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INTRODUCTION: PROJECT OVERVIEW & GOALS

- THE GOAL: MOBILIZE BYSTANDERS AGAINST GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE
- THE OPPORTUNITY: APPLYING BEHAVIORAL INSIGHTS
- THE APPROACH: COLLABORATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING
THE GOAL: Mobilize bystanders to support IPV survivors

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a leading cause of death and disability for women worldwide:

- In Georgia, a 2017 study revealed that 14% of ever-partnered women between the ages of 15–64 report having been sexually or physically abused by their partners.
- In South Africa, the national statistics office reports that one in five women have experienced violence from a partner in their lifetimes.

When IPV occurs, the survivor or perpetrator's friends, neighbors, or family members often witness or suspect what is happening. These bystanders can play an important role in IPV reduction, offering help to a survivor or imposing consequences on the perpetrator. Frequently, however, bystanders look the other way, and survivors are left unsupported.

To address this issue, the Behavioral Insights Team (BIT) and the UNDP country teams in Georgia and South Africa collaborated to apply a behavioral approach to encouraging bystanders’ actions against IPV. The implementing team included partners from U.N. Women, Georgia’s Innovation ServiceLab, and other agencies and NGOs. The project had two parallel goals:

- Develop and test an evidence-based, BI-informed intervention to encourage bystanders to engage with IPV prevention resources
- Use a hands-on approach to build UNDP country teams’ and partners’ capacity to apply the BI approach in future work
THE OPPORTUNITY: Apply behavioral insights

All bystanders to IPV face a choice: Take action to protect a survivor of IPV, or not?

- Whether they’ve witnessed IPV personally, suspect it within a relationship, or know about instances from family, friends, or neighbors, every bystander must make a decision about whether they will take an action. However, the default option (not taking action) can be quite powerful and the chance of defusing responsibility to others helps excuse inaction.

In order to change bystander behavior and make it more likely that they will act, we first need to understand the factors influencing those decisions: What are the barriers to action, and how can we address them?

Behavioral science—the interdisciplinary study of how and why people make the decisions they do—gives us tools to approach that behavior change strategically, identifying the barriers (no matter how insignificant they may seem) that can tip the balance between action and inaction.

Applying these behavioral insights can help decisionmakers develop programs and policies that more effectively encourage bystanders to act when they reach those crucial decision-making moments. Ultimately, that can make the difference that results in more survivors receiving the support they need.
THE APPROACH: Collaboration within the TESTS framework

BIT and the UNDP country teams worked together to apply BIT’s TESTS framework, which structured the process of applying behavioral insights to reach our impact goals:

Target & Explore
In these stages, we used an iterative, multi-method approach to answer two core questions:

▷ What bystander behaviors are helpful for IPV survivors in Georgia and South Africa?
▷ What are the barriers to those behaviors?

Solution
In this stage, we drew on the findings from our Explore phase and the broader behavioral science evidence base to develop an intervention encouraging our target action. In the solution phase, we answered the questions:

▷ What behavioral levers can we use to encourage the desired behavior?
▷ How will we reach people with our intervention?

Trial & Scale
In these stages, we implemented our intervention and tested the results using a randomized controlled trial (widely considered the gold standard for evaluation). This allowed us to assess:

▷ What was the impact of our intervention?
▷ What did we learn, and how can we apply it in future work?

In this report, we summarize activities and findings from each stage of our collaboration.
SECTION ONE: TARGET AND EXPLORE
ASSESSING THE CONTEXT AND IDENTIFYING BARRIERS TO BYSTANDER ACTION

- OVERVIEW
- METHODS
- FINDINGS
TARGET & EXPLORE: Overview

- At this stage in the project, our goal was to answer two core questions:
  - What can bystanders do to help survivors of IPV?
  - What are the barriers to those helpful actions?

- In answering those questions, we identified similarities across each country setting, as well as country-specific context that could influence our intervention approach.

- Our methods included field research and desk research on IPV, bystanders, and behavioral insights more broadly.

- In the following pages, we present more detail around our methods, and summarize our findings around those key questions and the country-specific context.
TARGET & EXPLORE: Overview

**INTERVIEWS & OBSERVATION**
- Two mission trips for on-the-ground research
- Stakeholder interviews and site visits with law enforcement, first responders, policymakers, and service providers
- Structured interviews with over 50 total bystanders, survivors, and service providers

**SECONDARY RESEARCH**
- Reviewed the evidence base (from academic and practitioner research) relevant to IPV and bystanderism
- This included IPV-specific research, behavioral science literature, and relevant findings from other disciplines and issue areas such as public health
  
  See appendix for sources

**SERVICE MAPPING**
- Identified and documented service providers operating locally and nationally
- Conducted due diligence through observation (e.g. calling a hotline) and stakeholder interviews

**DATA**
- Reviewed available data around IPV in Georgia and South Africa (e.g. call-center data, incidents reported to police, survey responses)
FINDINGS: What can bystanders do to help IPV survivors?

- Our research indicated that survivors do not receive sufficient emotional support. For example, they:
  - Experience pain from lack of emotional support, and their desire for someone to value and encourage them
  - Want to be strong and independent, but feel isolated and dismissed
  - Feel pressure to be patient and obligation to bear the abuse
  - Face shame and social stigma from leaving an abusive relationship, particularly after marriage or children
  - Feel pressure to protect the family reputation by keeping quiet about the abuse
  - Frequently normalize the abuse as a relationship issue when friends or family say something

- We also found that survivors need greater support to access services. Common themes among survivor experiences included:
  - The impact of logistical barriers (money, housing) to establishing independence
  - The need for counseling and legal support, particularly around housing and custody
  - Insufficient information about available services to meet those needs
  - Perceptions that services are only for poor or homeless women
**FINDINGS: What are the barriers to bystander action?**

Our research indicated that bystanders...

- **Hold negative social norms (or perceived social norms)**
  - Consider abuse to be a private matter between two people
  - Believe that others in their community would see it as interfering or breaking up a family if they intervene
  - Have the perception that women are obligated to keep their family together

- **Experience knowledge gaps around how they can help**
  - Don’t know what services are available or how survivors can access them
  - Don’t know how to help their friends/family socially, fear angering someone if they try
  - Don’t know how to recognize non-physical abuse

- **Feel fatalism and helplessness**
  - Believe that abuse is so common that there’s nothing to do about it, it’s a fact of life
  - Believe that helping only matters if the person being abused will leave, which is considered unlikely

- **Fear retaliation**
  - Fear that the abuser or his/her associates will retaliate
  - Fear that the survivor will turn on them
**FINDINGS: Country-specific context**

**In South Africa, a sense of urgency, but potentially limited options**

- Physical abuse is widely recognized as an issue; e.g. there have been high-profile public demonstrations around the need to address violence against women.

- According to interview respondents, police are not providing support to survivors. Survivors report being ridiculed, dismissed, and having their abuser avoid consequences by paying a minimal bribe. In addition, police are the referral pathway to public services, and if they don’t agree to open a case, survivors may not be able to access those services.

- Despite that, respondents frequently suggested that bystanders could call the police (perhaps because other service options were limited) but expressed doubt that it would help.

- Alcohol was cited as a contributing factor to abuse, and as a form of self-medication for survivors.
**FINDINGS: Country-specific context**

**In Georgia, changing social norms, and an emerging landscape of services**

- In the wake of recent highly publicized policy changes, bystanders have good knowledge about what constitutes IPV (not just physical violence).

- National surveys indicate a rapid decline in acceptance of IPV, but many abusive behaviors are still considered normal, particularly those related to a man’s “right” to control his wife’s decisions.

- Comprehensive services (e.g. housing, job training, counseling) are available and coordinated through state-sponsored service providers, but only recently, and uptake is low.

- This may be partly because accessing those services requires survivors to obtain a special legal “victim status,” determined by the police or an NGO council. Survivors who are not ready to share their experience in that setting therefore face additional barriers to receiving help.
SECTION TWO: SOLUTION DESIGN
DEVELOPING A BEHAVIORALLY-INFORMED INTERVENTION

• OVERVIEW
• REACHING THE TARGET AUDIENCE
• APPLYING BEHAVIORAL LEVERS TO TARGET BARRIERS
• IN PRACTICE: GEORGIA & SOUTH AFRICA INTERVENTION DESIGNS
SOLUTION DESIGN: Using behavioral levers to influence the target audience

- Behavioral interventions can help bystanders overcome the barriers identified in the previous section, using evidence-based behavioral levers to target each issue.

- Those levers can include changes in processes, policies, services, communications, and more. To define a manageable scope within these options, we focused on communication targeting bystanders.

- To design a communications-based solution, we needed to answer two questions:
  - What behavioral levers can we incorporate into our messaging to effectively target barriers to bystander action?
  - How can we deliver those messages to our target audience?

- In the following pages, we summarize our findings and decisions around those two questions.
REACHING OUR TARGET AUDIENCE
(primary intervention)

- In both Georgia and South Africa, we decided to deliver our primary messages via Facebook ads, using engagement with the ads (measured by clicks to “learn more”) to assess impact.

- This offered several advantages, allowing us to:
  - Quickly and affordably reach a large sample size (over 100,000 viewers), which gave us the statistical power to detect small differences in the way people responded to the ads.
  - Measure our impact indicator reliably, through Facebook’s ad platform metrics.
  - Use the ad to link to additional online resources, which provided valuable information to viewers—and another intervention opportunity, as discussed in the following slide.
  - Build capacity within the UNDP teams for a scalable, replicable, and transferable intervention and trial methodology

- In exchange for these advantages, we accepted some downsides:
  - Our ad could only be seen by Facebook users, which likely wouldn’t include people with very low incomes and limited internet access—for example, poor residents in rural areas.
  - Engagement with our ad is an indicator that a bystander might be willing to take action, but it does not tell us with certainty whether they did in fact change their behavior in the real world.
REACHING OUR TARGET AUDIENCE
(secondary intervention)

- We directed viewers who clicked on our Facebook ads to a landing page with additional resources around how to help.

- We designed these pages to be interactive, offering more opportunities to incorporate behavioral levers.

- We created the landing page in Google forms, which had advantages and disadvantages:
  - We could collect user-submitted information and measure engagement with the page reliably and cheaply.
  - However, we could not customize the visuals for the page; we were therefore limited to incorporating behavioral levers related to content, rather than those related to design.
BUILDING OUR BEHAVIORAL LEVERS:
Social norms

- As noted earlier, negative social norms around abuse as a private matter were frequently acting as a barrier to bystander action. Even if bystanders themselves didn't believe that, they believed others would, and they feared social judgment for going against that belief.

- In Georgia, we tackled that barrier by providing information demonstrating that the true social norm was different—most Georgians don't believe that abuse is a private matter. These data came from the recent national survey on violence against women, which found that 33% of Georgian women and 50% of Georgian men (not a majority, in total) believe that such violence is a private matter. We hypothesized that correcting the misperception would reduce the impact of that barrier, and perhaps even replace it with a positive social norm around taking action.

- In South Africa, we didn't have statistics around the social norm, so we relied on a clear declarative statement that abuse is not a private matter, coupled with language framing action as a duty and responsibility. We hypothesized that the unambiguous message and moral frame could lead viewers to reassess their own perceived social norms within a new moral frame. This could help establish new perceptions of social norms around what would be considered moral behavior, and/or help establish new moral frames which could motivated action even if perceived norms are remain unchanged.
BUILDING OUR BEHAVIORAL LEVERS: Reframing support

- In both countries, bystanders often indicated that they felt intervening wouldn’t do anything anyway. That perception of helplessness was a barrier to action.

  ▶ Perceived helplessness was often connected to an overly narrow mental model of “helping,” e.g. solving the survivor’s logistical or social barriers to exiting the relationship. If that didn’t seem feasible, bystanders assumed there was nothing they could do.

  ▶ The impact of this barrier was heightened in South Africa, where formal services (which can help overcome those barriers) were less available. In Georgia, bystanders were more likely to feel that connecting survivors to formal services was a viable option.

- To reduce helplessness, we developed messages reframing emotional support as a high-impact option; this was in line with what survivors prioritized. Our goal was to prompt bystanders to broaden their mental model of helping, incorporating emotional support. We hypothesized that this approach would reduce encourage action by making a highly feasible option more appealing and easier to recall.
BUILDING OUR BEHAVIORAL LEVERS: Knowledge gaps

- In Georgia, we saw that even though there were services available for IPV survivors, it was unclear to many bystanders what those services were and whom they were designed to serve. **Lack of knowledge around available services** was therefore acting as barrier to bystander action.

- In both countries, bystanders described hesitation around speaking to a survivor about the abuse, not knowing what to say or how the survivor would react. **Uncertainty about how to approach an awkward and difficult conversation** was therefore acting as a barrier to action.

- We incorporated these findings into our **call to action**, telling viewers to click to learn more. In Georgia, we offered two versions of that message to tackle both knowledge gaps; one offered tips on **how to support someone**, while the other offered **information about specific services**. In South Africa, where the service landscape was less consistent, we used a single, more general “**how to help**” message.

- We also incorporated these findings into the materials on our landing page, offering concrete tips and resources.
BUILDING OUR BEHAVIORAL LEVERS: Planning, timeliness, and commitment

Our ads were designed to help viewers form an intention to offer help. But in behavior change, intentions are only half the battle; they do not necessarily translate to action. We used several additional behavioral levers to increase the likelihood that bystanders would follow through on their intention to help:

- **Forming a concrete plan** is a well-studied tactic to increase the odds of follow-through. We therefore developed specific questions for viewers to fill out on the landing page, prompting them to consider specifics of how and when they would offer help.

- Timing is another important factor in translating plans to action. **Deadlines**, for example, are an effective way to motivate behaviors; we therefore incorporated deadline-related language into our ads (e.g. telling viewers to act now or regret it later) and added a question to our landing page asking viewers to pick a date by which they would help. We also used the landing page to enable **timely reminders**; viewers had the option to submit their email address in order to receive a reminder message at a later date.

- The same questions around planning and timely reminders serve to create a sense of **commitment** for bystanders. Answering the questions, particularly if submitting an email, is making a (fully voluntary) external commitment, which has been shown to improve follow-through.
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE:
Georgia’s intervention messages

We developed our Georgia intervention messages to include four different combinations of behavioral levers targeting our priority barriers. The English translation is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT KNOWLEDGE GAPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING HOW TO OFFER EMOTIONAL SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 1: When someone is being mistreated by their partner, a friend makes a difference. You can be that friend. Learn what you can say or do to support them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING HOW TO CONNECT SURVIVORS TO SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 2: When someone is being mistreated by their partner, a friend makes a difference. You can be that friend. Learn how you can connect them to services, job centers, and shelters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that IPV is a private matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 3: Only a minority of Georgians think you should stay quiet if you know of someone being mistreated by their partner. Learn what you can say or do to support them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 4: Only a minority of Georgians think you should stay quiet if you know of someone being mistreated by their partner. Learn how you can connect them to services, job centers, and shelters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE:
Georgia’s intervention messages

*SUPPORT* + HELPLESSNESS

SERVICES + HELPLESSNESS

*Due to an unexpected interaction between Google Forms and Facebook, each “Support” message had a '?' in the headline (as seen above) instead of the last Georgian characters. However, there is no indication that the question mark deterred clicks, as those ads were high performers.*
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE:
Georgia Ads

SUPPORT + PRIVATE MATTER

SERVICES + PRIVATE MATTER
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE:
Georgia landing page (service-focused)

CONCRETE TIPS FOR CONNECTING SURVIVORS TO SERVICES

Help someone who is being mistreated by connecting them to services.

Find a private moment when their partner is not around to ask them they are doing. Here are 3 things you can recommend:

1- Tell them to call the hotline at 110 0096 to get connected to free services from the state including crisis centers, counseling, job services, or shelters.
2- Tell them to visit an NGO, they can also provide access to counseling, job services, or shelters. You can find the closest NGO to you here [Link to webpage]
3- Tell them to call 112 if they need urgent help, including a doctor or the police

It can be helpful to make a plan ahead of time, so you’re prepared when it comes time to talk. Answer the following questions to make a plan to follow through.

QUESTIONS FOR “ACTION PLAN”

Is there someone you can think of right now who could use your help?

☐ Yes, I can think of someone I plan to help.
☐ No, I can’t think of someone now but I plan to help in the future.

By when do you plan to help?
Date: __________

How do you want to help them? (Pick as many as you want)
☐ I’ll connect them to free services from the state.
☐ I’ll tell them to visit an NGO.
☐ I’ll tell them to call 112.

We know that speaking to someone may be hard, so let us support you. If you give us your email, we’ll send you a reminder and more information on how you can help, this is completely optional.
Email: __________

Will you make a difference?
Submit my plan

Yes, I plan to help
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE:
Georgia landing page (support-focused)

CONCRETE TIPS FOR OFFERING EMOTIONAL SUPPORT

Help someone who is being mistreated by talking to them and supporting them.

Find a private moment when their partner is not around to ask them how they are doing. Here are 3 ways to support them:

1. Express your concern, but remember that people won’t always want to talk about their experiences. If people do share their stories, you can tell them that it’s not their fault. They didn’t do anything wrong and do not deserve to be mistreated by their partners. Their responsibility is to stay safe and to seek appropriate help, whether accessing resources or leaving the relationship.

2. Help them think of a place they could stay at if they want to leave their partner. Most people go to their parents’ home, at least for some days to think. Tell them that’s an option or help think of another relative or friends who could host them.

3. If they need money, help them think of ways they could earn money while staying safe. Help them think of potential jobs or people they could borrow money from temporarily.

It can be helpful to make a plan ahead of time, so you’re prepared when it comes time to talk. Answer the following questions to make a plan to follow through.

QUESTIONS FOR “ACTION PLAN”

Is there someone you can think of right now who could use your help?

☐ Yes, I can think of someone I plan to help.
☐ No, I can’t think of someone now but I plan to help in the future.

By when do you plan to help?

Date: ____________

How do you want to help them? (Pick as many as you want)

☐ I’ll tell them it’s not their fault and there is no shame in it.
☐ I’ll help them think of a place to move to.
☐ I’ll help them think of ways they could earn money.

We know that speaking to someone may be hard, so let us support you. If you give us your email, we’ll send you a reminder and more information on how you can help, this is completely optional:

Email: ____________

Will you make a difference?

Yes, I plan to help! Submit my plan
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE: South Africa ads

In South Africa we used two different combinations of behavioral levers to target helplessness and social norms barriers.

- We did not develop versions focused on services, as they are not consistently available at a national level. That gives a service-based message potential to backfire by frustrating viewers.
PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE: South Africa’s landing pages

INTRO FOR VIEWERS OF THE “HELPLESSNESS” AD:
When you offer support to someone in a violent relationship, your help can mean everything to them. You have the ability to make a difference. You’ve taken an important first step today by deciding to learn more—thank you for helping.

INTRO FOR VIEWERS OF THE “SOCIAL NORMS” AD:
When you offer support to someone in a violent relationship, you’re doing the right thing. Preventing violence is everyone’s business. You’ve taken an important first step today by deciding to learn more—thank you for helping.

QUESTIONS FOR ACTION PLAN (ALL VIEWERS)

Is there someone you can think of right now who could use your help?
☐ Yes, I can think of someone I plan to help.
☐ No, I can’t think of someone now but I plan to help in the future.

By when do you plan to help?
☐ I’ll help within the next two weeks.
☐ I’ll help within the next month.
☐ I’ll help within the next two months.

How do you want to help them? (Pick as many as you want)
☐ I’ll tell them it’s not their fault and there is no shame in it.
☐ I’ll help them think of a place they can go when they feel unsafe.
☐ I’ll help them think of ways they could earn money.

BODY TEXT (ALL VIEWERS)

Intervening when someone is experiencing violence can be difficult, and it can be hard to know how to begin. Here are some tips that will help you plan:

* Find a private moment when their partner isn’t around to express your concern and ask them how they are doing. Try to be direct and start by saying something like, “I’m worried about you because...” or “I’m concerned about your safety...”

* If the person confides in you, make it clear that you believe what they are telling you, and you know it is not their fault. (Many survivors of violence fear being disbelieved or shamed for their experience.)

* Don’t criticize them for staying in a violent relationship. Although you may want them to leave, they will have to make that decision in their own time. If you criticize their decisions, they’ll likely feel judged, not supported.

* Don’t tell them to be patient or advise them to try harder. Violence is not part of healthy relationships, and it is never the victim’s fault.

* If you want to speak with them about a place to stay, financial issues, or other practical concerns, ask them what would be most helpful and follow their lead. Don’t push them to focus on those questions if they would prefer not to. Sometimes emotional support is all a person needs.

* Don’t be discouraged if the problem doesn’t get better right away; be patient and keep offering support. That way, they’ll know they can turn to you when they’re ready.

Remember: more help is available, for you and for them. For more assistance call LifeLine Southern Africa’s Stop Gender Violence helpline: 0800 150 150. Your local police station may also be able to refer you to services for people experiencing abuse.

It can be helpful to make a plan ahead of time, so you’re prepared when it comes time to talk. Answer the following questions to make a plan to follow through.
SECTION THREE: TRIAL & SCALE
TESTING IMPACT AND LEARNING FROM
THE RESULTS

• OVERVIEW
• GEORGIA TRIAL DESIGN & RESULTS
• SOUTH AFRICA TRIAL DESIGN & RESULTS
• WHAT DID WE LEARN, AND HOW CAN WE APPLY IT IN FUTURE WORK?

*Note: For a detailed explanation of analysis methods, see Appendix
TRIAL & SCALE: Testing impact and learning from results

- In this phase, we apply rigorous evaluation methods to answer two questions:
  - What can we say about the impact of our intervention, overall and within each version?
  - What do those findings mean for next steps and future work?

- Rigorous testing gives us confidence that our interventions are doing what we think they’re doing.

- Alternatively, it shows us when we are headed down the wrong path, potentially wasting resources or even causing harm through an ineffective strategy.

- In the following pages, we summarize our findings and decisions around those two questions.

Note: A detailed explanation of analysis methods is shown in the Appendix.
TRIAL & SCALE: Testing impact and learning from results

- Our overall goal was to better understand how changes in messaging could impact whether bystanders engaged with IPV resources. Specifically, our trial tested whether our different messaging frames impacted whether Facebook users clicked on our ads for more information. Our trial included quantitative and qualitative elements:

  ▶ Using Facebook, we conducted two randomized controlled trials (one in Georgia, and one in South Africa) to test engagement, determining which of our messages most effectively motivated viewers to click through.

  ▶ Using Google forms, we also collected qualitative data on how people interacted with the behaviorally-informed landing pages. This gave us additional context around the services and actions perceived to be most useful or feasible.

- The findings from this trial are directly applicable for messaging campaigns targeting bystanders, particularly in online settings.

- Lessons learned through this process can also inform the broader landscape of interventions; e.g. the content of the 112 app in Georgia, or the processes for accessing services in South Africa.
TRIAL & SCALE: Georgia

In Georgia, we tested our four different ad messages against each other.

- Participants were randomly assigned to see one of our four ad versions through Facebook’s Ad Splitter.
- If a participant clicked on this ad to “Learn More” they were directed to one of 2 versions of the landing page where they could submit an action plan.

**AD LANDING PAGE SUBMIT ACTION PLAN**

Option to submit email address for follow up

**LANDING PAGES INCLUDE:**

- Information about how to help survivors
- “Action plan” questions to help people plan to help in the future.
TRIAL RESULTS: Georgia Overview

- Total Unique Viewers: 149,445
- Total Clicks to Landing Page: 2,324
- Action Plans Submitted: 116
- Emails Submitted: 20
GEORGIA AUDIENCE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VIEWERS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF VIEWERS WHO CLICKED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35,774</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>113,412</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that women seem more likely to click than men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VIEWERS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF VIEWERS WHO CLICKED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>31,115</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>36,381</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>27,497</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>23,032</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>20,687</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>10,733</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that older people seem more likely to click than younger.
GEORGIA RESULTS

- The ad that performed best combined:
  - Tips on providing social support
  - Social norms to tell people that abuse is not a private matter.

- Overall, ads focused on providing social support performed better than ads focused on services.

- Descriptively, the “Service + Private Matter” ad performed the worst. However, this difference was not statistically significant when compared to “Service + Helplessness” and performed only marginally worse than “Support + Helplessness.”
GEORGIA RESULTS BY GENDER

We examined how each ad performed with men and women and found a similar pattern of ad performance.

However, among men alone we did not find that any ad was significantly better or worse than another. This suggests the success of the “Support + Private Matter” ad was largely driven by its effect on women.
GEORGIA RESULTS BY AGE

The pattern of ad effect also persists across age ranges, though it is less distinct in younger age groups (18–44). The strength of “Support + Private Matter” is largely seen among ages 45–65+. 
### GEORGIA AD RESULTS: Interaction & engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VIEWERS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF VIEWERS WHO CLICKED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SHARES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO COMPLETED ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF PEOPLE WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN, OUT OF EVERYONE WHO CLICKED ON THE AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support + Helplessness</td>
<td>33,384</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service + Helplessness</td>
<td>49,047</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support + Private Matter</td>
<td>34,971</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service + Private Matter</td>
<td>32,043</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GEORGIA AD RESULTS: What viewers did

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY KNEW SOMEONE TO HELP</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP WITHIN 2 WEEKS</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP WITHIN 1 MONTH</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP WITHIN 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support + Helplessness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service + Helplessness</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support + Private Matter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service + Private Matter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEORGIA AD RESULTS: What viewers commit to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD TELL A SURVIVOR THERE WAS NO SHAME IN EXPERIENCING ABUSE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP A SURVIVOR FIND SHELTER</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP A SURVIVOR FIND WAYS THEY CAN EARN MONEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support + Helplessness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support + Private Matter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD CONNECT A SURVIVOR TO STATE SERVICES</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD CONNECT A SURVIVOR TO AN NGO</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD TELL A SURVIVOR TO CALL 112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support + Helplessness</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support + Private Matter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to an implementation error, participants who saw a “Support” landing page (top table) were only allowed to choose 1 choice, in all other instances they could choose up to three.
GEORGIA FINDINGS: What do they mean?

- The “Support + Private Matter” ad was the clear front runner. Offering people ways of providing social support and emphasizing that abuse is not a private matter through the use of social norms seems to be a particularly effective way to encourage engagement.

- While ads focusing on social support seemed to do better overall, it is likely that the nature of additional messages that this focus is paired with matters greatly. It may be that a message that focuses on social norms, like the “Private Matter” messages, is a particularly salient way to encourage social support.

- Facebook may be a better method to reach older people than we had previously thought and older people may be particularly motivated to intervene as active bystanders. The “Support + Private Matter” was especially effective among people over 45.

- While the ads varied in how effective they were at getting people to click to the landing page, once people arrived there they submitted action plans at similar rates. The “Service + Private Matter” performed better than “Support + Helplessness,” but we can’t be sure that this difference can be attributed to the differences in ad that participants saw.
TRIAL DESIGN: South Africa

In South Africa, we tested our two different ad messages against each other.

- Participants were randomly assigned to see one of the two ad versions through Facebook’s Ad Splitter.
- If a participant clicked on this ad to “Learn More” they were directed to one of 2 versions of a landing page where they could submit an action plan.

LANDING PAGES INCLUDE:

- Information about how to help survivors
- “Action plan” questions to help people plan to help in the future.
SOUTH AFRICA OVERVIEW

103,591
TOTAL UNIQUE VIEWERS

1,806
TOTAL CLICKS TO LANDING PAGE

22
ACTION PLANS SUBMITTED
SOUTH AFRICA RESULTS

Overall engagement rates were high for both ads (approximately 70% above the Facebook average.

We did not find a significant difference in how effective each ad was at encouraging people to click through to “Learn More.”

This result may mean that people are equally motivated by messages that tell them they can help and messages that tell them they should, additional research may help to tease whether or not people think of these barriers differently.

Unlike in Georgia, the message addressing the belief that abuse is a private matter (“Should Help”) was not a clear frontrunner. There may be more effective ways of addressing this barrier (for example, with statistics showing majority support for intervention, as in the case of Georgia).

Given these questions, social norms messaging may be particularly effective and an interesting avenue for further research.
SOUTH AFRICA AUDIENCE CHARACTERISTICS

We can observe that women seem less likely to click than men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VIEWERS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF VIEWERS WHO CLICKED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,110</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53,150</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that, generally, older people seem more likely to click than younger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VIEWERS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF VIEWERS WHO CLICKED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>43,219</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>24,086</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>10,669</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>7,056</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12,032</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Africa Results by Gender

Both ads seemed to perform similarly amongst men and women.

Women seem less likely to engage with either ad, but we cannot say what’s driving this effect. This is an interesting comparison to the ads in Georgia, where women appeared to be more likely to engage than men.
No large differences in ad performance exist in any age group.

Older women seem somewhat more likely to click than younger women, but this effect does not exist among men.
**SOUTH AFRICA AD RESULTS: Interaction & Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VIEWERS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF VIEWERS WHO CLICKED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SHARES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO COMPLETED ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF PEOPLE WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN, OUT OF EVERYONE WHO CLICKED ON THE AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can Help</td>
<td>51,631</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Help</td>
<td>51,960</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOUTH AFRICA AD RESULTS: What viewers did

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY KNEW SOMEONE TO HELP</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP WITHIN 2 WEEKS</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP WITHIN 1 MONTH</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP WITHIN 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can Help</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Help</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SOUTH AFRICA AD RESULTS:** What viewers commit to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO COMPLETED AN ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD TELL A SURVIVOR THERE WAS NO SHAME IN EXPERIENCING ABUSE</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP A SURVIVOR FIND A PLACE TO STAY</th>
<th>NUMBER WHO SAID THEY WOULD HELP A SURVIVOR FIND WAYS THEY CAN EARN MONEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can Help</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Help</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SOUTH AFRICA FINDINGS: What do they mean?**

- Both ads demonstrated high levels of engagement, including sharing. On average, Facebook ads have a click through rate of less than 1%, each ad we tested was more than 70% larger than this average.

- Though we were not able to distinguish which ad was more effective, we think they were both successful. Further research that tests different messaging around one of the specific barriers addressed by these ads would likely provide useful information in how to hone these messages even more.

- Once participants reached a landing page, their likelihood of completing an action plan was very similar no matter the ad or landing page they saw.

- Additional research can be performed on what messages perform best for each gender. Women were less likely to engage with these ads; it would be interesting to learn if women are less likely to engage in general or if they are motivated by different messaging all together.
CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS

■ There were high rates of engagement with the materials we created— in both countries, engagement was nearly double that of the average Facebook ad. This indicates that there is interest in bystander guidance resources.

■ However, the differences in engagement between the ads in the Georgia trial also demonstrated the importance of small tweaks in messaging.

■ The lessons learned around these small tweaks— e.g. the importance of correcting perceived social norms—can be used to inform the development of potentially bystander-facing programs and materials, e.g. the 112 app in Georgia.

■ Given that, it will be important to continue exploring additional barriers and message frames, as well as to continue exploring and refining our understanding of other barriers. This will suggests the need for more qualitative research and more quantitative testing.

■ After their hands-on role in this project, the UNDP country teams are well positioned to take that work forward.
APPENDIX 1:
ANALYSIS METHODS
METHOD

EVALUATION METHOD:

- We ran a randomized controlled trial (RCT) to evaluate the effect of the messages in both countries.
  - We did this by using Facebook’s Ad Split function, which automatically:
    - Creates random and non overlapping audiences
    - Shows one ad to each audience
    - Reports the number of unique viewers of each ad (“Reach”)
    - Report the number of unique link clicks from each ad

WHY EVALUATE?

- Evaluation allows us to build an evidence base and continually improve messaging and services.
- Ineffective messages are bad—unintentionally harmful messages are worse. Evaluation helps us avoid both.
IN DETAIL: Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs)

The following pages demonstrate the steps involved in running an RCT and highlight how we completed each step in these trials.

Start with a group of people (or organizations) you want to try something new with – e.g. people who are on Facebook in Georgia or South Africa

*We specified our audience in Facebook’s Ad Splitter as people who live in Georgia or South Africa*
IN DETAIL: Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs)

Randomly assign each individual in your audience to one of at least two categories:

- Treatment 1
- Treatment 2*

...a behaviorally informed message or process, e.g. one version of the Facebook ad

...a different behaviorally informed message.

Facebook automatically completes this step, creating random non overlapping audiences

Note: other times you will compare one or more “Treatments” to a “Control” message.
IN DETAIL: Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs)

Measure the outcome of interest for each group e.g. number of clicks on each ad. Now you can ask **two questions**:  
- What happened? E.g. did more people engage with one version of the ad?  
- If there’s a difference, could it be due to chance?

Since we know our groups are similar, **thanks to random assignment, we can be pretty confident that any differences are due to the treatment**, and not some underlying, pre-existing difference between our groups.

*Facebook reports back how many people saw and clicked on each ad. We can use this to answer these questions.*
After running our ads on Facebook we received aggregated data on who saw and clicked on each ad (similar to fig. 1).

We imported this data into Stata and created a data set with a row for every individual who saw the ad and an indicator of whether or not they clicked on it (similar to fig. 2).

### Fig. 1 Aggregate Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fig. 2 Individual Level Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETING RESULTS: Regression

Once the data was disaggregated to the individual level, we used Stata run linear regression models to determine the effect of being shown a certain ad on how likely someone was to click on it.

Regression is a statistical technique that allows you to analyze the relationship between variables and predict how an explanatory variable (like individual characteristics or an intervention) may affect a particular outcome.
INTERPRETING RESULTS: Data

Regression output provides an estimate of the average effect of seeing a certain ad message on the likelihood of clicking.

Regressions also report back whether an effect is “statistically significant.” When an effect is statistically significant we can be reasonably confident that the true difference is not zero. When we see a “p value” that’s less than .05, we say the results are statistically significant.

We ran several regressions to analyze each trial. In some we “controlled” for age and gender. This means we accounted for the variation in how likely someone would be to click on each ad because of these characteristics when we determined the effect of seeing a particular treatment.

- In our trial, the groups that saw each ad varied by proportion of age and gender; running these regressions gave us confidence that the patterns we observed were due to differences between the ads rather than difference between the groups.
INTERPRETING RESULTS: Data

Our analysis allowed us to determine how likely a person in our audience (someone living in Georgia or South Africa with a Facebook account) would be to click on each Facebook Ad we created.

It also allowed us to determine if the differences in the effects of each ad we tested were statistically significant—it allowed us to determine, with a high degree of confidence, that the differences we observe are caused by the ads, and not other factors.

We found a clear front runner among the ads we tested in Georgia and can be confident that the “Support + Private Matter” ad’s success over the other ads we tested was not due to random chance.

In South Africa, we developed estimates of the effect of each of our ads on our audience, however we were not able to determine if one of these ads would meaningfully perform better than the other.
APPENDIX 2:
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