Detailed Synthesis
Speakers Corner #41:

Strengthening Evaluation of Poverty and Conflict/Fragility Interventions

POVERTY AND CONFLICT LEARNING NETWORK

HIGHLIGHT OF MAJOR THEMES:

Day 1.

How do you design evaluation strategies in fragile environments?

Day 2.

How do you develop indicators to evaluate impact?

Day 3

How do you develop and implement tools for data collection?

Discussions during this Speakers Corner reflected the findings and conclusions from the Poverty and Conflict Learning Network. Each of the three days was devoted to a related theme in evaluation and assessment in conflict environments.

March 2011

This publication was produced for review by the U.S. Agency for International Development. It was prepared by John Berry. http://microlinks.kdid.org

U.S. Agency for International Development
www.usaid.gov

INTRODUCTION

The linkage between poverty and conflict constitutes a major area of concern for the international community. While USAID has a long history of working in conflict and fragile environments around the world, there have been growing demands for these interventions to be more effective. More and more USAID programs are expected to demonstrably impact peace and stability as they improve the well-being of the poor and vulnerable.

Despite being critical functions for understanding and improving effectiveness, evaluation and assessment have not evolved at the same pace as program growth. Recognizing USAID's ongoing interest in poverty reduction in environments of conflict and fragility, and its recommitment to evaluation, the Office of Poverty Reduction launched the Poverty and Conflict Learning Network in 2009 to address this critical knowledge gap.

For the last year and a half, the Learning Network has grappled with fundamental questions regarding the linkage between poverty and conflict such as: Can programs focused on economic development and poverty reduction also reduce conflict? Is there a causal linkage between poverty reduction and conflict mitigation? What strategies, indicators and tools can be used to measure this linkage?

The following report synthesizes the discussion of these questions during a recent Speakers Corner entitled "Strengthening Evaluation of Poverty and Conflict/Fragility Interventions" which took place from January 11-13, 2011.[1] This Speakers Corner was co-hosted by USAID's Office of Poverty Reduction and USAID's Microenterprise Development office and facilitated by members of the USAID-funded Poverty and Conflict Learning Network.

Highlights of Major Themes

Discussions during this Speakers Corner reflected the findings and conclusions from the Poverty and Conflict Learning Network. Each of the three days was devoted to a related theme in evaluation and assessment in conflict environments. The themes were:

Day 1 - How do you design evaluation strategies in fragile environments?

Discussion on strategies for evaluation design covered such topics as partnerships, research methodologies, financing evaluations and planning evaluations in fragile environments.

Day 2 - How do you develop indicators to evaluate impact?

On the subject of indicators, participants discussed what makes good qualitative and quantitative indicators, designing indicators in peace building situations, measuring changes in attitudes, and practices for capturing perceptions of time.

Day 3 - How do you develop and implement tools for data collection?

Exchange on the topic of data collection focused on techniques for obtaining information on sensitive topics, ensuring anonymity and informed consent, training to improve data collection, working with local partners, and innovative use of technology.

During the three days of discussion, participants presented a number of interesting field projects where these themes were key issues in project implementation. A wide diversity of opinions and comments were expressed; the purpose of this Speakers Corner was not to come to a consensus on all issues discussed, but rather to offer an opportunity to share ideas and opinions to a diverse global audience. This synthesis tries to capture the essence of the ideas discussed, without implying that there was universal agreement to any of these points.

Participant Statistics

Number of registered participants	102
New Microlinks members in discussion	77
Number of contributors	26
Number of resources submitted	23
Total number of posts	98
Discussion views	1,984
Countries represented	55

How do you Design Evaluation Strategies in Fragile Environments?

Any discussion of evaluation strategy design must begin by addressing fundamental questions such as: Is it possible to prove causal effects in fragile environments? And if so, should this be the focus of evaluation design? The facilitators noted a major change in perceptions of the importance of impact measurement. In part because of the difficulty of showing compelling evidence of aid impact, the public is increasingly asking if aid dollars are making a difference. This has required a fundamental shift in evaluation from an ***accounting*** perspective to a ***causal inference*** perspective.

Until recently many people thought about the evaluation of development work like an accounting exercise – find out if money went where it was supposed to, if people did the work they were meant to do and so on. Evaluations typically involved experts flying out after the end of a program to talk to project managers and beneficiaries to find out what happened. Questions of causality, and of whether interventions really made a difference, were often considered unanswerable, and therefore went unasked.

In the past decade there has been a fundamental shift regarding the importance of demonstrating impact, along with a growing focus on understanding causal effects of interventions. The fundamental questions are:

- How can we figure out how things would have looked *if an intervention had never happened*?
- What strategies have been used effectively to capture these linkages?
- What questions can or should be answered?
- What sort of expertise and resources are required?
- How are the results really useful?

In answering these questions, several key approaches and tools emerged that focused the discussion on improving evaluation design. These included:

- Partnerships between practitioners and academics;
- Research methodologies;
- Financing rigorous evaluation; and
- Evaluation in fragile environments.

1. Partnerships Between Practitioners and Academics

Infusing the design and implementation of program evaluations with rigorous empirical method often works best when there is a strong partnership between

For impact evaluations to work, it's important to have everyone in the program understand that they are involved in a scientific project that aims to test ideas about "what works."

Impact evaluations are more successful when they are seen less as technical exercises tacked on to existing programs and more as rich, substantive exercises to design programs for testing ideas and discovering how to bring about the desired change.

academics and implementers, and when this partnership is formed prior to the design of the program.

Building practitioner-academic relationships is important, but it takes a combination of the right chemistry, clear goals and open-minded managers who understand the benefits of collaboration. Getting the relationship right requires a mutual understanding of the skills, abilities and value added of each partner. Partnerships should also include a diversity of perspectives, including the voices of people on the ground.

Partnerships are most valuable when they span the duration of the program, from the design phase through implementation and analysis. In order to get the most from these relationships, academics and practitioners should collaborate at the beginning by conceptualizing "what needs to be done" and continue to the end in determining "whether it worked."

Often partnerships fail when conflict emerges between practitioners and academics; practitioners understand their role as helping people, while academics see themselves as neutral evaluators and have little stake in the program. These differences might seem natural, but they can create unnecessary tensions and obstacles. In addition, creating a division of labor between tasks
reserved for practitioners, with their substantive knowledge, and academics, with their technical knowledge, can impede progress and fail to fully utilize the diverse experience of both partners.

2. Research Methodologies

Randomized Control Trials (RCT) are considered by some to be the "gold standard" in proving causality, but there are many kinds of measurement strategies in the development evaluation toolkit. Each method is better at answering some questions than others. Evaluation design should be driven first by the questions that need to be answered, and then an appropriate methodology should be selected.

Randomized Control Trials have both their strengths and limitations. As an inference strategy, randomization sets up a structure to make meaningful comparisons and to understand how things would have looked had the program not taken place.

However, it can be difficult and costly to use RCT. In practice, implementing these trials makes most sense as part of an integrated research agenda, rather than a stand-alone study, and the trials are most effective when accompanied by measurement strategies using other quantitative approaches.

Randomized Control Trials are not the best tool for every evaluation, particularly because of the time and cost involved, as well as the relatively large sample size needed. In addition, these trials are difficult to implement when working with a partner for the first time or when testing a new methodology. Where appropriate, a key RTC study can help outline causal relationships and inform implementation strategy; then, other less intensive (and less expensive) types of impact evaluation can be used for follow up.

Evaluation designers need to consider a range of methodological options,

with different levels of rigor, to ensure the efficiency and impact of their research. After all, the overarching goal is to improve the accountability of aid organizations and to better understand what works and what doesn't, not simply to implement a high quality evaluation.

3. Financing Evaluation

Implementing organizations are cost-conscious and are unlikely to undertake activities, even empirically sound ones, which require them to absorb expenses not explicitly reimbursable by the contract or grant. Unless a donor is willing to come up with additional funds, few organizations are in a position to take on these costs. Therefore donors must embrace opportunities to work with academics and build in the additional costs that good—and rigorous—evaluations require. While funding robust evaluation is a financial burden, this kind of research can make a world of difference in improving program design.

Another challenge in financing evaluations is simply being honest about how expensive they can be compared to the amount spent on project implementation. Practitioners are sometimes hesitant to share information about the cost of evaluation with local partners; they fear local partners will proclaim how many more people they could help with that same money or question the value of an expensive evaluation when they believe they are using sound methodology. When a project's research budget matches or surpasses the implementation budget, it can cause both partners and donors to step back.

4. Evaluations in Fragile Environments

The challenges of implementing high-quality evaluations are even greater in conflict-affected and fragile states. First, resources are often much more limited in fragile contexts. Time is scarce, and both donors and implementing partners alike are anxious to see results, or "peace dividends," quickly. The initial program design is often rushed as a result, and baselines and academic partnerships may only be an afterthought. Furthermore, staff capacity is often reduced because aid agencies are not yet in full development mode.

Another factor, particularly in fragile states, is the barrier within aid organizations to learning from evaluations. These organizations may have defensive learning cultures where positive news is widely advertised and negative news is hidden. Furthermore, if the goal is to improve programming, then monitoring programs during implementation may be much more effective than evaluating them when they are done. Monitoring information can be easier for organizations to use than evaluations when there are systems in place to facilitate its internalization.

How do you Develop Indicators to Evaluate Impact?

Lack of universal indicators for measuring and comparing program impact across contexts is a key challenge for monitoring and evaluation in conflict environments. This lacuna has hindered learning and slowed the advancement of the field.

In the practitioner community, development of impact indicators has struggled with two key conceptual limitations. First, many practitioners have asserted that it is impossible to measure the outcomes of peace building programs because many outcomes are intangible. Second, many have argued that it's not feasible to develop a set of universal indicators because conflict situations are so context-specific that they defy comparison. In order to overcome these limitations, a balanced approach is required using a range of indicators to capture "soft" behavioral and attitudinal change and to strike a balance between context-specific information and data that can be compared across programs and environments.

Discussion on this topic focused on the process of developing indicators for measuring peace building and economic development impact, identifying what makes indicators effective or ineffective, and exploring the possibility of developing "universal" indicators. During these discussions, several key themes emerged on impact indicators. These included:

- What makes a good indicator?
- Designing and operationalizing indicators;
- Indicators for capturing changes in behavior and attitude; and
- Measuring change over time.

1. What Makes a Good Indicator?

Since indicators are intended to measure program impact, they should derive from program goals and objectives; they should be qualitative as well as quantitative and should not be too burdensome to implement. Finally, indicators should account for both negative and positive external factors in order to prove the linkage between the program and the change observed.

2. Designing and Operationalizing Appropriate Indicators

One technique for ensuring that project objectives drive indicator development is to create a causal model to trace how you predict change will occur during the project. Indicators should be selected based on this causal model and should use both quantitative and qualitative methods, and should triangulate data from multiple sources.

An interesting design option to consider:
If your programs cannot start up in all locations at once, then there is an opportunity to randomize "treatment" or intervention and control groups. By comparing the results of the treatment and control groups, you can attribute change in the treatment group to the project – assuming the treatment/control groups are "the same" except for the program.

There are unique challenges in designing indicators in post-conflict or fragile environments. This brings up the larger challenge of how to capture contextual concepts like safety, security, goodwill, etc. in environments where people aren't likely to discuss them. For example, in conflict environments it can be difficult to measure qualitative indicators like trust at the grassroots level. There are different approaches to surmounting this challenge, some concrete such as number of incidents (e.g. gun shots heard, physical violence, etc.) and others more holistic (e.g. percentage change in negative relationships between communities). The choice of methods depends on both your causal model and the type of conflict in which you are working (e.g. active versus latent).

3. Indicators for Capturing Change in Behavior and Attitude

Projects in conflict and fragile states frequently have peace building objectives. But what indicators can be used to measure peace building outcomes? For example, how do you measure changes in violence and security? Also, how do you measure changes in relationships between conflicting parties? What can changes in behavior and attitudes tell us about peace building outcomes?

On the one hand, indicators that capture changes in behavior – such as social interactions like intermarriage, economic interactions like trade or participation in violence, may provide a quantifiable marker of growing peace. On the other hand, tensions may simmer just beneath the surface of an apparently peaceful situation, visible only in people's feelings toward each other (which aren't captured by the survey). The key to understanding these relationships is often found in the intersection of behaviors and attitudes.

Surveys to measure changes in attitude over time have their limitations, especially in the context of development interventions. For example, at the end of a project, beneficiaries have strong incentive to tell you what they think you want to hear. If you are implementing a project that talks about the importance of dialogue, and at the end of the project you ask people about the

Asking a range of questions about behaviors and attitudes can help to find trends. For example, in Afghanistan, Banyan Global wanted to understand how working with employees from other ethnic backgrounds relates to attitudes towards those ethnic groups, and how these attitudes relate to perceptions of insecurity. Not surprisingly, the attitudes were easier to gauge than experiences and behaviors. There were two possible reasons for this. First, information on experiences and behaviors tends to be more sensitive than information on attitudes; second, it was very difficult for respondents to isolate experiences or behaviors from their context.

importance of dialogue, you shouldn't be surprised if you find what look like positive results. However, it is very hard to know if these results mean anything at all. Of course there are recommended ways to ask these questions, but the general risk of social desirability bias is strong. In order to avoid this bias, your research methodology needs to take social desirability into consideration in choosing how to phrase survey questions.

4. Measuring Change over Time

How is it possible to compare data from respondents in the baseline survey with different respondents at different times? Do you have to use the same respondents for end line survey or it is possible to use others?

Panel data – that is surveys of the same people over time – can be challenging to capture and analyze. Complications can arise if either the project or the context changes significantly over time to the point that the baseline sample is no longer representative. Collecting panel data presents an even greater challenge in conflict and fragile environments where locating the initial respondents years later can be very difficult.

There are a few techniques that can be used to mitigate these likelihoods. These include oversampling during the baseline survey, taking GPS readings, asking respondents for a contact who would know how to reach them, or asking where they would go if they had to leave their area. These aren't silver bullet solutions, but if you want to use panel data they can help.

How do you Develop and Implement Tools for Data Collection?

Preparation is key to a succesful data-collection exercise. It is often said that good preparation is half the work, but when it comes to evaluations it is more like 90 percent. Even with a solid design and good indicators, the data collected is useless if, for example, the data collectors have not been trained well. In addition, good preparation also requires forethought in planning how to address sensitive topics and how to use technology appropriately.

Discussions on developing and using tools focused on the following topics:

- Sensitive information ;
- Anonymity and informed consent;
- Training;
- Working with local partners; and
- Technology.

1. Obtaining Information on Sensitive Topics

Conducting research on topics such as economic growth and conflict in fragile environments often involves gathering data on experiences and attitudes that are very sensitive. Collecting these kinds of data is something everyone involved in research in conflict environments has struggled with at some point. It can be daunting to ask questions such as: Is the presence of government soldiers in your village bad for your household? Is there domestic violence

in this household? Is sexual violence prevalent in the village? It is particularly hard to address these questions and at the same time to develop concise and user-friendly tools.

Developing sophisticated questions to ask about sensitive topics indirectly and building the trust necessary for data collectors to ask these questions requires extra training. It is important to be realistic about this and anticipate that a large percentage of the training time for data collectors might need to be spent on preparing for these few questions. In addition, it is critical to have local team members involved in the tool design process, especially ones who will be involved in the data collection and have a sense of which questions are more or less appropriate.

In order to promote confidentiality and anonymity, you should:

- Offer reminders of confidentiality more than once;
- Offer reminders of the importance of the data and the value of the study;
- Use sealed envelopes so enumerator does not know the respondents answers;
- Use scrambled responses to add statistical noise to answers while allowing the aggregate results to remain interpretable; and
- Explain the research during repeated visits rather than trying to get consent for the entire research project at one time.

2. Anonymity and Informed Consent

Addressing confidentiality, anonymity, and consent are key challenges in a fragile or conflict environment, especially when you are trying to obtain information indirectly and with limited time and resources. How can you balance time savings with ethical rigor? Do ethical considerations vary depending on social and cultural norms? How do you manage the "informed" part of informed consent? And what can you do if you want to measure something without informing the respondents of what you're measuring?

The lengthy, legalistic consent forms that research review boards often request can do more to protect research institutions than to protect subjects, especially in environments with low literacy. In order to ensure that subjects understand what the research is about, how long it will take, and what the benefits and risks are, it can be more effective to use a short and simple script, making clear that the respondent can refuse or quit at any point.

The consent process should fit the context where you are working. Remember, respondents deserve respect for their time as well as their anonymity. As a way of empowering respondents you should also consider leaving them with a business card (with both local and international contacts) in case they have questions regarding the survey.

3. Importance of Training

Training of the data collection team should not be seen as an isolated stage of the process, but as an integral part of research design. This generates a

sense of local ownership and engages local counterparts in articulating the research agenda and determining the best way to obtain the information needed.

The initial training can be used as an opportunity for the local data collectors to review and provide input into the research tool to make it more locally appropriate. In addition, enough time should be allotted for practice with the final, edited, version of the tool so that consistency of the data collection is not compromised. Training can also provide an opportunity to adapt the way in which certain sensitive questions are asked, even if the question itself remains the same.

Training can take from several days to a week, depending upon the complexity of the tools and the data gathering methods, in addition to the time required for piloting efforts in the field. It is worthwhile to train more people than are needed, so that those who can't manage the data gathering don't get hired. Also, be sure to include debriefing sessions with the enumerators to talk through challenges and issues. Finally, after testing the tool, work with enumerators to revise and review the tool again with data collectors in the classroom prior to launch.

Field staff are the front line of data collection, so to the extent possible they should be involved in developing the data collection tools. This increases ownership and ensures the tools are appropriate to the local culture and are relevant for the program.

4. Working with Local Partners

There are several important issues to bear in mind when choosing how you want to to work with local partners and whether to contract a local research firm or to hire individual local enumerators. When deciding whether to use a firm or individual enumerators you need to take into consideration the nature and scope of the research agenda, the type of tools, the realities on the ground (for example security and mobility concerns) and your own management capacity. For example, if you use individually contracted enumerators it is particularly important to have at least one headquarters staff member in the field overseeing the study.

There are important benefits of contracting individual researchers. Local researchers are often from the area and have very detailed knowledge of the communities you are studying, so they can offer feedback on problematic questions or issues prior to and during the study. However, using independent researchers can require more training and management than relying on a single local survey firm.

5. Use of Innovative Technology

Despite upfront costs, new technologies can make research projects more cost-effective and strengthen the quality of the data and reliability of the findings. This can involve PDAs, mobile and smartphones, solar chargers or software such as Pendragon and Episurveyor. While there is a common assumption that higher technology necessarily means higher cost, numerous examples show how low-cost technologies can be used to streamline the design, data collection and analysis stages for a more efficient process and more reliable findings. Here are some thoughts and resources

When training local staff on the use of participatory assessment tools in conflict environments you should:

Combine "classroom" learning with practical application. Review and practice the tool in the office, then practice using the tool in the field with supervision from the trainer.

Be conflict-sensitive during the training itself. If facilitators come from different communities, include icebreaker activities and ensure that groups intermix.

Train note-takers rigorously, ensuring that they understand the objectives of the tool, key research questions, and the correct way to record information.

Discuss the nature of the conflict during training. Engaging facilitators in analysis will help them understand the context and promote ownership of the results.

Discuss how to word sensitive questions. Asking questions skillfully can overcome many worries about broaching delicate topics.

Encourage facilitators to anticipate potential biases. Practice sensitive probing for when facilitators suspect that participants are not providing complete responses.

Determine common translations for key conflict words. Having a common language for discussing conflict will increase comparability across focus groups.

to consider before moving from paper to screen.

Why to go beyond paper (and never look back)

Digital data collection can make surveys better, cheaper, and faster by collecting cleaner data. Survey interview software can prevent many of the simple but costly problems that plague paper data collection (e.g., missing answers, crazy answers, logically incompatible answers). Survey software catches and corrects these issues at the point of data collection (e.g. forcing the interviewer to answer required questions, restricting answers to allowable response options, flagging logical inconsistencies and prompting the interviewer to address them).

Digital data collection can also be cheaper in certain circumstances, especially when you consider the costs of paper data collection. First, there is printing--something that is always more costly and time-consuming than you would expect. Then there is transporting completed questionnaires back to the operational headquarters - which takes time, gas, and dedicated staff. Also you must review and/or edit paper questionnaire entries which take time and dedicated staff. Finally, manually keying of survey responses into a computer-readable format not only takes time and staff, but this process is also liable to data entry errors. Digital data collection eliminates all of these Issues.

Digital data collection is also faster. The costly paper processes outlined above all take time, from printing

questionnaires to keying responses into a computer. Digital data collection reduces significantly the lag from data collection in the field to data analysis in the home office. Data can come from the field the same day via e-mail and data can be transferred into a usable statistical software format (e.g., SAS, Stata, SPSS) in minutes.

Benefits of affordable electronic devices

A common objection to digital data collection is cost. For small and one-off surveys, this is likely valid. However, device prices are low and getting lower, with cheap PDAs costing $150. Cell phones cost as little as $100 and can be much cheaper if SMS is a viable data collection tool. Ultra-mobile PCs range between $250 and $600 depending on the features.

These costs can be a reasonable investment when one considers the cost savings from abandoning costly paper processes (e.g. printing) and the fact that these costs can be amortized over several projects (you can reuse computers many times).

Survey Software

A number of research organizations have already done their collective homework on suitable survey software and there are several reasonable options available which can be found online.

Resources for Evaluating Poverty and Conflict

Topical Websites

Poverty and Conflict Learning Network page, *Poverty Frontiers*
http://www.povertyfrontiers.org/ev.php?ID=10481_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

Poverty Reduction in Conflict and Fragile States: Perspectives from the Household Level, *Poverty Frontiers*
http://www.povertyfrontiers.org/ev.php?ID=1598_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

Designing For Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs, *Search for Common Ground, United States Institute for Peace, Alliance for Peacebuilding*
http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilr/ilt_manualpage.html

Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit, *Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame*
http://www.nd.edu/~krocinst/documents/crs_reflective_final.pdf

Research Networks

Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL)
http://www.povertyfrontiers.org/ev.php?ID=1598_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

Innovations for Poverty Action
http://poverty-action.org/

Systematic Reviews in International Development, *DFID*
http://www.dfid.gov.uk/R4D/SystematicReviewFeature.asp

International Growth Centre, *UKaid from the Department for International Development*
http://www.theigc.org/

International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3IE)
http://www.3ieimpact.org/expert_roster.html

Financial Services Assessment, *IRIS Center at the University of Maryland*
http://www.fsassessment.umd.edu/

Research Methods

Randomized Control Trials – "Field Experiments and the Political Economy of Development" *Annual Review of Political Science*
http://www.columbia.edu/~mh2245/papers1/HW_ARPS09.pdf

Natural Experiments – "The Consequences of Child Soldiering"
http://www.chrisblattman.com/documents/research/2010.Consequences.RESTAT.pdf

DDR Programs – "Reintegrating rebels into civilian life: Quasi-experimental evidence

from Burundi" *Department of Politics, New York University & Department of Political Science, Columbia University*
http://www.columbia.edu/~cds81/docs/bdi09_reintegration100701.pdf

Before/After Comparisons – "Difference-in-differences" *European Commission Regional Policy*
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/evalsed/sourcebooks/method_techniques/counterfactual_impact_evaluation/difference-in-differences/difference-in-differences_en.htm

Instrumental Variables – "Economic Shocks and Civil Conflict: An Instrumental Variables Approach" *Journal of Political Economy*
http://www.econ.berkeley.edu/~emiguel/pdfs/miguel_conflict.pdf

Regression, Uruguay – "Government Transfers and Political Support"
http://www.econ.berkeley.edu/~emiguel/pdfs/miguel_uruguay.pdf

Regression, Burundi – "Do quotas exacerbate or reduce ethnic conflict? Micro-level evidence from Burundi's military" *Department of Political Science, Columbia University & MacMillan Center, Yale University*
http://www.columbia.edu/~cds81/docs/burundi/samii10_bdi_ethnicity_army100915.pdf

"A Plea for Mechanisms" *Studies in Rationality and Social Change*
http://ebooks.cambridge.org/chapter.jsf?bid=CBO9780511663901&cid=CBO9780511663901A010&p=6

Causal Chains – "Unpacking the Black Box: Learning about Causal Mechanisms from Experimental and Observational Studies"
http://imai.princeton.edu/research/mediationP.html

Causal Chains
http://bullock.research.yale.edu/papers/enough.rtf

Behavior Change – "Development Assistance, Institution Building, and Social Cohesion after Civil War: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Liberia" *Center for Global Development*
http://www.columbia.edu/~mh2245/papers1/CGD_WP.pdf

"Event mapping in Congo" *Columbia Center for the Study of Development Strategies*
http://cu-csds.org/projects/event-mapping-in-congo/

Congo Loans Training
http://www.saynotoviolence.org/es/user/374

"Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice" *Annual Review of Psychology*
http://betsylevypaluck.com/Paluck_Green_AnnRev_2009.pdf

List-experiment Technique – "Eliciting Truthful Answers to Sensitive Survey Questions: New Statistical Methods for List and Endorsement Experiments" *Princeton University*
http://imai.princeton.edu/talk/files/Waseda10.pdf

Author's Acknowledgements

Organizing this Speakers Corner would not have been possible without the support of USAID's Office of Poverty Reduction and USAID's Microenterprise Development office. The quality of the exchange during this Speakers Corner is the result of the dedication of its facilitators: Macartan Humphreys, Meredith Kruger, Jenny Vaughn, Diana Rutherford, Adina Saperstein and Peter Van der Windt.