication and relationships, critical thinking and empathy. These in isolation might not seem to contribute towards the goal of prevention. However, they are directly connected to ability to challenge gender norms and to deconstruct and construct new concepts of masculinity. The evaluation helped us recognise that these are process indicators that will lead to the outcomes we are expecting. So, the team will work on incorporating these in our Theory of Change and give it due emphasis in our program learning and when reporting on progress in our annual evaluation reports.

Recommendation 4: ECF reviews its dosage(minimum number of training sessions attended) criteria for the Foundation Program and consider dosage as seamless including all programs – Foundation, Action and Leadership.

We agree that dosage is a critical feature in impacting change. We will make the following changes:

● Consider dosage as a factor throughout the three stages of AFE and not just Foundation Program as recommended by the evaluator. However, we will continue to run the AFE Foundation program for 15 weeks and not increase the topics or numbers of sessions within those.
● Run Foundation Program and Action Program in alternate order in a connecting series rather than in parallel. This means participants will graduate directly from Foundation Program to Action Program.
● The Action Program will be organised in individual communities on a weekly basis instead of in clusters, thereby removing one of the barriers for participation
● Participation in Action Events in Foundation Program will be one of the key criteria for graduation.

Even though these changes aren’t significant, the expected results such as higher dosage and higher retention will be significant.

These changes will be implemented at the beginning of next AFE program cycle in January 2016. The team is currently working on plans to manage the change and minimise disruption.

Recommendation 5: Align the curriculum with the age, dosage and goal of the AFE program and be informed by research, observations and findings at the field level. This will be a valuable contribution of ECF towards knowledge building.

We accept this recommendation. We have extended the age criteria to include boys in the age group of 13 to 17. This wide age group can be categorised as early adolescent (13 to 14 years) and adolescent (15 to 17 years).
We will realign the curriculum by adding activities or instructions to support mentors to adapt sessions for the age group they are working with at any given point. Also, mentors will be encouraged to enrol boys from similar age category in each cycle.

This will make program mentors’ job a bit more difficult. It can be managed with dedicated training and support for mentors.

The additions to the curriculum will be made gradually over the next 12 months.

**Recommendation 6: The Foundation program be reviewed to ensure that good facilitation takes place and develop strategies to increase retention of adolescent boys in the program.**

We accept the need to develop and further improve existing strategies to increase enrolment and retention. To this end, in addition to changes in the operations model and curriculum (as mentioned in response to Recommendation 5), we will continue to invest in development of mentors’ and overall team’s capacity and skills. We recognise that additional work is needed to create an ecosystem amongst participants’ parents, families and peers that encourages and supports enrolment and retention. This will be done through structured stakeholder engagement.

It is worth noting that ECF has been working for four years or more in most of the communities where AFE is being implemented. Enrolment of new participants has become increasingly difficult. Therefore, we will need to actively manage this challenge and adapt solutions on an on-going basis.

**Recommendation 7: Capacity building of mentors continues to be strengthened and recruitment be informed by which communities (language, ethnicity, status) ECF wishes to work in.**

We partially accept this recommendation. We recognise that program mentors are key to the success of this program. Since day one, we have invested in their development. Earlier in the year, we have added a coaching component to the training we provide. Each mentor along with the coach and their line manager will develop a professional development plan. We will continue to strengthen their capacity.

Mentor recruitment continues to be one of our biggest challenges. Identifying mentors from specific community or ethnicity definitely has its benefits and we intend to do so. However, this isn’t always realistic or practical. So, if we find individuals who have the basics - commitment to the cause, fluency in Marathi and Hindi, ability to unlearn and learn; we will provide the necessary training for the role including meeting the root of the need for diversity.

**Recommendation 8: ECF reviews its strategic partners and other community stakeholders, including families, and their contribution towards realizing their mission and goal.**

We accept that there is a need to strengthen our approach towards stakeholder engagement. Earlier, the focus of our stakeholder engagement was to increase participation in the program. We recognise that we need to compliment initial efforts with emphasis on articulating key messages and expected outcomes of the program in our interaction. We will formalise and structure this engagement with existing stakeholders that includes - women, girls, older men and general community members and strategic partners such as organizations working with women and girls in the communities. This will create an enabling environment for change to sustain.

**Recommendation 9: The emphasis on RDE continue, baselines be included and monitoring and evaluation continue to inform implementation and future planning.**
We accept the need for continued investment in RDE. In the past, we failed to conduct baseline assessment due to lack of resources. Now, RDE team is working on identifying how to embed baseline data collection within the program activities. In addition, for impact assessment they will aim to provide similar outputs through other methods such as randomised control trials.

We are currently seeking financial support to meet the demands of and from RDE.

**Recommendation 10: ECF look at how internal efficiency can be improved through increased numbers of skilled staff, review targets at the field level.**

We acknowledge the need for improved efficiency. The changes in the operations model as mentioned in response to Recommendation 4, will partially address this need at the field level staff. It is expected to reduce the cost per beneficiary.

We will need to recruit additional team members within middle and senior management to be able to meet the growing scope of our work. We will need individuals who fit in with the organizational culture, have expertise in specific areas such as curriculum development; driving quality at scale. Availability of such staff and resources to fund them are the two biggest constraints.

We are currently seeking financial investment to support this.

**Recommendation 11: Continue to use creative ways of tapping Indian and international funders including CSR.**

We have secured funds to support core operations for the next 10 months. We are currently working on diversifying our sources of income. Strategic advice and connections to potential funders are always welcomed. In addition to the on-going fundraising efforts, we have recently piloted corporate training for meeting two objectives - reaching a different target group and revenue generation, making it a win-win situation for ECF and the corporate partner.

**Recommendation 12: ECF management culture continues to be developed in its current and future projects.**

We take organizational culture seriously. We take pride in our lean and transparent way of working. During recruitment, cultural fit is a non-negotiable factor. We will continue to invest in strengthening this process.

**Recommendation 13: ECF develops its advocacy strategy and strategically network with civil society, donors and key influencers to promote its model of engaging men in the prevention of violence against women.**

We accept this recommendation. Our vision is to scale the approach of working with boys and men for prevention of gender-based violence and discrimination across India and beyond. We recognise that this is possible only if strategically partner with organizations across the country.

We are keen on sharing the program materials we have developed along with the lessons we have learned with practitioners, funders and policy makers.

As we are in year one of Project Raise, we have already started working with 8 organizations in West Bengal to support them implement the approach of working with boys and men for prevention of violence against women. We plan to work with 100 organizations over the next 5 years.
## Attachments

### Attachment One: Key Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder (category)</th>
<th>Stakeholder name and contact</th>
<th>Relationship to ECF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor to Donor</td>
<td>Chris Underhill</td>
<td>Advisor to Hummingbird Foundation and had conducted due diligence of ECF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chris.Underhill@basicneeds.org">Chris.Underhill@basicneeds.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Deep Griha Society,</td>
<td>CBO partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashlesha Onawale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>Arvind Chittewale</td>
<td>Mentor trainer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment Two: List of communities for sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Code</th>
<th>Community Name</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Ended</th>
<th>Number of Cycles completed (as of end of cycle 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B001</td>
<td>Bibwewadi Ota</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B002</td>
<td>Gadgoba Vasti</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B003</td>
<td>Mahatma Phule</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Cycle 3</td>
<td>3 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B004</td>
<td>Super Indira Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B005</td>
<td>Ramtekdi</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B006</td>
<td>Tadiwala Road</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B007</td>
<td>Bhimtola</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B008</td>
<td>Prem Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B009</td>
<td>Chaitraban</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B010</td>
<td>Ambedkar Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B011</td>
<td>Shashtri Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B012</td>
<td>Tulja Bhavani Vasahat</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Cycle 3</td>
<td>3 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B013</td>
<td>Mauli Hall - Khadki Bazaar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B014</td>
<td>Rautwadi</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B015</td>
<td>Depotline - Khadki Bazaar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Cycle 9</td>
<td>9 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B016</td>
<td>Bhimnagar</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All 12 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B017</td>
<td>Milind Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>1 cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B018</td>
<td>Soneri Maidan</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>1 cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B019</td>
<td>Panchasheel Ambedkar Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>1 cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B020</td>
<td>Shahid Bhagat Singh Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>1 cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B021</td>
<td>Vikas Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 4</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>9 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B022</td>
<td>Gulistan Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 4</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>9 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B023</td>
<td>Keshav Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 4</td>
<td>Cycle 6</td>
<td>3 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B024</td>
<td>Study Hall</td>
<td>Cycle 5</td>
<td>Cycle 5</td>
<td>1 cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B025</td>
<td>Yashwant Nagar</td>
<td>Cycle 8</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>5 cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Cycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandan Nagar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashewadi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohia Nagar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamuna Nagar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only those communities where 12 cycles were completed were selected as a sample.
Attachment Three: Project Raise Spheres of Influence and Theory of Change

Project Raise: Spheres of Influence
The spheres of control and influence as well as RAISE strategic partners were identified through group work.

Project Raise: Theory

![Diagram showing inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes related to Project Raise.](image-url)
### Attachment Four: Evolvement of the M&E framework from Cycle 1 to Cycle 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following monitoring and evaluation tools were used</td>
<td>The M&amp;E tools used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Enrollment forms</td>
<td>● Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Attendance sheets</td>
<td>● Enrollment forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Post questionnaire (measured gender attitudes)</td>
<td>● Outcome surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Mentor observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Interviews of mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Stakeholder mapping and engagement tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Parents visit report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Weekly report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cycle 4 (1st February 2012- 30th June 2012)**

Personal action plans were introduced.

**Cycle 5 (1st July 2012 : 31st October 2012)**

New tool introduced: Behaviour assessment tool

Modifications: Pre and Post questionnaire on gender attitude modified to a picture test (pre and post) which measured attitudes like the previous questionnaire

**Cycle 7 (1st April 2013- 31st July 2013)**

Modifications: Behaviour assessment tool was modified

**Cycle 10 (12th May 2014- 28th August 2014)**

Temporary M&E tools were being developed. The monitoring and evaluation tools used during this cycle were:

● Attendance
● Enrollment forms
● The outcome survey

**Cycle 11 (20th September 2014- 10th January 2015)**

The monitoring and evaluation tool used were:

● Attendance
● Enrollment
● The outcome assessment survey (new version)
● Pilot of FGDs with fieldworkers

**Cycle 12 (27th January 2015- 9th May 2015):**

The new M&E framework was used.

● Attendance forms
● Enrollment forms
● Attitude Surveys
● Pilot of Mentor Observation Tool
● Focus Group Discussions with parents

There has been some change in the M&E of the Action Program:

From Cycle 1- Cycle 11, the monitoring and evaluation tools used for the Action Program were:

- Attendance sheet
- Weekly reports

From Cycle 12 the following M&E tools were used for the Action Program

- Attendance sheet
- Enrollment forms
- Gender Attitude survey
Focus Group discussions with parents

In the Leadership Program, M&E was introduced in Cycle 12 with the following tools:
- Attendance Sheet
- Enrollment forms
### Attachment Five: Information of primary stakeholders and methodologies used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECF Management</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Community Foundation Co-Founders Program Director Research Development &amp; Evaluation Manager Program Manager (Action for Equality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Advisor – Key Informant</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder – Key Informant</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner NGO – Key Informant</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF Managers and Mentors</td>
<td>PLA - Theory of Change, Timeline and SWOT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF Mentors</td>
<td>FGD and Rating Scale</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF Managers</td>
<td>FGD and Rating Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers of adolescent boys</td>
<td>FGD (in two communities)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent boys</td>
<td>PLA tools (in two communities)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal PLA and FGD</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent boys</td>
<td>Attitude Survey</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment Six: Gender Attitude Survey

1. Ramesh and Pranita have been married for ten years. One day, Ramesh finds out that Pranita is having an affair with their neighbour. Ramesh is furious, he feels so humiliated and betrayed that he beats Pranita.

Do you think Pranita deserved this beating? Why?

2. Samir's father has a short temper, usually when he is tired after work. When he comes home for dinner, he often insults Samir’s mother and slaps her. Samir tells his mother that they should leave his father and go back to the village where she will be sAfE. Samir’s mother refuses. She says that his father loves her and that their family should stay together. For this, she it is willing to tolerate her husband’s behaviour.

Do you agree with Samir or his mother? What would you do in this situation?

3. Poonam loves fashion. She likes to wear jeans, short skirts, dresses and t-shirts. Girls at her school say she does this to get attention from boys. The boys tease and whistle at her when she walks in the street. When she complains about this, Poonam’s neighbours tell her that she is to blame for the teasing and harassment because of what she is wearing.

Is it Poonam’s fault that she is being teased? Why?

4. Chetu is six years old and likes to play with dolls with his two sisters. He dresses them, makes up their hair and takes care of them. His parents are very concerned about it because they want him to grow up to be a real man. They decide to stop him from playing with dolls.

Do you agree with Chetu’s parents actions? Why?

5. Shruti is 16, Navnath is 15, and they have two little sisters who are 2 and 4. Their mother is sick and is no longer able to get out of bed. She used to take care of the house and the children by herself. Their mother tells Shruti to stay at home to prepare food and take care of her sisters and the house. She doesn’t ask Navnath because she wants him to concentrate on this studies.

Do you think Shruti and Navnath’s mother is right? Why?

6. Nisha is a 19 year old college student. Her college has organised a social event for Saturday evening. When she tells her mother about this, her brother Ravi says she should not be allowed to go because girls often get harassed or molested in their community during the evening and he wants to protect her. Nisha’s mother agrees and she is not allowed to go to the social event, which makes her very sad.

Was telling Nisha to stay at home the best or only way to protect her? Why?
7. Ganesh takes the bus to the school with his friends every day. His friends always stare and make loud comments at girls on the bus, sometimes his friends follow the girls and touch their hair and take their hands. Ganesh does not like this and tells them they are annoying the girls. His friends make fun of Ganesh and tell him that he he must be homosexual. Ganesh is upset and and doesn’t want to lose his friends.

What should Ganesh do? Why?

8. Priyanka and Ramesh got married 6 months ago. Before marriage, Priyanka was training as a hairdresser and now she wants to start her own business. Now that they are married, Ramesh wants Priyanka to stay at home rather than work outside the house. He says that it is his responsibility to provide for his family and that Priyanka’s responsibility to look after the house and have children.

What do you think Priyanka should do? Why?

9. Nina's school is organising a field trip to Mahabaleshwar on Saturday. But her father tells her that on Saturday her mother will be at work and Nina needs to stay home to look after her little brother. Nina suggests that her elder brother could take care of the baby. Nina’s father says that her brother is playing cricket and only she can look after the baby. Nina knows this is because she is the only girl in the family.

Do you agree with Nina’s father’s decision? Why?

10. Mahesh and Nisha are married and both have a job. Nisha works at a travel agency, Mahesh is a shopkeeper. Nisha gets a promotion and starts to earn more money than Mahesh. Mahesh wants her to stop working. He tells her it is a man's duty to provide for his family and that they have enough money to support their family with his salary only.

Should Nisha continue to work even though Mahesh disagrees? Why?