ZERO TOLERANCE

www.zerotolerance.org.uk

“We need this to do things differently”: A framework for a new, inclusive and intersectional organisation to transform attitudes towards women and girls and promote gender equality in Scotland.

by Kate Nevens, Talat Yaqoob and Ellie Hutchinson from The Collective

January 2021

Acknowledgements

Zero Tolerance and The Collective would like to thank everyone who has contributed to this research in some way, in particular:

- All the research participants
- The Research Advisory Group
- Dr Ima Jackson
- Shirley Henderson, Jatinder Padda, Eleanor Gall and Iona Sorbie
- The Scottish Government

Contents

Executive Summary

Women and girls in Scotland continue to face discrimination and violence every day. For Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME), LGBTQ+, disabled, migrant and poor women, the harm they face is deepened further by racism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism and structural poverty. While this project began before the COVID-19 pandemic, it was completed and written during a time when women were more likely than men to lose their jobs, more likely to take on caring responsibilities, more likely to be in frontline 'essential jobs', more likely to suffer domestic abuse and coercive control, and more likely to experience poverty.

The pandemic has brought many of our social inequalities into sharper focus and reminded us of what we already know: women and girls continue to face social, political, economic and cultural inequalities and experience high levels of violence. At the root of these inequalities and violence are harmful social, cultural and gendered norms that drive negative attitudes and behaviours towards women and girls and lead to gender inequality. Gender inequality damages women's and girls' physical, mental and emotional safety, prevents them from living authentically and free from fear, and impacts workplaces, homes, education, communities, relationships, bodies and identities.

This project arises from a recommendation made by the First Minister's National Advisory Council on Women and Girls (NACWG) that the Scottish Government should develop a new 'What Works?' institute to "develop and test robust, evidence-led, inclusive and representative approaches to changing public attitudes in Scotland to girls' and women's equality and rights, including dismantling stereotypes about what girls and women should study, work at, and be" (NACWG 2019).

The NACWG envisages such an institute as "the place where 'good learning' happens and where specialist gender support can be accessed that will give public bodies; the third sector and business the tools to act to change the culture on women's equality" (NACWG 2019). Zero Tolerance was tasked with exploring this recommendation further, commissioning The Collective in undertaking a light-touch literature review and working with practitioners, policy makers, campaign groups, researchers and academics to respond to the following questions:

- What works in changing attitudes?
- What kind of organisation could help change attitudes to women and girls?

This report is broken down into seven sections: an introduction; our methodology; what we know about attempts to change attitudes to women and girls; what organisational approaches currently exist outside of Scotland; what the landscape looks like in Scotland; the design and direction of a new organisation; and three potential models, as well as a foundational model, for moving forward. At the heart of this work is a participatory, intersectional approach to understanding knowledge. Throughout our literature review, our discussion groups, our interviews and our workshops, we centred our commitment to hearing from groups who have been marginalised, who do not have access to peer-review processes, and for whom large-scale evaluations are beyond their resources and budgets.

This executive summary pulls together our main findings.

What works in changing attitudes?

In our review of what works in changing attitudes, we found that the process of attitude formation – whether pro or anti-equality – was complex and nuanced, and that attitude change work for one area of gender equality (for example, attitudes towards same sex marriage) would not be the same for another area (for example, attitudes towards Muslim women). Also, many evaluations were short term, so researchers were not able to explore the long-term impact of the work that had been completed. However, we were able to identify a few recurring themes around 'what works' and, importantly for those working for change, what does not.

Increased knowledge does not necessarily lead to attitude change, and attitude change does not necessarily turn into behavioural change

While the focus of this project was attitude change, it is not clear if changes in attitudes result in changes in behaviour in relation to the distribution of power, systemic inequality and the experiences of women and girls.

Single, one-off interventions and trainings do not work on their own

One-off workshops, campaigns or interventions tend not to have long-lasting impacts or signify changes in attitudes or behaviours. Instead, longer-term engagement using multiple methods tends to have more significant outcomes.

Relationship building is key

Relationships were found to be one of the key drivers in attitude and behaviour change, with an individual's actions being significantly impacted by the actions of teachers, support workers, family members, friends or other community members around them.

Projects need to be tailored to their contexts and include working with multiple stakeholders

Whether this is on-the-ground community projects or segmented marketing approaches, work that focuses on the needs, views and community of individuals was evaluated well.

'Quick fix' role models may not have the desired impact

While role models are heavily used as an attitude change 'quick fix', evaluations of their impact on changing attitudes and subsequent behaviour are very mixed. In some cases, the impact of role models is counter-intuitive, particularly if they are not relatable to the audience or engaged as a 'one-off'.

Approaches at community level to encourage modelling of desired behaviours are considered effective

Numerous studies and feedback from practitioners highlight the importance of role modelling within communities; friends, family, neighbours etc. tend to have a high impact on behaviour and attitude change.

Material and social benefits are more likely to support attitude change than changes in laws

While legislative change can impact attitudes, more evidence was found to support the view that material and social rewards support attitude and behaviour change. This was found to be particularly true for attitudes towards men's role in equitable parenting, as well as boys' engagement in anti-sexist programmes and behaviours.

Communication campaigns need to be accessible, relatable and positive

Communication campaigns have the biggest impact on attitudes when they are understandable, sustainable, empowering and positive.

Both myth busting and 'sympathy-inducing' campaigns often backfire

While myth busting continues to be a common message translation method, there is now compelling evidence that it does not work and can create negative effects, particularly when based on negative stereotyping.

Personal storytelling and messaging that focuses on values can be particularly effective

Individuals sharing their personal experiences and stories – whether through media and social media, or through face-to-face interactions – can be a crucial part of changing public perceptions about particular groups and challenging prejudice and stigma. Similarly, activating people's compassionate and 'public-spirited' values can increase support for campaigns in the long-term.

Policy change can help change minds

Research is mixed on whether messaging that focuses on policy change as being 'good for women' or about 'women's issues' helps or hinders attitude change. In some cases, messaging on 'policy for women' can educate the public that gender inequality exists and inform them that action needs to be taken to tackle it. In others, it can further embed ideas of gender roles or differences.

What are some of the challenges?

In reviewing different types of intervention aiming to change attitudes, we found a number of common challenges and gaps.

Intersectional approaches are missing

Across the different areas of intervention, we found very few examples of work which considered overlapping inequalities in relation to social norms and attitude change.

Difficulties working long-term and at scale

Many practitioners reaffirmed what the literature tells us about the difficulties of working within short-term, competitive funding environment. One told us, "You do what is funded, but what is funded is not evidence-based". Another said, "Short-term funding seems like a waste of money, what is it really going to change? Yeah, they'll know the legal definition of consent, but how long is that going to last?"

Lack of space and capacity to collaborate across silos or contexts

Small organisations often struggle to find the time and staffing to share lessons and collaborate across sectors, and different issue areas, such as violence against women, can become siloed. Further, levels of distrust exist between sectors working on these issues, whether it's government departments working against each other, or small organisations competing for similar funding.

Negative consequences for women who share their stories and for staff who handle backlash

While the value of sharing stories was recognised in the literature and by participants, it was also apparent from our discussions that sharing stories can negatively impact people's health and wellbeing, often within the context of toxic social media environments.

Difficulties working against the status quo, both with and against people in power

Across our review, interviews, discussion groups and workshops, a theme that emerged very strongly was power. Questions arose over who has power, where they have power, and how power is distributed; whether in relation to power in the classroom, in relationships with police and government, or in navigating competitive funding environments. A clear barrier for many working on the ground was the lack of critical reflection on how power is circulated within mainstream feminist spaces working alongside state institutions.

Complex relationship between attitude change, behaviour change and power

While attitude change was the focus of this piece of work, the relationship between attitude change and behaviour change is not straightforward; nor is the relationship between attitude change and the redistribution of power. We believe any new organisation would need to consistently engage with the question of if, when and how power is being redistributed as a result of attitude change work. We recommend that attitude change is seen as a means to achieve both specific and 'higher purpose' goals, rather than an end in itself, and is understood to be intimately linked to other strategies for transformative change.

What kind of organisation could help change attitudes to women and girls in Scotland?

From developing an understanding of what works and what some of the challenges are, we were then able to explore what kinds of institutes or organisations might be needed to promote attitude change towards gender equality. Drawing on our learning, we recommend 10 guiding principles in developing an organisation to support gender equality in Scotland.

1. ### Ensuring collaborative and collective approaches to building the organisation and ongoing decision-making and governance.

   A number of comments were made about the need to avoid replicating hierarchical structures found in national policy making or other government-led initiatives.

2. ### Centring experiences of women and examining ideas around 'expertise'

   The organisation should challenge received notions of where evidence and knowledge come from and centre the experiences of women.

3. ### Recognising that attitude change requires long-term engagement and sustained multiple, multi-track interventions

   The organisation should target individual and group attitudes as well as behaviours, communities, systems and structures. This is resource intensive work, with relationship building also central to sustainability.

4. ### Recognising the importance of highly tailored and small-scale community interventions to an overall picture of change

   Across research it is clear that although some overarching frameworks, messaging methods and attitude change methods can be applied relatively widely.

5. ### Making sure to build upon existing work in Scotland and helping build bridges across sectors and communities

   Silos, distrust, power and duplication were themes that occurred frequently in our discussions with practitioners, alongside the desire to work more collaboratively and more openly.

6. Understanding and challenging power dynamics

Any future model must seek to dismantle – and avoid reproducting – inequitable power dynamics, including through inclusive movement building, intergenerational learning and amplification of the work and voices of groups that hold least power.

7. Prioritising intersectional approaches and analysis across all streams of work

The organisation should be committed to delivering intersectional analysis by ensuring that intersectional understanding and gender competence are priority skills among staff and cultivated in the organisational culture.

8. Ensuring safe, inclusive spaces online and offline that promote community wellbeing

To be truly inclusive, spaces that enable conversation and dialogue must also create safe boundaries.

9. Working towards systemic, transformative change

Working to change attitudes cannot exist in isolation from an understanding of systemic inequality.

10. Embracing complexity, risk and failure

Systemic change will need to be supported by a bold vision to try, to learn, to fail and to try again. Not all activities will work, and not all projects will be a success, but enabling teams, individuals and communities to share their failures and their lessons honestly and openly will allow the organisation to understand better what works and what doesn't.

Recommendations and conclusions

At the request of the Scottish Government, three models have been developed for further examination and exploration. All models include a foundation focus on research and good practice dissemination, as well as capacity building on effective attitude change methods. These models are (in brief):

1. A collaboration and movement building space

Model 1 focuses on developing a Scotland-wide movement and peer-learning on attitude change work to challenge and change damaging attitudes towards and about women and girls. This model would work across communities in Scotland (practitioners, small charities, artists and community groups) and take a grassroots approach to change. This model would be member-led with co-production at its heart.

2. Project development and learning hub

Model 2 focuses on supporting the learning and development of projects (both existing and new) which are working on attitude change directly. This model would provide intensive support for these projects over an 18-month period to deliver highly competent, evaluated and evidence-based interventions. The model would operate under a relatively flat and non-hierarchical staffing structure and be informed directly by the projects it works with.

3. Research and practice centre

Model 3 would work most closely to a 'traditional' third sector model. It would focus on conducting and collating research on effective attitude change methods and establishing how these methods could be practically applied across Scotland. To enable participatory work in this model, community research methods would be included to provide research input from on the ground examples of attitude change interventions for the creation of toolkits and practical guides.

The research team has also created a framework for a foundation model, which we recommend is implemented for at least one year to create a base from which further examination of the three models can be pursued. This foundation model would include three members of staff who would be tasked with strategy development, research analysis, outreach and strategic communications testing. The foundation model would also provide space for the learning obtained through this report to be put into practice and for there to be a period of buy-in across sectors for this work.

From our light-touch literature review and participatory research we recommend that the 10 principles detailed above are at the heart of any organisation created. In order to create high quality and effective attitude change interventions, this work must be participatory (beyond the third sector 'usual suspects'), evidence-based, intersectional in its analysis, diverse in who it engages, and a space for practical guidance and accessible knowledge.

1. Introduction

Women and girls in Scotland continue to face discrimination and violence every day. For Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME), LGBTQ+, disabled, migrant and poor women, the harm they face is deepened further by racism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism and structural poverty. While this project began before the COVID-19 pandemic, it was completed and written during a time when women were more likely than men to lose their jobs, more likely to take on caring responsibilities, more likely to be in frontline 'essential jobs', more likely to suffer domestic abuse and coercive control, and more likely to experience poverty.

The pandemic has brought many of our social inequalities into sharper focus and reminded us of what we already know: women and girls continue to face social, political, economic and cultural inequalities and experience high levels of violence. At the root of these inequalities and violence are harmful social, cultural and gendered norms that drive negative attitudes and behaviours towards women and girls and lead to gender inequality. Gender inequality damages women's and girls' physical, mental and emotional safety, prevents them from living authentically and free from fear, and impacts workplaces, homes, education, communities, relationships, bodies and identities. The aim of this piece of work is to support Zero Tolerance to develop potential frameworks for a new organisation to change public attitudes to girls' and women's rights in Scotland.[1] During Phase 1 of the research, the consultancy team undertook a light-touch review on 'what works' to shift public attitudes with regard to intersectional gender equality, looking at lessons learned from small and large scale interventions in Scotland and beyond. During Phase 2, the team developed options for how such a new organisation could be structured and possible actions for its first year.

The project arises from a recommendation made by the First Minister's National Advisory Council on Women and Girls (NACWG) that the Scottish Government should develop a new 'What Works?' institute to "develop and test robust, evidence-led, inclusive and representative approaches to changing public attitudes in Scotland to girls' and women's equality and rights, including dismantling stereotypes about what girls and women should study, work at, and be" (NACWG 2019).

[1] For more information, please see: https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/gender-institute/

The recent Gender Social Norms Index, commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), shows that across 75 different countries worldwide, 90 per cent of men and women hold some biases against women, acting as invisible barriers to women achieving equality (UNDP 2020). However, much less is known about what works to change these attitudes in the longer term. This piece of work focuses on what has been tried and learned in the past about changing attitudes towards women's equality and rights in order to identify potential entry points and considerations for a new organisation in Scotland. Our report concentrates primarily on interventions and organisations that directly address individual, group and societal attitudes, either through projects that focus on interpersonal and community interactions, or through wider national or international campaigns.

Women and girls experience a wide range of overlapping, interconnected and mutually reinforcing inequalities. This piece of work also looks at gender norms and public attitudes around violence against women (VAW), women's poverty and economic participation, women's political participation, women's education (including early years), reproductive rights, body image and women's roles as carers, and how these interrelate. As Lingayah et al. (2018) argue, problems such as race and gender inequality are "structurally produced by interlocking public policies, institutional practices, interpersonal interactions and cultural norms and ideas", suggesting that efforts to combat structural inequality will not only need to work at all levels but also to understand the linkages between levels.

This report is broken down into seven sections: an introduction; our methodology; what we know about attempts to change attitudes to women and girls; what organisational approaches currently exist outside of Scotland; what the landscape looks like in Scotland; the design and direction of a new organisation; and three potential models, as well as a foundational model, for moving forward. At the heart of this work is a participatory, intersectional approach to understanding knowledge. Throughout our literature review, our discussion groups, our interviews and our workshops, we centred our commitment to hearing from groups who have been marginalised, who do not have access to peer-review processes, and for whom large-scale evaluations are beyond their resources and budgets.

The report has been written by Kate Nevens, Talat Yaqoob and Ellie Hutchinson from The Collective, a feminist research consultancy based in Scotland.[2] Together, we have over 40 years of combined experience in gender equality research and practice. Our careers span poverty, housing, international development, peace, employment rights, access to education, feminist policy and violence against women. The team took a collaborative, practice-oriented and feminist approach to the project, incorporating participatory and action research tools and ensuring the inclusion of voices from diverse communities. Additionally, Zero Tolerance set up a Research Advisory Group (RAG) to advise on the direction of the research and help develop ideas based on perspectives and background knowledge.[3]

[2] For more information on The Collective, please see https://www.thecollectivescotland.co.uk/who

[3] For more details on the Research Advisory Group and its members, see https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/gender-institute/

2. Methodology

This report is based on a combination of qualitative research methods, including a light-touch, 'scoping' literature review, discussion groups, interviews and participatory action research workshops. The research took a collaborative, practice-oriented and feminist approach, including:

- using participatory methods which are accessible and fully inclusive, ensuring that all workshops and discussion sessions were conducted as safe spaces;
- incorporating action research tools to ensure the ongoing involvement of research participants in the modelling of a new organisation;
- asking 'who aren't we hearing from?' to enable us to use our research as a tool to unpack power hierarchies with marginalised groups and reach out to smaller, grassroots spaces that may not previously have had the resources or capacity to share knowledge gained from attitude change activities;
- ensuring intersectional analysis and the inclusion of the voices of diverse communities by sourcing expertise from diverse places and proactively seeking out research and writing by women of colour; and
- looking for practical lessons learned and ideas that can be applied by practitioners to bring tangible, practical benefits to women and girls in Scotland.

We used a set of overarching research questions to guide our literature review, discussion groups, interviews and workshops. These questions were divided into three phases, as per the original tender, focusing on: 1) identifying what is known about changing

attitudes; 2) identifying an appropriate structure for a new organisation; and 3) identifying components and principles for three potential models. At each stage of the project, we returned to, reassessed and revised our set of questions. A full set of research questions used for the report, along with our research ethics, can be found in Appendices A and B.

Following advice from the RAG and Zero Tolerance, we did not select a specific research topic under the umbrella of 'gender' (such as attitudes towards violence against women, for example). Instead, we took a light-touch approach to looking across relevant topics related to attitude and norm change, including gender-based violence (GBV), access to abortion, women's education, women's employment, women's political participation and care. We also looked at where lessons might be drawn from work on mental health, poverty, race and immigration, and from organisations working on attitude change more broadly.

2.1. Literature review

In line with our focus on exploring and drawing lessons from different types of intervention, we have taken a light-touch, 'scoping' approach to choosing and analysing literature.[4] In total, we looked at 14 systematic or collated reviews of attitude change interventions, 41 specific project evaluations or reviews (internal and external, quantitative and qualitative), and 54 organisational strategies, guidelines, toolkits or papers on best practice. To provide background and context for our reading, we also looked at 29 analyses of public perception surveys across a number of different topics and over 50 papers that explored either the theory behind attitude formation or a particular topic in more depth. These were all English language papers, from a mix of Scottish, UK and international sources.

In order to provide the insights required to develop models for a Scottish gender equality attitude change organisation, the review focused on identifying and learning from literature which provided practical applications and/or evaluations of methods to change attitudes, and which took an intersectional approach and/or provided strategic analysis from organisations delivering similar work around the world.
The research has been conducted by a collective of three consultants who have expertise in both analysis and practice on attitude change and gender inequality. As such, the consultants' own networks, experience and knowledge have been applied where appropriate, particularly around model development.

The desk-based review was conducted through online searches of relevant literature. To do this, we used Google Scholar, OpenAthens and JSTOR, as well as full Google searches for relevant grey literature. An indicative list of keyword searches is available in Appendix C. Further reading

[4] As opposed to a systematic review or meta-analysis, which would be more suitable for analysis of a set of evaluations or interventions that shared either an approach or a topic.

was identified using a snowballing technique from initial reading, and the research team also followed up on reading recommendations made by the RAG and research participants. We sought out new literature as gaps were identified, and explored publications, evaluations and strategy documents from institutions and projects as they were identified.

Each paper, briefing or evaluation was categorised according to how useful it was in helping answer our research questions, and whether it included any intersectional analysis or perspective (see Appendix C). Where possible, we also prioritised literature that was produced or co-produced by community organisations or groups historically marginalised from traditional publishing processes. We recognise not only the bias implicit in the peer-review process and other traditional forms of 'quality control'[5] but also the difficulty determining race, gender and other characteristics from paper authorship.

Section 4 of this report details the institutional models we evaluated. These were either recommended by the RAG members, known to us, cited in literature we read for section 3 or identified in our online searches. We identified models which conducted specific attitude change research, provided support or guidance to others delivering attitude change interventions, conducted evaluations of attitude change work or delivered attitude change work on a foundation of social justice and equality as being the most useful for further analysis. A full list of institutional models is included in Appendix D.

2.2. What does the body of literature look like?

There is a huge range of literature available that looks at various aspects of attitudes and attitude change. The bulk of the literature across topics consists of analyses of surveys, opinion polls and studies that describe either variations in attitudes between different groups, a national picture of attitudes towards a specific issue at a single point in time, or changes in attitude over time across a nation or within a particular group. While these provide an important baseline of information, on their own they tell us very little about what has shaped attitudes and even less about what works to change them.

Even when these analyses are tailored to specific topics or commissioned by organisations working to change attitudes, it is difficult to use these to ascertain any causal relationships between interventions and broader public attitudinal change, particularly as data is often not localised enough, or surveys run regularly enough (Crawley 2009; Marcus 2015; Banaszak and Ondercin 2016).

In Scotland, the rest of the UK and Europe, a small but growing set of baseline data exists around attitudes towards women and

[5] See https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2019/03/26/gender-bias-in-peer-review-opening-up-the-black-box-ii/ or https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2019/nov/university-reading-lists-dominated-white-european-men/

girls, including on: violence against women (ScotCen 2014); women and work (NatCen 2019); family and caring responsibilities (NatCen 2018); body image (MHF 2019); abortion (Ipsos MORI 2011); and street harassment and online abuse (NatCen 2018). In addition, there is data more broadly on attitudes towards gender equality (EIGE 2013; NatCen 2018; Ipsos MORI 2019); discrimination, prejudice and positive action (ScotCen 2010, 2015; Stonewall 2012); inequalities (ScotCen 2016) and equalities (NatCen 2017); and prejudice. There are also surveys that examine women's and other protected groups' experiences of negative or discriminatory attitudes, norms and behaviours, including experiences of online harassment (Amnesty/Ipsos MORI 2017) and hate crimes (NUS 2013) as well as the specific experiences of young women (YWCA Scotland 2015; Taafe 2017; Girlguiding 2019). However, very little, if any, literature appears to link these two types of data to match changes in attitudes towards women with what women are experiencing in their daily lives, or to strategise for how to change the attitudes analysed.

There is an incredibly wide range of rich theory dedicated to understanding the factors that inform or influence attitudes, behaviours, perceptions, misperceptions, prejudice, stigma, social norms and gender norms, and to understanding how these may or may not link with one another, particularly at individual and interpersonal level. This literature is accompanied by a vast array of scales and measurements by which to measure attitude and behaviour change (see Darnton 2008; Ricardo et al. 2011; Michie et al. 2018).[6] Research has also explained where attitudes are formed (parents, media and traditional gender roles), and how that translates into voting intention and views towards women in public life. However, there is a lack of data (and of interventions) which seek to address attitudes in a tangible way. Some, less extensive, analysis does exists that looks at macro-level societal change and the role of policy making, mass media, popular culture and social movements in instigating widespread changes in attitudes. However, these bodies of literature do little "to illuminate implementation details of interventions" – that is, what kind of activities work to elicit change (Yamin et al. 2019).

Globally, there is a relatively large number of studies and evaluations of attitude and behaviour change interventions, as well as systematic reviews and collations of these studies. However, these are primarily concentrated around public health interventions to reduce 'unhealthy' personal behaviours (such as anti-smoking campaigns or campaigns to reduce alcohol consumption), rather than on interventions that seek to reduce prejudice or discriminatory behaviour towards others, promote equality and rights, or address structural inequalities (Darnton 2008; Crawley 2009; Yamin et al. 2019; Cislaghi and Heise 2020). Notable exceptions to this are studies on gender-based violence interventions, particularly in international development and North American contexts (Ricardo et al. 2011), and a growing body of literature around anti-poverty campaigns and anti-stigma campaigns around mental health.

Understandably, the interventions that are measured tend to be discrete, project-based activities rather than initiatives that are part of broader social movements or trends.

[6] For example, Michie et al. (2018) have identified 93 behavioural change techniques to report the intervention procedures of any kind of behavioural change intervention, and Ricardo et al. (2011) outline at least 10 different psychological scales for measuring attitudes towards sexual violence.

Evaluations of 'what works' to change attitudes tend to fall under three broad categories:

- large and small-scale quantitative studies which are set up to test public responses to different types of input (e.g. Facchini et al. 2017);
- experimental studies that evaluate practical interventions designed to bring about attitude change, often through randomised control trials and usually with limited target populations (often 'captive' audiences like students) (e.g. WHO 2010; Ricardo et al. 2011; Yamin et al. 2019); and
- qualitative evaluations conducted or commissioned by the initiatives delivering the project or intervention, often with donors/funders in mind (e.g. Marcus 2014).

Across these categories and across topics, the majority of evaluations are short-term, with outcomes or impact measured either immediately or within a short time period.

The majority are also heavily reliant on self-reporting of attitudes and behaviours, particularly in the latter two categories (Gidycz et al. 2011; Yamin et al. 2019). The qualitative evaluations conducted by projects themselves often focus on anecdotal or individual success stories (Duff and Young 2017), rather than on population-level results.

However, in doing so, they are more likely to privilege the experiences and voices of marginalised groups (William and Aldred 2011). There appear to be few, if any, evaluations which are able to compare different types of intervention on the same topic – for example, an intervention focusing on a school's project versus an intervention using national media.

There is a growing body of grey literature produced by the third sector and think tanks which usefully synthesises theory and evidence and provides guidelines for particular approaches. Examples include: Equally Ours' 'How to shift public attitudes on equality: A practical guide for campaigners and communicators' (Jennings and Quinton 2019); the Tri-Ethnic Centre's 'Community readiness handbook' (Plested et al. 2006); Joseph Rowntree

Foundation and the FrameWorks Institute's 'How to build lasting support to solve UK poverty' (2018); the Public Interest Research Centre's 'How to test your communications' (Sanderson 2018) and 'Framing equality toolkit' (Blackmore and Sanderson 2017); and New Philanthropy Capital's 'Systems change: A guide to what it is and how to do it' (Abercrombie et al. 2015). Other organisations are also producing guidelines on how to evaluate interventions, such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission's 'What works? Eight principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work' (Duff and Young 2017) and Overseas Development Institute's 'Changing gender norms: Monitoring and evaluating programmes and projects' (Marcus 2015).

A key gap is, unsurprisingly, literature that takes an intersectional perspective – this is true across all the different types of literature described above. For example, useful literature reviews and evaluations focusing on areas such as attitudes towards disabled people, LGBTQ+ communities and immigration have extremely minimal reference to disabled women, queer women or female immigrants, beyond noting that women in these groups are "more likely to experience negative attitudes" (Fisher & Purcal 2017; see also Abrams et al. 2016). Some literature and good practice guides, such as Sport Scotland (2005), explain different negative attitudes and prejudices experienced by disabled, BAME or LGBTQ+ women, but contain little analysis of how these might be addressed or challenged. Many project evaluations on non-gender specific topics fail to mention differential impacts on the lives of women, for example, Humankind and Teesside University's review of 'Challenging youth racism' interventions (Temple et al. 2019).[7] Of the list of literature we looked at (which had a bias towards literature with an intersectional lens), we would estimate that only around a third took a comprehensive or detailed approach to intersectional analysis, a third contained some reference to disaggregated data or overlapping characteristics, and a third had no intersectional – or even gendered – lens at all. Examples of good intersectional analysis include: Time to Change's 2019 in-depth research on attitudes towards those who use mental health services from BAME communities; Hillenbrand et al.'s 2015 review of promising practices around gender-transformative change; and the strategies and theories of change of a number of international feminist funding and movement building organisations.

[7] Not unusually, it appears this evaluation is authored by three white men.

2.3. Interviews, discussion groups and participatory action research workshops

We held focus group discussions and interviews (online only due to COVID-19) to analyse whether we had concluded accurate findings from the light-touch literature review, what participants' experiences in effective attitude change methods have been, and what needs a new organisation focusing on gender equality and attitude change could potentially meet.

Discussion group and interview participants included individuals from the third sector, women's rights activists, anti-poverty activists, anti-racism activists, anti-violence against women practitioners, public sector workers and community organisers. A total of 25 research participants have been involved in this stage of the research, some of whom were also involved in the participatory modelling workshop.

We had initially intended to run a smaller number of discussion groups with a slightly larger number of participants at each, but revised this plan due to COVID-19. The COVID-19 pandemic has also had an impact on the number of participants present from outside of the central belt of Scotland, and to a lesser extent, on the number of participants with caring responsibilities.

We also conducted a series of one-on-one and small discussion group sessions with representatives from the specific attitude change-related organisations we identified globally. UK and global attitude change organisations we spoke to included: FrameWorks Institute, Behaviour Works Australia, Equally Ours, Opportunity Agenda, Common Cause Foundation, Gender at Work, Soul City Institute for Social Justice,

The Coalition of Feminists for Change (COFEM), FRIDA The Young Feminist Fund (FRIDA) and the African Women's Development Fund. We asked representatives from these organisations about how their organisations were formed, what need(s) the organisation fulfils, how they work with government and public bodies, how they are funded and sustain themselves financially, how they deliver their work and why they do so in that way, and their governance/staffing structures. We also asked about their approach to intersectionality across their work and how they consider attitude change as part of their overall theory of change.

In the final phase of the project, we ran an interactive, online action research workshop with research participants who had been involved in earlier discussions. We also ran a similar workshop with the RAG and a final set of interviews and discussion groups with representatives from leading Scottish women's sector organisations, the public sector and human rights organisations. The action research workshop aimed to build and revise potential models with those who will ultimately collaborate with and benefit from a future organisation, helping to ensure further buy-in. Workshop participants were also given an opportunity to feed in asynchronously to the final three models using interactive online whiteboards.

An indicative list of questions we asked the discussion groups and individuals can be found in Appendix E, as well information on the methodology for the workshops.

3. What do we know about attempts to change attitudes towards women's rights and equality?

In this section, we look at some of the main types of intervention used to change public attitudes and the common lessons that emerge from these. We also look at some of the challenges and difficulties faced by those trying to do attitude change work.

3.1. What are some of the main types of intervention used to change public attitudes?

Initiatives and projects which aim to change attitudes and behaviours towards women use a wide range of approaches, from individual and small group interventions to community-wide programmes and multi-pronged media and policy campaigns. The majority of interventions we looked at fell under one or more of the following categories.

Face-to-face interventions with individuals and small groups

This includes initiatives designed to reduce prejudice, stigma and acceptance of violence against others, such as empathy training, unconscious bias training and inter-relational group sessions and dialogues. Across the labour market, significant resources are invested in 'unconscious bias' or 'equality and diversity' training, which stem from the hope that

attitudes are changed through awareness raising and knowledge building. However, evidence on the extent of success of these interventions is very limited. Interventions which use social contact between groups are particularly common in projects seeking to address negative attitudes towards immigrants, LGBTQ+ communities, BAME communities and people with mental health issues, and have also been used as a means of challenging and changing attitudes to women in male-dominated workplaces (Dahl et al. 2018). A large number of interventions focus on adapting the attitudes and behaviours of women themselves, such as training branded as 'empowerment', 'confidence-building' or 'skills development', particularly on issues relating to body image and political participation and leadership. Creating spaces for women to share stories and create new narratives are also increasingly used to help transform women's attitudes towards their own roles and behaviours.

Interventions at community level

This refers to community mobilisation, community dialogue and community readiness programmes that support communities to accept, model, make and sustain change. These interventions tend to make an explicit connection between individuals' and communities' willingness to change and the broader socio-economic drivers of maintaining change (Plested et al. 2006). A number of international programmes, such as Oxfam's 'We Can' campaign to address violence against women in South Asia,[8] train and support groups of 'changemakers' or community champions across multiple communities (William and Aldred 2011; Haider 2017).

Interventions that work with young people

These often focus on addressing gender stereotyping through dedicated lessons and sessions in schools and early years education, particularly around attitudes towards science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects and body image (SDS 2018). Other interventions engage parents and career guidance staff to use role models to expand and question young people's attitudes towards what is 'appropriate' for a particular gender or ethnicity (Thomson et al. 2005), or to create safe spaces and youth-led resources to help young people build self-confidence, make informed choices and advocate for their own interests (Marcus 2014). Whole-school approaches to address gender stereotyping and negative gender norms are also relatively common. These shift away from one-off campaigns focused only on awareness raising and move towards embedding a gender-aware ethos in policies and practice (AVA 2019).

[8] See https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/our-work/gender-justice/ending-violence-against-women/we-can/

Projects that work explicitly with men and boys

Much of the work we reviewed on men and boys focuses on social norm change using pre-existing attitudes and behaviours as a springboard for change, and draws on notions of social conformity and homosociality (Pascoe 2012). These approaches acknowledge that boys and young men are heavily influenced by the behaviour and attitudes of other boys and young men. Bystander programmes aimed at this group engage with men and boys as allies and cultivate their commitment to the prevention and intervention of gender-based violence (for example, the well-evaluated Green Dot programme[9] in North America; Ricardo et al. 2011). In tertiary prevention work with perpetrators of violence and boys engaging in harmful sexual behaviour, peer support networks and positive relationships are highlighted as important elements to prompt behaviour and attitude change (McNeish and Scott 2018). In international contexts, interventions on gender norms relating to work and care also utilise (male) peer networks and role models as tools for attitudinal change.

Interventions that combine attitude change work with service delivery or addressing broader socio-economic conditions

These are particularly common in international development contexts. For example, gender-norms work is commonly combined with microfinancing and health services initiatives in projects to address HIV/AIDS and gender-based violence (WHO 2010), and in a recent example from Tajikistan, behaviour change components are combined with economic empowerment to address harmful gender norms (Mastonshoeva et al. 2020). A number of Western European interventions around public health, transport and climate take a similar approach. In Scotland, for example, interventions to change behaviours around active travel are combined with the provision of cycle routes or help-to-buy bicycle schemes (Scottish Government 2010).

Information and communication campaigns

Communications campaigns were the most common types of intervention reflected in our review, and almost every thematic area we looked featured examples of social media campaigns, poster and coaster campaigns or advertising campaigns. These are often popular ways of reaching large numbers of people at relatively low cost. They have a variety of aims, ranging from raising awareness and increasing knowledge on a topic, to sharing stories to reduce stigma, to 'nudging' behaviour change. One example is the '#HeforShe' campaign, designed by the BVA Nudge Unit for The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women).[10] The campaign uses a four-step model to encourage men to speak out against gender inequality and simple online sign-ups as indicators of subsequent behaviour change.

[9] See https://cultureofrespect.org/program/green-dot-etc/

[10] See https://www.heforshe.org/en/

Interventions aimed at diversifying representation or changing the narratives told in popular culture, media and marketing

In Scotland, projects include the media monitoring work by Gender Equal Media Scotland,[11] Zero Tolerance's 'Media Guidelines on Violence Against Women',[12] 'Pass the Mic'[13] (focused on women of colour) and the collaboration between Scottish Women's Aid and Zero Tolerance, 'One Thousand Words'.[14] Globally, efforts by the Global Media Monitoring Project[15] and The Representation Project[16] highlight the lack of representation of women across media platforms (and, specifically, the harmful ways women are depicted in the media). Dove's 'Real Beauty' campaign[17] is a particularly prominent campaign around diversifying images of women's bodies, which was combined with a 'Body Image Pledge' for other corporations and marketing agencies to sign up to.

Edutainment interventions

In international development in particular, edutainment interventions are a popular way of trying to shift social norms and public attitudes, as well as to cultivate changes in behaviour at both community and national levels. These convey social messages and model positive behaviours through popular entertainment, such as local drama and radio, and national television and soap operas (see Somos Diferentes, Somos Iguales in Nicaragua and Soul City Institute for Social Justice in South Africa and as examples).[18] Edutainment projects often work in close coordination with services, such as hotlines and shelters, and combine mass entertainment activities with community activities, such as workshops and camps with young people (UNICEF 2005; Solórzano et al. 2008; Ricardo et al. 2011; Haider 2017).

Policy change and activism

Interventions that are primarily aimed at policy change can also impact public opinion (see section 3.2).

[11] See https://www.genderequalmedia.scot/res-media-monitoring/
[12] See https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/work-journalists/
[13] See https://passthemicscotland.wordpress.com/
[14] See https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/gallery/one-thousand-words/
[15] See http://whomakesthenews.org/gmmp/
[16] See http://therepresentationproject.org/film/miss-representation-film/
[17] See https://www.dove.com/us/en/stories/campaigns.html/
[18] See Solórzano et al. (2008) for information on Somos Diferentes, Somos Iguales and https://www.soulcity.org.za/media/soul-city-series/ for more information on Soul City's soap opera programming.

3.2. What are the key findings from practical interventions about what does and does not work to change attitudes?

Overall, while our review suggests that many levels and kinds of intervention can contribute to attitude change, available evidence from evaluations of interventions is relatively weak. Additionally, we found no literature comparing different types of interventions.

Generally, the interventions others have evaluated as most effective are those which work across multiple levels, employ a range of strategies and engage with a range of stakeholders, yet focus on one set of attitudes and behaviour change, such as challenging attitudes of young men towards acceptability of domestic abuse (UNICEF 2005; Abrams et al. 2016; Grant 2017). In her evidence review of interventions to challenge discriminatory norms affecting adolescent girls, Marcus (2014) finds no one approach to be clearly more effective than others. She does conclude, however, that programmes with more than one communication component achieve a higher proportion of positive outcomes than those with one component only, and that effectiveness is increased further still if those programmes are integrated with non-communication activities.

Interventions deemed most effective or successful also tend to be those based on a strong theory of change that looks beyond the individual to address the context within which they function (Darnton 2008). These interventions recognise that it is not one singular act or norm that enables inequality to happen, but rather a multitude of complex, visible and invisible actions and attitudes.

It is clear from our review that what will likely work to change attitudes on one aspect of women's rights and equality – for example, women's political participation – may be very different, and need to be measured very differently, to another, such as violence against women. The literature showed us that there is no one 'silver bullet' (Abercrombie et al. 2015). However, a number of key findings did emerge that may have implications for future attitude change work.

Increased knowledge does not necessarily lead to attitude change, and attitude change does not necessarily lead to behavioural change

Our review made clear that there is a significant lack of data to tell us whether attitude change efforts create behaviour change and, therefore, whether they lead to improvements across society and in the lived experience of women. This is largely due to the complexity of how attitudes and behaviours are formed and the multiple influencing variables at play. For example, a number of evaluations of teaching, training or information provision interventions around race and immigration show an increase in knowledge on the part of participants.

However, these evaluations either are unable to show whether attitude or behaviour change took place (Buchanan et al. 2008) or reveal no attitude or behaviour change (Sweetman 2017). Similarly, an evaluation of an unconscious bias training

programme conducted across three UK universities in 2015 and 2016 (Sweetman 2017) shows a mix of outcomes: increased self-reported knowledge of participants and some increases in tendencies towards pro-equality motivation or action, but very little decrease in stereotyping and no decrease in prejudice.

In a systematic review of over 60 programmes focusing on discriminatory attitudes affecting adolescent girls, Marcus (2014) found that the programmes recorded more changes in attitudes than in practice or behaviours, and that the gap between attitude and behaviour change was greater for media-based interventions than for approaches involving people more directly.

Single, one-off interventions don't work on their own

The majority of interventions we reviewed included some form of training for the intended attitude change audience. Across mental health anti-stigma work, campaigns run by See Me Scotland[19] and Time to Change[20] include significant training programmes to raise awareness of mental health stigma and supportive approaches for allies. Similarly, across specific gender equality efforts such as primary prevention of violence against women, training as a method of changing attitudes is a core focus. However, evaluation methods for such trainings are patchy at best and rarely provide any baseline or longitudinal analysis to enable understanding of the extent of the impact of training or the extent of behaviour change over time. According to the Equality and Human Rights Commission Scotland's 2018 review of unconscious bias training, high-quality training on equality only had a lasting impact of approximately eight weeks if it was not followed up with some other related intervention (EHRC Scotland 2018). The review stated the need for repeated interventions, such as follow-up reading, online tests and review of training, to sustain attitude change beyond the initial (potential) eight-week period.

Similarly, efforts to tackle girls' attitudes to STEM do not work if they are a single intervention. In their work across The Netherlands, Jansen and Joukes (2012) found that multiple, interrelated interventions delivered over a long-term period were most likely to be successful in changing girls' attitudes towards STEM. Their finding was echoed by participants in our discussion groups, particularly those who work on long-term interventions within school environments to promote attitude change to GBV. They told us, "you can see there is a prevention mindset in the schools we've had relationships with," and expressed that this was not the case among those who had attended one-off events only.

Relationship building is key

Evidence suggests that social contact interventions and interpersonal interventions in schools (Corrigan 2011; Scottish Government

[19] See https://www.seemescotland.org/

[20] See https://www.time-to-change.org.uk/

2020) and in workplaces (Dahl et al. 2018) are relatively successful in reducing discriminatory attitudes and negative stereotyping and changing attitudes towards GBV. A See Me Scotland evaluation (2019) showed that sharing lived experiences of mental health could produce changes in attitude. However, a number of evaluations and research papers suggest that the sustained success of interpersonal interventions is dependent on building and maintaining positive relationships. For example, social contact works, but only if the relationships are sustained and become friendships (McNeish and Scott 2018; MacInnis and Hodson 2019). A great deal of research on contact theory suggests that friendships between members of different groups have significant positive effect on "intergroup attitudes" (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006; Blinder 2011). A trans rights and equality campaigner in one of our discussion groups echoed this, saying the work they had done with LGBTQ+ organisations globally showed that people held significantly better attitudes towards a marginalised group when they had friends or family within it.

The importance of face-to-face engagement and relationship building was also highlighted by a number of discussion group participants. "I personally found that a lot of the time the face-to-face stuff is the stuff that works the best," said one LGBTQ+ rights and equality campaigner. They continued, "When people can come up (usually when you're trying to get a cup of tea) to ask you very in-depth questions and usually if you take the time to answer them without judgment, even if they've asked a really silly question, they're usually pretty receptive to whatever you have to say".

Relationship building between programme implementers and programme participants is another feature of effective interventions. An evaluation of the UK perpetrator programme 'Drive' (Hester et al. 2019) revealed that the programme had made a considerable impact on behaviour change (physical abuse reduced by 82 per cent; sexual abuse reduced by 88 per cent; harassment and stalking behaviours reduced by 75 per cent; and jealous and controlling behaviours reduced by 73 per cent). In a discussion of why this programme had been so successful, participants suggested that the high degree to which they felt their case manager cared and listened without judgement played a large role. They indicated that building initial trust was necessary before embarking on more "challenging and discomfort-producing activities".

Projects need to be tailored to their contexts and work with multiple stakeholders

While many attitude-change projects are nationally delivered, findings show that the more local and community-led the delivery, the more effective the project. Furthermore, bespoke tools and localised engagement methods increase the likelihood of success, as demonstrated by the Amina Muslim Women's Resource Centre's

2014 'You Can Change This' campaign,[21] which focused on community engagement through mosques and the influence of imams. However, this approach is undeniably more resource intensive and requires a longer-term plan, as smaller groups of people and communities are worked with on a one-to-one basis.
In one discussion group, rights and equality campaigners also noted that comparisons across various types of prejudice are not always helpful, as individuals, groups and communities can hold very different attitudes towards people with different protected characteristics. To illustrate, a representative from a disabled people's organisation talked about how prejudice against disabled people is often covert, as paternalistic attitudes that lead to discrimination are couched in 'positive' terms. As such, specific kinds of attitudes may need to be approached on a case-by-case basis.

Research and evaluations from various sectors note the importance of working with multiple stakeholders (women and girls, men and boys, families, community leaders, teachers, parents, state authorities, decision-makers) in order to achieve norm change. In a report on harmful sexual behaviour by children and young people, the Scottish government (2020) notes that interventions for young men and boys engaging in harmful sexual behaviour require "complex and ... significant collaborative working between statutory authorities, professional disciplines, the children involved and their families". For many working with young people and communities, teachers and parents are key audiences to amplify attitude change at a community level. A South African gender-based violence specialist, who runs training with the Soul City Institute for Social Justice, told us of the success of a series of 'Paradigm Shift' workshops she has been running.
These workshops are about engaging community-based organisations, parents and service providers (including police and healthcare workers) to examine and address in-built prejudices. She also does peer-education workshops with young girls on the same topic, who then cascade the training within their own communities. As a result of the engagement with various groups, they are seeing a number of shifts at the community level. In particular, more young women are accessing healthcare clinics.

'Quick fix' role models may not have the desired impact

Role models are heavily used as a 'quick fix' to engage more school pupils in gender-segregated subjects. However, their impact on changing attitudes, and therefore subject choices, is very mixed and, in some cases, counter-intuitive.
Betz and Sekaquaptewa (2012) found that STEM role models who were stereotypically feminine actually reduced the likelihood of girls taking STEM subjects forward, citing feeling that such role models were "unattainable". As such, while role models have been a 'go-to' for attitude change interventions, their use is not necessarily having the desired impact. In fact, use of role

[21] See https://mwrc.org.uk/campaign/you-can-change-this/

models might include an element of 'backlash' if they are used as the only intervention. However, approaches at community level to encourage modelling of desired behaviours are considered more effective. A report by the Scottish government on behaviour change notes that the example of others – neighbours, friends, leaders, colleagues – can have "a profound effect on behaviours across society" (Scottish Government 2010). Similarly, the Mental Health Foundation found studies suggesting that parental modelling of positive behaviours around body image, healthy eating and staying active – as well as avoiding criticisms of their own or others' appearance – could have a high impact on children's feelings about their own bodies (MHF 2019).

Secondary prevention and work with men and boys is incredibly limited in Scotland

Secondary prevention of violence against women in Scotland is very limited compared to other nations, particularly in terms of how formal and informal youth and education spaces respond to disclosures of incidences of sexist attitudes and behaviours. Of the prevention projects that do exist (such as those run by Rape Crisis Scotland[22]), we found gaps in how they are able to evaluate long-term impact on behaviour as cohorts grow up and enter different spaces, such as workplaces or further and higher education settings.

While perpetrator programmes and harmful sexual behaviour interventions have been found to have some success in improving outcomes for women, children and young people (Dobash et al. 1999; Hester et al. 2019), little Scotland-specific research and few programmatic interventions could be identified related to men and boys who exhibit and perpetrate sexist ideas, language and behaviours. One practitioner in our discussion groups shared that "people are really scared of it [secondary prevention programming] and scared of getting it wrong". As a result of this fear of 'getting it wrong', there are currently very low thresholds for risk, which results in more referrals to specialist services rather than early-stage school, family or community intervention and support.

There is, however, a growing body of international evidence of the value of engaging men and boys in the prevention of sexual violence. For example, Ricardo et al.'s (2011) systematic review found that a number of studies on bystander interventions could report significant or moderately significant findings. Preliminary results from Rwanda also suggest that engaging men in deliberate questioning of gender norms can begin to shift the burden of care work (Haider 2017) – although it is unclear how dependent such programmes are on local gender norms, as few comparisons exist between lower income countries and higher income countries.

[22] See https://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk/prevention-work/

Material and social benefits are more likely to support attitude change than changes in laws

International work on fatherhood and the role of men in heterosexual families (OECD 2016; Behson and Robbins 2016) has found that, rather than paternity leave legislation, the biggest drivers of change to attitudes and behaviours towards caregiving are material and social rewards, for example, paternity leave pay in line with maternity leave pay and workplace support for flexible working patterns and leave (OECD 2016). This is largely due to the choices that individual families make when one parent (usually the father) is in a higher-paid job, and loss of their salary, rather than the mother's, would have a bigger impact on household income. Indeed, Bernhardt and Goldschneider (2006) found that while attitudes towards parenting may have changed over time, behaviours towards gendered caregiving have not.

We found that successful bystander programmes often create social rewards for engaging in explicitly anti-sexist work and behaviours. In programmes such as the Green Dot bystander intervention programme, for example, boys who are identified as the most popular and influential boys on campus are targeted for programme entry.

Communication campaigns need to be accessible, relatable and positive

Research and evidence show that while communication campaigns can be effective, they can also fail for two reasons: failure to identify well-defined goals and objectives for the campaign, and failure to reach the intended audience or audiences in a sustained or adequately frequent manner (National Academy of Sciences 2016). The literature available also suggests that communication campaigns must be: accessible and jargon-free without losing purpose (Stangor 2011); factual without being statistics heavy (Stangor 2011; Facchini et al. 2017); and solution-focused (Jennings and Quinton 2019). The need for simple, clear messaging was reiterated by a number of participants in our discussion groups, particularly by those working for disabled people's organisations and trans rights organisations.

The challenge lies in creating messaging that appeals to those who would otherwise not be participating in this type of work. For example, Joseph Rowntree Foundation's analysis of race equality projects with young people (Lemos 2005) found that clarity in messaging and relatability to personal experiences were crucial to the effectiveness of the project in influencing young people's attitudes. It is "key that [messages] are relatable," agreed one discussion group participant. "You've got a challenge of needing to know where your audience is at so

that you can find something that moves them, but which isn't trying to move them so far that they can't make that move. It's about finding something that showcases enough difference but not too much difference to enable them to gradually move in the right direction."

Positive language that avoids reinforcing negative norms is also important. For example, saying "one in four young men think that if two people have had sex before, they don't have to get consent again" places emphasis on the negative behaviour. In contrast, a statement like "three in four men understand consent" works to build positive messaging around consent. The Equally Ours guide for campaigners and communicators (Jennings and Quinton 2019) uses the idea of 'dementia tax' to illustrate the importance of positive messaging. While the overarching message is that no-one should be taxed for having dementia, the idea of a 'dementia tax' actually reinforces the political right's argument that the concept of taxation is negative, rather than a force for social good.

Both 'myth busting' and 'sympathy-inducing' campaigns can backfire

These types of campaigns have been used across immigration, housing, gender stereotyping, poverty and climate change, mobilising large-scale research and media engagement in attempts to 'bust myths'. However, despite myth busting continuing to be a common message translation method, there is now compelling evidence that it does not work and can create negative effects, particularly when based on negative stereotyping (Mayo 2004; Crawley 2009). Often, myth busting attempts actually increase the number of myths an individual remembers (Jennings and Quinton 2019). The Opportunity Agenda (an American-based social justice and messaging organisation) explain that not only is myth busting ineffective, but it can also be proactively harmful, as myths are reinforced and individuals assume a credible source has evidenced their confirmation bias (Opportunity Agenda, 2011). Shelter, one of the UK's most prominent housing and homelessness charities, no longer uses myth busting in its communications work. According to its campaign manager, myth busting has been found to "amplify emotional triggers" and reinforce stereotypes (Donnelly 2017).

According to discussion group participants, message testing by LGBTQ+ groups shows that talking directly about rights, or the legality of why certain groups should be protected, also tends to backfire, as do messages that try to discredit the 'other side' by pointing out where funding for certain prejudiced groups or voices is coming from. In her research on attitudes towards immigration, Crawley (2009) notes that messages which seek to elicit sympathy may also reduce, rather than increase, public understanding.

Personal storytelling can be powerful

A number of participants in our discussion groups felt that personal experiences and stories – whether shared through media and social media or face-to-face interactions – is a crucial part of changing public perceptions and challenging prejudice and stigma. "It's about humanizing people and enabling people to feel empathy and feel like they understand some of the struggles people are going through," said one participant. Inviting guest speakers to give personal testimonies at events or trainings, or sharing films and audio stories about people's experiences, are considered particularly effective by those engaging day-to-day with target communities.

One discussion group participant engaged in anti-racist education work described this as "putting that lived experience out there". They continued, "it has more effect than producing statistics, so if you're saying 60% of young people experience racism in a classroom, then actually if you were to put up some quotes that go around it and showcase some of the experiences, that's more heartfelt, it kind of touches people more closely".

Messaging that focuses on values can be particularly effective

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC)'s 2016 review of interventions to address prejudice (Abrams et al. 2016) found that a number of 'intervention points' around prejudice formation existed, and that these can be used to reduce discriminatory attitudes. For example, programmes can be tailored to respond to specific views held by individuals: whether they categorise people; whether they are aware of stereotypes; whether they hold these stereotypes; or whether they apply them. The authors found that appealing to an individual's existing values, while using methods that reinforce values of equality and diversity and highlight pro-social norms, can instigate attitude change towards 'others'. To be effective, interventions need to feel personally relevant and speak to the values and 'starting points' of the individuals being influenced.

Equally Ours and the Common Cause Foundation also advise that repeatedly activating people's compassionate and 'public-spirited' values, rather than their self-centred values, will increase support for campaigns in the long-term (Jennings and Quinton 2009; Lingayah et al. 2018). However, a representative from Common Cause told us that they see voices on the right encouraging benevolence values – such as loving your family and community – in order to push regressive messaging around immigration. Progressive voices should learn from this, she says, and "pivot up" the other way. She explained that the same starting point of benevolent values of one particular group can be used to talk positively about the value of others in our community, such as we have seen happen around migrant workers in the NHS during the COVID-19 pandemic (Fernández-Reino et al. 2020).

Interventions aimed at diversifying media representation or changing media narratives are likely to have a positive impact on attitude change, but are particularly difficult to measure and can be co-opted

Projects or programmes that focus on diversity in representation across media and popular culture, while not specifically targeting attitude change or using known attitude change methods, are nonetheless taking an assumptive approach based on the belief that media and culture impacts attitudes. While such initiatives have been successful in drawing national and global attention to the lack of diversity and improving visible representation of diverse groups of women, evaluating the extent to which they change attitudes is complex and difficult to pursue. However, the more heavily evaluated edutainment and multimedia campaigns in international development contexts do tend to show fairly significant changes around attitudes towards gender, relationships with women and use of violence against women (Ricardo et al. 2011).

Unfortunately, attitude change around issues such as beauty standards can also be open to co-optation or re-appropriation, often for marketing purposes. A number of scholars who reviewed the Dove 'Real Beauty' campaign note that 'body positivity' has become increasingly appropriated and repackaged by the beauty industry, with more regard to diversifying their market base than pursuing transformative change for women (Johnson and Taylor 2008; Persis Murray 2012; Gill and Elias 2014). Persis Murray (2012) argues that the Dove campaign "positions the corporation to usurp the feminist role of engendering social change for women and displaces the influential mentoring role away from women who share girls' everyday lives onto an agent of institutional power".

Policy change can help change minds

Research suggests that debate and discussion across politics and media on policy changes specific to improving women's lives (such as quotas, maternity leave or tackling domestic abuse) can have a significant impact on general public attitudes. However, research is mixed on whether messaging that focuses on these policy changes as being 'good for women' or about 'women's issues' helps or hinders the cause. On one hand, it can educate the public that gender inequality exists and inform them that action needs to be taken to tackle it. On the other, it can further embed harmful ideas of gender roles or differences.

Filling ministerial or cabinet positions with people from under-represented groups has been found to have a positive impact on public attitudes towards women in public life (Allen and Cutts 2017). Here, visibility in policy and in politics becomes an attitude change mechanism. This illustrates the potential of strategic communications around policy development

and political engagement of women to shift attitudes, provided the messaging is clear, expresses the positive impact for the general public and prioritises women.

Policy changes themselves can also drive changes in attitudes, such as the implementation of political quotas (Allen and Cutts 2017) and shared parental leave (OECD 2016). The National Centre for Social Research (NatCen 2019) credits the multiple policies which have been implemented, or at least debated, around the gender pay gap, maternity pay, flexible working and women in leadership as driving attitude change. While this is likely to be the case, there is a lack of analysis to back it up. Even if we assume that policies or debates have influenced attitudes, we do not know which aspects or messaging have been most effective in doing so, nor do we know how attitude change relates to behaviour change, particularly as the literature on shared parenting highlights distinct gaps between progressive attitudes and traditional behaviours (Bernhardt and Goldschneider 2006).

During one of our discussion groups, an abortion rights campaigner from Northern Ireland talked about the opportunities that opened up for public engagement on reproductive rights following the passing of new legislation. However, they soon discovered that the public actually had a much better understanding of the issue than anticipated, and that the majority were with them in wanting change. Indeed, many felt that they had been previously drowned out by a very vocal and strident anti-choice minority. In this case, policy change did not lead to public attitude change, rather the two were mutually reinforcing. Policy change can also drive attitude change negatively, provoking backlashes, as is currently being seen around proposed changes to UK gender recognition legislation (Armitage 2020).

Social movements and protests can cause public opinion shifts, but are under-researched

While there is evidence to suggest that social movements are important drivers of public attitude change (such as #metoo, #blacklivesmatter, #everydaysexism, body positivity movements, decades of abortion campaigning in Ireland, among many others), these movements are not usually classified or evaluated as models of intervention in the same way that institutionally funded interventions are. Banaszak and Ondercin (2016) note that scholars have, historically, tended to ignore social movements' impact on public opinion. They argue that social movements – particularly those with strong collective identities, elite leaders, or strong formal organisations – have as much potential as other elites to shape public opinion.

3.3. What challenges do initiatives and organisations face when implementing and measuring attitude change projects?

Intersectional approaches are missing

Our research team is committed to taking an intersectional approach to research analysis and, as such, concerted effort has been put into identifying attitude change programmes or projects which consider overlapping inequalities, in particular around gender, disability, poverty and race. No details of a programme of this kind could be found. Many of the interventions we found predominantly target white, female, able-bodied and middle-class populations, particularly interventions around body image, and very few are culturally specific (MHF 2019). There also appears to be a general lack of gender mainstreaming in large, third sector-delivered programmes in Scotland (Wittman 2010), so when attitude change is looked at, gender norms and gendered attitudes are not often considered in the analysis.

Examples of attitude change efforts that have been implemented across different communities have helped to show how and why tailored approaches are vital and provided us with learning on why a particular approach has worked well with a particular community. What is missing, however, is an insight into how these attitude change efforts have impacted different groups within different communities – for example, BAME women, disabled women, or young men. Largely, this is due to limited community specific responses and, in particular, a lack of fully resourced and in-depth evaluation. Some efforts have been made (and are referenced in section 2.2), such as the Time to Change research into BAME mental health service users' attitudes, but more of this specific, intersectional effort is needed for us to learn about successful attitude change. While efforts to ensure 'diverse voices' are included in projects, communications and evaluation, the methods employed rarely (if ever) take a comprehensively intersectional approach.

Difficulties understanding and measuring change

One of the key challenges we found for initiatives seeking to change attitudes was the difficulty and cost of evaluating their programmes. In the projects we reviewed, we found that this was often linked to the difficulty of monitoring cohorts longitudinally, funding scarcity, short-term one-off projects and campaigns or a lack of evaluation tools and consistent data with which to measure. See Me is Scotland's longest running mental health anti-stigma campaign, including workplace, school-based and public awareness activities. In its 2016–2019 evaluation, they found that some of the strategic

outcomes (e.g. reduction in negative stereotypes) were difficult to assess. The report found that current evaluation tools do not provide accurate or comparable data to enable meaningful evaluation. Few, if any, of the evaluations we looked at were able to assess changes beyond six months after project completion, and most studies that looked at attitude or behaviour change used only self-reported measures to assess the results (Gidycz et al. 2011; Yamin et al. 2019).

For most smaller initiatives and campaigns, evaluations tend to focus on individual success stories and qualitative data collected from project participants. Where learning is identified, it often focuses on operational aspects of project implementation rather than the fundamental assumptions underpinning intervention design (Duff and Young 2017). That said, the importance of anecdotal and qualitative feedback can be underplayed by the more scientific studies and can often tell us more than quantitative data when mapped against a strong theory of change.

The most comprehensively evaluated areas of intervention are mainly mental health or international development, where there is also a fair amount of concentrated resources, in terms of both funding and large teams assigned to the evaluation. One of the most well-evaluated attitude interventions, by the mental health campaign group Time to Change, had the resources to hire 10 external private sector consultancies to evaluate its work and was able to make use of a range of evaluation tools. However, Abrams et al. (2016) note that even these evaluations "do not disentangle the specific aspects of the campaign that work well" and fail to determine whether any of their campaign activities are effective as standalone interventions or are more effective than others. Even with more resources to dedicate to evaluating, isolating the impact of the programme and ascertaining which element of the intervention may have caused a change is difficult, given the number of variables at play. It is also difficult to determine what counts as 'success' (Crawley 2009; Gidycz et al. 2011).

This is particularly true for campaigns that incorporate multiple strategies at multiple levels which, conversely, are often those noted to be the most effective. For example, a school-based programme on consent is influenced by the environment it is delivered in, who it is delivered by, the discussion amongst peers, media influence and parental influence. Hillenbrand et al. (2015) describe how "measuring such change is an inherently complex and holistic

endeavor" and that "gender-transformative measurement systems must be equipped to embrace complexity and context-specificity, as well as the halting and often unpredictable nature of social change". Unfortunately, instead of embracing complexity, the design of many projects is limited by what they can measure, with desired behaviour change set at fairly unambitious levels. This is further exacerbated by donor requirements, especially when projects have short timeframes and are results driven.

For example, few attitudinal programmes make the link from men's behaviour change on one issue to changes in attitudes towards sexism more generally, and those that do tend to evaluate success through engagement in simple acts, such as signing pledges or public speaking. While these acts can be useful when seen through a community-readiness approach as the start rather than the end of engagement, there is little monitoring and evaluation on how these acts create space for further, deeper engagement by men or what impact this has on women and communities. For example, while the '#HeforShe' campaign encourages sign-ups for men to speak out against gender inequality, little is known of what happened next. Did men who signed the pledge ultimately make changes in their workplaces or families as a result? Similarly, in the study conducted by Facchini et al. (2017) on anti-immigration attitudes in Japan, their measure of behaviour change was willingness to sign up to a petition to support a more immigration-friendly policy.

Finally, a number of organisations explain that message testing is crucial (Sanderson 2018; see also section 3.4). From our research, it is not clear how many interventions have the funds or the time to do extensive – if any – message testing. Our discussion groups confirmed this: most small organisations in Scotland do not have the resources to set up comprehensive message testing for their campaigns, or even the time to collate existing evidence. However, Sanderson (2018) also notes that, while important, message testing "can't do everything", is not a substitute for relationship building, and can take place formally and informally.

Difficulties working long-term and at scale

Liddell and Hickman (2019) note that short-term funding cycles create issues with staff retention, capacity and long-term planning. The difficulty of working within short-term funding cycles was a common theme emerging within our groups and interviews with practitioners, with one noting, "Short-term funding seems like a waste of money, what is really going to change? Yeah, they'll know the legal definition of consent, but how long is that going to last?" and another saying, "You do what is funded, but what is funded is not evidence based". This correlates with findings from Haider (2017), who notes that short timelines decrease the effectiveness of projects and programmes aiming to contribute to social norm change. Many participants recognised the double bind of chasing funding to maintain

services, while recognising that the attitude change services they are funding are limited in scope, evaluation and impact: "One-year funded projects create more problems than they solve."

Furthermore, competitive short-term funding cycles were also found to limit cross-sector collaboration and sharing of what works across all fields working to challenge inequality. One participant noted: "We're always chasing a fund, we could have one almighty service if we combined efforts, but we're scared to do that work." For people working in rural communities, this was felt to be particularly important, especially if funders are seeking participant figures as outcomes, rather than impact. They told us that the "cost per head isn't really worth it. You could go to a school in Glasgow and see 600 young people, but here it's 60 for the same price". Working within competitive funding environments places many barriers to true collaboration between organisations working on similar issues. As one explained, "We're all fighting each other for the same funding, it's almost awkward to have really strong relationships with them because if we get our funding, they don't get theirs".

Within our reading, we found that long-term, relationship-oriented work requires a high degree of staff time and specialist localised knowledge, making community-focused work difficult to scale up (Mastonshoeva et al. 2020). Many of our discussion group participants working in school settings highlighted long-term, positive relationships with schools as crucial to the work and the impact of their programmes. Many suggested that specific Sex and Relationship Education (SRE) teachers should be in place, or, failing that, staff knowledge and confidence should be increased through training. Some practitioners also mentioned that services and education can work against their own messaging, particularly around schools reinforcing stereotypes or reasserting 'power over' hierarchical models of learning. One participant working in formal education noted that teachers do care about social justice but "don't have the awareness" about gender equality. The question here, then, is how social justice can be perceived without an acknowledgement of gender inequality.

Participants in our discussion groups also talked about the difficulties of small organisations trying to reach a large number of people through face-to-face, interpersonal engagement, particularly when the group of individuals who are able to do this face-to-face work is particularly small (for example, trans people or women who sell sex). "You can't keep going back to the same people asking them to share their personal experience," one discussion group participant said. Yet, "if every single trans person in the world told their story now it probably still isn't enough in a numbers game".

Lack of space and capacity to collaborate across silos

In our discussion groups, we found a disconnection between the preventative work happening at national and at local level. Many working at local level identify the key aspects to attitude change as "capacity building and training of professionals, 1:1 work and person-centred approaches and awareness raising", rather than as policy or legislative change (Liddell and Hickman 2019). This also speaks to a degree of distrust between those working with different models of change and the difficulty across sectors in creating space for all campaigners, be they activists, communications leads or policy managers. One research participant also noted that in the past, funders have enforced partnerships between organisations with different value bases and capacities, which has actually eroded, rather than built, capacity to work across silos. Similarly, concerns were expressed about how power within partnerships is enacted, with larger organisations often holding funds, outcomes and systems, thereby creating a sub-contracting relationship rather than a true collaborative partnership.

Common Cause also mentioned the difficulties around collaborations between government departments as an issue. "If we did really well [with one department] who started to really encourage intrinsic values in their work, but then you have the Home Office doing the complete opposite, it sort of counteracts. So that is challenging".

Lack of global learning between higher and lower income countries

There is a huge amount of detailed evidence, testing and learning from international development in lower income countries on working with men and boys and changing social and gender norms in communities. For example, there is very effective work happening in Pakistan and India to end period stigma and period shame, as well as well-evaluated work exploring the impact of edutainment on gender roles and caring responsibilities (IPPF 2010). While it is essential to recognise that any intervention needs to be context-specific, and that international development approaches need to be decolonised, there is nonetheless little attention paid by higher income countries to the evidence generated on 'effective' interventions in low- and middle-income countries.

Negative consequences for women who share their stories and for staff who handle backlash

As previously noted, anti-stigma and anti-prejudice campaigns commonly encourage people to share their stories, either in groups or publicly. This is particularly true of campaigns to reduce stigma and change social norms around abortion. A number of researchers, including Michie et al. (2018) and Woodruff et al. (2020), report that women who share their stories around abortion in public communication campaigns

– even those who use only their first names or an alias when doing so – commonly experience harassment or other negative experiences as a result, both online and offline.[23] However, the same cohort of women also reported positive experiences of sharing their stories, so there is clearly a difficult balance to be struck and a need to ensure that adequate support is made available so that stories can be told and publicised in ways that minimise harm.

In the discussion groups, LGBTQ+ rights and equality groups and disabled people's organisations highlighted the difficulties in sharing stories. "Using your own stories is very powerful stuff but it's also hugely emotionally draining for the people doing it," said one participant. A representative from a disabled people's organisation noted the huge amount of time and resources required behind the scenes to empower a person to speak out and then to support them afterwards. She also noted the difficulties of dealing with a fast-moving media story, with journalists asking for lots of 'case studies' in very short timescales, often from people living through extremely stressful situations such as losing their social care, and the challenges of providing the necessary support in these intense situations. Support for people who end up 'accidentally' having their story in the media was also mentioned as something that is needed, as are more stories of collectives and movements as well as individuals – "where you can speak up and be part of a collective".

LGBTQ+ rights campaigners also spoke of the dramatic increase in opposition they have experienced in recent years, including the rise in misinformation being circulated, the general toxicity of social media and the increasing misrepresentation and polarisation of rights issues by mainstream media driven by clickbait. This is having a hugely detrimental effect on LGBTQ+ individuals, particularly trans women, as well as on the staff of LGBTQ+ organisations and trans-supporting women's organisations more broadly. "We are struggling to encourage new people to come forward because they've seen… and heard about what's been happening," said one participant. The space for trans voices in the media is also closing down. "It's extremely difficult for trans people to get a voice in mainstream media at the moment and virtually all of the articles being written are coming from an anti-trans perspective, but those same articles claim that they are the silenced ones," one participant told us.

Burnout, fatigue and cynicism were found to be pervasive themes in our discussion groups. Concerning funding, one noted, "Short term funding [is] not good for organisations' or for people's wellbeing, the job can be pretty hard going". The 'hard going' nature of the work was repeated by many of the participants, with some commenting on the personal impact of responding to harassment and hate, particularly in the context of the Gender Recognition Act

[23] In the Woodruff et al. (2020) study, respondents reported negative experiences that included: physical threats and death threats, being called offensive names, receiving distressing images online, having someone purposefully try to embarrass them, and being sexually harassed. These experiences contributed to emotional stress, problems with loved ones and difficulties at work and/or school.

reform. As COFEM acknowledge, attempting to make large-scale change, while also delivering community services and responding to harassment, can affect the mental and physical wellbeing of those challenging unequal power structures (COFEM 2018).

Difficulties working against the status quo, both with and against people in power

Almost all of our discussion group participants mentioned power and the importance of shifting cultural messages from power 'over' to power 'to' in order to make long-lasting, sustainable change. One told us, "Power is the crux of it… but most of our structures and systems – white supremacy, patriarchy, capitalism – are about 'power over' and really violent. Critical deconstructions of power structures are so important. If you're in a school structure having a conversation about this, in a school which is really hierarchical and authoritarian, how are young people meant to understand power in different ways?"

Many of the organisations we spoke to had previously partnered with key public bodies, such as government, police, social work and education, while aware of the need to challenge existing power structures: "We cannot replicate exclusionary structures." Some participants highlighted that while many programmes focus on young people, it is the adults holding power around them who should be the target of attitude change programmes. There was a common theme of frustration around attitudinal change work with young people being undermined by teachers, police, parents and politicians, and a shared sense that attitude change work should be structural, not individual. "People who have power... their attitudes [should] change."

However, not all of the issues that discussion groups had around power dynamics were focused on government authorities. Many raised concerns about what they perceived to be a Scottish women's sector that can also replicate some of these exclusive, insider–outsider dynamics, including through how research on women's issues is conducted. "If you look at the

main feminist organisations in Scotland, they're not intersectional organisations at all," said one participant. "I consider myself to be a feminist since I was a teenager, but there's no way that I would engage with those organisations at all." Similarly, another participant felt that she was often consulted on women's issues but rarely listened to: "A lot of times when you're talking to people, they're looking through you, they're not looking at you… [they don't] value what I had to say." In one of the discussion groups, the participants highlighted that it was incredibly unusual for there to be more than one woman of colour participating in an event, for example, particularly one that was not specifically focusing on issues around race. Women of colour in this group expressed concerns around the need to address white women's attitudes and the defensive white fragility that doing so can generate.

The National Council for Voluntary Organisation's report on competition and collaboration in the third sector found that competitive funding practices are having a negative impact and that "harmful organisational practice" is incentivised by commissioning and procurement (NCVO 2020). They also found that mission drift relating to the prioritisation of business development tended to limit large organisations' ability to support the "diverse ecosystem" of the third sector that is needed to create social change. For many of the practitioners we spoke to, growth-based organisational priorities (rather than change-based ones) reduced the ability for organisations to challenge power hierarchies and implement systemic social change.

Government departments can also often be looking for quick wins. "We find that sometimes government departments are looking for the kind of quick wins that they can show they've done XYZ," said one of the behaviour change institutes we spoke to. "But what we know is that if you're [using the wrong kind of messaging to achieve] a positive sort of behaviour change or attitude change in the short term, over the long term it can have negative implications and weakens engagement with social and environmental policies."

3.4. What can we learn from segmentation research, nudge theory and reframing?

Delivering clear, compelling and action-based messaging is fundamental to marketing across advertising and politics. To enable the creation of such messaging, segmentation research is utilised. Segmentation research is a method of audience analysis through segmenting of the population using common characteristics. Most often these are:

- demographic segmentation (age groups, gender, etc.);
- psychographic segmentation (opinion, political beliefs);
- geographic segmentation (rural or urban); and/or
- behavioural segmentation (lifestyle, purchase power, etc.).

In 2017, the Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC) contracted YouGov to conduct audience research to understand how the Scottish public understands and views human rights messages. This research included over 1,500 adults aged 16 and over through survey participation and four focus groups (SHRC 2018).

Researchers identified four categories of individuals: broadly supportive (42%), conflicted (30%), opposed (13%) and undecided (14%). The 44 per cent of conflicted and undecided are (or should be) the focus of engagement to change minds. This data is in line with other segmentation research related to views towards taxation and health spending that illustrates approximately 40-50 per cent of a participant group could be engaged and have their attitudes or opinions changed.

Unlike the majority of baseline attitude research available, the SHRC (2018) segmentation research asked not only about the message itself, but also how and by whom the message is delivered. It found that a disability rights campaigner with lived experience has a bigger impact on attitude change than the chair of a national human rights institution. The research also revealed the flawed use of 'celebrities' to engage society in human rights issues, finding that trust in a message delivered by a 'famous person' were significantly lower than trust in a message delivered by a national, expert human rights organisation. Case studies, framing and messages which use the word 'we' were found to be most relatable and impactful. Statistics did increase awareness and improve attitudes, but at a much lower rate. The data revealed that across most groups, people have the highest trust in research they do for themselves on an issue they are conflicted on. The analysis by SHRC provided information on which media channels are consumed by those who are supporters, conflicted about or opposed to human rights. However, it did not provide insight into how this research or media can deliver human rights messages in a compelling and influential way.

In another example, Scottish Women's Aid commissioned segmentation research of how the public felt about messages on women's inequality and violence against women.[24] YouGov was commissioned to deliver surveys and focus groups, and preliminary findings suggest similarities to the research by SHRC: overall, around 40-50 per cent of participants fell into the 'could be swayed' category. Findings reveal that approximately 59 per cent of those surveyed felt that men and women were equally likely to experience domestic abuse or sexual violence, when in reality, women are more likely than men to do so.[25] The discrepancy between participants' beliefs and reality may be due to the increase in government and police communications that include the messaging that domestic abuse can be experienced by men too, yet fail to incorporate a gendered analysis.

The research also tested responses to messaging about women. Two sets of messages were tested: one stated that "people are never to blame for the abuse they experience" and a second that "women are never to blame for the abuse they experience". The former was significantly more likely to be agreed with than the latter. In this case, making an issue specifically about women decreased the likelihood of agreement. This is a difficult lesson for gender equality-focused organisations that are, in essence, being told from such research that talking about women may close an audience off to engagement. Furthermore, the research found messages that linked violence against women as both a cause and a consequence of gender inequality were potentially too complicated for audiences. The participants in the research understood and agreed that violence against women was a cause of gender inequality; however, they did not agree or fully understand that gender inequality was a cause of violence against women.

Strategies from these learnings now need to be developed and tested. In particular, much of the existing work around messaging needs to be 'unlearnt' and understood as contributing to disagreement or, at the very least, disengagement. Again, the missing piece of the puzzle is the delivery mechanism. If we know what the messages should (or rather, should not) say, we next need to know by whom, how and on which platforms messages should be delivered for segmented audiences.

In the past five years, a growing number of organisations have also begun to implement a reframing approach in their communications campaigns, particularly around poverty (CPAG 2016; Volmert et al. 2016), race (Lingayah et al. 2018) and equal marriage (TIE 2016).

[24] This research is currently unpublished. As such, the data is preliminary, not for further distribution, and is the property of Scottish Women's Aid. Further messaging testing is due to be commissioned.

[25] Around 4 out of 5 reported incidents of domestic abuse in Scotland involve a female victim and male perpetrator. See https://www.gov.scot/publications/domestic-abuse-scotland-2018-2019-statistics/pages/2/ for 2018-2019 statistics.

In simple terms, framing is a method of communicating. It is creating a story around a message to present an issue to an audience. As such, reframing is adjusting the story for a particular purpose, and commonly takes place after research and data reveal that an initial or common framing of an issue creates or embeds inequality. For example, common framings such as 'those on benefits are lazy' or 'women are naturally better at being carers' need to be adjusted – or reframed – through a new, more accurate and compelling story or 'frame'. Lingayah et al. (2018) argue that a 'productive' frame will trigger helpful cultural models and values, such as social responsibility. For example, when making the case for an alternative economic model, the New Economy Organisers Network (NEON) identified one useful frame as being 'resisting corporate power' (NEON et al. 2018).

One reframing approach around poverty, advocated for by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and FrameWorks Institute (2018) suggests telling a new story that:

- starts with poverty, not politics or ideology;
- says why tackling poverty matters by relating to shared values of compassion and justice;
- is brought to life by messengers who embody these values;
- explains how the economy locks people in poverty;
- explains how poverty can be solved by positioning the economy as a designed system that can be redesigned and benefits as helping to loosen poverty's grip;
- uses examples, rather than statistics, to show that poverty exists and to demonstrate its characteristics and impacts;
- shows how we rely on public systems, painting a clear picture of what they look like; and
- counters fatalism with clear solutions that make a tangible difference.

The FrameWorks Institute, a UK- and US-based think tank, specialises in supporting social issues-focused organisations to frame or reframe their narratives through tried and tested methodologies. It has developed its own model to analyse framing and narratives – 'Strategic Frame Analysis' – which draws from theories originating in cognitive science, social behavioural science and psychology. While framing is an important aspect of narrative development, it is a top-down approach that focuses on language and messaging rather than how messages are delivered. It allows for

no deeper analysis of how the message engages or is owned by a community and how it empowers or creates change beyond the message itself. Consequently, little is known about the impact this particular reframing approach has had on daily lives, particularly of those experiencing poverty. While consistent messaging is clearly of great value, there is little data to confirm correlations with Joseph Rowntree Foundation and FrameWorks Institute's work and any positive changes in policy. We have also yet to find any explicit reframing examples on women's rights or equality. Further, when examining the potential of the reframing approach for work to challenge racial inequality, Lingayah et al. (2018) note that such approaches are "potentially change-making" but need to be used "alongside other change strategies, including efforts for institutional reform, organising and movement-building, research and insights into social problems and policy innovation".

The FrameWorks Institute, along with other comparison institutes, such as BehaviourWorks Australia, also embed nudge theory analysis into their behaviour change work. Nudge theory is used in behavioural economic, political theory and behavioural science and focuses on indirect methods to influence behaviours or decision-making. Nudge theory, according to academic Professor Kelly, former Director of the Centre for Public Health at the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, is built on the understanding that around 80 per cent of human behaviour is 'automatic', and that by changing automatic cues we can change the outcomes of people's lives to assist them in making healthier choices (Kelly, 2015).

Nudge theory has been used most readily across public health campaigns and 'low level' interventions which focus on small changes, such as the covering of cigarette stands behind shop counters to create an 'inconvenience' or additional step to purchasing. However, despite success in some areas, critics have questioned the ethics behind nudge theory and accused interventions utilising it as creating an environment of 'manipulation' of behaviour rather than creating awareness and education to support the proactive choice of healthier decisions.[26] In order for nudge theory to be applied to gender equality work, significant message testing would need to be conducted and assessment made on what 'small-scale' nudges would be appropriate across a range of communities and audiences, as the 'nudge' for young men would be different to the 'nudge' required for older populations. Waylen (2018) concludes that despite its limitations, nudge theory may be beneficial in creating behaviour change, provided it works alongside other methods which include policy interventions.

[26] This critique of nudge theory was discussed at The Australian Prevention Partnership Centre conference in 2015. See https://www.saxinstitute.org.au/news/a-nudge-and-a-think-the-architecture-of-choice-and-health/

4. Outside of Scotland, what organisational approaches currently exist to understand and support 'big picture' attitude change?

Following on from our review of interventions, in this section we explore organisational approaches to supporting 'big picture' attitude change. We ask what we can learn from them and how they are structured, and we conclude with recommendations relating to intersectionality and accessibility for any similar Scottish-based organisation.

To do so, we have reviewed a number of organisations focusing on attitude and behaviour change which we believe have a broadly comparable mission and aim to what is being sought by the NACWG for Scotland (see Appendix D for a full list). Most have a strong research delivery element, and all deliver some form of training and capacity building for those looking to influence attitudes across communities or policy at local or national level. Some deliver their own projects or partnership projects with social change charities as examples of 'good practice' on attitude change and narrative design. A few also provide consultations and support to pilot projects, test messages or approaches for audiences using their recommended methods, and conduct evaluation and analysis before larger-scale or longer-term investments are made.

There was a divide between organisations which take a more top-down approach, focused on messaging, framing and providing expert advice (e.g. FrameWorks, BehaviourWorks Australia and Behaviour Insights Team), and those which take a more system change and/or co-production approach,

which includes developing models with community groups and building capacity with those delivering on the ground work (e.g. Equally Ours and Opportunity Agenda). While these are quite distinct from one another in ethos, the delivery activities of research, training and consultancy are very similar.

Few – if any – explicitly gender-focused attitude change organisations seem to exist outside of those delivering specific (and usually community-level) interventions. The Soul City Institute for Social Justice, a South African intersectional feminist organisation which uses a social change model that combines prime-time popular mass media and social media with community mobilisation, is a potential exception. However, they are more focused on direct delivery of programmes based on a multi-level attitude change model than on learning or testing which interventions work more broadly.

There are also gender-oriented consultancies that focus on structural gender inequality and whose theory of change references, but is not solely based, on attitude change. For example, Gender at Work is an international consultancy supporting organisations from the United Nations through to grassroots community organisations to undertake strategic learning and evaluation from a gender equality perspective. There are also a growing number of feminist organisations and collectives around the world which practice intersectional approaches while seeking transformative, systemic change. While their remit may not be limited to or primarily focused on supporting attitude change work, we believe that many lessons can be drawn from these organisations, particularly those driving change in lower and middle-income countries.

Overall, we found that the majority of organisations which work explicitly on 'attitude' or 'behaviour' change but do not have an overarching gender focus did not have a clear feminist or intersectional approach outlined as part of their work, although they may have gender-specific projects. Other than Equally Ours and Opportunity Agenda, no organisation mentioned working on or having an understanding of intersectional analysis.

4.1. What kinds of organisations exist outside of Scotland?

Each of the organisations we reviewed do one or more of the following kinds of work.

Behavioural science and strategic communications

Of the organisations we reviewed, the one with the clearest link to government is The Behavioural Insights Team (BIT). Formed in 2010 by the UK's then coalition government, BIT's purpose was to provide input into messaging, apply 'nudge' theory and support the government to understand public attitudes towards policy initiatives. For example, it was tasked with assessing whether benefit sanctions were effective, found them to be ineffective and made recommendations for applying them more usefully. The unit has since expanded across Eastern Asia and America and is now only partly funded by the UK government and operated by Nesta (a UK think tank). The organisation relies largely on applying existing research by others on behavioural economics and sociology to policy positions or interventions, and works by testing messaging, using data analytics (e.g. algorithms to understand the reach of a social media message), analysing policy and providing training to others. The focus is on mixed methods evaluation and wide-ranging support to evaluate the behavioural change impact of messaging campaigns and policy interventions.

Behaviour Change, a not-for-profit social enterprise based in London, provides a similar function to BIT, as does the BVA Nudge Unit, which operates globally with a more corporate focus. While Behaviour Change's main focus is environmentalism, it applies its thinking to a number of social equality issues. The BVA Nudge Unit has a focus on both internal (within organisations) and external behavioural change, and applies nudge theory across a range of topics, including cities, health, public policies, marketing and management. Both organisations can be hired by government, businesses and the third sector to research audiences, test messaging and interventions, and provide strategic recommendations on ways forward to create behaviour change. However, unlike BIT, neither Behaviour Change nor BVA Nudge Unit appears to have a particular focus on intervention evaluation.

BehaviourWorks Australia (BWA), another similar set up to BIT, has developed its own model that is owned by the organisation and accessible solely through BWA consultants. This includes:

- desk-based research of issues;
- analysis of the target audience;
- taking a 'deep dive' into the community (e.g. local/ demographic data);
- applying and testing messaging;
- evaluating and analysing findings; and
- reflecting and adjusting.

The organisation model works as a partnership between academics and 'behaviour change practitioners' to implement what it has called the 'BW Model'. The BW Model provides a route for those delivering attitude or behaviour change interventions to identify the problem, conduct research, analyse their audience and then implement and evaluate the methodology. BWA is the only organisation we identified providing monitoring and evaluation models which are implemented depending on the type and size of the behavioural change project (e.g. surveys, focus groups, large-scale data sets, longitudinal analysis). The organisation provides recommendations to stakeholders on which methodology should be used.

The FrameWorks Institute, as outlined in section 3.4, has developed the 'Strategic Frame Analysis' – a method of researching and analysing messaging and communications around social issues. Strategic Frame Analysis involves testing, content analysis, frame development and usability trials (which focus on how practitioners apply the knowledge gained). The method provides a rigorous and detailed analysis that goes beyond a snapshot understanding of current attitudes and provides expertise on how message framing can influence individuals on a specific issue. The FrameWorks Institute also offers training related to framing, paid consultancy services to provide detailed analysis, and 'FrameChecks', a paid-for service which provides a brief review of an organisation's current messaging and recommendations to increase their effectiveness.

The Centre for Behaviour Change, based at University College London, is a world-leading behavioural science research institute. It provides academic consultancy expertise, specialist research on a range of methodologies, testing of interventions, and open source online resources. The institute also provides paid-for training, as well as an MSc in behavioural change science. The centre works across academia, third sector, public service delivery and government to provide insights in best practice on behaviour change, with focus areas largely dependent on the interests and needs of clients. As such, only a limited range of its past consultancy work has involved gender inequality, after ActionAid hired the Centre for Behaviour Change to evaluate their women's rights and GBV programmes in Nepal, Kenya and Ethiopia. This work involved evaluating the programme against known behaviour change best practice and providing recommendations for ActionAid to take forward, which are currently in implementation (Chadwick and Pender, 2020). The Centre for Behaviour Change uses the 'Behaviour Change Wheel framework' to assess how interventions should be developed to be most effective.

Common Cause Foundation, based in Manchester, England, is centred on framing and messaging through the lens of values. Their model is based on a specific set of evidence from social psychology around intrinsic values. "We know that if individuals are able to prioritise intrinsic values – which are things like community, love for your friends

and family, protecting the environment, social justice, equality, etc. – they're more likely to engage in pro-social and pro-environmental behaviour and attitudes," a representative told us. They have a strong evidence base for their model, which has been 'tested' with thousands of people in over 100 countries worldwide. They describe their work as being focused on: supporting organisations with communications and messaging; delivering research and analysis around human values; and framing to increase engagement, business development (i.e. fundraising) and knowledge dissemination.

Examples include working with the UK's Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs on pro-environmental public messaging and with museums in Manchester on their public messaging, which they describe as "practical and hands on". Common Cause Foundation conducted research on why people attended museums and developed an engagement strategy to create emotional and values-driven ties between staff and visitors. Through this, it tested and assessed messages which have since been used successfully in promotion, donor strategies and communications. The organisation also provides a training programme and bespoke workshops to support others to assess and harness the power of values in their communication and does some 'beyond communications' work supporting organisations to apply intrinsic values to how they operate. In 2020, it also has aspirations to deliver open workshops in Scotland.

What Common Cause Foundation does with values, Narrative Initiative does with narratives. A US consultancy aiming to create a community of practice around 'narrative thinking', the Narrative Initiative seeks to help organisations advance 'deep narrative shifts' by creating space for collaboration, providing infrastructure for narrative change as an emerging field of attitude change work and making available new tools and methodologies. Its projects look at the narratives used by global populist movements, narratives that can support the emergence of a more just and equitable economy and the role of technology in narrative change.

Equally Ours, a UK-wide organisation, offers consultancy on effective strategic communications. However, unlike the organisations described above, Equally Ours does so through a specific equalities-focused and gender-competent lens. As such, they seek to avoid reinforcing unhelpful stereotypes when delivering messaging to 'win over' positive attitude change; for example, avoiding reproducing gender stereotypes around women and sport when trying to engage men in improved attitudes towards caring roles. This emphasises the need to embed gender competence in strategic communications work and messaging research. This particular point was emphasised heavily in our interview with Equally Ours on its recommendations for any model being developed in Scotland.

Multi-level and co-production models

Social Impact Lab, based in Alberta, USA, is a consultancy organisation which "invests in innovation" by working with the social sector across the USA (voluntary sector, but not necessarily government funded). It works across areas such as children and young people and poverty and provides a capacity building programme for those working in the social sector to develop new approaches to messaging and project design. It delivers its own 'community-based' interventions and can be hired to test methodology and narratives on issues that community organisations come forward with. The organisation creates open access research resources for others to learn from, as well as creating a stakeholders and partnerships collaboration platform.

Equally Ours delivers its work to create more effective narratives to progress equality and human rights through participatory models and partnership approaches. The organisation delivers training for practitioners and campaigners across equalities organisations and the third sector, commissions research specifically on effective attitude change methods and audience segmentation and provides testing on messaging developed by partner organisations. They also partner with others to support the development of attitude change campaigns, as well as delivering their own campaigns related specifically to improving the understanding of human rights. Speaking to a representative, it is clear that Equally Ours has a balanced approach in terms of spending time across both the theory behind and the application of strategic communications, understanding how their recommendations work in practice, evaluating their work, and developing new approaches. "[We aim to] be as light on theory as possible," they told us. "It is about the practical application for organisations – it needs to be accessible and purposeful."

Opportunity Agenda was launched in 2010, with a specific mission to progress social justice across the USA. It does this through forming compelling and values-driven narratives, building capacity around messaging and movement building across communities, and engaging with the creative industries to promote storytelling. Aside from Equally Ours, it is the only model we have found which has a specific mission to advance equality and support others to influence policy change through narrative design. Unlike any other model, Opportunity Agenda has trained and paid fellows who act as specialist press-ready influencers on specific social justice issues. The organisation provides open access resources and specific research publications to support community organisations to tell their stories better.

Monitoring and evaluation support

In our review, we found organisations that focus on developing theories of change and mapping outcomes incrementally and in participatory

and accessible ways. Using a story mapping process to map existing gender norms and ways of conceptualising change, Gender at Work has developed a framework to help organisations and communities "diagnose the different things that need to change", as well as to interrogate the interrelationship between gender equality, organisational change and the 'rules of the game' held in place by power dynamics within communities. Other organisations such as Social Impact Lab, Promundo and MenAlliance combine theory of change work with a social and systems change approach to work through ideas collaboratively with other organisations, stakeholders and communities. In 2015, the Time to Change campaign group reported that it was moving towards supporting local partners to run campaign work from regional hubs and that it would be supporting them to use their evaluation tools locally to help make more in-depth comparisons across regions

While some of the combined models mentioned in the previous section evaluated their own interventions or provided methods of good practice on evaluation (namely, FrameWorks and BWA), most of the comparative examples we found provided very little insight into high-quality and in-depth assessments of the extent of change on attitudes or behaviours achieved by either their own or others' interventions. Some university teams and consultancies do offer specialised support with running randomised control trials (RCTs). However, it is unclear whether the topics for these are determined by the research department or at the request of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) trying to evaluate their programmes. RCTs are often considered the most stringent way of determining whether a cause–effect relation exists between the intervention and the outcome (Kendall 2003), but often take as much time to set up and run as the intervention itself.

According to Batliwala and Pittman (2010), many monitoring, evaluation and learning systems are inadequate in tracking risk, negative change, backlash and unanticipated change. Given the unpredictable nature of social change, gender-transformative monitoring, evaluation and learning systems require robust tools and systematic processes for risk monitoring, as well as gender expertise for interpreting the pushback that often accompanies progress in women's rights work (Hillenbrand et al. 2015). In this understanding, feminist evaluation is not prescriptive, but rather offers a lens and framework for thinking about evaluation and unpacking the deeper systems and beliefs beneath surface-level differences in gender roles, relations and outcomes. It also acknowledges that the process of evaluation itself can reinforce or challenge power relations (Hillenbrand et al. 2015).

Large-scale attitude surveys or research projects

The vast majority of attitude change work is centred around research that provides a baseline or snapshot understanding of societal attitudes on specific equality issues. While there are a

number of polling organisations facilitating this research across the UK, such as YouGov, they largely provide analysis around messaging and segmentation research. Outside of the UK, the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) Gender Statistics Database contains data on attitudes and perceptions of GBV and public opinion on gender equality and gender equality policies more broadly.[27] They have also mapped stereotypical gender attitudes and perceptions by collecting narratives and stories (EIGE 2013). While this is an incredible source of information on public opinion, current trends and changes over time, the focus of this work is primarily to understand attitudes in order to inform policy making and policy decisions, rather than to identify which other interventions can effectively help shift attitudes and norms.

However, organisations such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation attempt to bridge this gap. Focusing on research, policy, collaboration and practical solutions, they use similarly large sets of data on attitudes, but run specific research to test and develop models that might change attitudes. Similarly, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) aims to create practical solutions through evidence and relationships. Both of these independent organisations have overarching social change visions, and both aim to create meaningful relationships with collaborators and partners.

While not necessarily using the language of 'attitude change', a growing number of community-focused organisations are using community-based participatory research or community action research to conduct collaborative research. This model, in which community members either lead research themselves or conduct it in partnership with professional researchers, is designed to empower communities, mobilise them towards social change and produce beneficial outcomes for all those involved in the research (see DCRT 2011; Murray and Wright-Bevans 2017; Katz-Wise et al. 2019). While such a model can be used to explore a wide range of community issues, it often has understanding and shifting social or cultural norms at its heart. It also speaks directly to a number of the lessons drawn out in section 3.2 about the centrality of relationships to attitude change work and the need for interventions to be highly contextualised. Similar to RCTs, participatory or community action research is much more able to measure change in a community that has been targeted by an intervention than other methods. While potentially less expensive than national surveys and large RCTs, community-based participatory research is still a time-consuming methodology and does not always progress in a linear fashion (Murray and Wright-Bevans 2017).

Policy research and analysis

What Works Network Centres, based in London and largely operating in England (with one associate centre in Wales), are part of the UK government's What Works Network. With nine centres in total, they cover health and social care, economy, ageing, homelessness and more, and

[27] Available data cover all Member States and is derived from European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights survey on violence against women and the Eurobarometer Special Surveys. See https://eige.europa.eu/gender-statistics/dgs/browse/ta/ta_pubopn/ta_pubopn_geneq/

each centre takes a different approach depending on the nature of the policy area and their government-established core focus. The centres provide evidence gathering and analysis, policy recommendations, creation of open access resources and support to help the application of evidence, knowledge dissemination, and training and capacity building. The centres operate as both think tanks and research labs and have an indirect impact on attitude change rather than specifically focusing on attitude change delivery.

Other think tank-based organisations, such as the Europe-wide Migration Policy Centre[28] and US-based Institute for Public Relations,[29] provide more in-depth analysis of attitude change research and how it can be applied to policy change efforts. However, these examples are non-political organisations which do not take policy positions to improve legislation or tackle inequality directly.

Largely, think tank-based organisations do not feature the participatory or community action research methods described above, though a more collaborative approach did exist within the Centre for Social Action at De Montfort University (established in 1995, with work cited until 2014, however, nothing since 2014 could be found). The Centre focused on service-user engagement in both research processes and service delivery to deliver social action (community) research. The purpose of this research was to gain direct input from lived experience expertise and engage with the community directly in order to improve buy-in for, for example, public health initiatives. Through their methodology, the centre was able to influence policy development and improve research outputs. According to the centre's case study submission to the 2014 Research Excellence Framework, social action has impacted upon local council policy in relation to community cohesion and resilience.[30] The methodology was also used to change community attitudes in Leicester towards participation in surveys and research to improve data collection.

Worldwide, there are a large number of gender-focused institutions focusing on feminist policy analysis and gender mainstreaming, such as the national feminist research centres in New Zealand and Denmark and the EU's EIGE, or monitoring bodies, such as the Gender Monitoring Office in Rwanda.[31] We recognise that such institutions are incredibly important to achieving wider structural change, but as they do not appear to have demonstrable focus on changing public attitudes as part of their models, they fall out with the scope of this particular project. As such, we have not looked at whether or how these institutions take an explicitly intersectional approach to how they work; this might be something worth exploring

[28] See www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/

[29] See www.instituteforpr.org/

[30] See https://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/

[31] We found the gender-mainstreaming approach to be particularly common in countries often considered more 'gender equal', such as in Scandinavia or New Zealand.

further. It is also worth noting that we feel feminist policy analysis to be well covered in Scotland by organisations such as Engender[32] and others, who would form a different 'branch' of transformative change on gender alongside an institute focusing more strongly on attitude and norm change.

Large, multi-level, multi-year campaign models

Both the Time to Change and See Me national mental health campaigns referred to in section 3.2 are examples of multi-level initiatives focused explicitly on attitude change and invested in to deliver long-term change through dedicated organisations. In these examples, the organisations have been working for almost 15 years to deliver attitude change on mental health stigma. While attitudes have improved towards mental health in that timeframe, progress has been incremental, illustrating the need for long-term investment. To speak to audiences at multiple levels and make as much impact as possible, the campaigns have used multiple different approaches concurrently, including national advertising, schools-based work, workplace training, public pledges and photo exhibitions. These organisations are also examples of the most robust (and ongoing) evaluations of attitude change and were cited by one of our focus groups as recognised good practice.

'This Girl Can' [33] and the 'Be Real' [34] campaigns are both well-known UK campaigns addressing gender stereotyping around women's body image. Similar to Time to Change and See Me, these campaigns have a dedicated organisational structure and branding behind them, rather than being one-off campaigns or projects from another organisation, and are very well resourced. Both involve prominent media campaigns centred around diverse portrayals of women and both have education and community health strands as less visible layers to their campaign. Internationally, there are also a large number of multi-year programmes and campaigns, and dedicated organisations, working on shifting gender norms around GBV (see section 3.1), with a particular focus on combining work with young people, communities and mass media.

Companies have also been known to create large multi-level 'cause marketing' campaigns combining their social marketing knowledge with a social cause they wish to highlight. For example, Dove's campaign for 'Real Beauty', as mentioned in section 3.1, was based on a global research study they conducted with 3,200 women across 10 different countries (Persis Murray 2012). This led to an international television and print advertising campaign which Dove coupled with the Dove Self Esteem Fund for outreach work in partnerships with NGOs in the form of in-person and online workshops on self-esteem.

[32] https://www.engender.org.uk/
[33] https://www.thisgirlcan.co.uk/
[34] https://www.berealcampaign.co.uk/about/

Multi-level campaign models such as these have the advantage of having a strong and clear focus on the types of attitude they want to change and the audience for their work. Since they are comparatively well-resourced and time-bound 'projects', they can set up clear monitoring, learning and evaluation frameworks, undertake targeted research and also, to a certain extent, compare different types of intervention across a particular topic. They are also expensive, and, due to their reliance on social marketing teams, can feel quite corporate.

Training, capacity building and peer-learning spaces

Almost all of the organisations we looked at – from those focusing on behavioural science consultancy through to organisations focusing on movement building – have training programmes and capacity building as a core part of their work. For example, Equally Ours provides both open workshops and bespoke sessions on how to tailor strategic communications and 'unlearning' communications which embed stereotypes on issues about inequality. Opportunity Agenda delivers webinars, public events and training for communities on communication effectiveness and tailors these to different audiences (e.g. the media or general public). Their training is evidence-based and practical, and they track post-training impact to evaluate the effectiveness of their delivery. Many, such as Equally Ours, Narrative Initiative, Public Interest Research Centre (PIRC) and Joseph Rowntree produce simple, accessible toolkits and guidelines for running effective strategic communications interventions. Similarly, MenAlliance and Global Women's Institute provide toolkits and training for community leaders and those engaging with men.

In the more overtly feminist organisations, such as the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) or Gender at Work, participatory, peer and active learning are common approaches. Representatives from Gender at Work told us about their active learning programme, which they see as more of a collaborative process than a training session. In this model, organisations and communities come together as a 'peer group' or 'platform' to identify the key problem they want to solve and ideas for how they will solve it. Participants are then provided with coaches, mentors and facilitators for a period of 18 months as they work through implementing their plan. Gender at Work estimates that they support around 100 organisations or communities in this way. Through these collaborative learning partnerships, they also do pilot and test approaches ('change experiments'), with approaches decided by the community. In India, for example, they worked for a number of years with a group of civil society organisations trying to change community attitudes around women's employment, especially around certain groups of women. "What we really did was get the organisations to think what strategies would work right, and then they went ahead and piloted these sorts of solutions in their own communities in their own districts," a representative told us. "The net result of that was that within the eight

districts in which we worked the access of Muslim and Dalit women to the employment guarantee scheme increased tremendously – the data is 400 per cent."

'Innovation' and 'problem-solving' models provided by organisations such as Nesta offer incubation hubs and accelerator programmes to provide intensive support to 'start-up' social innovators. While these approaches are not specific to attitude change interventions, they may be a way of approaching designing, piloting and scaling up 'successful' attitude change interventions.

A number of organisations, including Gender at Work and Common Cause Foundation, also run institutional capacity building programmes to help larger organisations (including businesses, NGOS, research organisations, unions, public bodies and government departments) to understand and promote attitude change within their own staffing bodies and through their own systems and processes. In fact, Gender at Work was established, in part, to broaden out from the one-off gender mainstreaming trainings that were being offered and provide something more holistic to institutions who want to address gender inequalities within their own systems through transformative processes. Currently, they are working with teachers' unions across seven countries in Africa. "Gender training really only ticks one box: it's that understanding that change needs to happen at different levels and at informal and formal levels… and the recognition that organisations themselves are gendered," a Gender at Work representative told us.

Movement building, collaboration spaces and collective leadership

Some of the bodies we looked at focused on creating collaborative spaces for allied movements, bringing together grassroots activists, artists, public sector, private sector and community organisers, and focusing on movement building and collaboration as a means of changing public attitudes. For example, MenAlliance, a membership organisation tackling gender inequality through engaging with men, hosts many spaces for collaboration, support and knowledge sharing. Similarly, AWID and the Global Women's Institute both host a number of conferences and capacity building workshops, and work to support young leaders in change making at various levels. In addition to convening spaces where the participants determine the agenda, FRIDA also provides collaboration grants for groups who want to work together after meeting in the space.

COFEM is a global advocacy collective of over 200 individual members responding to a shrinking and 'co-optation' of space for feminist movements, and sees itself as providing solidarity and safe space, discussion, problem solving and advocacy to advance feminist strategies for ending violence against women. Most of its members do not necessarily work in explicitly feminist organisations – or, in fact, work in actively anti-feminist structures – so this space is particularly important for sharing concerns, challenges and successes. "We're forming partnerships with other people and other groups that are doing the same thing so we're

working together in more of a collective action rather than in competition," a representative told us. Similarly, Gender at Work increasingly sees movement building as a core part of its work. "Collective leadership and movement building really resonates with the kind of work that we're particularly interested in," two representatives told us. "Building that collective commitment and shift in attitudes and commitment to gender equality that's more rooted in the community that little bit deeper than what happens through those high-level flashy [communication] campaigns."

Impact hubs and civic square spaces are found across the globe and bring together diverse thinkers, practitioners, activists and policy makers to work on 'wicked problems' – social or cultural issues that are complicated, complex and seemingly insurmountable. This approach has much in common with tech spaces conceptualising themselves as 'neighbourhood labs' or incubation spaces. They tend to use design thinking, whereby a multitude of actors engage with a problem and identify points for change through an iterative process of testing ideas, learning from failures, changing approaches and developing new ways of doing.

For example, Birmingham Impact Hub/Civic Square has responded to barriers to good quality childcare by undertaking a whole systems approach to how childhood is conceptualised within society. Within this work, they have engaged with town planners, play experts, community green spaces, parents, artists and architects to explore child friendly cities and education. They state: "while investing in the dark matter of large-scale system change, we must also invest in the dream matter – the artists, writers, designers, dreamers and creative visionaries – those who dare to dream up bold new futures for humanity and have the capacity to stretch our imaginations further than we ever thought possible." Such models are built on collaboration, participation, risk, testing, failure and creativity, and have the potential to embed systems and structures that encourage strong relationships, positive use of power, collaboration, inclusion, and an intersectional, intergenerational approach (Wakefield 2017). They also problematise who is considered to have 'expertise' – in the example from Birmingham, parents and children, as well as policy makers, were seen as equal partners to projects relating to childcare and childhood.

(Feminist) funding models

There is a strong cross-over between feminist organisations seeking transformative change through movement building and feminist organisations reinterpreting and challenging how funding is provided – including by providing funding to civil society organisations themselves. This includes organisations such as the African Women's Development Fund, FRIDA The Young Feminist Fund, Mama Cash and Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice. Some governments, including the Canadian government, the Dutch government[35] and the Swedish government, are also beginning to engage with how to

[35] See for example the Dutch government's Power of Women and Power of Voices grant instruments https://www.government.nl/documents/policy-notes/2019/11/28/policy-framework-strengthening-civil-society, and the Global Alliance for Green and Gender Action Programme https://www.mamacash.org/en/global-alliance-for-green-and-gender-action/

support feminist grant-making, according to representatives from FRIDA and Gender at Work. FRIDA is a fund for young feminists led by young feminists. Attitude and norm change are core elements of its theory of change (FRIDA 2019). It sees itself as contributing to this by supporting feminist organisations and changemakers around the world through flexible core funding that is not tied to restrictions or agendas that limit grantee partners' work. "When young feminist organisers are provided with the resources, leadership opportunities and capacities they need, radical shifts to movements' landscapes and social change trajectories occur," they told us.

FRIDA was created out of the need for more "organisations within philanthropic space to really recognise that young feminists are experts of their own reality". "They know best what they need, they know best what their political agendas are, what their priorities are and that they understand their context best," a representative from Peru told us. It recognises itself as a funder and knows that it does not speak on behalf of the movement(s) it supports. "It's always important to be aware of the power dynamics and to really centre the perspectives of movements on the ground themselves and try to amplify what they're doing rather than speak on their behalf." FRIDA's model of grant-making, similar to a number of the other organisations in the list above, is participatory. "What that means is that when groups apply for funding from FRIDA, they are invited to participate in the selection itself, so according to regions or countries they receive an anonymous list of other proposals and a summary and they get to vote," explained the representative. "It's also a way of increasing accountability so that you know young organisations have a sense of what other young feminist collectives are working on in their own context." In addition to flexible core funding grants, FRIDA also provides additional resources through capacity strengthening grants, collaboration grants and travel grants. It also seeks to avoid the burdensome reporting requirements and detailed backend admin work of traditional funders that "takes away valuable time for feminists balancing lots of responsibilities they are not compensated for".

Funders such as FRIDA and AWID see working in the funding or philanthropy space as fundamental to the redistribution of power – a process "not just to shift resources but to shift power". They recognise that philanthropic giving "exists because of inequality and is born of colonial capitalist dynamics" (FRIDA 2020). They place a great deal of importance on moving public money and decision-making on its use directly into communities (Civil Society Futures 2018; Miller and Jones 2019).

Innovation or incubation organisations such as Nesta also offer what they refer to as 'scaling grants' to help small organisations scale up their social innovations and also support organisations to set up different forms of crowdfunding models.

4.2. How are these organisations structured and resourced?

Comparable institutes were approached for interviews to learn more about their operations and origins. All were asked questions related to their funding, their staffing structures and the rationale behind why they were created, and asked for their advice on challenges any Scottish model should consider. In total, eight institutes were interviewed.

On their origins and rationale behind their creation, the vast majority explained the difficulties government, academic and voluntary sector bodies faced in creating a more equal, healthier or more environmentally aware society (depending on the expertise of the institute being interviewed). They discussed the difficulty of creating lasting attitude change, the problematic nature of government interventions assuming attitude change would create behaviour change and the number of unknowns or undiscovered areas of research on attitude change. The majority of institutes were created to better understand attitude change and to provide practical applications across public, private and voluntary sectors. However, the methods and models by which these institutes pursue their work differs greatly. While some use a purely academic, research-driven and 'knowledge exchange' model, others prioritise capacity building, movement building and application of evidence-based approaches.

Private or non-profit consultancy models with traditional hierarchies

FrameWorks Institute was set up by a woman with significant experience within the voluntary sector in the USA. She identified that the 'doom and gloom' form of fundraising, awareness raising and campaigning was not getting through or, worse, was counterproductive to the messages of charities she was working with. The institute began through philanthropic funding and focused on messaging and framing within the USA. It has since grown and delivers work across the UK and USA. The organisation is self-sustaining through consultancy and research income generation. The staff structures are largely traditional in terms of hierarchy (with president, vice-president, senior strategist positions and a board with oversight). The organisation also hosts 16 research fellows.

Academia models with traditional hierarchies

BehaviourWorks Australia is hosted within a university and was founded in recognition of the need for a more robust understanding of behavioural change related to climate change and sustainability. Since then, the organisation has

expanded its subject specialisms to include a number of social justice issues, including gender equality. At any one time it is working on between 50-60 research projects. The organisation started with 1.5 staff (originally fully-funded) and currently has 30, including a number of research fellows; the majority of staff are post-doctoral researchers. The main source of income generation is through education programmes and student fees through their MSc programme. However, state funding is also received through the Environment Protection Agency. It leads on projects such as public health attitude change interventions and evaluations, and is part of an academic partnership, which is expected to publish research papers and participate in academic activities. The organisation is governed by a board which consists of nine key partners.

Private or non-profit consultancy models with semi-collaborative structures

Common Cause Foundation operates as a small not-for-profit consultancy, working largely with NGOs, governments and the creative industry. It focuses work on the organisations with a large reach into the public sphere, and delivers messaging, framing and outreach through them. The organisation is founded on academic evidence building on social psychology and behaviour science, with a focus on delivering compelling attitude change through building on individual and group values. The organisation started as a research project and, ten years later, is a self-sustaining consultancy team with four part-time staff. The organisation operates in a collaborative manner with a largely flat (shared leadership) staffing model and a focus on long-term change and longer-term projects. They told us: "We do have... loyalty to long-term change. Knowing that there's not a kind of magic bullet for this work."

Gender at Work operates with co-directors and working groups doing the decision-making. It focuses on "building cultures of equality" through "diagnosis" of what organisations need, capacity building, training and the creation of resources. The organisation is governed through a board of global experts (including representation from Scotland). Members of the board are gender equality experts, academics and practitioners. As the organisation works globally, decision-making on delivery is carried out by the working group and/or clients in-country to ensure relevance and effectiveness at a local level.

Non-profit funding and development models with membership or participation focused structures

FRIDA centres on shared leadership and participatory decision-making. It has a co-director model and co-chairs of the board (the board is a required structure as it is a registered trust in Canada). It describes itself as "youth led". The primary focus of the organisation is to fund feminist activity and develop movement building. The funding is focused on the needs of the groups or communities who apply, rather than setting out a traditional application process where predetermined outputs need to be delivered. It provides capacity building for feminist researchers (these are paid opportunities) and multiple resources for feminist activists and organisers on how to effectively deliver projects, programmes and grants. FRIDA does receive some state funding and trust funding to deliver its work and "pass on" this funding to on the ground projects.

COFEM is an advocacy collective and membership organisation of approximately 215 individual members. It operates through a six-person secretariat of part-time consultants. Under this, it organises working groups which are open to all members. Sitting alongside the secretariat is a coordinating committee of six women (all voluntary) who play an advisory role and sit in the different working groups. Originally, the organisation existed as a project within a national organisation in Uganda. It has since had multiple iterations, including as a project of a second organisation and as part of a national organisation in the USA. It is currently a project within Voices Amplified – a global network of over 500 organisations. The organisation has made a commitment to be as "non-hierarchical as possible" within its structures. According to our interviewee, COFEM does not take any state funding: "They [members] don't feel the government is necessarily accountable to them so they would prefer to be more of a watchdog or accountability kind of role as opposed to one where they're [government] sitting in." Much of the funding COFEM receives is through Giving Back, a philanthropic trust working with athletes, high net worth donors, corporations and celebrities.

4.3. Who are the key partners and stakeholders in their work?

Across the interviews and desk-based research conducted on potential comparison models for a new organisation for Scotland, a wide range of stakeholders and partners were identified as being deeply engaged with the organisations we spoke with, whether through developing skills, messaging or framing, commissioning research, or seeking consultancy support for attitude change programmes. These included education bodies, public bodies, parliamentarians, community organisations, charities, voluntary organisations and private companies as key partners and stakeholders.

Almost all organisations work in some way with national and local government and public bodies. In some cases, research is directly commissioned by the government; in others research is led and funded by the institute itself, and then supported to inform and shape a local authority programme. Across the interviews conducted, government (either at a local or national level) were not part of boards or steering committees, and so any collaboration was seen as partnership working rather than government influence. No institute interviewed delivered work that would be labelled as 'for the general public' in a wider sense.

We found that organisations such as BWA have a significantly higher proportion of private sector partners in comparison to most other models. This is partly due to the nature of the behaviour change activity and topics being delivered by the organisation and the nature of funded academic research through private companies (in this case, those companies who are working on fossil free alternatives, for example). The FrameWorks Institute work in the main with larger national organisations which focus on social change, such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Equally Ours and Gender at Work both focus on social justice and equality issues specifically, and as such are more likely to work on the ground with women's organisations, equalities organisations, charities and community organisations, supporting them to deliver compelling, effective, strategic and gender competent communications. Gender at Work also engage highly effectively with teacher unions to deliver gender equality work across schools.

Opportunity Agenda, FRIDA and COFEM all engage at a more grassroots level. Both FRIDA and COFEM have an extensive database of community-focused organisations (either as members or those they fund). COFEM, working as a collective of activists, feminist academics, leaders and practitioners, is the only organisation we interviewed which focuses specifically on individuals as changemakers and supports them to deliver change. Opportunity Agenda works with some individuals (largely activists) as part of their capacity building and outreach. However, like those above, the majority of the focus is on supporting the activities and messaging of organisations – such as campaign groups – making change at a local or national level.

4.4. What common challenges do they face?

Financial sustainability and funding

Multiple organisations commented on the precarity of funding (particularly Gender at Work, FRIDA and COFEM). While the majority of organisations did not take state funding or were in receipt of minimal state funding, many were still beholden to trust funding and philanthropy, which – in the current global climate particularly – is increasingly difficult. Gender at Work specifically mentioned difficulties with the limited and competitive nature of gender equality-specific funding. For organisations working as consultancies and generating their own income, challenges around growth were identified. As the work being delivered is often to charities and third sector organisations with limited budgets, pricing needs to be competitive and appreciative of their financial positions.

Buy-in at leadership level and across an organisation

Gender at Work discussed the need for senior level buy-in to the culture change work being delivered. This was also echoed by others, including the FrameWorks Institute, who told us that organisations cannot deliver attitude change well if they see it as a one-off intervention. They explained that organisations need to use effective framing and messaging in all communications and across all projects, and to do so competently, full investment of both funding and time is required from every level of the organisation.

Knowing when to say no

BWA described challenges arising from the growing interest in behaviour science and attitude change and the wide array of work across this area. Given how complex the field is, it is critical or the institute to have a clear and consistent mission. They told us that while many potential clients or partners approach them, the challenge is knowing what is within the parameters of a clear and consistent mission and what is additional, or what 'muddies the waters' of the organisation's purpose. For example, BWA usually declines approaches to conduct evaluations on behaviour change interventions that they have not designed and co-delivered, as it is resource intensive to do so.

Multiple actors and multiple variables

As Common Cause expressed in their interview: "We realise it can't be one organisation or government that can do that. You need a whole swathe of the society to be adopting this sort of method." For change to be delivered, a challenge for any new organisation in Scotland will be to ensure buy-in across partners within the third sector, women's organisations, local and national government and public bodies. Our interviews and desk-based research made clear that a 'tipping point' of multiple actors is required to create change, and partnerships working on the same mission in the same way are particularly crucial.

4.5. Are these models 'effective'?

The organisations we researched utilise a range of intervention methods and theoretical underpinnings. However, some of the commonalities include spending time developing their own evidence base or theory of change for the approach they are using; an emphasis on building the capacity of others to apply new approaches; and the need to work deeply on an issue or with a stakeholder over a considerable period of time. The organisations range from behaviour change-focused, to attitude change-focused, to strategic communication-focused or a mixture of them all. For some, particularly the more gender-focused organisations, attitude change formed one part of a broader theory of change and set of activities, while others focused more specifically on behavioural and attitude science. Similarly, the varying methods used, the differing ultimate objectives of the organisations, the communities worked in and the length of time they have been operating makes them difficult to compare directly to one another.

As such, while the majority of the organisations we reviewed have annual reports and project evaluations, they varied considerably in terms of how they measure and think about the impact of their work – as well as how much funding they have available to do this – and do not tend to compare their chosen approach directly to others'. The different organisations also vary considerably in terms of their aims, meaning that it is difficult to

identify which approach is most 'successful' or 'effective'. It is also worth noting that a number of the behavioural change models are developed by private sector consultancies and, as such, need to be marketable to clients. Marketability which may be partly down to proof of effectiveness, but also to how appealing the idea and pitch is to a client. Similarly, as mentioned in section 3.4, marketing approaches such as 'nudge theory' have been criticised for creating an environment of 'manipulation' of behaviour rather than creating awareness and education to support proactive choices.[36]

While it is difficult to determine 'effectiveness', our analysis shows that the organisations using multiple types of interventions – including providing in-depth support to groups or partners to develop programmes at community level, delivering capacity building and training, and providing evidence-based tools and research insights for those on the ground – appear to have higher levels of engagement and a wider reach. This hypothesis is informed by the case studies, stakeholder lists on organisation websites and interviews with organisations. For example, organisations such as Equally Ours and multi-level campaigns like Time to Change have embedded community focused, co-production and participatory approaches as a core part of their work, alongside strategic communications.

In terms of addressing underlying gender norms and transforming gender equality, the movement-building and feminist funding organisations have the clearest and strongest articulations of theories of change, where attitude change is one part of a broader approach to tackling gender inequality. While a number of the behaviour science organisations look at the relationships of attitudes and behaviours to structural inequality, few regularly engage on reframing around gender norms specifically. More research on this topic could be worthwhile if strategic communications is of particular interest as an approach to attitude change on gender.

[36] See the Australian Prevention Partnership Centre conference video series https://www.saxinstitute.org.au/news/a-nudge-and-a-think-the-architecture-of-choice-and-health/

4.6. What does an inclusive, intersectional feminist approach look like?

A core aim of our research was to look not only at what kinds of approaches might be 'effective' at changing attitudes, but also where and how inclusive, intersectional feminist approaches are being used. At times, these concepts felt a little at odds with one another, as many of the more traditional ideas around evidence and effectiveness are based on what many organisations and individuals see as patriarchal notions of expertise and exclusivities around who holds and disseminates knowledge.

Common Cause recognises some of the issues inherent with being an organisation founded on "a body of research within the social psychology remit…that is normally led by Western white men in ivory towers in the UK and US". "A scientific way of knowing is also very Western and very privileged" a representative from Common Cause tells us. In order to engage with this, Common Cause are investing time in developing an 'embodied knowledge' approach, whereby people have the opportunity to think about their own values, the knowledge they hold within themselves, and the experiences they have had, rather than leading exclusively with what the evidence tells us. "I think one of the fundamental differences is recognising that we don't come in as 'experts'," said a representative from Gender at Work. "We acknowledge that the people in their own context know what they have to change better than us, and it's actually surfacing those and facilitating them to develop their own solutions."

What 'taking an intersectional feminist approach' looks like varies quite considerably according to different understandings of individuals and organisations. Too often, the term is inaccurately used interchangeably when organisations mean diversity or inclusion, although there is and should be a complementary overlap between these concepts. To apply an intersectional approach essentially means to acknowledge, examine and crucially address how overlapping structural inequalities impact different individuals and groups differently, and how these can be perpetuated by the systems, processes and analyses used by a group or organisation. Some of the core components mentioned by organisations and collectives who see themselves as taking both an explicitly intersectional and inclusive approach to transformative gender work include:

- ensuring intersectional gender competency in data analysis by digging deeper into existing evidence and statistics to see which groups of women are affected differently;
- ensuring that data collected is high quality and fully disaggregated to enable it to be analysed through an intersectional lens;

- rethinking what counts as 'expertise' or 'expert knowledge' (for example, FRIDA trains young feminist grantees as researchers);
- ensuring that organisations, collectives and projects are led by a truly diverse group of voices that are reflective of the groups that the organisation seeks to support, and that organisational systems are inclusive and participatory;[37]
- examining internal structures and power dynamics of the organisation, including who makes decisions and how decisions are reached about where resources come from and go to; [38]
- holding themselves accountable to the movements or groups they seek to support;
- supporting collaboration and creative thinking for work to challenge gender inequality;
- embedding self-care and community wellbeing as a political act to support the sustainability of feminist work and collective care for others working to challenge inequality; and
- ensuring that language and process are inclusive and accessible.

As mentioned in section 4.1, while a number of movement building and feminist funders take an explicitly intersectional feminist approach to their work, we could find few attitude-change organisations who do the same. "People panic at the thought of intersectionality due to its apparent 'shopping list nature'," said one research participant who is the intersectional lead at an LGBTQ+ equality organisation. "But if you're looking at people as individual people, it is an organic, person-centred approach."

On the other hand, COFEM has a 'feminist pocketbook' which includes tips on how to develop feminist coalitions, organisations and movements from an intersectional basis. It outlines how those with privilege must step back and engage in critical self-reflection, and explains

[37] Most of the organisations that spoke of themselves taking an explicitly intersectional approach also had some model of shared or collective leadership and participatory decision-making.

[38] In their 'Resource Mobilisation Ethics' (FRIDA 2020), FRIDA sets out a series of dilemmas about the origin of the money it accepts, its non-negotiables for fundraising and the characteristics of partners that it wants to actively seek out to engage with.

why organisations must amplify the voices of women who are historically marginalised and support women leaders from diverse backgrounds who actively drive changes in their own lives and communities (COFEM 2018). A representative from COFEM also talked to us about how important it is to think about the intersections of different oppressions faced by staff and partners within an organisation – particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic – and what this means for their day-to-day welfare and workload. "We're all experiencing a different kind of reality right now," she said. "We need to make sure that we are not driven by product creation and results, but by ensuring that each team member is able to do things in a way that is appropriate and effective for them." Gender at Work also notes that in its institutional capacity building programmes, it has increasingly started working with feminist and women's organisations to support them to address the "power relations within [their] organisations, create spaces for these issues to be surfaced and worked on as a collective problem in order to really allow them to walk the talk and live their feminist values in their organisation".

Processes around measuring impact and examining where and how funding is distributed are also crucial components of taking an intersectional and inclusive approach. A number of feminist movement building organisations have identified that cross-sectoral work (with communities facing marginalisation and oppression such as refugees, LGBTQ+ women, BAME communities, women who sell sex, and women with disabilities, for example) is particularly underfunded globally. For AWID, feminist funding can help resource these under-resourced areas, while also helping to shift dominant narratives and break down silos (Miller and Jones 2019). Researchers such as Hillenbrand et al. (2015) note the need for an intersectional feminist lens for monitoring, learning and evaluation that embraces complexity and captures the critical intersections of gender, race, class and sexuality. Our research thus far does not suggest that such a lens is common practice in the mainstream approaches to measuring attitude change or provision of funding and resources.

5. What can we learn from the Scottish landscape?

In this section, we turn to look at what exists in the current Scottish landscape in terms of data collection, attitude change initiatives and supporting institutions, and what gaps a new organisation might be able to fill.

5.1. What data is collected in Scotland?

The National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) and the Scottish Centre for Social Research (ScotCen) conduct baseline analysis (including the Scottish Social Attitudes Survey) which provides helpful data to better understand where the Scottish population stands on key issues. ScotCen repeats key questions regularly to gain insight into whether attitudes have changed – for example, they ask questions on attitudes around domestic violence at regular intervals and analyse any changes in views.

As already noted in section 2.2, when put together with other data sets from the UK and Europe, we have a small but growing set of baseline data around attitudes towards women and girls that touches on Scotland. Unfortunately, this consists predominantly of either one-off surveys or instances of one or two gender-related questions existing within a larger data set, making for a rather fragmented picture overall. Furthermore, as mentioned in the section 2.2, these data sets are still not being applied to, or being matched up with, attitude change mechanisms or initiatives. As a result, it is difficult to use them to ascertain any causal relationships between campaigns and project interventions and broader public attitudinal change, particularly as the data is often not localised enough or surveys run regularly enough (Crawley 2009; Marcus 2015; Banaszak and Ondercin 2016).

This is especially true for Scotland, where, according to an Equality and Human Rights Commission briefing paper on attitudes to discrimination and equalities in the Highlands, little to no data exists on attitude change or baselines at a local level (EHRC Scotland 2012). Similarly, little to no thorough data is available from communities or groups within Scotland to provide insight into how attitudes are formed or to understand baseline attitudes depending on race, class, gender or sexuality. We have also found no information about the degree of social contact between groups in Scotland, despite the number of interventions based on increasing social contact as a method of attitude change (Crawley 2005). However, as noted in section 4.1, some organisations are using community-based participatory research or community actions research to work collaboratively with communities to understand social dynamics, such as Community InfoSource[39] and the Scottish Community Development Centre.[40]

In addition to national survey institutes, there are a number of organisations monitoring and evaluating impact in the Scottish third sector. Social Value Lab,[41] based in Glasgow, provides a number of support measures to cross-sector clients, including service design, strategy development, social impact measurements and monitoring and evaluation. They describe their governance model as "social-purpose business; part-owned by employees, part-owned by leading charity CEIS [Community Enterprise in Scotland]" and have provided support and research on a range of issues, such as the role of local cinemas, partnership working and community development. The Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations (SCVO) also run regular trainings on monitoring, learning and evaluation.[42]

Evaluation Support Scotland[43] provides support for third sector bodies by upskilling staff to monitor and evaluate outcomes, with a focus on asking 'so what' questions. This means that rather than measuring the number of participants at a training as an outcome, third sector clients are asked, "so what?" – what impact has this had, and what change has this made? Their income comes from government grants, providing evaluation training and support to the third sector and, more recently, working with funders to provide support to grantees to develop evaluation tools and mechanisms. Interestingly, while it was established to support evaluation in the third sector, the organisation also now works closely with funders to build consensus around evaluation tools and measurements. However, from our interviews with practitioners, there seems to be a lag between joined up thinking amongst funders and the continued drive for activity-based evaluations on the ground. Evaluation Support Scotland does not hold research gathered by third sector clients, but rather provides spaces for knowledge sharing and inter-sector support.

[39] See https://www.infosource.org.uk/
[40] See https://www.scdc.org.uk/
[41] See http://www.socialvaluelab.org.uk/
[42] See https://scvo.org.uk/support/events/
[43] See https://evaluationsupportscotland.org.uk/

5.2. What gender and attitude change-related work and projects exist in Scotland?

The following are examples of direct and indirect gender and attitude change work happening in Scotland, either currently or in the recent past.

Equally Safe in Practice

Equally Safe[44] is a Scottish Government strategy for tackling violence against women that includes specific collaboration projects with direct and indirect attitude change efforts. Equally Safe in Practice is a project bringing together Scottish Women's Aid, Engender and the Improvement Service to create coherent, feminist and high-quality training on violence against women and girls and gender inequality more widely.[45] The project brings together workers from across the public sector and provides them with the space to learn about systemic gender inequality, its consequences for women, how it relates to violence against women and their own role in tackling it. To enable the creation of compelling training which changes minds, Scottish Women's Aid has commissioned a series of surveys and focus groups on messaging from YouGov, discussed previously in section 3.4.

Equally Safe at Work

Another part of the Equally Safe strategy, Equally Safe at Work,[46] led by Close the Gap,[47] works across seven local councils to improve employer practice and tackle violence against women. The project is delivered through training, employer policy development, data collection and analysis to enable employers to understand the causes and consequences of violence against women, as well as how they can create proactive and preventative cultures. The project has created an 'employer accreditation programme' to encourage engagement.

Education Scotland

Within Education Scotland[48] – a Scottish Government executive agency – sits a gender equality team whose remit is to work within early years, primary and secondary education spaces to promote gender equality within subject choices and to explore the pipeline of gendered education. The team provides training and resources for teachers and practitioners to challenge unconscious bias around gender, promote STEM subjects to all children and to champion equalities in their own school environments.

[44] See https://www.gov.scot/publications/equally-safe-scotlands-strategy-prevent-eradicate-violence-against-women-girls/

[45] See https://womensaid.scot/project/equally-safe-in-practice/

[46] See https://www.equallysafeatwork.scot/

[47] See https://www.closethegap.org.uk/

[48] See https://education.gov.scot/

Sport Scotland

Sport Scotland[49] created a good practice guide on 'Making women and girls more active' (2005) which also explored the cultural and social barriers women face, such as attitudes and prejudices about sexuality, disability and ethnicity. However, the recommendations emerging from this report are primarily about how to address the consequences of these attitudes (more accessible venues etc.), rather than the underlying causes. While Sport Scotland appears to still have a focus on women and equality in sport, it is not apparent if addressing underlying norms, attitudes and cultural barriers remains part of their strategy.

Gender Equal Media Scotland

Gender Equal Media Scotland[50] is a coalition of organisations and individuals, led by Engender and the University of Strathclyde, aims to improve the representation of women across Scottish media – as employees, contributors and subjects of media attention. It does this through media monitoring, data collection, events, blog writing and social media use. The indirect impact on attitude change comes from transformation of how Scottish media works and, therefore, transformation of the attitudes of those consuming it.

Attitude change-related training and intervention work

Multiple organisations, including Equate Scotland[51] and Amina Muslim Women's Resource Centre[52] deliver training across a number of issues, including unconscious bias, workplace practice, anti-racism and anti-islamophobia. This is delivered with a direct aim to challenge stereotypes and deliver attitude change and based on Scottish and international evidence. However, much like other interventions discussed, the impact on attitude change is not fully known or resourced enough to fully evaluate.

Violence against women organisations and initiatives to work on attitude change

A number of campaigns and programmes focusing on preventing GBV exist. Rape Crisis Scotland's 'This is not an invitation to rape me' campaign[53] focused on changing public attitudes towards common myths around rape, and Scottish Women's Aid's 2012 'Together we can stop it' campaign aimed to develop community responses to domestic abuse

[49] See https://sportscotland.org.uk/
[50] See https://www.genderequalmedia.scot/
[51] See https://equatescotland.org.uk/
[52] See https://mwrc.org.uk/
[53] See http://www.thisisnotaninvitationtorapeme.co.uk/

prevention. There are also many prevention packages aimed at formal education spaces, notably, Rape Crisis Scotland's prevention education programme (discussed in section 3.2) and Equally Safe in Higher Education at the University of Strathclyde.[54] Other work promoted with young people and practitioners working with young people include Zero Tolerance's 'Under Pressure' training programme[55] and the 'Mentors in Violence Prevention' programme developed by the Violence Reduction Unit.[56]

Across campaigns and programmes, we found a common gap to be the lack of accessible paper trail detailing what happened during these initiatives and what the impacts and learnings were. Since reporting back to funders must often be prioritised over sharing learning across and between communities and organisations (as discussed in section 3.3), funders have a role to play in supporting shared knowledge and learning through funding reports, applications and evaluations.

5.3. What lessons can be learned from other Scottish initiatives on attitude change?

While a specialist attitude change organisation focused on gender equality does not exist in Scotland, there are effective models in other areas which can be learned from in terms of ensuring well-evaluated projects; working across other equalities areas and supporting co-production and community engagement. For example, See Me (discussed in section 3.2) demonstrates the importance of long-term investment and a multi-intervention approach, and the prominent Time for Inclusive Education (TIE) Campaign,[57] a volunteer-led charity aiming to combat homophobia, biphobia and transphobia in schools with LGBTQ+ inclusive education, can be learned from in terms of attitude change interventions in education settings.

There are also growing numbers of BAME-led, anti-racist education initiatives across Scotland focusing on engaging educators, parents and students on anti-racism. One of our discussion group participants talked about how she works with her student teachers and teaching community to help change attitudes around race and create spaces for teachers to develop

[54] See https://www.strath.ac.uk/humanities/schoolofsocialworksocialpolicy/equally-safeinhighereducation/

[55] See https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/under-pressure/

[56] See https://www.svru.co.uk/mvp/

[57] See https://www.tiecampaign.co.uk/

an anti-racist consciousness. With her student teachers (predominantly from a white ethnic background) and through a programme for head teachers, she encourages them to think about "whiteness as an ideology and a social construct and to think about how all the systemic structures are kind of embedded within that". She told us, "I get them to think about themselves, their own lived experience, to think about how they can begin to widen that to think about how they plan effective teaching and learning experiences for young people". She has also instigated a programme for universities to sign up to an anti-racist declaration and commit to decolonising their curriculums.

We can learn from the Independent Care Review's co-production and narrative change model, and from their commitment to recruiting experts on communications, engagement, data analysis and research delivery.[58] A lot can be learned, too, from work undertaken by the SHRC on attitudes towards human rights. In 2017, the SHRC teamed up with YouGov to test and identify the impact of different messages on people's attitudes towards human rights in Scotland (SHRC 2018). The project was very well received by other third sector organisations, and research participants noted that it would be worthwhile repeating the research in future to see where things have changed. Some of the key findings from this work – for example, that messages on disabled people's rights are best delivered by a disability campaigner rather than the head of a formal organisation or similar – would be very helpful for any new organisation looking at attitudes towards women's rights and equality. Learning can also be taken from the Wellbeing Economy Alliance Scotland,[59] which has worked to create a significant shift in narrative on how the economy should work in a relatively short period of time, creating policy and commentary interest that did not previously exist.

Various organisations and groups in Scotland advocate for 'whole school approaches' on addressing equality and anti-discrimination issues within the education environment, and see schools as a key space for challenging norms around gender, sexuality and race. For example, TIE, who work collaboratively with a number of quality and education organisations across Scotland, made 33 recommendations for LGBT-inclusive education that were accepted by the Scottish Government in 2018 (LGBTI Inclusive Education Working Group 2018). While these were not specifically framed as attitude change work, ideas around wider culture change within schools are embedded within the recommendations. It is not clear whether this desired culture change has been evaluated or reviewed since the campaign's recommendations have been taken up, but this could be a key source of learning for a new organisation focused on attitude change around gender. Similarly, Education Scotland talked to us about the importance of whole school approaches, while recognising that "teachers are [both] signed up to social justice" and on a "learning journey"– and that take up of new approaches can't be "imposed".

[58] See https://www.carereview.scot/

[59] See https://wellbeingeconomy.org/scotland

5.4. What's missing from the Scottish landscape?

A key gap mentioned by everyone we spoke to is the lack of longitudinal, tailored evidence around what works and what doesn't work in changing attitudes within Scotland, with one participant commenting: "We need analysis of big issues." There is very little data available on the effectiveness of attitude change efforts of any kind in Scotland. While some interventions have been evaluated (such as See Me), the majority of work is untested and/or includes very light-touch evaluation. While both Social Value Lab and Evaluation Support Scotland provide support to Scottish organisations on measuring impact and effectiveness, neither have a specific model for attitude change or gender norm work.

Participants in discussion groups also referenced the lack of information and evidence on good practice, and particularly the lack of Scotland-specific data. While participants knew where to find baseline information (e.g. Scottish Social Attitudes Survey), they acknowledged that information on why attitudes are formed in a certain way, how attitudes can be changed and what delivery models work to make change happen was missing. Useful one-off sets of evidence – for example, SHRC's 2018 findings on attitudes towards human rights – were noted as being in need of a refresh, particularly given the changes we have seen in the political and social landscape during recent years. While some interventions have delivered evaluations (such as Time to Change), these have been costly and, despite significant resourcing, have not always been thorough. Discussion group participants also identified a problem with how and when evaluations occur, explaining that the reliance on 'self-reporting' in evaluation leads to biased data. Another key gap is message testing, which is generally considered an expensive and time-consuming activity for small organisations whose primary work is delivering services or support to particular groups.

Similarly, lack of understanding of intersectionality, lack of intersectional analysis or practice and lack of intersectional data was repeatedly mentioned as a gap in the Scottish landscape. Specific mention was made of the lack of intersectional approaches to gender equality attitude change, and the fact that this indirectly causes problems. For example, using images of white women only or visibly able-bodied women can create exclusionary practice, and using data which sees women as a homogenous group can render the reality for BAME women invisible.

Of equal concern was the lack of opportunity to collaborate across the women's movement in Scotland, and the lack of spaces to learn from one another, work in partnerships and think collectively and strategically about 'big picture' issues like gender norms and attitude change. One of our RAG participants said she is "yearning for collaborative space in which those with gender expertise and anti-racist practice, and disability and able activism, could theorise and deeply engage". This collaborative space does exist to some extent, largely in an ad hoc way through the work of national women's organisations and events hosted by the NACWG). However, there is clearly appetite from participants for this to become a formalised

space to encourage collaboration and learning across the women's movement and wider equalities and community organisations and groups. Many participants voiced frustration with working across silos or being 'locked out' of existing spaces: "We don't need to reinvent the wheel, the model works, there's lots of good stuff, sometimes we make something our own rather than sharing resources." Duplication, silos, distrust and exclusion were recurring themes with the practitioners we spoke with, particularly relating to mainstream feminist organisations, schools and teachers.

Similarly, while there are a number of sector-specific spaces for capacity building, many of our research participants said these are felt to be "the same faces" or "the same exclusionary spaces" and that there is a high degree of power imbalance in Scotland's third sector. A number of women of colour in one of the discussion groups said that their perspectives are "not just marginalised and minoritized but totally invisible" and that they often find themselves as the one BAME representative in a group of women having to be the "voice of lived experience". This appears to be self-perpetuating, as women from diverse backgrounds are increasingly less likely to participate the less diverse the spaces become. One participant said that any new organisation "absolutely has to cover the intersectionality from my perspective otherwise I would just disengage". Scotland's women's sector was also described by one RAG participant as "fraught with turf issues", and so the tight-knit sector might struggle to open up to new models and ways of working, particularly if there is increased competition for funds.

In order for attitude change to be delivered well, a number of actors, across multiple levels, need to be working together with similar methods and messaging. Yet there is a potential lack of community investment and support for more informal groups and initiatives to participate in bigger-picture thinking. Many participants noted the difficulty in working on short-term projects in terms of relationships they were able to build with other organisations, communities or groups, as well as output-driven funding arrangements. One participant noted that "unless you've got a good relationship in schools and lots of follow up, you're just a tick box".

Finally, a number of discussion group participants felt that, for various reasons, including the COVID-19 pandemic, now is a good time to be engaging with the public around their attitudes towards equality and rights. One disability rights campaigner talked about how COVID-19 has "helped people to understand what restrictions that are external to the self can do and how impactful that can be on your life just through the lens of having to live through lockdown". An abortion rights campaigner from Northern Ireland talked about how policy change to decriminalise abortion has opened up space for new conversations with the public on reproductive rights in countries yet to decriminalise abortion, such as Scotland. However, other groups, such as LGBTQ+ and BAME organisations, expressed worry over a regression of public attitudes and perceptions around equality and rights.

6. The design and direction of a new gender equality and attitude change organisation in Scotland

In this section we consider whether attitude change is transformative, recommend guiding principles for a new organisation, and outline potential strategic priorities, stakeholders and business models for consideration.

6.1. Reflections on 'Gender Institute': Is this the right name?

From the learning we have gained in the previous sections, and reflection on the importance of rethinking power hierarchies within the field, we are concerned that the terminology of 'Gender Institute' is no longer fit for purpose. While we appreciate that 'Gender Institute' was an interim title given to kick-start this work, members of the RAG, as well as participants in the discussion groups, expressed concern that the term 'institute' feels "academic or elite". Given the emphasis that the researchers, participants and literature have placed on participation, collaboration and power as foundational tools to change attitudes, we would recommend a more inclusive and accessible name for any organisation going forward, such as the 'Scottish Centre for Gender Equality in Social Attitudes'.

The term 'gender' is also being used in 'Gender Institute' without a clear definition of whether the work would focus on gender and gender identity in its widest sense, or on a slightly narrower area of attitudes towards women and girls (fully inclusive of trans women). Our understanding from the original recommendation – derived from the NACWG's first year of work through

a participatory and inclusive process – was that the identified need is for an organisation to focus on attitude change to improve the lives of women and girls. However, within this, we see the organisation engaging with the impact of gender norms and stereotypes on women's economic, social and political equality, and the relationship between gender norms, attitudes and behaviours, which we recognise have negative implications for wider sections of society in addition to women and girls. Consequently, while we recommend that the focus remains on changing prejudicial and negative attitudes and gender norms that affect self-identifying women and girls, we do not believe that any of the three models would need to be a women-only space (though women-only spaces may emerge as parts of the models). This view is based on feedback from research participants, as well as a desire to ensure that the burden of changing attitudes and 'fixing' gender norms does not fall only to women.

6.2. Is attitude change transformative?

While attitude change is at the heart of this project – what works, what are other organisations doing, what can we learn – a question was raised during our first RAG meeting around whether attitude change work can actually lead to the transformative changes needed to progress women's rights and dismantle structural inequalities. We believe, therefore, that it is important to question and reflect on whether attitude change is what the new organisation would ultimately want to measure, as well as how it might go about doing so. For, as Hillenbrand et al. (2015) remind us: "gender-transformative change questions internalized belief systems and closely held identities, challenges entrenched institutionalized structures, and deals with everyday habits and relationships that may be caring as well as unequal. Such change is often emergent rather than linear; it is multidimensional and sensitive to diverse actors' experiences of change."

While the evidence we have collated is inconclusive on attitude change as the central component of change, it suggests that attitude change can form one element of wider structural, transformative change and be an important lever for pushing decision-makers. However, as Cislaghi and Heise (2020) argue, when it comes to gender-related practices, changing people's beliefs is not enough to achieve norm change and eventually change people's actions. Change in gender norms would "require change in institutional policies, people's narrative, power relations and media discourse, to cite but a few examples" (Cislaghi and Heise 2020). Researchers looking at race equality have also noted that, due to resistance to talking about 'race' and racism in mainstream settings (something which may prove challenging for intersectional feminism), it may make sense to find levers for change other than public opinion – particularly given how resource intensive public facing campaigns can be and how difficult it is

to measure outcomes (Crawley 2009; Lingayah et al. 2018). A disability rights campaigner who joined one of our discussion groups mentioned that a key barrier to progress on disabled people's rights is needing people to understand that it is societal changes that are required, rather than simply individual attitudes – which is where a lot of current interventions sit.

Analysing the way attitudes are formed and their impact on policy making and political decision-making also provides insight into how attitudes are both an influencer of and influenced by policy decisions. For example, the equal marriage campaign in Scotland[60] involved efforts over years to challenge and change attitudes around same-sex relationships through campaigns, education, popular culture and through the hard work of grassroots groups and third sector organisations. As attitudes changed, more progressive policy changes were pursued by successive governments as a consequence of voter attitudes and increasing public buy-in. At the same time, policy changes around same-sex marriage and change in the status quo created by legislative change improved attitudes towards same-sex relationships. As found by the Scottish Social Attitudes Survey (ScotCen 2015), the proportion who view same-sex relationships as "not wrong at all" has risen from 29% in 2000 to 59% in 2015 (legislation on same-sex marriage passed in December 2014).

However, our analysis also suggests that an overly technical focus on attitude change can risk depoliticising the ultimate goal. It could also potentially pull work away from radical action and whole system change towards models that fit with current patriarchal notions of how third sector (and public sector) work should happen, particularly if limited to awareness-raising activities or simple sign-up campaigns. We recommend that any organisation would need to engage with this question by regularly asking itself if, when and how power is being redistributed as a result of attitude change work.

We also recommend that attitude change is seen as a means to achieve both specific and 'higher purpose' goals rather than an end in itself, and as intimately linked to other strategies and priorities for transformative change. As such, we concur with Gaventa (2006): "those seeking to challenge power in all of its spaces, levels and forms need to search not for one solution, but to build multiple, linked strategies and in different sequences, depending on the starting point in any given context. The challenge is to understand what these strategies might be, and how they can be linked to realign all of the dimensions of power. That is when transformative change might really occur."

[60] See https://scvo.org/policy/campaigns/20-years-delivering-change/equal-marriage/

6.3. What might some guiding principles be for an inclusive and effective new organisation?

Our objective for this project was to draw on the learning gathered from participants, the literature and our organisational reviews to recommend three potential models for a body that could change attitudes in relation to gender equality in Scotland. Before proposing the models, in this section we will outline 10 guiding principles to enable any new organisation to have an impact on the lives of women and girls while embodying and enabling feminist, anti-racist, anti-ableist and trans-inclusive values. We recommend that any model going forward is founded on the following 10 principles.

1. Collaborative and collective approaches to building the organisation, as well as to ongoing decision-making and governance

Our findings suggest that it is hugely important for the design and strategy of any model to be developed collaboratively, and that co-production is central. In our discussion groups, a number of comments were made about the need to avoid replicating hierarchical structures found in national policy making or other government-led initiatives. Instead, we should seek out good practice on participation and power sharing to learn from the multiple ways of organising within gender equality spaces that support consensus and collaboration without losing designated roles and responsibilities.

This participatory, collective approach should be built in from the very beginning and be part of how any model is designed, established and executed. However, it is also important to remember that, while it is unlikely that an organisation can be truly intersectional if it is not collaborative and participatory in nature, collaboration does not, in itself, ensure intersectionality. Therefore, we recommend taking care to ensure that various barriers and invisible power dynamics are made explicit to ensure meaningful and diverse participation. As one discussion group participant explained, it's about having to "live those values".

2. Centring experiences of diverse women and examining ideas around 'expertise'

A number of younger women and women of colour participants in the discussion group said that a barrier to participation would be if a future organisation "didn't look like them", and others mentioned the importance of centring lived experience. As such, any model should challenge received notions of where evidence and knowledge come from by centring the experiences of women, marginalised groups and grassroots changemakers. It should also be led by the women from the communities where and for whom change is being sought and remain grounded in local knowledge and solutions. Some of the models we propose – such as a collaborative space and feminist funding – lend themselves to this more readily, however, it is important within all models of working. Any intervention designed or supported by a new organisation will require a high degree of understanding of the nature of the problem and those affected by it, as well as a high degree of targeting using processes such as community action research.

A new organisation should avoid reconstituting existing norms around power, decision-making and ways of knowing or understanding. It should engage consistently with questions around who participates in research gathering and who is 'learned from'. One discussion group participant explicitly stated the need to avoid being part of, or creating, a "feminist patriarchy". A further core element to this principle is to ensure that people are not being expected to work for free, as this tends to privilege those who already have access to such spaces.

3. Recognising that attitude change requires long-term engagement and sustained multi-track interventions

This, in aggregate, can target individual and group attitudes as well as behaviours, communities, systems and structures, and is resource intensive work. Any model also needs to recognise the centrality of relationship building and community work to long-term attitude change and the need to create and support sustainable models of working that can maintain and build on these relationships.

4. Recognising the importance of highly tailored and small-scale community interventions to an overall picture of change

Across research it is clear that, while overarching frameworks, messaging methods and attitude change methods can be applied relatively widely, a tailored approach to smaller audiences is likely to be most effective. One research participant said that although learning between and across communities is crucial, it is important to recognise communities and audiences are "all different, especially when it comes to levers for attitude change". Linked to this, discussion groups mentioned the need for community participation and co-production in intervention development, to ensure that methods utilised are relevant and appropriate.

5. Building upon existing work in Scotland and helping build bridges across sectors and communities

Each potential model will need to take into account the wide range of individuals and organisations in Scotland already working effectively at smaller scales - often on a voluntary basis – on projects which contribute to attitude change. It will be essential to support these actors rather than increase their workloads or burden, and to learn from existing work on the ground. This will require working collaboratively with stakeholders to develop priority areas and a framework for change, while taking care to avoid exacerbating silos or separating change models from wider aims around addressing structural inequalities.

6. Understanding and challenging power dynamics

Models that aim to support gender equality must have a deep understanding of feminist principles around power; that is, they must support 'giving power to', rather than 'having power over'. As such, work should support movement building, sustainability and wellbeing, intergenerational learning and amplifying the voices of groups that hold least power. We recommend working to build inclusive alliances and collaborations across Scotland, as well as mechanisms within which a wide range of diverse stakeholders are able to hold any new organisation to account.

7. Prioritising intersectional approaches and analysis across all streams of work

Regardless of which model is taken forward, it should be committed to delivering intersectional analysis and embodying an intersectionality competent culture. This would mean that outputs are analysed through an intersectional lens, data that recommendations are built on are intersectional, and intersectional thinking is embedded in training, network building and delivery. To enable this, expertise on intersectional analysis and gender competence should be sought out, and those with the greatest degrees of privilege invited to step back and engage in critical self-reflection.

8. Ensuring safe, inclusive and accessible spaces online and offline that promote community wellbeing

To be truly safe, inclusive and accessible, spaces that enable conversation and dialogue must also create safe boundaries within which to do the work. This means not only creating policies around language but also encouraging reflections on leadership, role modelling and power. “Speaking in plain English is really important,” said one research participant.

9. Working towards systemic, transformative change

Work to change attitudes cannot exist in isolation from an understanding of systemic inequality, and so any attitude change work taken forward must be embedded in system-wide change. We recommend developing capacity and conducting robust analysis to build understanding of how institutionalised inequality sustains and embeds harmful attitudes while harmful attitudes sustain and embed institutionalised inequality.

10. Embracing complexity, risk and failure

Systemic change will need to be supported by a bold vision to try, learn, fail and try again. Not all activities will work, and not all projects will be a success, but enabling teams, individuals and communities to share failures and lessons honestly and openly will build understanding of works and what doesn't. "It's OK for some things not to work," said one research participant. "Without funder buy-in [to the idea of risk and failure], it is difficult to have honest learning." Establishing a culture that enables risks and supports failure as part of the learning process will enable more long-term change. This work has demonstrated that attitude change on women's rights and equality is likely to be emergent rather than linear, and that it will likely remain unclear how much time complex social change will take – regardless of how much evidence is collated. Any future model must also recognise that progressing gender equality and women's rights is inherently political work that requires transforming deeply embedded patriarchal structures (COFEM 2018).

6.4. Who would a new organisation collaborate with?

Following the first RAG meeting, it was concluded that a new organisation should not be a delivery body working directly with a particular audience whose minds it is looking to change. Instead, it should work with organisations to support others' interventions. As such, the organisation's key method of achieving its vision would be supporting changemakers in Scotland who are working towards a shared goal.

A number of research participants talked about the need for any new organisation to involve "not the usual suspects" and for the organisation to "look different" to what currently exists in Scotland. "It should be a voice that amplifies the voices of established organisations, not recreating [the] wheel," one explained. Participants also noted the importance of working across sectors and silos and breaking down barriers of distrust and exclusion: "It can't replicate the exclusionary structures that already exist, we need this to do things differently, so more people deliver attitude change."

While the exact groups the centre would collaborate with, and the kind of support it would provide, would vary according to the model chosen (see section 7), it is likely that any models would seek to work with a range of individuals and groups including third sector organisations, women's and equalities organisations, community organisations, informal networks, groups on the ground, church and faith groups, young people, individual activists, social change influencers, citizen journalists and allies within traditional, social and entertainment media. We would envisage these stakeholders coming from a wide range of areas relating to women's rights and equality and including those engaged with equality and rights of BAME women, immigrant and refugee women, LGBTQ+ women, rural women, disabled women, care-experienced women and women in poverty.

The organisation would also seek to collaborate with and support emerging changemakers, whether young people engaging in gender equality work or adults developing their understanding of the issues, as well as individuals and groups who have lived experience of the harmful impact of gender norms and negative attitudes. The need to acknowledge the individual journey people go on while developing their understanding of gender equality issues was reflected both by RAG members and participants in our interviews, who noted the importance of allowing time and space to reflect, learn and develop. In all models, we would see these stakeholders as having key leadership and decision-making roles. "This group is where we see expertise coming from," concluded one group of research participants.

We envisage that, depending on the model chosen, the new organisation would also seek input from university and private sector research teams working on attitude, behaviour or social change, as well as think tanks, national survey bodies and specialist social marketing experts. Additionally, there are many potential links within the existing Scottish landscape; such as awareness raising through Education Scotland, working with funders on developing evaluation models through Evaluation Support Scotland, or exploring gendered service design through Social Value Lab. Media and business were, in the main, not identified as key stakeholders by the research participants, but should be engaged with through other women's organisations and projects such as Gender Equal Media Scotland. However, in alignment with the core principles, any new model would work alongside, rather than for, existing projects, businesses and groups. This list of stakeholders should not be seen as 'set in stone', but rather flexible and adaptable to a new organisation's priorities and areas of activity.

6.5. What are the potential strategic priorities and areas of engagement for a new organisation focusing on attitude change?

In our review of attitudinal change literature, projects, organisations and practice, as well as through our participatory action research workshops with practitioners, we have developed a number of potential strategic priorities and areas of engagement that may be considered for a new organisation focusing on attitude change and gender equality in Scotland. While each of these priorities is reflected within existing equalities work, a new organisation offers an opportunity to bring together diverse voices and groups in a strategic, collaborative way. Potential strategic priorities include:

- working with communities;
- working with young people;
- working with men and boys;
- creating effective messaging for communication campaigns (and tackling backlash);
- changing representations in media and popular culture to change attitudes on women's and girls' rights and equality;
- working with businesses and public sector; and
- engaging with attitude change through activism and using attitude change to disrupt power.
- Empowering women to engage in attitude change work, and to call out behaviour and unjust treatment as it happens, was also considered as stand-alone area for activity. However, it was felt by the research team that this could be embedded across the above areas in ways that avoid placing additional burden on women as agents of change. Instead, emphasis could be placed on developing feminist leadership in attitude change work across the board and a systems-change focus within the new organisation itself.

However, when discussing potential strategic priorities with research participants and the RAG, many of those in the practitioners group were of the view that strategic priorities should be set once the organisation has formed, and only in collaboration with experts, women's organisations and with diverse community voices to ensure an inclusive and intersectional approach. According to one practitioner, "It is not an inclusive model if it is predetermined".

We also identified the following as potential areas of activity which could be applied across the strategic areas outlined above.[61]

1. Facilitating space for collaboration and movement building for individuals and groups working on attitude change

This could include linking up smaller and bigger organisation for increased impact and scale; supporting collective and transformative leadership and co-production of ideas and projects; sharing achievements and successes as well as lessons learned; and convening hackathon-style collaborative design events. Such a space could help build on what has already been tried, create learning between different groups and sectors, help to avoid duplication of efforts and work towards creating a critical mass needed for change. "On collaboration, any mechanism that makes people who tell their stories or whatever else it is they're doing feel connected to a bigger whole in some way is a positive thing," said one participant. "People can feel very isolated and alone."

2. Providing training and capacity building opportunities, with an emphasis on participatory methodologies, action[62] and peer learning

This could include mentoring; sabbaticals and placements; participatory workshops; training of trainers programmes; 'unlearning' activities; and interactive seminar programmes with 'big picture' thinkers. One research participant mentioned the value of providing such training to individuals and informal groups as well as to established organisations, as a way of making the training more embedded in communities and more sustainable.

[61] For a visualisation of this process, see https://miro.com/app/board/o9J_kpqq7IU=/

[62] See, for example, Gender at Work's action learning model https://genderatwork.org/gender-action-learning/

3. ### Undertaking 'desk-based' research and collating existing evidence from different areas of intervention, with an emphasis on gender norms and how attitude change interacts with systemic inequality

This could include curating 'banks' of resources and creating online resource hubs on international and local best practice; undertaking systematic reviews or 'meta-analysis' of interventions in specific areas; producing accessible printed and virtual toolkits; and sharing good practice and processes.

4. ### Developing a Scottish evidence base on areas such as strategic communication and community engagement

This could include partnering with national survey institutions to develop and run regular attitude surveys specific to gender equality (with well-disaggregated data); mapping Scotland's 'changemaker' landscape and lessons learned from past initiatives; testing messaging on particular areas related to gender equality; and undertaking community research designed to understand and challenge underlying gender norms.

5. ### Supporting Scottish organisations to understand and evaluate the impact of their existing work, and target their work

This could include evaluating projects on their behalf; providing tailored frameworks, tools and training on participatory monitoring and evaluation and theory of change; helping design and test approaches; and helping organisations identify and work with key groups (particularly young people, men and boys and those who remain undecided on key issues).

6. ### Providing feminist funding

This could include giving small to medium grants for existing and new projects; providing collaboration grants; and providing core funding for organisations and groups that are struggling to find time and capacity for 'bigger picture' thinking around gender norms and attitude change. From our research, feminist funding focused on evidence-based attitude change interventions was mentioned as a helpful addition that might increase ability and willingness of smaller and informal groups to take part. However, care would need to be taken to avoid replicating existing competitive funding frameworks or placing strain on current funding allocations for equalities and women's organisations.

7. Providing ongoing wellbeing support for individuals and organisations

This could include supporting organisations to build strategies for addressing backlash; liaising with the media and supporting women to tell their stories safely; responding to burnout; and building in the emotional sustainability of an organisation or group. Care would need to be taken to ensure that appropriate expertise was identified for areas where specialist support is required, such as sexual violence.

8. Developing and testing new intervention models in collaboration with specific community and third sector partners

Our discussions found little support for a new organisation to do this at the outset, however, activities of this nature might arise organically from other, more foundational activities around collaborative learning and research.

9. Providing institutional capacity building for public bodies, media organisations and businesses to address gender stereotyping within their systems and processes

This could also include supporting funding organisations to embed good practice around gender and attitude change in their funding objectives.

10. Collaboratively developing an overarching, multi-strand campaign model on a specific issue negatively impacting women and girls in Scotland

This could be, for example, on attitudes around consent or attitudes towards migrant women.

In discussion with practitioners and the RAG, the first six areas of activity were the most popular, and the final two the least. However, it was also noted that many of these areas overlap, and all had some value.
Of particular note is that there was little support for an organisation to deliver change or interventions directly, or to develop a campaign on one particular area.

6.6. What are some potential business models for a new organisation?

In terms of the business model and governance structure for a new organisation, we reviewed the following options.

- Semi-governmental commission business model

While it has been indicated that this proposed new organisation would be government funded, at least in terms of set-up costs, a number of our discussion group participants felt it important that the organisation maintain autonomy from the government in order to retain the ability to challenge government where necessary. As such, some participants did not wish to see a 'top-heavy', quasi-governmental 'commission' model, as they did not see such it as being accessible, inclusive or responsive enough to changing climate and administrations. Many also raised concerns about people being less willing to be involved if conversations were open to freedom of information requests.

However, in some discussion groups, participants felt that the organisation should have a statutory underpinning of some kind to signify commitment at the national level for the work, as well as to provide the infrastructure, resourcing and support needed to gain buy-in from groups out with the equalities field. One person noted that there would need to be firm commitment from the Scottish government "to learn and listen from the institute, regardless of leadership".

- Nested or hosted project or secretariat business model

Another option is an organisation that is independent of government and housed either by an existing equalities organisation, between women's organisations, and/or by a gender competent community-focused

organisation. This has, in the past, been a relatively common way for new human rights and women's organisations to start up in Scotland. In these cases, organisations have generally been hosted by one, relatively sizable organisation. However, an option suggested by one of our interviewees was that the new organisation's staff could actually be hosted across multiple different organisations, similar to the model of Menu For Change[63] – a project established to tackle food insecurity in Scotland. In this structure, each host organisation would employ one staff member with an agreement in place for how they form a secretariat with staff hosted across other organisations.

There could be a number of advantages with this 'multi-nest' model. For instance, it would enable formation of a network of organisational partners across sectors and bring diverse perspectives to the table. It may also support a breaking down of silos and encourage collaborative working and a shifting of power hierarchies within the sector, with more support for community groups working across different issues and in different locations. Despite COVID-19 restrictions on office working, the need for physical spaces located across the country still remains a potential opportunity for collaboration and participation.

However, there are a number of different challenges associated with this model, particularly around who and where the host organisation(s) would be, what the respective roles and responsibilities will be, and what constraints and limitations a particular host organisation might come with. The difficulties of being hosted in a highly bureaucratic system or within an organisation lacking a robust understanding of gender equality, for example, would create unnecessary barriers to success for any new organisation. Parameters would need to be clearly set out and agreed at the outset to mitigate this, as well as a clear separation of staff and resourcing.

[63] See https://menuforchange.org.uk/

"The organisation or project that is being hosted needs to develop its own way of being and its own values," said one interviewee. "This can be difficult if there's a lack of clarity or tension with the host." Similarly, developing shared values across multiple existing organisations could also be complex in the 'multi-nest' model. The extent to which the new organisation is known to be 'hosted' and what this would mean for the perceived agenda of the new organisation is also a consideration, as is the organisational, financial and existing staffing capacity of the host organisations(s), particularly if the preferred hosts are smaller, frontline-facing community organisations who are likely already overstretched and overburdened.

- ### Independent charity model

A number of participants favoured an independent charity model, feeling it would enable any new organisation to establish autonomy and participation from the start. In particular, if a new organisation were to be established as a two-tier membership Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO),[64] it would be able to co-create a formal constitution and ways of working with government and power holders within a potential membership model.

However, considering the traditionally scarce funding landscape for both equalities organisations and start-ups, as well as the time required to set up an organisation from scratch and navigate the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR)[65] process, the practical difficulties of developing this model may outweigh some of the benefits. Additionally, although a two-tier membership SCIO model is seemingly well-suited to the principles outlined in section 6.3, the process of membership development will likely be a full-time role in the organisation's inception, and large funders are potentially unlikely to support an untested model to develop this work. Some existing women's organisations also noted the potential difficulties of a new, 'fully formed' organisation emerging within what is already quite a tight-knit ecosystem of women's organisations, foreseeing difficulties around negotiating mandates and avoiding toe-stepping on what is seen as existing organisations' 'territory'.

[64] See https://www.oscr.org.uk/becoming-a-charity/becoming-a-scio/

[65] See https://www.oscr.org.uk/

- ## Independent not-for-profit consultancy model

While an independent not-for-profit consultancy might enjoy the same potential benefits of an independent charity model – autonomy and participation – it also comes with added benefits of flexibility, responsiveness to changing needs of stakeholders, and the ability to set its own agenda rather than respond to funders' demands. The majority of the behavioural change organisations we looked at outside of Scotland were small to medium-sized consultancies.

A consultancy model could also offer training and events packages, as well as bespoke research, in order to generate additional income. However, the drawbacks of this model are also related to funding and resourcing. While some women's organisations in Scotland are pursuing alternative income generation avenues through consultancy, the returns are still minimal in comparison to public funding required for them to successfully deliver their work. Efforts to raise such income may also add pressure on their core delivery and purpose, making it difficult to carve out and maintain space for reduced-cost work. To mitigate this risk, consultancy packages would need to be focused and specific.

Almost all those we spoke to as part of this project preferred either the independent charity model or the nested project or secretariat model, although, notably, a number of people felt strongly in favour of one rather than the other. There is potential to pull together these findings to develop a hybrid model. A nested project model with an income generating stream that becomes an independent charity over the first three years, for example, could create a more sustainable and autonomous model than any of the options above. For all business models, we recommend starting small and scaling up over time, with a particular emphasis on building in participatory decision-making processes involving a wide range of stakeholders at every stage of development. We recognise that this would need to be facilitated carefully in order to ensure that a range of diverse voices are heard and more established voices prevented from dominating.

7. Conclusion: Three potential models for a 'Scottish Centre for Gender Equality in Social Attitudes'

Analysis of literature in this area, interviews with multiple comparative organisations and focus group discussions with the RAG, practitioners and campaigners across the women's and equalities sector in Scotland has led us to propose the following models as a route map for how a 'Scottish Centre for Gender Equality in Social Attitudes' could be formed.

The three proposed models for the new organisation are:

1. a collaboration and movement building space for diverse changemakers to come together and co-produce and lead on projects and knowledge across sectors;

2. a project development and learning hub to support existing projects and programmes; or

3. a research and practice centre focusing on gendered strategic communications and community-based research.

Each of the three models work as a standalone organisation. However, we believe as a research team that the most effective version would be a larger, long-term organisation that incorporates elements of all three models as its core programmes of work – movement building, capacity building and research. We also believe that it is important for those who will be working with, and benefiting from, the new organisation to be involved in the next stages of choosing, developing and laying the groundwork for the most suitable model.

As such, we have also developed a foundation model which we strongly recommend is seen as the next step for the formation of a 'Scottish Centre for Gender Equality in Social Attitudes'. The development and input across the first year of the foundation model will provide a route map to establish which of the three follow-up models (or which combination of models) should be pursued. The foundation model helps to create further space for this next stage of participatory modelling and decision-making.

Our proposal is that all three models (plus the foundation model) share the same vision, overall mission and values, as well as a common thread. Their difference lies in their specific mission statement in how they will work towards fulfilling their mission and achieving their vision.

Vision

A world in which self-identifying women and girls are able to live authentically and free from inequality, violence and harmful stereotypes.

Overall Mission

To address harmful gender norms and facilitate a long-term shift in public attitudes towards women's and girls' rights and equality by supporting changemakers in Scotland who are working towards this goal.

This includes, but is not limited to, shifting attitudes and gender norms around:

- violence against women and girls;
- women's education, economic activities and division of labour;
- women's voice, decision-making and power;
- women's bodies; and
- specific groups of women, including, but not limited to, BAME women, migrant women, younger and older women, LGBTQ+ women and disabled women.

Values

We envisage the new organisation being underpinned by feminist, anti-racist, anti-ableist and trans-inclusive principles. As such, this organisation will:

- centre the experiences of diverse women and girls;
- amplify the voices of those who experience systemic inequality and oppression;
- take a collaborative and participatory approach to decision-making;
- prioritise intersectional approaches and analysis across all streams of work;
- ensure safe, inclusive spaces online and offline that promote community wellbeing;
- work towards systemic, transformative change; and
- be open to complexity, riskand failure.

Common Thread

Any future model should design and deliver capacity building training to support evidence-based attitude change interventions. It should be a 'library' of expertise, where relevant research is collated, and where open source publications, good practice guides and/or tailored briefings on effective attitude change examples – with Scotland-specific guidance on application – can be found.

7.1. Foundational Model: A participatory approach to choosing and developing a model for a new organisation

Throughout the development of this foundational model – in the brief literature review on 'what works', from interviews with comparable organisations across the world and from focus group discussions with those who would be working with a new organisation – inclusive decision-making, participatory methods, preventing any one-size-fits-all approach and a focus on practical application were repeatedly emphasised. In order for the Scottish Government to fund a new organisation with buy-in from across the third sector, communities and the women's sector, this learning must be incorporated into how any model is finally shaped into a 'viable' organisation.

We recommend this foundation model as a next step following the commissioning of this background report and exploratory model development. Please note, we strongly recommend that this is a foundation model only, designed to be followed by one (or more) of the three larger and long-term funded models detailed below.

This foundation model should initially be funded for one year and hosted within one or more existing women's, equalities or community-focused organisations. The host organisation(s) should share the values outlined above and demonstrate a firm commitment to, and understanding of, gender equality. The core focus of the foundation model's activity would be delivering a participatory process and establishing buy-in to identify how the organisation can further develop to deliver what is needed in Scotland.

We recommend that an initial development team is created, with the view to becoming a more substantial and long-term funded organisation over time. The development team should consist of three staff: one with expertise in setting up organisations and strategy development; one with expertise in participatory methods and research analysis; and one with expertise in strategic communications. The team would be supported by a steering group or reference group who, in addition to the core team, should reflect a diverse set of life experiences, knowledge bases and backgrounds, and could include some of the research participants and advisory group members who have been part of this initial project.

This foundation model would be responsible for the following areas:

1. designing and facilitating a fully participatory process to develop a three-year strategy and organisational model, based on the options and learnings outlined in this report;

2. identifying operational functions (whether a central office, satellite offices within communities or staff distributed across a range of organisations);

3. identifying funding streams (including the setting up of consultancy and/or income generation if considered a legitimate route forward);

4. developing user-friendly learning outputs from this report and an initial evidence base for those currently working on attitude change focused on gender equality;

5. testing gender equality attitude change messages and strategic communications focused on gender stereotyping with different audiences to develop a Scotland-specific learning report (ensuring to build on, rather than duplicate, the work of others, such as Scottish Women's Aid); and

6. setting up the 'Scottish Centre for Gender Equality in Social Attitudes' as an independent charity.

The foundation model would be expected to work in the following ways, in line with the values mentioned above.

Participatory development

The foundation model would work with a wide range of communities and audiences who would be working with and learning from the centre of expertise. This should include (but not be limited to) those working on the ground on women and girls' equality, those working on wider gender equality, those working on wider equalities issues, community practitioners and campaigners/activists. Participation would focus on collaboratively developing a 'map' of attitudes and norms that need to change across Scotland to progress women's equality and rights,[66] as well as developing the organisation's three-year strategy, a robust theory of change and operational model.

Long-term thinking

The foundation model would accept that no work on attitude change can be achieved in a one-year or even three-year funding stream. Therefore, it would commit to developing thinking which would lead to long-term change, acknowledging that this would require long-term funding.

Community and diversity informed

The model would ensure that the three-year strategy includes a diverse range of people and is informed by attitude change work happening on the ground in Scotland, such as youth-work in a

[66] We suggest the following themes as the starting point for this mapping process: attitudes towards violence against women and girls; attitudes towards women's education, economic activities and division of labour; attitudes towards women's voice, decision-making and power; attitudes towards women's bodies; attitudes towards specific groups of women, including but not limited to BAME women, migrant women, younger/older women, LGBTQ+ women, disabled women.

local community on masculinity or body image, or work delivered by a specialist local project led by the Muslim community on women's and girls' rights. The three-year strategy should not be informed solely by known and 'Western-focused' attitude change interventions; effort must be made to go wider and source diverse expertise.

Intersectional analysis

The foundation model should develop its strategy through an intersectional lens. In practice, this means ensuring that those who experience multiple and compounding inequalities and discrimination have access to the work of the organisation and are able to freely and equally participate in it – including in its decision-making. It also means ensuring that multiple and compounding inequalities are acknowledged and are taken into account when attitude change good practice is being developed and research being analysed.

Budget for this foundation model should include:

1. staff salary and on costs (for three team members at the same salary grade);
2. activity costs for outreach and participation;
3. knowledge dissemination costs (report(s) design and distribution);
4. investment in polling, focus groups and message testing as needed (please note, costs of this could be substantial as this would likely require external agency support); and
5. overheads cost contribution to the hosting organisation.

Across all focus groups (with the RAG and external participants), there was a clear preference and recommendation for the organisation to be ultimately established as an independent charity or organisation with the potential to generate its own financial sustainability through grants and, potentially, non-profit consultancy. The foundation model may be supported through funding from the Scottish Government, although this has yet to be confirmed and was not clear at the point of publication of this report. Any public funding granted to this initiative should not be at the expense of other women's and equalities organisations which are already in receipt of limited funding; it should, instead, be sourced as additional funding in its own right.

7.2. Model 1: Collaboration and movement building space

Specific mission	To support community-based, member-led, intersectional feminist spaces that share and produce ideas and knowledge for social transformation.
Stakeholders	Informal community groups, charities, activists, influencers, faith groups, organisations, practitioners, policy makers, artists, individuals, young people and families. It will also need to take care to include those outside of the central belt, in small towns and in rural areas.
Priority areas of work	To be developed in Year One.
Key activities	• Provide physical and online collaborative spaces for communities, individuals, artists, faith groups, activists and organisations to come together to share knowledge and expertise on gender norms and attitude change work. • Develop and facilitate working groups to support community research with a focus on specific areas e.g. working with men and boys, body image, reproductive rights etc. • Provide 'ideas project' funding through small to medium grants. This would support collaboration between members to work together on identified priorities and projects and develop innovative new ideas for attitude change. • Make available additional funding to support monitoring and evaluation, community-based interventions and information sharing, as well as to backfill posts where necessary to enable staff to take part in projects. • Provide a community wellbeing space for the members and movement.

- Co-produce advocacy plans to address recurring issues/barriers/opportunities emerging from members.
- Share information with existing sister organisations, members and the general public.

Research component

- As part of the ideas projects, members of the collaborative space would identify priority areas where new research is needed or existing research findings need to be collated, analyse from the perspective of the issue or context they are working on, and identify appropriate research teams and methodologies.
- The secretariat team would also provide research briefings, tools and international good practice on methods to change attitudes across prioritised issues.
- Similar to Model 2, learnings from the Ideas Project will form a large component of evidence gathering, and these learnings will be disseminated through the network.

Year 1 work plan highlights

- Recruit co-leads through a sabbatical programme with existing community groups and SCIOs.
- Align structure, governance, recruitment and policies to values.
- Source physical hubs across the country to be supported by local community organisations, and run introductory participatory workshops. These local community organisations will have an existing remit around excluded groups, such as BAME women, communities of colour and disabled women, for example. The hubs would share space with a number of community or charitable organisations.

- Develop membership through community networks and public outreach.
- Support the membership to select priority work areas and develop working groups.
- Design a plan to resource projects for year two.

Staffing considerations

For this model, we would suggest a small, decentralised 'secretariat' team with expertise and experience in co-production, participation and engagement across diverse and often ignored communities. We recommend a flat structure with job shares and flexible hours across roles, with sabbatical placements sought from membership.

Specific roles could include membership coordinators, operations coordinators, fundraisers, ideas project coordinators, community research coordinators, facilitators, administrative and finance support.

Relationship to other organisations

All information gathered through community research, ideas projects and collaborative spaces would be shared openly with other organisations working to promote any aspect of gender equality. The community model would not have a national campaigning arm but would share knowledge with national organisations who do. Similarly, all community research produced would be open source and available to the general public. This model would support and facilitate place-based, community-led change and would respond to the needs of different communities in different locations; therefore, it would be flexible and responsive to their needs.

How it will enact values

- ### Centring experiences of diverse women

  Through working directly with communities, individuals and activists (including survivors and interested parties), women's experiences of gender inequality as well as change making will be central to how work and priorities are developed.

- ## Collaboration, consensus and amplification

  As a collaborative space, this community hub model is focused on collaboration and will amplify the expertise of groups previously 'locked out' of formal processes around change making. Mechanisms will be established such that everyone has an equal role in taking projects forward, including ensuring additional support for anyone with access needs and over-representation of groups who are usually under-represented.

- ## Intersectionality and diversity

  The hubs will be initiated in collaboration with local, community organisations that specifically focus on BAME, LGBTQ+, migrant and disabled women. Recruitment will take place through these organisations, and expertise will be sought from a broad range of organisations and individuals.

- ## Safe, inclusive spaces

  Each hub will have an explicitly intersectional and trans-inclusive memorandum of understanding in place for members. The organisation will also undertake regular reflection and work on power, inclusion and equality internally.

- ## Working towards systemic, transformative change

  This model supports a grassroots, community-led and community responsive approach to systemic change, recognising that place-based expertise is essential for sustainable and meaningful change. The flat structure proposed also supports a re-imagining of power within workplaces and envisions an alternative way to formally organise to promote gender equality.

- ## Openness to risk and failure

  The ideas project fund will support a range of interested people to come together around one idea. This may include artists, families and online influencers as well as activists, practitioners and policy makers. Bringing together a range of perspectives and experiences means some of the ideas will 'work' better than others. However, all learning will be shared openly and transparently to enhance future iterations of projects and knowledge produced.

How this model works under potential COVID-19 restrictions

This model is highly participative, and would have embedded within it regular co-production discussions and workshops. While we continue under restrictions caused by COVID-19, we anticipate this work would largely exist online, unless social distancing measures can be maintained to allow a small gathering. Specific investment and time need to be put into the prevention of digital exclusion which may exist in this model, for example, the use of data cards and iPad/laptop rentals to enable participation.

Rationale from research

The need for, and value of, participation and co-production came through clearly in both the interviews and focus groups. Focus group participants repeated the need for better linking with community-focused and grassroots organising to deliver impact on attitude change, and, in fact, a space or hub for collective activity was asked for specifically. A statement which illustrates the need for collaboration spaces was made in our discussion with practitioners focused on working with young people: "Part of the problem is that there's no physical space and no staff members, very difficult to build community when you don't have someone working on it full time, you can't expect to build it on just running a few events a few times a year."

Our research suggests that there are many smaller community groups and individuals engaged either directly or indirectly in attitude change work in Scotland, and that the learning from this is not currently being captured and built on.

The need for a wide-ranging and valued network is also reiterated in the work of Time for Change and See Me. In particular, both organisations have been successful in engaging large audiences in anti-stigma dialogue, which needs to be successfully transferred into gender equality discussions.

This model also takes inspiration from some of the international feminist movement building models and civic space models, which locate their effectiveness in the diversity and community-led nature of where they locate expertise and agency.

Finally, on recommendation from focus group participants, this model focuses on creating an equal footing between staff, boards and members to challenge the traditional power structures which are so often a barrier to inclusion.

Model 1 SWOT Analysis

(including research participant and advisory group feedback, see Appendix F)

This model was possibly the most popular among research participant practitioners, with people particularly liking the inclusivity of the model, the way it prioritises lived experience and the elements of community ownership and empowerment. One research participant expressed feeling that this was the most innovative model.

Strengths

- Inclusive of a broad range of voices, has wide reach into different communities and includes mechanisms for under-represented groups and smaller, community groups to contribute to a national conversation.
- Empowering space for people and strong demonstration of internal power balance.
- Space to share lived experiences of inequality as well as share practical experiences of what has worked within communities.
- Potential to work in a highly tailored way on specific projects, while also coming together to lead across communities and sectors.
- Community owned and led with community members identifying priorities. Research participants liked that "research is not left for the specialists, but the affected people" and that "it is not just amplifying experiences but actually recognising that this is expertise". They also supported open source research outputs.
- Research participants felt that the ideas project concept is both ambitious and challenging, but also practical, strategic and sustainable. "It's fab and needs to be a bit blue skies."
- "Building in sabbaticals for key staffing is an excellent thing," said one research participant.

Weaknesses

- Could require a fair amount of infrastructure.
- Convening people around 'attitude change' may be too broad a starting point and it might be unclear how to set priorities.
- Assumes that there is already a level of capacity, knowledge, skills and desire to address gender attitudes in the relevant communities.
- One research participant raised the question: "Will the work be regarded by those in decision-making as of equal value to that produced by experts and academics?"

Opportunities

- This model can give voice and platform to new and previously unheard groups of people.
- No-one is currently coming together in Scotland to discuss attitude change across different areas of women's rights and equality, or even rights and equality more broadly.
- The network and movement side of this can have a significant impact beyond specific projects.
- One research participant said: "This model could really start and strengthen a much wider conversation [on power imbalances in Scottish civil society]. A really valuable side product could be sharing learning on how to reimagine power within charities/ organisations, what does this look like in practice".
- Aligns with current discourse around community asset building that has chimed during the pandemic.

Threats Or Barriers

- Potential for there to be an over-burdening of participants and stakeholders as they may be involved in multiple efforts (especially for community organisations), particularly during COVID-19.
- Potential difficulties ensuring power and responsibility are distributed evenly among diverse stakeholders, particularly around those who represent a paying employer and those who are participating as individuals or from informal groups, with risks around participation becoming weighted in favour of 'usual suspects'.
- Potential issues around digital exclusion if the model was to take place online.

7.3. Model 2: Project development and learning hub

Specific mission

To identify, support and build the capacity of existing projects and initiatives (formal and informal) that have attitude change and gender norm change components and objectives.

Stakeholders

Informal community groups, faith groups and activist groups, charities and third sector organisations, umbrella bodies and networks focused on rights and equalities. Public bodies and businesses as potential 'clients'.

Priority areas of work

Priorities could be determined either by the staff of the 'hub' or by the partner organisation. A call for expressions of interest could ask for organisations or projects that have worked in one of the following areas.

Changing attitudes towards or gender norms around:

- violence against women and girls;
- women's education, economic activities and division of labour;
- women's voice, decision-making and power;
- women's bodies; and
- specific groups of women, including, but not limited to, BAME women, migrant women, younger/older women, LGBTQ+ women, disabled women.

Through one or more of the following ways:

- working with communities;
- working with young people;

- working with men and boys;
- creating effective messaging for communication campaigns;
- changing representations in media and popular culture; and
- engaging with attitude change through activism.

Key activities

To offer ongoing support to existing projects or programmes with:

- identifying gender norm change and attitude change components of their work, and linking these to the long-term structural/transformative changes they are seeking;
- undertaking intersectional analysis and approaches;
- understanding gendered power dynamics in the spaces they work in;
- testing intervention methods or messaging; and
- understanding, measuring and sharing lessons on impact.

The 'hub' will do this by inviting (circa 5) organisations at a time to apply to be part of 18-month capacity building programmes as partner organisations. The programme will offer support through:

- providing 'top-up' grants to enhance attitude change components of existing work;
- seconding a member of hub staff to be part of the organisation or group for up to two days a week;
- identifying and bringing in other organisations and specialist companies to support with specific needs, and identifying cross-cutting needs across partner organisations where external support would be useful; and
- conducting interactive problem-solving and lesson-learning workshops with the other partner organisations.

This model will also provide capacity building and training opportunities to a wider pool of organisations and initiatives, based primarily on the learning and needs arising from projects. This will include: publishing and disseminating learning; developing accessible toolkits on key areas of best practice; and running quarterly training sessions/ workshops on key emerging topics. Space will also be created for the projects to share their own lessons learned more broadly.

Year 1 work plan highlights

- Recruit specialist staff with expertise in the areas outlined.
- Map existing projects, groups and organisations that could benefit from support.
- Run a series of interactive workshops with a broad range of participants to explore where existing projects have attitude or gender norm change as part of their design (whether explicitly or implicitly).
- Develop and disseminate a toolkit for organisations to explore the relationship of their work with gender norms and attitude change.
- Call for expression of interest in 18-month partnership and co-production programmes, and select of five organisations or initiatives to work with as partners.
- Identify specific needs of partner organisations.
- Run project orientation sessions with all partner organisations.
- Conduct collaborative learning and dissemination sessions.
- Conduct training sessions for wider network.

Research component

While the core team would collate and make accessible tools from existing evidence and research, the primary research outputs from this model would be the learning from the partner organisations themselves about what is working in their communities. Community research could also form part of the 18-month project initiatives.

Staffing considerations

For this model, we would suggest a small, flat structured team (which should include staff from the foundation model) with expertise in attitude change campaign design, diverse public engagement and research co-production, who can come together to make collective decisions on strategy and management. Roles to be advertised as open to job shares and flexible working.

We would also suggest additional specialist staff with experience in the following areas: working with communities; working with young people; working with men and boys; strategic communications; and social activism. Each week, one or two days of their time would be spent with partner organisations.

This model would not necessarily require permanent office space for the team, but would need access to meeting space (perhaps once per week), shared workspace for staff who are not able to work from home, and workshop space and equipment.

Relationships to other organisations

All third sector organisations would be eligible to make expressions of interest, regardless of size. Part of the capacity building programme would involve identifying and linking up partner organisations with other organisations in Scotland or internationally who are doing similar work or could provide support in specialist areas. Public bodies or businesses would be considered for support on a case-by-case basis and would be chargeable clients.

How it will enact values

Centring experiences of diverse women

- The partner organisations will need to develop and/or show their own methodology for putting diverse women's experiences at the front and centre of their work.

Collaboration, consensus and amplification

- The hub will develop two-way memorandums of understanding with partner organisations, which would make clear that the model is designed to support and maximise the impact of existing projects through collaboration and learning.

Intersectionality and diversity

- The hub will ensure that a wide range of organisations are partners for each 18-month programme, and that projects address issues specific to different groups of women. The partner organisations would also be brought together to learn across experiences. Staff recruitment will be conducted in a way that enables a diverse selection of candidates and ensures all staff have a strong background in intersectional analysis.

Safe, inclusive spaces

- The hub will have a strong and public safe spaces policy in place, which it will share with partner organisations. The hub will also undertake regular reflection and work on power, inclusion and equality internally, and provide tools for partner organisations to do the same.

- ### Working towards systemic, transformative change

  This model will identify partner organisations for the capacity building programme that the team believe to be working towards systemic transformative change, and support these partners to have space and time to think about the role of attitude and gender norm change within this, without expecting anyone to change their strategy or agenda.

- ### Openness to risk and failure

  The hub will not require partner organisations and projects to provide evidence of 'success' in an 18-month timeframe. Rather, space will be made for lesson learning and discussion, including on sharing achievements, potential emerging points of impact, and challenges and failures where they exist.

How this model works under potential COVID-19 restrictions

As with Model 1, this model would also be somewhat disrupted by COVID-19 related restrictions, however, to a lesser extent. The one-on-one, long-term engagement work with five key initiatives can be delivered online, provided there are no digital barriers to applicants. Participatory workshops and training would need to be delivered online, and for a short period, a more localised and socially distanced engagement could be considered (restrictions dependent).

Rationale from research

Across the literature evidence base and interviews, the need for long-term engagement and investment was repeatedly cited. Evidence showed that where a longer-term attitude change initiative had been engaged in (with a specific message and community), it had longer lasting impact. This is also clear from evaluations on bias and equality training by EHRC Scotland (2018), which identified the need for longer-term and multi-intervention projects.

As such, this model proposes 18 month long intensive intervention work with community-focused projects, to support, develop and embed attitude change efforts. The secondment model to support the partner organisations is an extension of the Gender at Work model (outlined in section 4.1), which offers 18-month non-embedded mentorship programmes.

This model addresses the research finding that staff in community organisations and members of informal initiatives often have the needed expertise for delivery, but lack time and headspace to do in-depth monitoring and research as part of their programmes. As one interviewee told us: “Through membership, capacity building and consultancy, it [participation] is embedded in by making sure a wide variety of stakeholders and communities are involved in development of a frame or project that works and knowledge dissemination.”

Model 2 SWOT Analysis

(including research participant and advisory group feedback, see Appendix F)

This model was felt both by research participants and the RAG to be practical, focused and feasible, with a clear benefit to community-level organisations, particularly when it comes to helping evaluate the impact of projects, understanding the attitude change components of wider work and building on potentially lost learning from past work. This model was seen to have potential to create space for smaller, newer organisations to be supported alongside the more established ones and to be a good way of building 'what works' evidence from practical learnings

Strengths

- Practical interventions that help strengthen existing smaller community organisations.
- Clear direction and focus with realistic 18-month timescale to work with the same organisations.
- Embeds monitoring and evaluation across its activities.
- Could be time and resource saving as there are structures and systems in place already.
- Like Model 1, potential to work in a highly tailored way on specific projects, while also coming together to lead across communities and sectors.
- "We know that there are things that are happening that are not being properly recorded. All organisations have little bits of work, but the hub can provide a unified point for strategy built on all that evidence," said one research participant.

Weaknesses

- Potential lack of community ownership in a more centralised model than Model 1 – needs to have a strong co-production focus.
- One research participant (who favoured Model 1) felt that this model is "not bold or innovative enough to bring transformational change" as it would bring the "same voices at the forefront".

Opportunities

- Supports and amplifies the impact of existing projects in Scotland.
- Chance to revisit recommendations and suggested solutions from previous projects.
- Presents a framework within which thematic projects and initiatives can enhance attitude change and learning components, without being explicitly focused on attitude change – allows for a greater number of intervention types to be learned from.

Threats Or Barriers

- It could be difficult to find existing projects which cover the different priority areas and the diversity of voices required.
- "Currently, certain organisations dominate" said one RAG participant, "and we need to be careful this model doesn't amplify these organisations but makes conscious space for new ones".
- Staff turnover at partner organisations could threaten sustainability.
- Could risk reinforcing weaknesses and gaps in existing 'change work', rather than identifying new projects and learning from outside Scotland.
- Requires strong buy-in from the community.

7.4. Model 3: Research and practice centre

Specific mission

To develop, analyse and disseminate research and expertise on good practice related to community-based attitude change and gender-transformative strategic communications (communications strategies that focus on transforming gender norms and stereotypes).

Stakeholders

Third sector organisations, women's and equalities organisations, research groups and units, public bodies and government, community organisations and practitioners.

Priority areas of work

Priority topics should be set by staff and local community researchers (see staffing considerations below) along with a steering group. This should be informed by the change being sought after in Scotland and with analysis from the research developed through this project. There would be two on-going priority areas with topics within these to be finalised.

1. Gender Equality Transformative Strategic Communications (with topics chosen through staff leads and steering group):
   a. at a local community level;
   b. through third sector partners;
   c. through national interventions; and
   d. through government interventions (policy linked attitude change and public awareness activities).

2. Community-based attitude and norm change. This would be delivered by paid local community researchers who have previously delivered some gender equality attitude change activities – but who would also receive supplementary training in participatory action research. The purpose of this would be to learn directly from on the ground delivery that is conducted and analysed by those closest to the communities. Priority topics would be decided by community researchers with a view to create publications and learning tools for wider dissemination as well as support positive change within communities themselves.

This model would also build on the capacity building and resources created during the foundation year and provide training, research briefings and toolkits on effective community-led attitude change methods and strategic communications, tailored to different audiences.

Key activities

Source of research and expertise:

- conducting reviews and/or analysis of UK-wide and international research related to community-based attitude change and strategic communications with a focus on learning from interventions and developing practical applications for different communities and gender-focused practitioners in Scotland;
- working in partnership with community researchers (and providing research skills) to develop on the ground learning from attitude change interventions;
- disseminating good practice to organisations and individuals on attitude change and strategic communications through open source publications and knowledge exchange events;
- disseminating good practice on evaluating attitude change and longitudinal evaluation; and
- researching priority areas and key 'change agents or communities' to share how best to change attitudes (e.g. young people and attitude change or rural communities and attitude change). These priorities would be set through input from experts and a steering group or board.

Training and capacity building:

- *delivering training sessions to organisations or networks on* evidence-led methods to change attitudes, develop competent theories of change and embed fully evaluated methods into project plans.

Year 1 work plan highlights

- Recruit key staff.
- Develop an open source database of attitude change research publications (informed by international practice).
- Develop a 'putting theory into practice' guide on how organisations (small, community-based, regional or national) can design meaningful attitude change interventions focused on attitudes towards women and girls.
- Design and develop of a training programme to build skills (based on the guide above), including a programme to train local community researchers in participatory action research.

Staffing considerations

To enable feminist leadership practice and inclusive working structures, this model would try to create a flat leadership structure.

It would include two 'research leads', one focused on community research and one focused on gender-focused strategic communications. We would recommend that the community research lead works with a small team of part-time/sessional local community researchers spread out across Scotland who would lead on participatory action research projects in their communities. These local community researchers would come together for trainings, to share learnings and to develop community research practice on attitude change on women and girls. They should be people already active and trusted within their community (community meaning either geographic community or identity-based community), and be able to demonstrate a commitment to the values of the new organisation. Training would be provided in participatory action research.

There would also be a 'training and partnerships' lead who would focus on the design of the capacity building programme and pursue outreach to key stakeholders, as well as a 'communications and organisational development' lead.

In this model, a steering group would provide governance and strategic direction. This governing structure should include representatives from the women's sector, wider equalities sector and community practitioners who are well informed on gender inequality and intersectional approaches to analysis as well as community-based research.

Relationships to other organisations

Organisations (from any sector) would be able to access the learning produced by this model (both research and training) and use it to develop their plans on attitude change and gender inequality. It would be recommended that funding would cover delivery of training and capacity building for third sector, community or public sector organisations, however, private sector organisations would be expected to pay for these services.

How it will enact values

Centring the experiences of diverse women

The model would be led by a majority women steering group or board, which should include diverse voices often not heard but delivering work in communities. The model would also look to outreach a wider source of expertise to inform priorities and provide a Scotland-focus to international research input. Care would be taken to over-represent women from groups that are normally under-represented, and establish inclusive mechanisms for participation to ensure more traditionally powerful voices do not dominate.

Collaboration, consensus and amplification

The model would include the use of 'in practice' experts – practitioners on the ground across communities who would be able to support dissemination of knowledge from attitude change efforts and share guidance on avoiding pitfalls and achieving maximum impact. These experts would be paid for their input.

Intersectionality and diversity

The model would ensure that research was widely sought out to inform practice, and that rather than relying on 'Western' or 'global north' examples, learning would be sought from international examples and BAME researchers. Communities would be engaged from across Scotland, and a particular focus would be placed on taking an intersectional lens to all research outputs.

Safe, inclusive spaces

The model would ensure that all events, training and spaces of working would operate as safe and inclusive spaces for all self-identifying women and girls. There would be a non-judgmental, feminist and supportive environment created in any physical or online spaces.

Working towards systemic, transformative change

The purpose of the training and capacity building component of this model is to ensure that learning can take place widely and interventions developed at all levels across society. The wider the engagement, the faster the pace of culture change. This model would focus on developing gender equality attitude change work that is built on a foundation of understanding of systemic inequality.

Openness to risk and failure

The model would review its research and training outputs regularly by seeking feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, and would lead by example by ensuring that it has robust evaluation mechanisms in place. In doing so, the model can develop, deliver and adjust according to the needs of stakeholders and service users.

How this model works under potential COVID-19 restrictions

This model would be the least disrupted by COVID-19 restrictions as it is least reliant on regular face-to-face interactions or sharing of physical space. However, given that all three recommended models rely on a foundation of participation and co-production, there will be some inevitable limitations caused by largely online participation. Therefore, digital participation or exclusion must be considered and overcome.

The community research model may be disrupted as community researchers will also need to conduct their work online or keep to strict social distancing when conducting local research.

Rationale from research

This model is most closely related to a number of pre-existing, aforementioned organisations, such as Equally Ours, Common Cause and Social Impact Lab, in its focus on strategic communications, capacity building, consultancy and research development. However, in order to incorporate the participatory models championed by focus group participants and the success of localised activity highlighted by the literature, a community research angle has been included. This will ensure bottom–up engagement and a lived experience-based, well-informed research process (see, for example, DCRT 2011). As was explained in the interview with Equally Ours: "We balance research and practical engagement – making sure it is not too much of the former, as it prevents participation."

As mentioned in section 4.1, Equally Ours also emphasised the need for gender competence to be embedded in any model which takes forward strategic communications work, to ensure this work is not done in isolation of feminist thinking. Our research noted that while gender is commonly referred to in wider reframing and strategic communications work around structural inequality, it has not been the focus of concentrated efforts in this area. The reframing approach also appeared to resonate among a number of the RAG participants, suggesting a further exploration of the gender angle in reframing work could be well received.

Model 3 SWOT Analysis

(including research participant and advisory group feedback, see Appendix F)

This model was potentially the most popular among the project's RAG, who felt that this option was both the most tangible and the closest to what they had envisioned at the beginning of the project, particularly due to the focus on strategic communications. Mechanisms for drawing on both international expertise and community research were seen as positives, as was the potential for this model to embed learning at local, organisational and national levels. The outputs from this model were seen to be particularly useful by established third sector organisations and organisations with strong policy, communications and media programmes of work.

Strengths

- Founded upon tried and tested methods and drawing on research, practice and academic expertise, including international expertise.
- Makes large quantities of dense research accessible and helps shift reliance on approaches that are known but not well tested.
- Helps provide a baseline against which Scottish organisations can prove effectiveness.
- One research participant particularly liked the suggested mechanism for incorporating community feedback and research into the overall strategic picture.
- A RAG participant felt that there is particular strength "not only in having better developed, more evidence-based strategic messages but in making sure that they are embedded not just at a national level but at a local level".

Weaknesses

- May miss grassroots expertise or input (not as deeply entrenched in localisation as Models 1 or 2).
- Research and advice outputs may not be tailored enough (compared to Model 2), as what works for one community may not necessarily work for another.
- One research participant expressed concern that this model overlooks the capacity of community: "Expertise does not only lie with certified experts."
- Research at this size and level requires a lot of time and resources, and it would be some time before recommendations and advice started to be used at community level.
- Measuring change associated with the work of this model could be difficult and time consuming.

Opportunities

- Increased understanding of 'what works' in attitude change.
- Opportunities for cross-fertilisation of ideas with sectors and projects.
- Potential for finding and bringing in new equality expertise and voices.

Threats Or Barriers

- Need to ensure this model enables connection between national or strategic knowledge and local implementation.
- Risk that neither the knowledge nor the investment required to roll it out is adequately distributed.

7.5. Key points to consider when developing any model

Across our focus group discussions and interviews, a number of points were made that might help to secure stakeholder buy-in and maximise impact for this work, while also protecting it from some of the pitfalls that others have faced previously.

Gender competence and a robust understanding of intersectional analysis

Whichever model of the three is built onto the foundation model, it must have within its working culture, outputs and expectations of staff a high level understanding of systemic gender inequality and how it manifests across different areas and levels within society. Along with this, it must include a competent level of understanding, and knowledge of application, of intersectional analysis. Multiple times, we have seen well-meaning initiatives fail to deliver for women (particularly, working class, disabled, BAME, migrant and LGBTQ+ women) largely due to a lack of understanding of the pervasive nature of gender inequality and power dynamics. For a new organisation to be successful, this risk – which can be overcome through engaging with expertise across the equality and rights movements in Scotland – must remain a primary concern.

How power and expertise are located from the beginning

From the very outset, the development of this organisation must consider who is holding the power and making the decisions, and how this can best be distributed to a diverse and inclusive set of stakeholders. Early recruitment decisions – including for short-term consultants – should be open, accessible and go to significant effort to attract applications from a wide, diverse talent pool. Where appropriate, positive action measures should be taken to attract applications from under-represented groups.

Relationships with government and other authorities

The work of the new organisation will likely be to examine the most effective methods to change attitudes and behaviours which centre around women and take an intersectional approach. As such, it is possible it will be advising on or critiquing the attitude change efforts of government, local authorities and public bodies. To enable full and unbiased delivery of this work, consideration should be given to how the new organisation can be supported to be an independent authority in this

area. A new model should be welcomed as a critical-eye and source of support for any organisation or institution looking to deliver effective gender equality related attitude change. To allow this to happen successfully, clarity is needed over funding sustainability and the relationship with funders.

Long-term funding and commitment

As previously mentioned, for this work to create any meaningful change, it must be supported through long-term sustainable funding. Our research does not suggest that a short-term, one-off intervention would have either the impact or participation that would be needed to start shifting attitudes and gender norms in Scotland. However, funding cannot be at the expense or in competition with other women's, girls', equalities or rights organisations in Scotland. Instead, funding should be sourced through multiple avenues, with additional, long-term investment for gender equality work identified to ensure this organisation has impact and is fit for purpose. The organisation should also consider finding other 'top-up' sources of income, as needed, from year three onwards (however, given the purpose of this work, it is likely some grant funding will be required for some core staff/activities).

Positioning within/alongside the women's sector

While we have recommended that the foundation model could sit within a women's or equalities organisation for the initial year one period, after that point, as recommended from those we interviewed, there is a preference for an independent organisation to be formed. The organisation should sit alongside established and expert women and equalities organisations, and should be informed by their policy and strategy work but not replicate existing spaces, objectives or models of working, or compete for existing strands of funding. We would also recommend that representatives and expertise from the established women's sector help to develop the model during the foundation year, alongside emerging and more informal groups from Scotland's feminist space.

Glossary

Attitudes: Settled ways of thinking or feeling about something. Attitudes are held by individuals, but are also formed, reinforced and experienced at a community level (Fisher & Purcal 2017). Attitudes and behaviours are linked – as attitudes are reflected in behaviour – but not identical (Fisher & Purcal 2017).

Communities: Groups of people who share something in common – such as a group living in a particular locality, or groups based on common identity, interest or practice – such as networks for autistic people or violence against women support groups.

Evaluation: A process that aims to measure the outputs and impact of an intervention.
Gender: "Gender refers to the characteristics of women, men, girls and boys that are socially constructed. This includes norms, behaviours and roles associated with being a woman, man, girl or boy, as well as relationships with each other. As a social construct, gender varies from society to society and can change over time" (WHO 2020).

Gender-based violence: "Gender based violence is a function of gender inequality, and an abuse of male power and privilege. It takes the form of actions that result in physical, sexual and psychological harm or suffering to women and children, or affront to their human dignity, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life. It is men who predominantly carry out such violence, and women who are predominantly the victims of such violence. By referring to violence as 'gender based' this definition highlights the need to understand violence within the context of women's and girl's subordinate status in society. Such violence cannot be understood, therefore, in isolation from the norms, social structure and gender roles within the community, which greatly influence women's vulnerability to violence" (Scottish Government and COSLA 2018).

Gender norms: The social, cultural and economic expectations that relate to how men and women are 'supposed' to behave and act.

Harmful sexual behaviour: Behaviours and actions used by young people and children that perpetrate sexual harm to others.

Intersectionality: From Professor Kimberlé Crenshaw's work exploring how the American legal system wasn't able to respond to discrimination faced by black women due to their identification with multiple identity characteristics (Crenshaw 1989). More recently used to describe how identity characteristics intersect with one another other to create overlapping and compounding discrimination.

Intersectional gender competence: Deep understanding around promoting and embodying an intersectional approach to tackling gender inequality.

Intervention: (For our purposes) an activity or project designed and carried out with the aim of changing public attitudes on a particular issue or area, or shifting gender norms (Duff and Young 2017).

Prejudice: Bias that devalues people because of their perceived membership of a social group (Abrams et al. 2016).

Primary and secondary prevention of violence against women. Primary prevention refers to interventions that seek to tackles the root cause of violence against women: gender inequality. It is a long-term strategy to prevent violence from ever happening by challenging attitudes, values and structures that sustain inequality and violence (Zero Tolerance 2020). Secondary prevention, or early intervention, occurs when it is not possible to prevent violence occurring to mitigate further escalation, or to lower the prevalence of violence.

Pro-social norms: Expected rules of positive behaviour within communities and societies. For example: "in this society we help each other out."

Social norms: Expected rules of behaviour within communities and societies. Importantly, subverting social norms may result in social or material punishments, whereas upholding social norms may result in social or material rewards.

Stereotypes: "A stereotype is a widely held, simplified, and essentialist belief about a specific group. Groups are often stereotyped on the basis of sex, gender identity, race and ethnicity, nationality, age, socio-economic status, language, and so forth. Stereotypes are deeply embedded within social institutions and wider culture. They are often evident even during the early stages of childhood, influencing and shaping how people interact with each other" (Gendered Innovations 2020).

Structural inequalities: Inequalities that are perpetuated and entrenched by social, economic and cultural structures and embedded across societal institutions in a way that maintains inequality between different groups of people. This understanding supports the notion that inequality is not a result of individual failures (e.g. not working hard) but rather through structural constraints that prevent equality (e.g. government policies around income support or police actions towards racial profiling).

Bibliography

Abercrombie, R., Harries, E., and Wharton, R. (2015). *Systems change: A guide to what it is and how to do it.* New Philanthropy Capital (NPC). www.thinknpc.org/resource-hub/systems-change-a-guide-to-what-it-is-and-how-to-do-it/

Abrams, D., Swift, H. J., and Mahmood, L. (2016). *Prejudice and unlawful behaviour: Exploring levers for change.* Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC). www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/research-report-101-prejudice-and-unlawful-behaviour-exploring-levers-change/

Allen, P., and Cutts, D. (2017). How do gender quotas affect public support for women as political leaders? *West European Politics*, 41(1), pp.147-168.

Amnesty and Ipsos MORI (2017). Social media can be a dangerous place for UK women. Amnesty International and Ipsos MORI. www.amnesty.org.uk/files/Resources/OVAW%20poll%20report.pdf

Armitage, L. (2020). Explaining backlash to trans and non-binary genders in the context of UK Gender Recognition Act reform. Journal of the International Network for Sexual Ethics & Politics, 8, pp.11-35.

AVA (2019). What works in prevention programmes. Against Violence and Abuse (AVA). www.ask-ava.org.uk/index.php/toolkit/prevent/learning/what-works-in-prevention-programmes/

Banaszak, L. A., and Ondercin, H. L. (2016). Public opinion as a movement outcome: The case of the U.S. women's movement. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly,* 21(3), pp.361–378.

Batliwala, S. and Pittman, A. (2010). *Capturing change in women's realities: A critical overview of current monitoring and evaluation frameworks and approaches*. Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID). www.awid.org/publications/capturing-change-womens-realities/

Behson, S. and Robbins, N. (2016). *The effects of involved fatherhood on families, and how fathers can be supported both at the workplace and in the home.* Presented at United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) Division for Social Policy and Development Expert Group Meeting on Family Policies and the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, New York, 12–13 May 2016. www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/docs/egm16/BehsonRobbins.pdf

Bernhardt, E., and Goldscheider, F. (2006). Gender equality, parenthood attitudes, and first births in Sweden. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 4, pp.19–39.

Betz, D. E., and Sekaquaptewa, D. (2012). My fair physicist? Feminine math and science role models demotivate young girls, *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(6), pp.738–746.

Blackmore, E., and Sanderson, B., (2017). *Framing equality toolkit.* Public Interest Research Centre (PIRC). www.publicinterest.org.uk/framing-equality/

Blinder, S. (2011). *UK public opinion toward migration: Determinants of attitudes.* The Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford. www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Briefing-Public_Opinion_Determinants.pdf

Buchanan, J., Wilson, S. T., and Gopal, N. (2008). A cross cultural virtual learning environment for students to explore the issue of racism: A case study involving the UK, USA and SA. *Social Work Education,* 27(6), pp.67–682.

Chadwick, P., and Pender, T. (2020). A*pplying behavioural science to reduce gender-based violence within international development.* Action Aid. www.actionaid.ie/applying-behavioural-science-to-reduce-gender-based-violence-within-international-development/

Cislaghi, B., and Heise, L. (2020). Gender norms and social norms: Differences, similarities and why they matter in prevention science. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 42(2), pp.407–422.

Civil Society Futures (2018). *The story of our times: Shifting power, bridging divides, transforming society.* Civil Society Futures. www.civilsocietyfutures.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2018/11/Civil-Society-Futures__The-Story-of-Our-Future.pdf

COFEM (2018). *Feminist pocketbook.* Coalition of Feminists for Change (COFEM). www.cofemsocialchange.org/feminist-pocketbook/

Corrigan, P. (2011). Strategic stigma change (SSC): Five principles for social marketing campaigns to reduce stigma. Psychiatric Services, 62(8), pp.824–826.

CPAG (2016). *What's In A Frame? The poverty sector's search for convincing messages*. Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG). www.cpag.org.uk/news blogs/news listings/what%E2%80%99s-frame-poverty-sector%E2%80%99s-search-convincing-messages/

Crawley, H. (2005). *Evidence on attitudes to asylum and immigration: What we know, don't know and need to know.* COMPAS Working Paper, 05-23. www.compas.ox.ac.uk/2005/wp-2005-023-crawley_attitudes_asylum_immigration/

Crawley, H. (2009). *Understanding and changing public attitudes: A review of existing evidence from public information and communications campaigns.* Centre for Migration Policy Research. www.phf.org.uk/publications/understanding-changing-public-attitudes-rewiew-existing-evidence-public-information-communications-campaigns-executive-summary/

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139–167.

Dahl, G., Kotsadam, A., and Rooth D. (2018). Integration change gender attitudes? The effect of randomly assigning women to traditionally male teams. NBER Working Paper No. 24351, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Darnton, A. (2008). *Reference report: an overview of behaviour change models and their uses.* Government Social Research. GSR Behaviour Change Knowledge Review. www.assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/498065/Behaviour_change_reference_report_tcm6-9697.pdf

Dobash, R., Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., and Lewis, R. (1999). A research evaluation of British programmes for violent men. *Journal of Social Policy*, 28(2), pp.205–233.

Donnelly, P. (2017). *Busting some myths: why myth busting doesn't work.* Shelter. www.blog.shelter.org.uk/2017/04/busting-some-myths-why-myth-busting-doesnt-work/

Duff, C., and Young, C. (2017). *What works? Eight principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work.* Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC). www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/what-works-eight-principles-meaningful-evaluation-anti-prejudice-work/

DCRT (2011). *Community-based participatory research: Ethical challenges.* Durham Community Research Team (DCRT). www.dur.ac.uk/socialjustice/researchprojects/cbpr/

EHRC Scotland (2012). *Understanding attitudes to equal opportunities and discrimination in Highland.* Briefing Paper. Equality and Human Rights Commission Scotland.

EHRC Scotland (2018). *Unconscious bias training: an assessment of the evidence for effectiveness.* Equality and Human Rights Commission Scotland. www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/unconscious-bias-training-assessment-evidence-effectiveness/

EIGE (2013). A study of collected narratives on gender perceptions in the 27 EU Member States. European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). www.eige.europa.eu/publications/study-collected-narratives-gender-perceptions-27-eu-member-states/

Facchini, G., Margalit, Y., and Nakata, H. (2017). *Countering Public Opposition to Immigration: The Impact of Information Campaigns.* IZA Discussion Paper No. 10420. Bonn: Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).

Fernández-Reino, M., Sumption, M., and Vargas-Silva, C. (2020). From low-skilled to key workers: the implications of emergencies for immigration policy. O*xford Review of Economic Policy*, 36(1):382-396.

Fisher, K. R., and Purcal, C. (2017). *Policies to change attitudes to people with disabilities. Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 19(2):161–17.

FRIDA (2019). Garden of Change. FRIDA The Young Feminist Fund. www.youngfeministfund.org/GardenOfChange/

FRIDA (2020). *Resource Mobilisation Ethics Policy*. FRIDA The Young Feminist Fund. www.youngfeministfund.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/RME-1.pdf

Gaventa, J. (2006). Finding the spaces for change: A power analysis. *IDS Bulletin*. 37(6), pp.23-33. Gendered Innovations (2020). Stereotypes.

Gendered Innovations. www.genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/terms/stereotypes.html

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., and Berkowitz, A. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), pp.720–742.

Gill, R., and Elias, A. S. (2014). 'Awaken your incredible': Love your body discourses and postfeminist contradictions. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics,* 10(2), pp.179–188.

Girlguiding (2019). *Girls' Attitudes Survey*. Girlguiding. www.girlguiding.org.uk/globalassets/docs-and-resources/research-and-campaigns/girls-attitudes-survey-2019.pdf

Grant C. (2017). *Behaviour change approaches for social norms regarding gender.* K4D Helpdesk Report series. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Haider, H. (2017). *Changing gender and social norms, attitudes and behaviours*. K4D Helpdesk Report series. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Hester, M., Eisenstadt, N., Ortega-Avila, A., Morgan, K., Walker, S., and Bell, J. (2019). Evaluation of the Drive Project: *A three-year pilot to address high-risk, high-harm perpetrators of domestic abuse.* The Drive Partnership. Bristol, UK: University of Bristol.

Hillenbrand, E., Karim, N., Mohanraj, P., and Wu, D. (2015). *Measuring gender-transformative change: A review of literature and promising practices.* CARE USA. www.care.org/wp content/uploads/2020/05/working_paper_aas_gt_change_measurement_fa_lowres.pdf/

IPPF (2010). *Men are changing: Case study evidence on work with men and boys to promote gender equality and positive masculinities.* International Planned Parenthood Federation. https://www.ippf.org/sites/default/files/men_are_changing.pdf/

Ipsos MORI (2011). *Public Attitudes towards abortion*. Ipsos MORI. www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/public-attitudes-towards-abortion/

Ipsos MORI (2019). *International Women's Day 2019: Attitudes towards gender equality in Scotland.* Ipsos MORI. www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/international-womens-day-2019-attitudes-towards-gender-equality-scotland/

Jansen, N., and Joukes, G. (2012). Long term, interrelated interventions to increase women's participation in STEM in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology,* 5(3), pp.305-316.

Jennings, A., and Quinton, K. (2019). How to shift public attitudes on equality: *A practical guide for campaigners and communicators.* Equally Ours. www.equallyours.org.uk/talking-about-equality-guide/

Johnson, J., and Taylor, J. (2008). Feminist consumerism and fat activists: A comparative study of grassroots activism and the Dove Real Beauty campaign. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 33(4), pp.941–966.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the FrameWorks Institute (2018). *How to build lasting support to solve UK poverty*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. www.jrf.org.uk/report/how-build-lasting-support-solve-uk-poverty/

Katz-Wise, S. L., Pullen Sansfaçon, A., Bogart, L., M., Rosal, M. C., Ehrensaft, D., Goldman, R., E., and Bryn Austin, S. (2019). Lessons from a community-based participatory research study with transgender and gender nonconforming youth and their families. *Action Research*. 17(2), pp.186–20.

Kelly, M. (2015). *Nudge theory in public health – a way to achieve behavioural change?* SaxInstitute. www.saxinstitute.org.au/news/a-nudge-and-a-think-the-architecture-of-choice-and-health/

Kendall, J. M. (2003). Designing a research project: Randomised controlled trials and their principles. *Emergency Medicine Journal* 20, pp.164–168.

Lemos, G. (2005). T*he search for tolerance: Challenging and changing racist attitudes and behaviour among young people.* Joseph Rowntree Foundation. www.jrf.org.uk/report/challenging-and-changing-racist-attitudes-and-behaviour-young-people/

Liddell, E., and Hickman, A. (2019). *Breaking The Pattern: The report*. Evaluation Support Scotland. www.evaluationsupportscotland.org.uk/resources/violence-against-women-breaking-the-pattern-report/

Lingayah, S., Khan, O., and McIntosh, K. (2018). *Making the case for racial equality: The potential and limits of 'Framing'.* Runnymede Trust. www.runnymedetrust.org/companies/191/74/Making-the-Case-for-Race-Equality/

MacInnis, C. and Hodson, G. (2019). Extending the benefits of intergroup contact beyond attitudes: When does intergroup contact predict greater collective action support? *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology,* 3(1), pp.11– 22.

Marcus, R. (2014). *Changing discriminatory norms affecting adolescent girls through communications activities: Insights for policy and practice from an evidence review.* Overseas Development Institute. www.odi.org/publications/8537-changing-discriminatory-norms-affecting-adolescent-girls-through-communications-activities-insights/

Marcus, R. (2015). *Changing gender norms: Monitoring and evaluating programmes and projects.* Overseas Development Institute. www.odi.org/publications/9830-changing-gender-norms-monitoring-and-evaluating-programmes-and-projects/

Mastonshoeva S., et al. (2020). *Evaluation of Zindagii Shoista (Living with Dignity), an intervention to prevent violence against women in Tajikistan: Impact after 30 months.* International Alert and What Works To Prevent Violence. www.international-alert.org/publications/zindagii-shoista-living-dignity-evaluation/

Mayo, R., Schul, Y., and Burnstein, E. (2004). "I am not guilty" vs. "I am innocent": Successful negation may depend on the schema used for its encoding. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, pp.433–449.

McNeish, D., and Scott, S. (2018). *Key messages from research on children and young people who display harmful sexual behaviour.* Centre of Expertise on Child Sexual Abuse. www.csacentre.org.uk/resources/key-messages/harmful-sexual-behaviour/

MHF (2019). *Body Image: How we think and feel about our bodies.* Mental Health Foundation. www.mentalhealth.org.uk/publications/body-image-report/

Michie, L., Balaam, M., McCarthy, J., Osadchiy, T. and Morrissey, K. (2018). *From her story, to our story: Digital storytelling as public engagement around abortion rights advocacy in Ireland.* Presented at the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Montreal QC, Canada, 21–26 April 2018, Paper No. 357.

Miller, K., and Jones, R. (2019). *Toward a feminist funding ecosystem*. Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID). www.awid.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/awid_funding_ecosystem_2019_final_eng.pdf/

Murray, M., and Wright-Bevans, K. (2017). Methods for community research, action and change. In Brooks, J. and King, N. (Eds.), *Applied Qualitative Research in Psychology.* London: Palgrave.

National Academy of Sciences (2016). *Ending discrimination against people with mental and substance use disorders: The evidence for stigma change*. Washington DC: National Academies Press (US).

NACWG (2019). *Scottish Government's Response to the National Advisory Council on Women and Girls: 2018 Report Recommendations*. National Advisory Council on Women and Girls (NACWG). www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-governments-response-national-advisory-council-women-girls/

NatCen (2017). *Moral issues: Sex, gender identity and euthanasia. British Social Attitudes 34*. National Centre for Social Research (NatCen). www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/latest-report/british-social-attitudes-34/moral-issues.aspx

NatCen (2018). *Gender: New consensus or continuing battleground? British Social Attitudes 35.* National Centre for Social Research (NatCen). www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/latest-report/british-social-attitudes-35/key-findings.aspx

NatCen (2019). *Women and work. British Social Attitudes 36.* National Centre for Social Research (NatCen). www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/latest-report/british-social-attitudes-36/key-findings.aspx

NUS (2013). *No place for hate: Hate crimes and incidents in further and higher education: race and ethnicity.* National Union of Students (NUS). www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/no-place-for-hate hate-crimes-and-incidents-in-further-and-higher-education-race-and-ethnicity/

NCVO (2020). *Rebalancing the relationship: emerging findings and draft recommendations.* National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO). www.publications.ncvo.org.uk/rebalancing-the-relationship/download-report/

NEON, NEF, FrameWorks Institute and PIRC (2018). Framing the economy: How to win the case for a better system. Public Interest Research Centre (PIRC). www.publicinterest.org.uk/framing-economy-report/

OECD (2016). *Background brief on fathers' leave and its use*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). www.oecd.org/els/family/Backgrounder-fathers-use-of-leave.pdf

Opportunity Agenda (2011). *The Myth About Myth Busting.* Opportunity Agenda. www.opportunityagenda.org/explore/insights/myth-about-myth-busting/

Pascoe, C. J. (2012). Dude, you're a fag: masculinity and sexuality in high school. 2nd ed., Berkeley: University of California Press.

Persis Murray, D. P. (2012). Branding 'real' social change in Dove's campaign for real beauty, Feminist Media Studies, 13(1), pp.83-101.

Pettigrew, T. F., and Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 90(5), pp.751–783.

Plested, B. A., Edwards, R. W., and Jumper-Thurman, P. (2006). *Community readiness: A handbook for successful change*. Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research. www.ndhealth.gov/injury/nd_Prevention_Tool_Kit/docs/Community_Readiness_Handbook.pdf

Ricardo, C., Eads, M., and Barker, G. (2011). *Engaging boys and men in the prevention of sexual violence.* Promundo. www.promundoglobal.org/resources/engaging-boys-and-young-men-in-the-prevention-of-sexual-violence-a-systematic-and-global-review-of-evaluated-interventions/

Sanderson, B. (2018). *How to test your communications.* Public Interest Research Centre (PIRC). www.publicinterest.org.uk/TestingGuide.pdf/

ScotCen (2010). *Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 2010: Attitudes to discrimination and positive action.* Scottish Centre for Social Research (ScotCen). www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-social-attitudes-survey-2010-attitudes-to-discrimination-and-positive-action/

ScotCen (2014). *Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 2014: Attitudes towards violence against women in Scotland.* Scottish Centre for Social Research (ScotCen). www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-social-attitudes-survey-2014-attitudes-violence-against-women-scotland/

ScotCen (2015). *Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 2015: Attitudes to discrimination and positive action. Scottish Centre for Social Research* (ScotCen). www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-social-attitudes-2015-attitudes-discrimination-positive-action/

ScotCen (2016). *Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 2016: Public attitudes to inequality. Scottish Centre for Social Research* (ScotCen). www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-social-attitudes-attitudes-government-political-engagement-2016/

Scottish Government (2010). Ten key messages about behaviour change. Scottish Government. www2.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/175356/0102354.pdf/

Scottish Government (2020). Harmful sexual behaviour by children and young people: Expert Group report. Expert Group on Preventing Sexual Offending Involving Children and Young People. www.gov.scot/publications/expert-group-preventing-sexual-offending-involving-children-young-people-prevention-responses-harmful-sexual-behaviour-children-young-people/

Scottish Government and COSLA (2018). *Equally Safe: Scotland's strategy to eradicate violence against women and girls.* Scottish Government and COSLA. www.gov.scot/publications/equally-safe-scotlands-strategy-prevent-eradicate-violence-against-women-girls/

SDS (2018). *Review of improving gender balance Scotland*. Skills Development Scotland (SDS). www.skillsdevelopmentscotland.co.uk/media/44705/review-of-improving-gender-balance-2018.pdf

SHRC (2018). *Building a human rights culture in Scotland: Insights from audience research*. Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC). www.scottishhumanrights.com/media/1754/building_a_human_rights_culture_scotland.pdf

See Me Scotland (2019). *See Me: Three Year Evaluation Report.* See Me Scotland. www.seemescotland.org/about-see-me/how-we-are-making-a-difference/three-year-evaluation-reports-2016-2019/

Solórzano, I., Bank, A., Peña, R., Espinoza, H., Ellsberg, M., and Pulerwitz, J. (2008). *Catalyzing personal and social change around gender, sexuality, and HIV: Impact evaluation of Puntos de Encuentro's communication strategy in Nicaragua*. Horizons Final Report. Washington, DC: Population Council.

Sport Scotland (2005). *Making women and girls more active: A good practice guide*. Sport Scotland. www.sportscotland.org.uk/documents/resources/makingwomenandgirlsmoreactive.pdf

Stangor, C. (2011). *Principles of Social Psychology*. eCampusOntario. www.ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/socialpsychology1interntl/front-matter/acknowledgements-ecampusontario/

Stonewall (2004). *Understanding prejudice: Attitudes towards minorities*. Stonewall. www.stonewall.org.uk/system/files/Understanding_Prejudice__2004_.pdf

Sweetman, J. (2017). *Evaluation of train the trainers unconscious bias training (Phase II).* Equality Challenge Unit. www.ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/handle/10871/30369/

Taafe, H. (2017). *Sounds familiar?* Fawcett Society. www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=fbf75b5f-aee4-4624-8df4-833ffcc1a2d7

Temple, D., Copsey, N., and Carter, A. (2019). *Challenging youth racism: Project report 2019.* Humankind and Teesside University. www.research.tees.ac.uk/en/publications/challenging-youth-racism-project-report/

Thomson, E., McKay, A., Campbell, J., and J., Gillespie, M. (2005). *Jobs for the boys and the girls: Promoting a smart, successful and equal Scotland. Equal Opportunities Commission Scotland.* www.closethegap.org.uk/content/resources/Occ-seg-Scotland-Final-report-Feb-2005.pdf

TIE (2016). *Attitudes Towards LGBT in Scottish Education.* Time for Inclusive Education (TIE). www.basw.co.uk/system/files/resources/basw_65241-10_0.pdf/

Time to Change (2015). *Time to change: Summary of impact and learning. Time to Change.* www.time to change.org.uk/sites/default/files/TTC_Phase2_legacy_Children_and_Young_People.pdf

Time to Change (2019). *Our impact.* Time to Change. www.time-to-change.org.uk/about-us/our-impact

UNDP (2020). Tackling social norms: *A game changer for gender inequalities.* United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). www.hdr.undp.org/en/gsni/

UNICEF (2005). *Strategic communication for behaviour and social change in South Asia*. United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). www.communityengagementhub.org/resource/unicef-guide-to-strategic-communication-for-behaviour-and-social-change/

Volmert, A., Gerstein Pineau, M., and Kendall-Taylor, N. (2016). *Talking about poverty: How experts and the public understand poverty in the United Kingdom*. The FrameWorks Institute. www.frameworksinstitute.org/publication/talking-about-poverty-how-experts-and-the-public-understand-poverty-in-the-united-kingdom/

Wakefield, S. (2017). *Transformative and feminist leadership for women's rights*. Oxfam America Research Backgrounder series. www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/transformative-feminist-leadership-womens-rights/

Waylen, G. (2018). Nudges for gender equality?: What can behaviour change offer gender and politics? *European Journal of Politics and Gender*. 1(1), pp.167-183.

William, S., and Aldred, A. (2011). *Changemaking: How we adopt new attitudes, beliefs and practices: Insights from the We Can campaign.* Oxfam. www.policy practice.oxfam.org.uk/our-work/gender-justice/ending-violence-against-women/we-can

Wittman, A. (2010). Looking local, finding global: Paradoxes of gender mainstreaming in the Scottish Executive. *Review of International Studies.* 36(1), pp.51–76.

Woodruff, K., Schroeder, R., Herold, S., Roberts, S., and Berglas, N. (2020). Experiences of harassment and empowerment after sharing personal abortion stories publicly. *Contraception: X*, 2: 100021.

WHO (2010). *Addressing violence against women and HIV/AIDS: What works?* World Health Organisation (WHO). www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/9789241599863/en/
WHO (2020). Gender and Health Overview. World Health Organisation (WHO). www.who.int/health-topics/gender/

Yamin, P., Fei, M., Lahlou, S., and Levy, S. (2019). Using social norms to change behavior and increase sustainability in the real world: A systematic review of the literature. *Sustainability*, 11(20), pp.5847.

YWCA Scotland (2015). *Status of young women in Scotland*. YWCA Scotland. www.ywcascotland.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Status-of-Young-Women-In-Scotland.pdf

Zero Tolerance (2020). *Primary prevention of violence against women and girls: Briefing Note*. Zero Tolerance. https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/resources/Primary-Prevention-Briefing.pdf/

Appendix A: Research questions

Our research questions were divided into three phases according to the original tender. These were reviewed and reassessed at each stage of the project.

	Phase 1.1: Identify what is known about changing attitudes	Phase 1.2: Identify an appropriate structure	Phase 2: Develop models
Questions from tender	Understand what does and what doesn't work to change attitudes Utilise lessons learned from attempts to change attitudes on other issues (e.g. poverty)	Lessons from Scottish institutes and knowledge exchange initiatives Identify (successful) intersectional approaches, how they worked, and what was required from inception to achieve this Identify centres or institutes in other countries that aim to promote attitudinal change towards women's rights Identify good practice, challenges, and how they operated	Identify key skills and functions for the institute Identify effective governance structures Identify priorities for actions Identify further questions to be addressed by the institute

	Phase 1.1: Identify what is known about changing attitudes	Phase 1.2: Identify an appropriate structure	Phase 2: Develop models
Revised to four or five key questions for focus	What are some of the main types of intervention used to change public attitudes? What are some of the key findings from practical interventions about what does and does not work to change attitudes? What challenges do initiatives and organisations face when implementing and measuring attitude change projects? What can we learn from some of the more popular/dominant theories about attitude and behaviour change?	What previous and current institutions and organisations in Scotland can be learned from? What types of organisations/ institutions exist outside of Scotland, that seek to understand and promote public attitude change towards women's rights and equality, or more broadly? Do any institutions take an intersectional approach to their work? If so, what does this look like? How are these organisations measuring or evaluating attitude change, and the impact of their own work? How do they articulate their Theory of Change? How are these organisations structured and resourced? Who are their main stakeholders?	As above, with the following additional questions: What is the vision of the organisation and what would the organisation be aiming to achieve? What kind of support would the organisation provide and to whom? What would the core values of the organisation be, and how would these be embedded across its systems and processes? How would the institute engage, collaborate and coordinate with other organisations and networks? How would the institute ensure an intersectional approach? What might the organisation's work plan look like for year 1?

Appendix B: Research ethics

The research team developed a set of ethics at the outset and followed it throughout the project.

Integrity, quality and transparency

- Consultants will brief all research participants in writing and verbally on the purpose of the research and the intended outputs, as well as the role of Zero Tolerance and the Scottish Government, and how their information will be used.

- We will tell research participants that we want to hear their experiences and views, encourage them to tell their own stories, and inform them they can ask questions of the researcher.

- The potential benefits of the research will be clearly stated but not overestimated.

- We will provide a one page information sheet on the research which will include: the purpose of the research; the procedures; who will have access to the data; the risks; the benefits or absence of risks to the individual or to others in the future or to society; ways to withdraw from the research; an invitation to ask questions and contact details for the researchers. The information sheet will use clear and accessible language.

- We will carefully consider any conflict of interests or researcher subjectivity and bias that may arise during the course of the research, and ensure the independence of the analysis in discussion with Zero Tolerance. Emerging research findings will be discussed with the full research advisory group, and multiple options for potential models for the institute will be presented.

- We will share our findings openly and promptly with research participants, once any relevant consent has been obtained. Reports to the public should be clear and understandable, and accurately reflect the significance of the study.

Consent and confidentiality

- Verbal consent will be obtained from all participants, after provision of full explanation of the purpose of the research in writing and verbally (as above). If we think that anyone may be identifiable through the information they give us, this will be discussed with the research participant.

- Written consent will be obtained if we wish to use any names and/or organisations in the report.

- Transcripts and notes will be kept in a secure filing system, with no contact detail information attached to them. All written reports beyond the immediate consultancy team will be anonymised.

- Contact details for workshop invites and interviews will be shared only between the consultants and any workshop partner organisations, and only when necessary, and will be deleted at the conclusion of the project.

- Interviews and workshops may be audio recorded for consultant use only – verbal consent will be obtained and recordings will be deleted at the conclusion of the project.

- Researchers will further comply with any Zero Tolerance data protection policies and guidelines.

Safe spaces, do no harm and beyond

- The research will not only take a do no harm approach, including respecting cultural sensitivity, avoiding exposing anyone to risk and avoiding imposing a burden of over-researching certain groups, but it will also seek to support research participants in their own goals and promote wellbeing, human rights and gender justice.

- Any potential risks such as physical, social or psychological distress to participants or researchers, whether directly or indirectly involved, which might arise in the course of the research will be identified ahead of workshops or interviews.

- We will ensure that interviews and workshops take place in a setting where the research participant is comfortable and able to speak freely. Research participants will be informed that they can stop the interview at any time, or leave a workshop, and researchers can also stop the interview at any time if an interviewee becomes distressed. The rights and dignity of interviewees will be respected throughout.

- We will make sure we have good knowledge of local referrals ahead of any workshops or interviews, in case any disclosures happen. If the interviewee raises any questions about safeguarding, or reports any material that gives us grounds for concern, we will tell them that we will take advice on their case, discuss with Zero Tolerance and come back to them with a suggested referral.

- Our research will be fully trans inclusive and we will adopt and publicise a 'safe spaces' policy for all workshops, based on Scottish Trans Alliance code of conduct. We will adhere to the belief that everybody has the right to define their own identity – including their gender identity – free from arbitrary and limiting social constraints. This will include, if necessary, being clear that transgender women are welcome, and that transphobia will not be tolerated.

- Gender-sensitive principles will be applied throughout and women-only spaces for interviews will be created if appropriate.

- The consultancy team will adhere with any child protection or safe space policies of both Zero Tolerance and the partner organisations they work with.

Feminist principles and prioritising the participation of socially excluded groups

- We will prioritise speaking with people from marginalised groups who work or volunteer with community-based organisations and initiatives.

- In order to ensure inclusive outreach, a fee of £50 will be offered to research participants who do not represent a paying employer.

- We will endeavour to create an equitable power dynamic with the participant, having a conversation and undertaking the research with them rather than 'on' them. Interviewees will be given space to tell their own stories, offer their own interpretations, ask questions and comment as the research progresses.

- Participants will be asked in advance if they have any accessibility needs, and budget has been set aside for British Sign Language (BSL) or language interpretation for online workshops with disabled people's organisations or community organisations with staff or volunteers who don't have English as their first language.

Ethical approval

- Ethical approval for the project will be obtained from Zero Tolerance, following consultation with the research advisory group.

Appendix C: Literature review search terms and assessment criteria

Search terms

In order to identify literature for the literature review, the following search functions were used: Google Scholar, OpenAthens, JSTOR and general Google searches.

Keyword searches used:

Attitude change +	Framing, messaging, in communities, women of colour, BAME women, disabled women, LGBT women, gender roles, working class, gender, inequality, sexism, misogyny, men, strategic communications, evaluation, effective methods, what works, how to deliver, charity communications, organisations, models, monitoring and evaluation, gender norms, social norms, stereotypes, stigma, prejudice, campaigns, communication campaigns, information campaigns, social contact, bystander, nudge theory, edutainment
Mental health +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), community action, ending stigma (this also included a direct search for See Me and Time to Change publications)
Women, workplace +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), unconscious bias, sexism, men's attitude, male-dominated
Women, education +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), unconscious bias, sexism, STEM
Women, politics +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), sexism, attitudes to women's leadership, men's attitudes, social media attitudes
Abortion and/or pro-choice +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), changing attitudes, changing public opinion, Irish referendum, reproductive rights
Race and/or racism +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), changing attitudes (towards), changing public opinion, (addressing) prejudice, addressing racism, anti-racism, BAME women, women
Immigration and/or immigrants +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), changing attitudes (towards), changing public opinion, (addressing) prejudice, women
Women and/or girls + body image +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), behaviour change, stereotypes, media, social media, education

Parenting +	Attitude change (and other terms as above), fathers, fatherhood, caring, gender roles, work, flexible working, paternity leave
GBV and/or VAW +	Attitude change, behaviour change, gender norms, community programmes, perpetrator, perpetrator programmes, harmful sexual behaviour, consent, schools programmes, prevention, masculinity, media.

Assessing and narrowing the literature

Each paper, briefing or evaluation read was categorised as follows (please note that usefulness is not indicative of quality, but rather of whether the literature provides useful insights for the particular research questions):

Is the paper useful to our research?

Useful or very useful	Provides evidence-based analysis of what works (or does not work) on attitude change/or provides detailed examples of models or strategic plans/ or is a robust evaluation of one change programme or a systematic review of multiple attitude change programmes, e.g. a 3 year longitudinal analysis of mental health attitude change programmes.
Somewhat useful	Provides evaluation of a programme or interventions/or provides insights into a programme with only pre- and post-attitude baselines/or analysis or theory of how attitudes are formed rather than how to change them/or provides useful advice and lessons learned on a particular approach/or fills a particular gap in analysis, e.g. EHRC review of unconscious bias training.
Less useful	Provides baseline attitude or snapshot analysis only – no evaluation provided or insights into how attitudes were influenced/formed, e.g. UK government insights paper on women and body image.

We also took note of whether we felt the paper used an intersectional lens for its analysis:

Does the paper contain intersectional analysis?

Yes	Explores intersecting patterns between different structures of power and how people are simultaneously positioned/or provides differential analysis on attitudes towards different groups of women/or explores one intersection, such as disability and gender, but in depth.
Some	Provides some disaggregated data sets for different overlapping characteristics/or explores one intersection, such as disability and gender, but to a shallow degree.
No	None of the above

Appendix D: Table of institutes

List of behaviour or attitude change focused organisations we looked at:

Organisation	Type of institute	Sector	Country/ Region	Does this organisation focus on gender equality or equalities more widely?
African Women's Development Fund	Grantmaker	Gender	Africa	Yes
Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice	Grantmaker	LGBTQ+	US	Yes
Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID)	Grantmaker and movement building	Gender	Gender Global	Yes
Behaviour Change	Behavioural science consultancy	Social justice and environment	UK	No
Behavioural Insights Team	Behavioural science consultancy	Behaviour change (general)	UK	Somewhat - equality and diversity one of their 12 areas
BehaviourWorks Australia (BWA)	Consultancy	Social justice and environment	Australia	No
BVA Nudge Unit	Behavioural science consultancy	Behaviour change (general)	Global	No
Centre for Behaviour Change	Behavioural science consultancy	Higher education	UK	No
Centre for Social Action	Behavioural science consultancy	Public health	UK	Yes

Organisation	Type of institute	Sector	Country/ Region	Does this organisation focus on gender equality or equalities more widely?
Civic Square Birmingham	Civic/ participatory space	Civic infrastructure	UK	Yes
Coalition of Feminists for Social Change (COFEM)	Network for collective action	VAW	Global	Yes
Common Cause Foundation	Consultancy	Social justice & environment	UK	No
DevComms Lab	Consultancy	International development	UK	No
Equally Ours	Consultancy	Equalities (general)	UK	Yes
European Institute for Gender Equality	Policy think tank	Gender	EU	Yes
FHI 360	Consultancy	International development	Global	Somewhat - Gender is one of their practice areas
FrameWorks Institute	Consultancy	"Progressive change"	Global	Somewhat - equalities as part of progressive change
FRIDA The Young Feminist Fund	Grantmaker	Gender	Global	Yes
Gender at Work	Consultancy	Gender and international development	Global	Yes
Gender Equal	Policy think tank	Gender	New Zealand	Yes

Organisation	Type of institute	Sector	Country/ Region	Does this organisation focus on gender equality or equalities more widely?
Global Women's Institute	Research and action	Gender and international development	USA	Yes
Joseph Rowntree Foundation	Research and policy	Social change	UK	Somewhat – equality one of six areas of work
Kvinfo	Policy think tank	Gender	Denmark	Yes
Mama Cash	Grantmaker	GBV	Global	Yes
Men Can Stop Rape	Multilevel campaign	VAW	US	Yes
MenEngage Alliance	Membership and capacity building	Gender	Global	Yes
Move to End Violence / NoVo Foundation	Movement building	VAW	US	Yes
Narrative Initiative	Network for collective action	Social justice	US	No
Nesta	Innovation foundation	Health, education and digital data	UK	No
New Economy Organisers Network (NEON)	Movement building	Economy	UK	No
Oversees Development Institute (ODI)	Think tank	International development	UK	Yes
Opportunity Agenda	Movement building	Social justice	USA	Yes

Organisation	Type of institute	Sector	Country/ Region	Does this organisation focus on gender equality or equalities more widely?
Palladium	Consultancy	Social progress and commercial growth	Global	No
Promundo	Consortium	Gender equality and VAW	Brazil and Global	Yes
Prospera	Grantmaker	Gender	Global	Yes
Public Interest Research Centre (PIRC)	Consultancy and research centre	Equality, anti-oppression, environmental justice	UK	Yes - equality and justice
Social Impact Lab	Movement building	Equality, justice, environment	USA	No
Soul City Institute for Social Justice	Communications and edutainment (large-scale)	Gender	South Africa / Southern Africa	Yes
Time to Change	Multilevel campaign	Mental health	UK	Somewhat
Voices for Change Gender Hub	Research hub (time-limited project)	Gender	UK and Nigeria	Yes
What Works Network	Government network	Public policy	UK	No

Appendix E: Interview and discussion group questions, and participatory workshop methodology

Phase 1.1: Discussion groups and one-on-one interviews with Scotland-based practitioners and campaigners

During Phase 1.1 we ran a series of collaborative discussion groups and one-one-one conversation with Scotland-based practitioners and campaigners. The purpose of these was to understand what kinds of activities and interventions are being used in Scotland to affect attitude change on rights and equality, what practitioners feel is working and not working, and what challenges there are when doing this work. These discussion groups and conversations included:

- Organisations and practitioners working directly on community-level change in Scotland, including with working with young people
- Organisations and practitioners working with marginalised groups of women in Scotland, such as rural women, BAME women or disabled women
- Campaigners working on rights and equalities issues

Participants were identified through the literature review, the research team's existing networks and recommendations from the research advisory group (RAG). The research team used a semi-structured format using a combination of the following questions:

1. What type of attitude change activities have you/your organisation delivered/ participated in? (please note this may be direct attitude change work or attitude change may be an indirect consequence of your work)
2. Changing attitudes can be hard work – what have you seen that has made a real, lasting difference? What do you think works to change peoples' attitudes?
3. Have you found any ways to try and measure this kind of work? How do you assess whether it is having the impact that you want?

4. What are some of the main challenges you have faced when doing this work?

5. If an organisation or space was created to support gender equality through attitude change, what could it deliver that would be most helpful to you/your organisation?

6. What is the most important change that can be made in Scotland to tackle negative attitudes towards women/gender equality?

7. Who is the most important audience for attitude change efforts to be directed to?

8. Do you have any questions for us?

Phase 1.2: Key informant interviews with representatives from Scottish and international institutions

During Phase 1.2 the research team conducted key informant interviews (KIIs) with representatives from organisations focused on attitude change in Scotland and internationally. The organisations were identified through the literature review and recommendations from research participants and the RAG (a full list of institutions can be found in Appendix D).

The purpose of these KIIs was to understand how different kinds of organisations approach attitude change work, and to see if there are any best practices or key areas of learning that would help with developing potential models for Scotland (see research questions in Appendix A).

The KIIs followed a semi-structured format using a combination of the following questions:

1. Can you tell us about how the organisation was formed?
   What was the need identified that the organisation filled?

2. How did you come to the model of working (framing/capacity building/research)?

3. [For gender orgs] Do you work much specifically on attitude change, and how do you see this relating to broader transformative change on gender? How do you ensure an intersectional approach to your work? How do you organise yourselves around your values?

4. [For attitude change orgs] Do you have any specific projects or programmes of work focusing on gender, or equalities and rights more broadly? Do you think about intersectionality in your work OR how do you organise yourselves around your values?

5. Who are your main stakeholders, and how do you work with or support them?

6. How does the organisation work with government and public bodies, if at all?

7. What are some of the common challenges you face?

8. How do you try and measure the impact of your work? Have you found any mechanisms that work well for looking at attitude change?

9. What would you do differently if the organisation was new and to be established tomorrow?

10. How is the organisation funded and financially sustained?

11. Is there anything in particular you think we should be recommending, is included or considered when developing a model for an institute in Scotland?

12. Do you have any questions for us?

Questions were tweaked or added to according to the specific participant(s).

Phase 2: Participatory modelling workshop and asynchronous interactive feedback

This workshop aimed to build and revise potential models with those who will ultimately collaborate with and benefit from such an institution, and help ensure further buy-in. Workshop participants were also given an opportunity to feed in asynchronously to the final three models using interactive online whiteboards on Google Jamboard.

The following were used as prompts and discussion questions.

'Live' workshop 1 (plus live session with RAG)

What we provided the participants	Discussion question posed
Outline vision, mission and values for a new organisation	Developing a new organisation to support attitude change towards women and girls in Scotland: what changes (if any) would you make to the proposed vision, mission and values?
Example areas of attitude change	What attitudes or cultural norms do you think need to change most in Scotland? What (and who) in particular do you think needs to change?
Examples of potential stakeholders	Which groups of people do you think this new organisation should: • support and collaborate with? • seek input and expertise from? • seek to influence and challenge?
Examples of types of activity the organisation could do	Thinking about the groups that you think this new organisation should support and collaborate with (previous flipchart) what kind of support do you think is most useful or needed in Scotland?
Examples of different business models and organisational structures	What kind of business model or structure do you think would work best for this new organisation, and why? How would we ensure that the model takes an intersectional approach?

Asynchronous interactive feedback (plus live session with RAG)

<table>
<tr><th>What we provided the participants</th><th>Discussion question posed</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Revised mission, vision and values

Three outline models:

1. A collaboration and movement-building space
to support community-based, member-led intersectional feminist spaces that share and produce ideas and knowledge for social transformation.

2. A project development and learning hub
to identify, support and build the capacity of existing projects and initiatives (formal and informal) that have attitude change and gender norm change components and objectives.

3. A research and practice centre
to develop, analyse and disseminate research and expertise on good practice related to community-based attitude change and gender-transformative strategic communication.</td><td>What drew you to this model?</td></tr>
<tr><td>What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of this model? What might be opportunities or threats?</td></tr>
<tr><td>What would you change about this model? Is there anything missing or needing further development?</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>How might you as an individual or your organisation work with or make use of this model?</td></tr>
</table>

ZERO TOLERANCE

www.zerotolerance.org.uk