



*Power concedes nothing without a demand.  
It never did and it never will.*

Frederick Douglass  
19<sup>th</sup> century Abolitionist

## **Generating Genuine Demand with Social Accountability Mechanisms November 1 – 2, 2007**

### **SUMMARY REPORT**

The World Bank's Communication for Governance and Accountability Program (CommGAP) held a workshop entitled *Generating Genuine Demand with Social Accountability Mechanisms* in Paris, France, in November 2007. Workshop participants included practitioners from around the world who have used these tools in their own as well as other countries; leading scholars and researchers in the fields of communication, political science, social development, social marketing, media development, and governance; and representatives from developing country governments and donor organizations.<sup>1</sup>

The workshop explored the following broad questions:

- How can we use social accountability (SA) mechanisms more effectively and selectively to ensure greater impact and generate genuine demand?
- What is needed (at both the policy and practice levels) to help ensure that SA tools create the behavior change they intend (change the behavior of public authorities or agencies in some positive way)?
- What can the fields of communication and the allied social sciences (including research into social movements and other forms of collective action) teach us?

The workshop was organized around the following five process stages of SA mechanisms:

<b>PROCESS STAGES</b>	1. Analyzing the public sphere/political context	Features of political context that affect the feasibility and efficiency of SA mechanisms, such as the degree of media freedom, and freedom of speech, information, and assembly.
	2. Gaining official support in using SA tools	Approaches and techniques that have proven successful in gaining permission of public officials to allow the SA mechanism to be introduced.
	3. Building Citizen Competence (informed citizenry)	How to meet citizens' information needs (including those who are marginalized, remote, and illiterate), so that SA tools can work effectively.
	4. Mobilizing public will and inspiring citizen activism (engaged citizenry)	Approaches and techniques for overcoming obstacles to engagement, such as cynicism, despair, lack of perceived self-efficacy.
	5. Achieving behavior change in public officials through mobilized public opinion	Approaches and techniques used to mobilize public opinion in order to ensure the preceding stages result in behavior change of public officials and thereby lead to more accountable government.

<sup>1</sup> This learning event is the basis for a formal publication with several participants contributing case studies and reflections. In addition to this report, knowledge gaps will be identified that can be filled through further research conducted by CommGAP. Participants will continue to help to shape this research agenda.



During the workshop, competing and converging conceptions of SA were discussed, ranging from instances when non-governmental actors hold governments accountable when internal systems of accountability fail in specific areas of service delivery and with specific SA tools, to the idea that governments should be compelled to be responsive to the public's needs and preferences and that the potency of civic engagement is often neutered through technocratic initiatives. Within this wide definitional spectrum, participants were tasked to present evidence of good practice and applied research, and deliberate on key topics that contribute to the success or failure of SA initiatives.

The workshop concluded with a final session that addressed the following questions: What next steps will move the work forward? What constitutes good practice? How can we use SA tools better to bridge supply- and demand-side accountability interventions?

This report is organized in five sections corresponding to the five process stages around which the workshop was organized. Each section of this report has the following components: a summary of panel presentations and plenary discussion, a digest of each presentation, and descriptions of approaches and techniques pertaining to each session.

Approaches and techniques were drawn from panelist papers, presentations, and discussions. For the purpose of this report, approaches and techniques are defined as follows:

Approach	<i>A general way of addressing an issue or problem</i>
Technique	<i>A particular method of accomplishing a desired objective</i>

The final section of this report includes recommendations and action steps based on main ideas distilled from each discussion topic.

## **SESSION I: ANALYZING THE PUBLIC SPHERE/POLITICAL CONTEXT**

This session explored the features of the political context that affect the feasibility and efficiency of SA mechanisms, such as the degree of media freedom, and freedom of speech, information, and assembly. The session also provided a broad overview incorporating an inclusive conceptualization of the democratic public sphere, as well as the need to interrogate various dimensions and differential levels of political context as related to the democratic public sphere.

The first speaker urged participants to consider the public sphere as an organizing frame for the various issues related to SA. The speaker defined the democratic public sphere as the space between state and society, with the core components of legally guaranteed civil liberties; freedom of information; access to official information; a public culture of transparency; a free, plural, and independent media system; and a vibrant civil society. Given these features, the democratic public sphere is the rightful site for the deployment of SA mechanisms.

The second speaker asserted that democracy is best served when all citizens have the capability to question authority, seek accountability from the state, and participate in the process of government. Relating the Indian experience in adopting the Right to Information Act of 2005, the speaker argued that an access to information regime is the prerequisite for these conditions. It is also essential to consider the intrinsic role of media in these processes. Genuine demand requires an enabling environment where accountability relationships can flourish.

The third speaker discussed a Mexican NGO's experience in navigating legal processes in order to enhance accountability relationships. He argued that three conditions help bring about a SA regime: access to information; communities of practice around these issues; and the existence of a political opposition.



Following the three speakers, the following comments and ideas were elicited during the open forum:

- There should be a place for the willingness of government to give information, not just the ability of citizens to ask for information.
- Civil society's relationship with government can be either as negotiating partner or enemy.
- Is it really possible to navigate any political context? What about contexts where there is no protection of human rights? Not all SA mechanisms are applicable everywhere. But there are ways in which to call political authority into account.
- Donors should take a longer term perspective.
- Search for solutions from within the local context.
- Giving feedback to service providers is essential, as illustrated by the experience of citizen report cards (CRCs) in India and Kenya. What if service provider is a monopoly, citizens do not have the opportunity for exit.
- In the technical work of development, the focus is on finding solutions that are universal, what one participant called "getting to Denmark!" Specialists are supposed to know how to bring about outcomes in any context. But often, context and expertise clash.
- We need to help local stakeholders learn how to ask the relevant SA questions—they already know their own context.
- Government is not monolithic. It is possible to engage with certain parts of government to leverage change in others.
- SA mechanisms provide criticism to public officials without political filters.
- The public sphere is a fragmented space, more mosaic than monolith.
- We have been thinking of the citizen as a rational individual, interacting with the public sphere. But we have a limited rationality; sometimes what triggers SA are public campaigns that use heuristics, such as celebrity endorsements.
- There is a need to clarify definitions. The public sphere and SA are contested concepts.

**Sina Odugbemi**, head of the World Bank's Communication for Governance and Accountability Program, urged participants to take a look at the public sphere as an organizing frame for the various issues related to SA. Taking a public sphere perspective requires a keen understanding of political context. Are SA mechanisms effective means of generating genuine demand regardless of context or depending on context? If agreement can be reached on a hospitable set of conditions for the application of these mechanisms, is it sensible for reformers to engage inhospitable environments in similar fashion or should they deploy a different set of analytical tools?

The democratic public sphere is that space between state and society, and is the rightful site for the deployment of SA mechanisms. As such, its constitutive components must be safeguarded and carefully scrutinized. These components include civil liberties; freedom of information; access to official information; public culture of transparency; free, plural, and independent media systems; and a robust civil society and associational life.

**George Cheriyan**, Associate Director of the Consumer Unity and Trust Society (CUTS) in India, asserted that democracy works best when all citizens have the capability to ask questions from authority, seek accountability from the state, and participate in the processes of government. An access to information regime has the potential to enhance quality to deploy SA mechanisms. Envisaged as a "magic wand against corruption," the Right to Information (RTI) movement in India was a civil society-led initiative, which started in the mid-1990s. The enactment of the RTI in 2005 was a landmark development and provided citizens the right to information, in stark contrast to the official secrets act operating at that time.

It is also essential to take stock of the role of the media in enhancing a right information regime. Evidence of success includes the finding that in the last two years, the country's corruption perception index improved without any other major changes in related areas of law or governance.

Generating genuine demand requires creating an enabling environment. The RTI law is part of this enabling environment and serves as basis for the deployment of SA tools by triggering more transparent



and accountable administrative actions and increasing the capacity of civil society organizations to demand better services from government actors. Giving citizens the capacity to access information is only the precondition; people should understand the information received and be able to ask relevant questions.

Relating his organization's experience in engaging in legal action toward enhancing SA, **Jorge Romero Leon**, Executive Director of Fundar, emphasized the idea that while political context matters, any political environment can be navigated successfully. While there are contextual conditions that facilitate this navigation, actors can engage in any context in terms of promoting and attaining SA. Nonetheless, context matters in several ways. For example, more political plurality makes available more space for participation. In this way, opposition matters and frames conditions where SA operates.

Part of Fundar's success story can be attributed to the rise of Mexico's congressional opposition in 1997. Contingent with the rise of the opposition was an enhancement of receptiveness toward SA on the part of legislators. It should be noted that political opposition is an important indicator of a plurality of political forces.

Legal resources can be brought to bear on SA initiatives. Fundar does its best to bring legal recourse and resources to bear toward this objective. For example, Fundar challenged the legality of a secret fund of the Mexican government.

According to Leon, three conditions help in bringing about a social accountable regime. Access to information is the first and most important enabling condition. Citizens and civil society need a law that provides and protects access. Second, communities of practice should be cultivated. The trend toward specialization among organizations requires that good practices be shared among them. Third, a political opposition should exist, as well as good auditing institutions within government.

From a public sphere perspective, opening up spaces for SA allows for the creation of publics through civil society action. In addition, within this space, the art of political navigation must be shared among organizations.

Relating Indian and Kenyan experiences in implementing Citizen Report Cards,<sup>2</sup> **Gopakumar Thampi** opined that the semantic of the phrase "citizen report card" itself is important to consider, in that it connotes in simple yet powerful language that the target of the report is subject to evaluation and criticism. This evaluative dimension has implications in terms of gaining support from government officials, as well as mobilizing public opinion. Realizing that you need to break through the barrier of the semantic, on one hand, and harness its power, on the other, is an important insight.

Fine tuning the technical aspects of the tool should be preceded by an open, transparent, and inclusive awareness- and consensus-building phase. The overarching objective of this awareness-building phase invites stakeholders to ask the question: Is this tool applicable in a particular context? The "Critical 8" framework can help in making this judgment.<sup>3</sup> Stakeholders are asked to rate the local context based on

---

<sup>2</sup> Citizen's Report Cards (CRCs) are participatory surveys that solicit user feedback on the performance of public services. CRCs can significantly enhance public accountability through the extensive media coverage and civil society advocacy that accompanies the process.

<sup>3</sup> The "Critical 8" are as follows: **Political Context** – How would the political institutions in the country support or hinder methodologies like CRC?; **Decentralization** – Do local bodies have reasonably high degree of financial & policymaking power?; **Ability to Seek Feedback from Citizens** – Would organizations feel safe conducting public feedback exercises like the CRC?; **Citizens Ability to Voice Experience** – Do citizens feel free to give honest feedback about government services?; **Presence & Activism of Civil Society Organizations** – Are there active CSOs in the country? Are they independent & non-partisan?; **Survey & Analysis Competency** – Are there demonstrated local skills for survey and analysis?; **Quality of media** – Is the media independent? Do they cover issues related to public services? Will they cover CRC findings and present them in an unbiased manner?; **Responsiveness of Service Providers** – Do service providers seek consumer/user feedback? How open would they be to independent assessments of their performance?



the “Critical 8” and explain how they determined scores. Based on “Critical 8” analyses, for example, the tool was found to be inapplicable in Brunei and Rwanda. Also, a demand assessment is required to find out whether the tool can be effectively applied to a context.

Considering the role of the media is also essential. How will journalists spin/report results? Whether the report card results show a good and/or bad evaluation, journalists are more likely to focus on the negative. In order to enhance the integrity of the reporting of the results, extensive media briefings on how to use and interpret findings are required.

The CRC de-romanticizes civil society. The perennial search for reform champions is challenged by the realization that civil society is a contested context populated by players with what are often competing agendas.

### **Approaches & Techniques**

Following is a list of approaches and techniques for analyzing the public sphere/political context:

#### **APPROACHES**

Assess the macro-level context through a public sphere analysis	This approach provides a systematic framework for delineating the features of the public sphere, including its constitutive components: civil liberties; freedom of information; access to official information; public culture of transparency; free, plural, and independent media systems; civil society; and associational life.
Assess the legal/regulatory environment	The passage of a national access to information law may not be a necessary nor sufficient condition for SA to flourish, but it goes a long way in assisting SA advocates in their work.
Build a coalition supporting an access to information regime	Access to information undergirds the ability to adopt and deploy SA mechanisms. As a prerequisite for the work of SA, a broad coalition, driven by civil society, should fight for it in places where it doesn’t exist. This should also serve as the basis for a permanent community of practice gravitating around these issues.
Build legal capacity on access to information issues	Civil society should be the focus of these capacity building initiatives, as they serve as permanent checks against corrupt authority.

#### **TECHNIQUES**

Deploy the “Critical 8”	The awareness-building phase for SA tools asks the question: Is this tool applicable in a particular context? Making this judgment can be carried out by the “Critical 8” framework. Stakeholders are asked to rate the “Critical 8” and explain how they made score determinations.
Challenging governments in international courts	The system of international courts—and perhaps more importantly, international norms undergirding international law—can be powerful allies of SA advocates who experience difficulty operating in the domestic context.



## FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSE CARDS

### ***Q: What lessons have you learned about how to overcome structural challenges/obstacles in the political context when introducing social accountability mechanisms?***

Need to locate SA tools within local sensitivities and sensibilities; need to locate political incentives to transcend the technical nature of SA tools. Capacity building to create political negotiation for a win-win solution.

Awareness-building is essential before embarking on any accountability exercise (report cards, etc.); need to bring the government in; need to identify political incentives to build support of elites.

RTI (example of India and Mexico) is an SA mechanism, but needs to be accompanied by political context in which information is not only accessible but can be appropriated into a broad context and to know public opinion and public demand. This requires the complementary right to freedom of opinion and expression and a plural media environment. The citizen report card may not be very distinguishable from a technocratic answer survey unless it is linked to social mobilization around a particular concern or issue. Would the CRC be more effective in the context of a specific service or campaign rather than covering a broad set of services?

Access to information is key to generating genuine demand with SA mechanisms.

Evaluation of the political context in order to implement social accountability; donors need to think long-term; context does matter.

RTI was successful because of the rights-based approach. Better than access to information—RTI gives more legal mechanisms than access to information.

Conditions/features of the political context should be taken into consideration in adopting the social accountability mechanisms that are used in the context/country; the CRC as a diagnostic tool—very good process; political contexts are varied—no blueprint approach to approaching social accountability.

Need to fully understand the complexity of local political context; need for variable approaches, and more importantly defining success in a way that's appropriate to the context. One theme that jumps out is personal/citizen motivation; sometimes anger over injustice isn't the same as motivation to engage productively in accountability. What are multiple sources of motivation (to show up, speak out, etc.) and multiple ways of engaging them?

Government officials may have incentives to support public accountability; they want information about other agencies; they want to know what the public really thinks about their performance.

SA mechanisms would help to overcome contexts such as monopolies or poor government performance, making information public and creating competition among providers. However, SA mechanisms are not applicable as such in every context. They should be adapted to the context and local challenges.

The importance of right to information legislation in reducing corruption—especially in the Indian context.

Understanding the political incentives; building upon indigenous knowledge, rather than “blue prints;” and building partnerships with legislatures, which have the primary function of crafting reform legislation.

Information is critically important not just as a resource for social accountability, and not just as a moral precept, but also as a means and mechanism for changing the expectations of government actors themselves.

Media play very important roles in the institutionalization of SA tools. By correctly presenting the practice and outcomes of SA exercises, they can exert influence on the political context. Political navigation for civil society organizations becomes crucial, especially for democratizing countries. One should be aware of different public interests. Plus, applying one SA tool successfully in one case doesn't mean that it will be successful in other cases with different public interests.

The importance of being patient and thinking about long-term changes; the need to continue working on access to information and right to information in Argentina to contribute to SA mechanisms because this is a key instrument for strengthening democracy all over the world; the political context is really important and the impact is not a right idea to think about in all the times and places; the need to articulate NGOs' and governments' interests, demands, and goals.



The contexts of different tools can vary. Generalizing about all tools should be avoided; the question remains whether a tool should be used even if the context seems hostile; pre-intervention consensus building can help create ideas to overcome obstacles.

There is a need to go beyond the "conventional" political context. One needs to locate social accountability in the "real" political context of the people in which the cultural matrix of the stakeholders is fully opened up and accessed. This helps us to understand the concept of social accountability itself as the people have it naturally.

Political context is very important and not a universal blueprint that can or should be applied; media are very important in ensuring SA, but maybe rather than looking for objectivity and impartiality (impossible to achieve in reality) we should ask for accuracy and diversity.

What exactly is the impact of SA mechanisms? What are the observable indicators of a developing "public sphere?" I suggest that the WB devote some effort to developing such a database. To be more concrete, indicators of citizen participation (how many people voted in local elections) and citizen awareness would make it possible to evaluate the effectiveness of SA mechanisms.

Public sphere as an arena, with issue and games—a fragmented space, a mosaic; with irrational or semi-rational actor—what triggers demand for accountability can be unexpected, e.g., a film, an actor, and help to overcome structural obstacles.

Not driven by rights but by value of market; FOI laws useless UNLESS there are mechanisms to deliver; report cards, etc., not only mechanisms for accountability, etc. Public opinion also is important.

Need to demystify RTI resurfaced in the discussion and I appreciate it. Question lingers: How do we show the political incentives to state actors of RTI? I wrote this because the Philippines has yet to have an RTI law.

Need for enabling legislation and policy; strong partnership between government and state stakeholders; need for champions; culture of openness and transparency.

Is it a matter of good judgment to provide tools/mechanisms of social accountability to people whose lives may be placed in danger by use of these tools/mechanisms?

Incentives matter. One should find out how to mobilize these incentives in order to bring pressure to bear; any political context can be navigated successfully, focusing on the broad diversity of public officials/legislators, etc., and making use of legal/human resources available; it is important to approach congress/local legislatures due to their relevance for creating checks and balances.

Media and media sector were mentioned and discussed several times as a couple of key areas of change. One way of strengthening media's capability to meet this responsibility would be to contribute to strengthening the media as a sector in its own right; and also to support professional journalism training on the job in areas like health, water, education, land mines.

## **SESSION II: GAINING OFFICIAL SUPPORT IN USING SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY TOOLS**

The second panel discussed approaches in securing official support in SA and presented specific country experiences in implementing SA tools. These experiences illustrate effective approaches and innovations in mobilizing citizen engagement to gain public support.

The session featured a diagnostic framework that enables the user to analyze the spectrum of state support for SA mechanisms (by identifying various modes and sources of state support). This was followed by a presentation of country experiences from Armenia, Philippines, and Uganda in implementing SA tools. While the country examples represent different social and political contexts, dialogue with government, social partnerships, and mobilization of civil society, and strategic use of the media were common interventions that contributed significantly to the effectiveness of SA mechanisms.

The first speaker, **Harry Blair** from Yale University (Associate Department Chair, Senior Research Scholar and Lecturer in Political Science), presented a framework which maps out the elements that underpin support for SA, particularly the level of state posture, the mode of state response to citizen



demand, and the type of SA mechanism that is likely to be adopted. Blair argues that the type of state support spans a spectrum ranging from championship and accommodation to opposition and grudging assent, and each level of support corresponds to a menu of choices for SA mechanisms.

The second speaker, **Varuzhan Hoktanyan** from Transparency International Armenia, highlighted the importance of the political and social dimensions in ensuring effective SA, particularly in the real-world context of Armenia. The indifference of public officials and the growing apathy of civil society were cited as important obstacles to generating genuine demand for change.

The third speaker, **Kenneth Mugambe** from the Government of Uganda (Commissioner, Budget Policy and Evaluation Department), presented the government's successful experience in undertaking public expenditure tracking surveys. Mugambe highlighted the positive results in improving transparency and accountability in resource transfers for public services and the institutionalization of the PETS as a mainstreamed activity in Uganda's budget process.

The fourth speaker, **Redempto Santander Parafina** from the Philippines, (Director, Government Watch [G-Watch] of the Ateneo de Manila University School of Government), shared important lessons from their successful on-going partnership with the government in implementing SA mechanisms to improve governance in the education sector. With the help of committed civil society organizations and volunteer groups, G-Watch achieved significant results in increasing the overall effectiveness of public service delivery through system reforms aimed at enhancing transparency and accountability.

In the plenary session, the following comments and suggestions were presented on gaining official support in implementing SA tools:

- Keep goals in mind in the process of getting government buy-in. Pursue a two-stage process: first, at the initial stage where less threatening issues can be raised; second, at the later stage, such as during implementation, where messages can be framed around project accomplishments and gaps that need to be addressed.
- Emphasize that SA tools are complementing and not substituting government efforts.
- Understand context to effectively persuade government at different levels, including champions and non-champions.
- Tailor approaches according to specific circumstances, e.g., where there is no political will, or where political situations are fragile. In such cases, civil society needs to navigate the political landscape to determine areas where they can have most impact. Culture matters. Lack of due consideration to socio-cultural factors can weaken citizen demand.
- Discuss SA results with government before undertaking public dissemination. Ensure balanced reporting of both positive and negative findings. This establishes credibility and promotes the value of transparency.
- Timing is important in implementing SA. Typically, governments are more receptive and inclined to support prior to an election period.
- Framing is important; both overarching broader frames such as service to public interest and specific, narrow frames involving personal and professional interests.
- Sustainability is the most important measure of what works. Clarity on the larger picture is critical in determining whether small, incremental changes fit in the overall reform process. The pre-conditions are citizen awareness and knowledge to make action possible. NGOs and donors should consider their roles to make sure that short-term accomplishments add up and are aligned with the larger, broader goals.



## **Summary of Presentations**

**Harry Blair** of Yale University discussed the spectrum of state posture and support to citizen demand for SA, which provides a means to identify choices of appropriate mechanisms. Blair presented illustrations of the spectrum along a continuum of state response ranging from accommodation to opposition and state support ranging from active to repressive. In cases where the state takes active posture, Blair identified four modes of state support—championship, strong backing, encouragement, statutory endorsement. The other end of the spectrum where the state assumes a negative posture, the six levels of support are acceptance, consent, acquiescence, disinterest, forbearance, or grudging assent.

Blair also presented a matrix that mapped out examples of SA initiatives according to the level and mode of state support, and corresponding sources of authority and required funding. It provides a useful framework for examining the requirements for success and exploring approaches for strengthening state support for SA mechanisms.

Based on an analysis of the patterns along the spectrum of state responses, Blair presented the following observations: (1) the most important mechanisms are not those where state support is most active, with elections, civil society, and media considered as most fundamental; (2) a majority of mechanisms exist independent of state financing; (3) support for SA mechanisms does not necessarily require state funding to be successful; (4) all authorities for SA mechanisms need continued support from other actors; (5) national and local levels require different SA mechanisms.

**Varuzhan Hoktanyan**, Vice Chair of the Center for Regional Development/Transparency International Armenia, noted the importance of building social partnerships as optimal strategy for gaining official support and emphasized that in the case of Armenia social and political factors are key determinants of the attitudes of public officials.

Unlike other country examples which have democratic governments or newly democratizing environments, the Armenian political context and SA initiatives operate within a difficult environment. Hoktanyan lamented the negative impact of the country's reversal to an authoritarian regime—as reported by Freedom House and other international organizations—rising corruption and widespread abuse of political power. While there are legislative acts to enhance the application of SA tools, for example, the Law on Self-Governance that requires the Council of Elders to consult with citizens in budget preparation. However, Hokatanyan referred to these as “empty formality.” The mandates are not used in practice due to complete indifference of public officials and apathy of citizens. Donor support is the single most important motivating factor for implementing SA tools. Lack of ownership and political will and an apathetic civil society continue to be problems which jeopardize the sustainability of any reform initiative.

Hoktanyan concluded his presentation with the following suggestions: (1) encourage civil society to be more active by building the capacity of civil society to demand behavior change from public authorities; (2) strengthen civic competence; and (3) use advocacy strategies to promote public pressure from civil society organizations and international organizations.

**Kenneth Mugambe** from the Government of Uganda (Commissioner, Budget Policy and Evaluation Department), presented Uganda's experience in using SA mechanisms, particularly public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS) in the education sector. The discrepancy between increased allocations to public education and the poor outcomes in primary school enrollment rates heightened awareness of the need for greater transparency and accountability in budget disbursements. This prompted a closer examination of resource flows from the central government down to the district levels.

The first survey done in 1990-91 found that only 13 percent of per-student, non-wage funds from the central government reached schools, and that public primary education was mostly funded by parents by up to 73 percent of total school spending in 1991. Information on disbursements of capitation grants to schools and recordkeeping was poor at the district level compared to the central level. Local government officials had the informational advantage on the amount of funds received as transfers and benefited in



the process by reducing the amount of funds actually used for the school. A follow-up survey in 1995 showed that, on average, less than 30 percent of allocated capitation grants reached the schools, and it took about four months for funding to get to the beneficiaries. Weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation and lack of systematic inspections were among the key challenges in the disbursement of funds.

To ensure that resources are allocated to social sectors, the government created a Poverty Action Fund as a ring-fencing mechanism, which also allowed clear tracking of resource flows. Measures to enhance transparency included a government requirement to publish resource transfers at the district level using newspapers and radio. Schools were also required to maintain public notice boards to post information on funds received. Access to budget information triggered debate between civic leaders and politicians and allowed primary schools to demand entitlement from district officials. The 1997 Local Government Act contained provisions for accountability and information dissemination. The government also required districts to deposit all grants to schools in their own accounts, and delegated authority for procurement from the center to the schools. By 1999, schools had received more than 90 percent of their capitation grants.

PETS is an institutionalized mechanism in Uganda. The government, as the willing partner, works closely with civil society organizations and donors. Uganda's long experience shows that the biggest challenge is the weakness of civil society to demand accountability from government.

Director **Redempto Santander Parafina** of Government Watch (G-Watch) presented the Philippines seven-year experience in implementing SA and focused on how partnership for SA can be ensured and sustained. Established in 2000 by an academic institution, the Ateneo de Manila School of Government, as an anti-corruption program, G-Watch is based on strong partnership between the government and civil society. The program focuses on preventing corruption through active dialogue between the state and the citizens and collaborative efforts in pursuing effective strategies to support reforms to improve governance. Simple and easy-to-use mechanisms were developed and used to monitor delivery of public goods and services, such as textbooks, medicine, as well as in public works and construction of school buildings. The support of government champions who listen and appreciate the benefits of the interventions resulted in positive and proactive response from government.

In the Textbook Program, G-Watch has an active partnership with the Department of Education (DepEd) and a consortium of civil society organizations. Guideposts in establishing partnership include: (1) working with a trusted agency official who will listen and act on report recommendations; (2) focusing on system reform, rather than witch-hunting or shaming to build rapport and trust; (3) using of simple and easy-to-use tools; and (4) comparing the plan with the accomplishment.

Reforms were undertaken in the international competitive bidding process and in synchronized delivery system. G-Watch was involved in key stages of the process—in the review of bidding documents, the actual bidding, the awarding of contract bid, and in the inspection, delivery and distribution of the textbooks. Civil society groups, including volunteers among young scouts and church parishioners, played a key role in on-the-ground monitoring of processes and tracking results. The volunteer groups involved increased from eight in the first round to 30 in fourth round of the program.

Since its inception in 2003, about 65 million textbooks were tracked. The champion within the Department of Education (Undersecretary Luz) ensured that civil society was mobilized effectively in the bidding process and on-the-spot, systematic monitoring of textbook deliveries. The Textbook Count resulted in a 40 percent price reduction and shortened procurement cycle by half, from 24 months down to 12 months. In the next round of Textbook Count, an innovation was introduced that involved the monitoring of textbooks from the district to elementary schools. This innovation was done with the support of a private soft drink company (Coca-Cola), which provided vehicles to transport the goods to remote villages. This addressed the problem of non-delivery of 21 percent of textbooks in elementary schools, particularly in poor districts.

Strong support from middle managers was key to the success of G-Watch. Despite frequent shifts in leadership in the DepEd—with four successive changes in Department Secretaries within a brief two-year



period from 2004-06—the program benefited from the unwavering commitment of mid-level managers. This was crucial in sustaining support for the program from within amid unstable transitions in the institution. Parafina cited other important lessons: (1) adopting a non-confrontational approach; (2) pursuing innovations and diversified interventions; and (3) mitigating risks of co-optation through constructive engagement and positive response from government.

### **Approaches & Techniques**

Following is a list of approaches and techniques for gaining state support for SA mechanisms.

<b>APPROACHES</b>	
Assessing and improving official support using the spectrum of state posture and state support	<p>This approach provides a systematic framework for examining sources of support and key success factors that each type of SA requires. It is based on the view that levels of state support can vary across a spectrum ranging from intensely active to extremely reluctant support. For development practitioners and civil society organizations, the approach provides a way of determining the most appropriate SA mechanism and its likelihood for success, as determined by such indicators as the state’s mode of support, the source of authority or political mandate required, the financial resources needed and at what level of government, national or local, will it be operationalized. In cases where the level of state posture is passive, remedies can be considered to improve the degree of support and move toward the active rung of the scale. For international donor agencies and program specialists, the spectrum provides a menu of choices for development assistance in SA.</p> <p>The rank-ordering technique used in this approach can be applied by developing a matrix and plotting the SA mechanisms according to the degree of state support received.</p>
Mobilizing support from middle managers	<p>As the critical link within the bureaucracy, middle managers can make or break any reform implementation. Many country examples illustrate the importance of marshalling their support that will expedite action on the reforms needed. Middle managers committed to support SA become advocates of change within government. Their involvement in the early stages of the SA process helps build their ownership and accountability if they have been part of the overall reform process.</p>
Formalizing partnerships with government agencies	<p>Collaboration and partnering arrangements with government formalized through written agreements, such as Joint Statements or Memorandum of Agreement, clearly define roles and responsibilities between partners and strengthen commitment in implementing mutually agreed objectives and tasks. A public agency that enters into a formal partnership agreement provides a firm expression of their willingness and ability to engage in a collaborative undertaking to support reform initiatives.</p>
Problem-solving sessions among agencies and stakeholders	<p>State-citizen synergies in SA initiatives are strengthened through an atmosphere of productive dialogue and mutual cooperation. Problem-solving sessions provide a positive mechanism of presenting and discussing results of SA. This process fosters a productive exchange of ideas and a shared understanding of the problems that can lead to collaborative action between the government and civil society. A confrontational approach can easily trigger a negative, defensive response from government, particularly when the SA findings presented are perceived as unfavorable or controversial. When this</p>



happens, the relationship becomes adversarial and threatens the likelihood of positive action on the part of government.

Identifying champions within government

Champions are catalysts and advocates of change. Successful experiences in SA are often led by reform champions at various levels and stages of the reform process. These actors believe in the benefits of the interventions, are willing to listen, take a proactive stance, and can push for public action.

**TECHNIQUES**

Analysis of state posture and state support

Mapping out SA mechanisms on a spectrum with designated points corresponding to level of state posture (active, passive, repressive) and level of state response (accommodation, indifference, opposition).

Using a rank-ordering technique, SA mechanisms can also be plotted on a matrix according to state posture and mode of state support, source of legitimizing authority, requirements for success, and state financing and level of operationalization.

This technique provides an instrument to guide the selection of appropriate mechanisms from a menu of choices, as well as a method for strategic positioning in terms of interventions or remedies needed to improve the level of state support thereby moving up the scale or spectrum.

Establish early engagement

Take government on board at the beginning of the process and adopt a participatory approach. Engage all actors involved to build trust and ownership to create incentives for public officials to support the initiative as partners. Within government, there are different factions. Work with various actors within government. Less threatening and non-political issues politically can be taken in the early stages of dialogue.

At the back-end, think through how to present and frame accomplishments and gaps that need to be addressed. Make sure that you engage the government as co-owner; it creates incentives for public officials to work with you. If results can be presented in a balanced way, the government may be more receptive. Relationships occur at different levels and should be maintained over time.

Consider the context and focus on the positive

Effective persuasion requires careful consideration of the local, political context. This can help in framing issues consistent with the broader development goals and enhance their professional incentives to lend support as reform implementors. It is also important to craft clear and consistent messages. Start with what's working and what the gaps are.

Create facts on the ground

In countries where the environment is politically precarious, and where civil society can do the work, providing evidence on the ground boosts the power of information. Find credible people who are influential and respected in government. Use them as spokespersons.

Design simple and easy-to-use monitoring tools

Implementation of SA mechanisms depends on and benefit from volunteer efforts in various stages of the design and implementation process. Monitoring of results and performance is one critical area that determines the impact and sustainability of SA. Simple and effective monitoring tools that volunteers with varying skill levels and background can easily use promote inclusive and broader involvement of citizens in tracking gaps between promise and performance.



## FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSE CARDS

### **Q: What approaches and techniques have you found most effective in securing buy-in or support of public officials in using social accountability mechanisms?**

The question may be wrongly posed since, as Harry Blair's paper showed, there is a very wide range of SA mechanisms most of which don't require "official" support and some of which may be less effective if they are not seen to be independent, e.g., CRCs. More important is tacit acceptance by public officials; dialogue with public officials and politicians involved in the area of concern; and cooperation in access to information. (Buckley)

Civil society does not require the officials' permission to introduce SA mechanisms! These mechanisms arise out of the failure of governments to do their job. Buy-in will occur when government realizes that large numbers of citizens are dissatisfied with this failure. Buy-in is facilitated when contacts are made with officials who are more sympathetic to reforms.

Taking the government on board in the beginning and building confidence/mutual trust; develop a strategy for the dissemination of outcomes of various studies.

When should state buy-in be sought (e.g., citizen report cards) and when is it less important or even antithetical to the functioning of the mechanism (e.g., investigative journalism)? How exactly do we want to define "social accountability?" Many different definitions have emerged implicitly here, though not as yet explicitly. (Harry Blair)

Leveraging external audiences—either "influence-makers" in other non-governmental spheres (emirs, politicians' spouses, religious leaders, celebrities) or media watchdogs or NGOs—someone to "look over one's shoulder." Getting early commitments from government actors (public if national leaders, no publicity needed if middle-level management).

Focus on changing behaviors of ordinary citizens.

The premise is problematic because sometimes it is not valuable to obtain state support. For instance, we need truly independent journalists.

Political culture matters and you cannot change an obstructive type through awareness creation; public interest lobbying, use credible, powerful people who are influencers of government officials; frame the quest for social accountability as being in the national interest.

Rational, emotional (affective), political loyalty, and other considerations that drive decision-making need to be understood and influenced to secure buy-in.

The citizen report card—but it must be understood that this takes years!

The approach to governments should never be a "permission" approach. You should inform governments of your intention because that helps them to be more receptive, but demanding accountability and implementing monitoring is a right of citizens and civil society organizations so it's not a question of gaining permission.

Highly dependent on nature of accountability mechanisms; some more political than others; see government as partner—show them the political value or market value of what is being done; rights approach leads to antagonistic relationship with government.

Credibility of CSO; concrete types of intervention and expected results.

Building a mutual partnership with government; credibility and professionalism; avoiding antagonism; complementarity. The support of public officials is gained when there is sustainability. The officials' support can create such sustainability.

NGOs should consider their role and become more professional, and donors more aggressive. Other civil society structures (for example, churches and mosques) should also be considered. Timing is very important; during transformation or revolutionary times, NGOs and other CSOs must actively work with the population.



Procure relationships for the long-term; engage public officials with carrots and sticks; seek champions of transparency but also work to develop them, and learn to work with those who are not champions; promote co-ownership and co-sponsorship of specific initiatives.

Focus on issues that connect directly with livelihoods (G-Watch and PETS); demonstrate clear incentives; not clear from the presentation (explicitly) but recognized as critical; from the perspective of civil society organizations, the importance of getting research and evidence absolutely right, watertight, and rigorous before presenting it to government officials.

Systems perspective—ecological perspective; using indigenous resources—social, cultural, discursive; finding incentives for governments to cooperate in SA.

Except in the context of dictatorships, dialogue coupled with a collaborative attitude has a better chance of success compared to confrontation. It is useful to understand also that the state is not monolithic, and that there are multiple potential partners within government.

Creating a baseline to compare with results generated by the SA—in order to explicitly show the benefit of engagement; A collaborative approach, so that public officials don't feel threatened by SA mechanisms; institutionalize mechanisms so that they are less vulnerable to changes in leadership.

In order to avoid the mechanism from being appropriated by a single faction of the government or by a political party, the mechanism should be institutionalized. The institutionalization of the mechanism requires building acceptance by all in government/political society (particularly the opposition).

Involving appropriate department/part of government in mainstreaming social accountability into the development process (e.g., M&E department in Economic Planning Ministry).

All those in which civil society engages public official beforehand, dialogue being a crucial one.

For a non-practitioner, this strikes me as a “trick” question. Public officials in what type of regime? If the regime is democratic, I would guess that number of votes to be gained would be a key incentive. If non-democratic, perhaps outside donors rather than voters become the key drivers.

### **SESSION III: BUILDING CITIZEN COMPETENCE (INFORMED CITIZENRY)**

The third session focused on building an informed citizenry, and how communication and SA mechanisms can cultivate, enhance, and sustain citizen competence in less than ideal real world political contexts. Building citizen competence implies that we expect citizens to know their rights and be both willing and able to take action so that governments can be held accountable.

The first presenter discussed the importance of speech-based communication and different modes of engagement, as well as lessons learned that are critical to building citizen competence. The second presenter discussed the importance of conceptualizing how SA mechanisms are deployed. Under one dominant conception of democracy, the public itself should define problems and work toward addressing them using SA mechanisms, which enhance information processes and information flows, and promote cross-sectoral partnerships. Moreover, a special focus should be placed on building the competence of young people in ways that take into account developmental processes.

The other speakers presented two real-world case studies that described ways in which an informed citizenry can be cultivated. In the case of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the importance of training journalists to be well informed and independent was stressed. Despite harsh environmental conditions in fragile states such as the DRC, radio plays a key role in reaching out to citizens. In Argentina, building capacity of student journalists as intermediaries was shown to be effective, specifically by training students to make access to information requests through school projects.



In the plenary discussion, SA mechanisms were discussed as means to respond to identified problems and to address government failure. However, the challenge is reframing and communicating an issue to convince the public that it deserves serious attention. The different types of journalism—civic, public, citizen, participatory—play an important role in building an informed citizenry, but there are many obstacles in terms of what journalists can report. Also, in some environments, information overload and conflicting messages can stir up fear in people and sometimes create information or transformation deficits. Hence, building an informed citizenry is better stated as building an empowered transformed citizenry.

There is also the challenge of getting media attention on SA issues, especially where plurality and competition exist, as there is a tendency to sensationalize. Another concern is that many public officials act deliberately to influence the media agenda. However, the public sphere is not only about media, but a concept of everyday talk on issues concerning the public that take place everywhere.

While consultative programming structures and mechanisms are useful in engaging citizens in participatory debate, other strategic communication channels should be considered when trying to influence decision-makers. The main focus should shift from educating citizens to building an informed citizenry, as the fundamental task in any political society is to create an effective citizenship where citizens can engage in public argument, and listen and participate in public deliberation.

### **Summary of Presentations**

**William Keith** of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee discussed the importance of face-to-face communication and referenced the United States Forum Movement when citizens started talking in public spaces. Study circles, forums, and town halls are forms of getting people together with the goals of mutual learning, education—content and public speaking skills—and deliberation.

Although many types of forums model democratic/civic discourse, there are lessons to be learned from the US Forum Movement, in particular. There is the tension between agonism and cooperation. Is public discourse supposed to be agonistic or is there a cooperative dimension, and how should these be balanced out? Creating a sense of significance is important, but there are also issues concerning trust and neutrality, hence public forums should not be structurally biased. Good leadership is a crucial aspect in managing people and ideas to keep the process moving. To achieve long-term participation over various topics, other aspects such as entertainment are needed so that people stay continually engaged. One way to do this is to recast arguments into narrative forms that are deemed important and relevant. Finally, teaching public speaking matters and the classroom can be a real place of engagement.

**Peter Levine**, Director of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), presented two conceptions with which to think about politics, governments, and democracy. Under the first concept, the state governs, makes authoritative decisions, and administers them, while the public has three roles: 1) they know or find out what the government is doing; 2) they discuss among themselves; and 3) periodically make their own binding decisions or influence decisions that effect governance.

SA is seen as a way of enhancing these three roles by providing ways of making information flow much better (right to information act, disclosure of public budgets, etc.), and providing specific concrete forms of discussion (e.g., participatory budgeting and getting public to vote on something). If not a binding decision, the SA process may somehow influence public opinion in terms of voting leaders in and out of office.

Under the second concept, the public, through deliberation and discussion, defines problems and works to address them by creating public goods, facilities, services, cultural products, norms, among others. SA, under this conception of democracy, would be accountability to everyone else. Levine ascribes value to both paradigms, but the second concept is more feasible, as it's difficult to imagine consistent and broad public participation in stand-alone deliberative processes created by governments. Deliberation comes most naturally when it's part of everyday work in communities.



Finally, Levine discussed the importance of supporting young people early on to help them become better informed citizens. While effective ways of engaging the younger generation may be culturally specific, flexibility could be built in by considering mixed-aged groups, mentorship arrangements, etc.

**Mary Myers**, Development Communication Consultant from the UK, presented their experience in building an informed citizenry in the fragile state of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) by building a cadre of informed journalists.

The media sector in DRC is disorganized, susceptible to corruption, and lacking in infrastructure. There is lack of trust among citizens, state, and the media. Furthermore, journalists have no formal training, civil society is weak, citizens are unaware of their basic rights, complexity of the governance is difficult to teach, and tradition does not allow the questioning of authority. Hence, investigative reporting is almost non-existent and the watchdog function of the media is limited. Despite many obstacles, radio is still a key source of information for most of the population. Myers states that the most pressing problem in the media sector is economic viability—“you can not have a press which is editorial independent without it being financially independent.”

In the DRC, the international community has set up a station which is financially independent of interest groups and is therefore able to report in a balanced and unbiased fashion. Also, DFID’s training for media managers on business management is important in creating an independent voice. Finally, DFID and other donors have started to think and act strategically about media support and regulation and have linked these explicitly to governance issues. These initiatives should contribute to a better informed citizenry.

**Laura Zommer**, Communications Director of the Center of Public Policy Implementation for Equity and Growth (CIPPEC), presented a case study involving students at the University of Buenos Aires monitoring their access to information rights as part of the Communication Sciences program. Argentina does not have a freedom of information law, but a decree permits citizens to request information from the executive branch. There are also 12 provincial laws in existence.

The objectives of the exercise were to train students/future journalists to formulate requests, understand the importance of access to information and other rights, as well as monitor results of each ministry’s performance. At the end of each semester, civil servants, NGOs, and a few journalists are invited to share and discuss the results. Also, some of the most interesting requests and responses have been covered by the media, which has provided incentive for civil servants to handle requests. Out of the 816 information requests, about 53 percent received responses. In many cases, the students were asking for information already available on official websites, but not easily found.

**Approaches & Techniques**

Following is a list of approaches and techniques to build an informed citizenry.

APPROACHES	
Broaden journalists’ knowledge of SA	Journalists often lack formal training, but play a key role in building an informed citizenry. To achieve greater dissemination on SA issues and information on the roles and responsibilities of the government, journalists must understand what those are and have a protective space to report on these issues and those concerning the communities. Furthermore, this approach should provide journalists an opportunity for innovation and creativity in reporting.
	Some of the techniques are providing journalist training on governance structures and issues, as well as training on the business side of journalism.
Enhance coordination	As mentioned by Myers and others in the plenary discussion, an



among development partners to think and act strategically about media support and regulation

independent and plural media system contributes to better informed citizenry and enforces action to hold governments accountable. However, even in a plural and competitive environment, there are issues such as a tendency to sensationalize, and difficulty to get media attention on SA issues.

Techniques to enhance coordination may include better sharing of research and good practice, and collaborate with local media to create independent media stations.

An inclusive approach that includes young and marginalized groups in building citizen competence

An inclusive approach towards building citizen competence is needed that includes young people and marginalized groups. Young people are often neglected but are the future leaders and need the knowledge and skills to become informed and effective citizens.

Techniques include establishment of partnerships with schools and universities to incorporate skills to become effective citizens.

Engage citizens in dialogue via different modes of structures and mechanisms

There are many ways to engage citizens in public debate such as consultative programming (call-ins, listeners' surveys, etc.). However, there are other strategic communication channels than media that should be considered in engaging citizens and building competence. Innovative, participatory mechanisms should be deployed using a two-way communication model with new and appropriate technologies, such as blogs and cellular technology (SMS).

Techniques can include providing easy access to information and government officials. Content should be developed both in an educational and entertaining way such as narrative communication formats, in a language easily understood.

**TECHNIQUES**

Promote and develop training for journalists

In addition investigative reporting, training on governance structures and issues are essential, as well as training on the business side of journalism to create an independent voice.

Establish partnerships with academia to implement interdisciplinary curricula

Partnerships should be established with academia to develop interdisciplinary curricula that reflect the skill-sets needed for young people to become effective citizens, such as including public-speaking and good leadership skills in the classroom, activities to exercise rights to information and freedoms, knowledge of government structures and understanding of institutions, and engagement of students in developing entertaining content on governance issues. Furthermore, internships and mentor programs could be organized for students to learn directly from their peers.

Engage with marginalized groups

Reach out to marginalized groups and provide training on basic communication skills and exercises on rights to information and freedoms, as well as inform marginalized groups of ways to participate in public debate.

Develop a platform to enhance coordination among development partners

A platform to discuss and share good practice and research on media support and regulation would be useful to better advocate and coordinate efforts towards independent and plural media systems. Evidence-based research can help influence decision makers to advocate for an independent and plural media system.

Support independent media

The international community should continue to support and collaborate with local media to establish independent media stations. Editorial independence contributes to balanced reporting and a strengthened



informed citizenry that is better equipped to enforce action to hold governments accountable. In addition, an independent press reduce tendency to sensationalize news.

Utilize and raise awareness regarding existing information sources, as well as consultative structures and mechanisms.

To build an informed citizenry and engage citizens in public debate, information sources and feedback mechanisms must be promoted and easily accessible. For example, in the case of Argentina, many students were requesting information that was already accessible on the government website, but not easily found. Also, existing consultative programming mechanisms should be promoted and new information technology should be explored to engage citizens in public debate.

## FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSE CARDS

### ***Q: What approaches and techniques have you found most effective in creating an informed citizenry?***

The focus should be on how “to form” citizens rather than “to inform” them.

Empowerment/social education workshops at village level and an education that relates to life going on outside the school/college.

Direct, “unmediated” communication between voters and elected officials (more tomorrow)!

Why may not be needed, waste a lot of time and money. If goal is to resolve a problem then it may be only a political exercise to change the opinion of key decision makers that is needed. Clearly media is important but need to expand the definition to include social media, etc.

Dialogue – Engagement – Managing differences in perspective. These “process” skills are needed so citizens and their government can reach durable agreements on what needs to be done to solve problems. Citizens need to reframe issues; the government won't.

Informed citizenry does not mean active citizenry (ready to be influenced on decision-making). Not always too much information leads to informed citizenry. SA as “public work” will be more effective, than as a stand-alone activity. Direct communication can be very efficient.

Power and influence of the media; importance to enhance citizens capacity by building their effective citizens abilities; use of IT to get citizens to participate in alternative mechanisms

Extensive use of the media; plays, dramas where people are illiterate; public forums for discussion; getting people to participate in campaigns, events; exposing children to civic values, behaviors.

Strategic communication, social mobilization, and informed advocacy.

Plan a message/plan how to deliver it. Develop learning networks, not only for the sake of effectiveness, but for their own sake. Take time to develop relationships with other organizations; use carrots and sticks with media and develop capacities.

Need to encourage media plurality and think beyond formal communication channels and rediscover/reinvigorate traditional cultures of orality.

Training journalists and incentivizing them (financially, professionally, through peer mechanisms, and through regulation) to cover governance issues in an informed and interesting way.

Media and education need to work together. We need a model where they complement each other. Skills perspective on citizenship is very important, not just knowledge or attitudes.

Providing young people with opportunities for serious civic work.

Empowerment communication strategies; conscientization using Freire's culture circle approach; theatre; PRA/PRCA techniques.



Increasing/supporting young citizens to exercise and learn their civic rights, and therefore, become the next generation of transformative citizens.

Communicative actions that pay attention to the use of frames, narrative, metaphor—ideas and themes and hopes prevalent in every day talk. It is not discrete pieces of information—truth claims false/true—but interpreted bundles of information framed in a compelling narrative that motivates and mobilizes public will.

What was important in the Uganda PETS in education case was the display of information on the budget allocations which made it possible for the beneficiaries to monitor the actual delivery of this money.

I think you have to consider media support in SA, in particular:

- Promotion of consultative programming structures and mechanisms, e.g., Internet fora, blogs, news, ombudsmen, listeners call-in, SMS participation with live broadcasts, editorial councils, which includes civil society organizations, viewer surveys, etc.
- Media literacy to train NGOs and citizens on how to use media consultative structures.
- Parliamentary broadcasts
- Build capacity for investigative journalism and participatory journalism.

Address both supply side and demand side. Supply side: improve structures and processes to build transparency, explore other venues to reach citizens. Demand side: mobilize civil society, educate messengers and champions, and penetrate informal social networks. Build relationships and trust and agenda even before problem exists.

Despite the cautionary points during discussion, there seems to have been a dominant idea that the media are guardians of democratic and social accountability. But who watches the watch people? Especially when the media have been shown to distort perceived citizen reality on some of the most pressing issues of the day.

Develop autonomous civic sources of information; right to information policies; regulated media pluralism—to limit media concentration / to foment alternative sorts of media.

We didn't really address needs of these constituencies, but instead assumed citizens are a homogenous mass. This produced a rich dialogue, but the missing part of it should be examined in some future setting.

Teaching basic rights, including right to information; create "Justice House" to teach and help citizens how to manage with their violated rights; rural and alternative radio; capacity journalists

Promoting community communication capacity, including in-person fora, media.

Access to the government-held information.

The media have a key role but one which is not always positive, therefore building a plural media environment, high quality journalism and participatory media, and giving voice to citizens are important. Radio is particularly useful for remote, marginalized, and illiterate groups, and as an oral medium it enables and resonates with the citizen's desire not only to be informed but also to speak. Citizen's communication competence is informed by the media environment but can also be developed in its own right through debate, critical reflection on the media's role, etc.

## **SESSION IV: MOBILIZING PUBLIC WILL AND INSPIRING CITIZEN ACTIVISM**

The fourth panel discussed issues in promoting public engagement in social accountability mechanisms and approaches in overcoming obstacles to broad citizen participation.

The session featured a conceptual framework in examining issues that impact the public will and key design elements to inspire civic activism. It also included presentations on case examples of mobilizing citizens, such as the use of unmediated information campaigns in the US, and the developing country perspectives from India and Malawi provided insights on the challenges and approaches in getting people to demand and governments to respond.

The first speaker, **Taeku Lee** of University of California, Berkeley (Associate Professor, Department of Political Science) discussed important conceptual issues that underpin approaches to mobilizing public



will and presented a framework for identifying what kind of public to be mobilized for a given mechanism, what kind of participatory input and kind of public influence to be expected. Mapping out the possible types of publics based on these three key dimensions requires a good understanding of power and empowerment.

The second speaker, **Shanto Iyengar** of Stanford University (Harry and Norman Chandler Professor of Communication and Professor of Political Science) presented a brief narrative on why media campaigns fail and discussed the significant opportunities of using information technology and new platforms for unmediated information to engage broad sectors of civil society. The ongoing research on the US experience in using CD-based campaigns provides an illuminating example of its potential in mobilizing citizens in non-electoral settings.

The third speaker, **Samuel Paul** of Bangalore, India (Public Affairs Center), focused on the key actors and actions essential in effectively mobilizing public will, namely, the citizens' acceptance of issues based on their felt needs, the government's positive response to address gaps in their performance through active dialogue and discussion with citizens, the support of champions and catalysts, the broad engagement of citizens to promote collective action, and the strategic and extensive use of effective forms of media to widen reach among citizens. As Paul emphasized, "The power of information is critical in creating genuine public demand. Media is a powerful means of reaching people so all forms of available media should be used to ensure people engage in collective action, which is oftentimes difficult."

The fourth speaker, **Christopher Kamlongera** of the University of Malawi (Professor of Drama and Theater Arts and Director, African Center of Communication for Development) highlighted the importance of focusing on the people themselves as the central starting point in designing interventions to mobilize collective public action.

### **Summary of Presentations**

**Taeku Lee** of UC Berkeley provided a conceptual presentation and discussed important conceptual issues on a broader level, as well as the narrow, practical dimensions in mobilizing public will and inspiring civic activism. At the outset, Lee acknowledged that the meeting's objective of generating genuine citizen demand to ensure the effectiveness of SA was both simple and elusive—simple because of the elegance and attractiveness of the political logic behind SA mechanisms but it does not easily translate to mobilized publics and workable institutional mechanisms; elusive because the idea of mobilizing public will where public will does not exist is a non-starter, especially among those who study people's behavior empirically.

Lee referred to the existing debate in modern political science between Walter Lippmann's elitist view and indictment of public opinion as a "blooming, buzzing confusion" and John Dewey's pragmatist view that goes against an idealized conception of public will, that "one does not need to be fully informed about what shapes people's behavior in order to think about public will." While most political scientists support Lippmann's view, Lee believes that the debate is not fair and is clearly one-sided. He further pointed out that "the battle between empirics and normative in modern political science is never fair because it is far too easy to weight 'is over ought,' and to weight 'prediction over possibility.'"

In support of Dewey's view, Lee raised two points: (1) while those with strong beliefs in egalitarianism will find Lippmann's elitist views disconcerting, Lee believes that it should not be totally rejected as long there is recognition that achieving virtuous ends such as egalitarianism, social justice, and SA is a process and if the goal has not been reached, it does not mean that the process is not worth it; (2) that public will is not an idealized concept and that more thought should be given to how public will can be designed.

Lee concluded his presentation with a brief description of the four key dimensions in thinking about and taking a nuanced view of public demand: (1) What kind of public is it? (2) What is mode of expression and how people express themselves politically? (3) What kind of influence are people willing to engage and what governing elites are willing to allow? (4) What goals/deliverables to see if things have worked? Lee emphasized that mobilizing public will and inspiring citizen activism involves a process of transformation.



It also presents a menu of choices on a range of goals beyond using SA mechanisms—from educating the public, empowering the public, changing citizen preferences, changing policy outcomes, or changing the power balance between ruling elites and citizens, a process which requires sustainable participation. In his paper, Lee considered SA to be the benchmark of good governance, providing evidence in achieving three outcomes: (1) transparency in the relationship between principals and agents; (2) answerability of agents and their sense of obligation to justify the choices made on behalf of principals; and (3) power of principals to sanction and punish agents when they fail to meet their obligations.

**Shanto Iyengar** of Stanford University opened his presentation with a provocative statement that “market-based media do not foster accountability.” He supported this observation based on the following developments: (1) the rapid spread of market-oriented news has led to a rise in demand for more entertainment or “soft news” rather than more information on politics and public policy in news programming; (2) the economic incentives, especially in competitive markets, prompt media to ignore their civic responsibility resulting in non-substantive news coverage and a non-engaged public, particularly notable during national elections; and (3) news coverage is shaped by media management resulting in a media agenda that reflects the interests of the elite.

Notwithstanding these discouraging trends, however, Iyengar expressed optimism and qualified his observations stating, “But... for SA practitioners, all is not lost!” He emphasized that information technology offers many possibilities that have significant potential to effectively inform and engage citizens. He cited promising alternatives through new forms of unmediated information which facilitate revival of direct modes of communication between large groups of citizens and various organizations.

In particular, Iyengar described his current experience with harnessing computer access through the use of CDs. Compared to web-based platforms, which present challenges with speed requirements and further increasing the divide in connectivity and web access, the use of CDs have proven to be cost-effective and accessible alternatives that promise a wider audience reach. Other effective tools include electronic newsletters, voter guides, or handbooks—all of which facilitate delivery of information, enhance user-control in terms of volume and topics of information accessed, and feature entertainment and interactivity to promote user interest and engagement.

In conclusion, Iyengar briefly described the experience with the CD-based intervention within the US context from 2000-2004. Results from empirical studies done in 2000 and 2002, funded through foundation grants, confirm the impact of CD use in building informed citizens and generating a greater sense of citizen engagement. However, the low level of exposure remains to be the main challenge. And as Iyengar noted, this can be boosted by targeting specific constituencies and collaborating with key advocacy groups.

**Samuel Paul** of the Public Affairs Center in Bangalore, India, defined the two sides of generating genuine citizen demand. One side is the public acceptance of the issues that demand accountability, and the other is the government response and action on issues presented. Positive response from citizens will only happen if the issues raised are based on citizens’ felt needs, on matters deemed personally relevant and significant. Government, on the other hand, needs to view the importance of responding to citizen demand and act responsibly to fill in gaps between what has been promised and what has been achieved.

Paul emphasized key factors that need to be considered in effective implementation of SA mechanisms. First, information dissemination plays a key role in creating greater citizen demand. And in order to stimulate collective action, the strategic use of various forms of media is essential to broaden reach among citizens. While civil society works with imperfect institutions and operates within a set of limitations, these constraints should not deter efforts to effectively mobilize the media.

Second, champions and catalysts are needed to lead civic advocacy. To ensure broad citizen engagement, evidence from SA initiatives, such as citizen report cards, have to be translated in simple and understandable language using street plays and other creative channels of disseminating information.



Third, government response to citizens' demand should be facilitated through dialogue with citizens to foster openness and mutual trust. Report findings and recommendations from SA initiatives need to be discussed, understood, and acted upon. Building allies within government can stimulate government response on recommended courses of action.

Paul concluded his presentation with an example from India that illustrates the power of information based on a small civil society intervention. Initial demand for greater information and transparency on campaign and elections led another civil society group to seek action from the courts. This experiment reached the attention of the Supreme Court and eventually led to a legislation that mandates the collection of information on candidates for dissemination to the voters. Similarly, the citizen report card initiative in Delhi and other cities has led the head of the National Planning Commission to advise the chief ministers of all the states to adopt this approach. He has also set up a fund that the chief ministers can draw upon when they launch their projects.

**Christopher Kamlongera** of the University of Malawi presented a clear overarching message in implementing SA at the village level. "Start with the people and add value to what they are doing. This will ensure credible, durable, and sustainable activities necessary to improve transparency and accountability."

Kamlongera shared a personal narrative that illustrated how cooperation exists in the village, and the opportunities available to allow people to raise issues, to build ownership, transparency, and accountability. His experience in providing communication support to the Malawi Social Action Fund made it much more apparent to him that people in the rural villages are being trained (in the areas of) transparency and SA. Systems should not be transplanted from other contexts without recognizing or taking into account resources are available locally, and what works on the ground. To neglect local context jeopardizes the sustainability of any development initiative.

In his paper, Kamlongera noted key recommendations in strengthening the effectiveness of SA tools based on their experience in using community score cards: (1) scale up the implementation of SA in Malawi and (2) mainstream SA as an integral part of the social and political agenda in the country.

On communication activities, the following practical approaches were also recommended: (1) adapt the community scorecard process to the local context; (2) sensitize all development service authorities and providers in Malawi about community scorecards; (3) conduct training workshops for development workers and community-based development committees on community scorecard processing; (4) integrate community scorecard process in all core training for development workers in the country; and, (5) conduct a nation-wide communication campaign introducing the community scorecard process.

The plenary discussion raised other important issues: (1) building political will and public will; (2) understanding and working within the local context, using local leaders and harnessing local creativity; (3) addressing the cost of public participation and use of formal and informal mechanisms of participation; (4) ensuring representation of the poor and addressing a culture of silence; (5) mobilizing the media while at the same time using informal networks and local approaches to effective communication; and (6) recognizing that sustainability is most critical and that it is a long-term process.

**Approaches & Techniques**

Following is a list of approaches and techniques for mobilizing public will and inspiring citizen activism.

<b>APPROACHES</b>	
Map out types of publics, participatory inputs and degree of influence	A diverse menu of possibilities for mobilizing public will can be derived using a framework that applies key dimensions that define degrees of public representation, the cost of participatory inputs (cheap to costly) and the extent of influence that ruling elites are willing to concede.



(see Taeku Lee’s paper)

Applying these dimensions on a linear scale provides a more nuanced view of who is the public to be mobilized.

For example, a linear scale that represents participation on a range of inclusive (more representative) to exclusive (more mobilized) and corresponding types of publics can offer a choice of possible publics to be activated depending on the political context and the type of SA mechanism used.

The types of publics that can be mobilized range from inclusive, more representative participation (which includes the general public, random selection, self-selected participants) to more mobilized, exclusive participation (which includes targeted recruits, civic organizations, and professional stakeholders).

Similarly, a scale of participatory inputs, ranging from cheap to costly and corresponding forms of input: passive receptacle and preference expressions (more anonymous) to preference transformation and deliberation and decision making (more informative) will highlight the obstacles and transactions costs involved in public participation.

Use local, political context and people as the starting points

A people-centered and context-specific approach provides a reliable guide to effectively mobilize public will and inspire civic activism. Start with understanding people’s felt needs and aspirations, the obstacles to their participation, as well as their living conditions and external environment (social, political, cultural, media). Recognizing the shifts in people’s interest and motivation helps identify other drivers of influence that can be tapped to ensure sustainability of engagement. Use local leaders as key messengers and advocates of citizen activism.

Enlist educational institutions as partners and target the youth as audience

Educational institutions could be tapped as active partners in broadening public access to information using digital media. For example, the impact of CD-based information campaigns, given their pedagogical value, could be enhanced and its reach widened by bringing them into classroom discussions. Targeting the technological-savvy youth who represent a significant segment of the population will broaden exposure and visibility.

**TECHNIQUES**

Make strategic use of the media, traditional and modern

Media plays a central role in building informed and competent citizens capable of demanding accountability from public officials. Results of SA mechanisms should be broadly disseminated and translated in simple, easy-to-understand information.

Key messages should be clear, consistent, and compelling using effective channels of communication such as print, radio, TV, as well as creative platforms such as local plays, street theater, posters, and billboard in strategically located points, to reach as wide an audience as possible.

The path from awareness creation to citizen activism has several intermediate steps, which include building knowledge, changing attitudes, and empowering citizens. And creativity is a key element of citizen empowerment.

Mobilize formal and informal social networks

Existing social networks, formal and informal, are also effective channels of mobilizing citizen engagement. Strong coalitions could be developed through collaboration of organizations or groups of people



with shared objectives but who differ in terms of specialized or issue-based interests.

Synergies derived from new partnerships can lead to creative approaches in developing context-specific and culture-sensitive means of effectively mobilizing public will and inspiring citizen activism.

Use technology to renew direct communication between groups of organizations and individual citizens

The burgeoning growth of information technology offers numerous and promising alternatives for renewing direct means of communication, while at the same time, providing greater user-control at reduced cost. This approach brings informed citizenship back by circumventing the market-driven environment that has reduced news media to shallow, superficial and entertainment-heavy forms of reporting and journalism.

Various media platforms that incorporate education with entertainment offer interesting and cost-effective options for citizens to escape the barrage of manipulative and non-substantive content in news programming.

Use electronic newsletters, guides, or handbooks

These media platforms provide interactive tools that can deliver significant amounts of data and information on-demand. It empowers users with greater control in actively seeking out preferred topics of interest, and relevant issues of concern. Multi-media CDs and DVDs can be designed to promote engagement and interest using software tools and interactive games to enhance entertainment value.

#### FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSE CARDS

##### ***Q: What approaches and techniques have you found most effective in overcoming obstacles to citizen engagement and mobilization?***

The example here can be broken down into two categories: enabling environment and capacity building. Enabling-environment approaches include changing the political, legal, regulatory context to ensure freedom of expression, access to information, freedom of association, and media pluralism. Capacity-building approaches include establishment of diverse, sustainable, and independent media including community media; building ICT infrastructure; education (especially literacy); and building a culture of citizen engagement through political action.

More difficult to specify but very often of crucial importance are the social and political circumstances that raise citizens' desire and readiness to mobilize and that contribute to conscientization and act as catalysts of political upheaval and change.

Start with people's work, with knowing the conditions (political, cultural, media, etc.); base your work on existing formal and informal community systems and networks. Create awareness by providing information generated through various technical tools may sometime be enough, but in most cases one would need to support additional mobilization actions to get from awareness creation to public action. Look for local leaders in the community and recognize that social accountability efforts require long-term support.

Start with understanding obstacles, see how these can be addressed; create supportive environment; find out ways to reach people effectively.

Need to recognize the ebb and flow of conditions that motivate people, so sustainability needs to have multiple sources. In surveying the all-important "local context," a useful framework is the shifting roles and bounds of "inside" and "outside." Typically, government is inside and citizens outside (as people talk about it) but not always. There might be several insides and outside. Conflict of professionals can lead to passive dependent citizenry.

Start with existing local systems and see how to use or improve them; do your research; understand the socio-political context; environments and situations are highly contextual; realize the context and work with it.

OECD is exploring specific barriers for two groups: (1) willing and unable—many people would share intent but face education, discrimination, self-confidence barriers; (2) able but unwilling—large numbers of people can participate (face no external barriers) but choose not to. Why? How can they be enticed and encouraged?



Start with the people; knowing them culturally and all!

From existing social capital, facilitate small but visible changes; continuously engage indigenous knowledge with technical expertise to surpass localized obstacles.

Participation in creating the activities and media for mobilization; creating awareness does not guarantee action; other interventions might be needed.

Engage local leaders and pay attention to local context and the mechanisms of social accountability that each community has. The media (traditional and new ones) are essential to increase mobilization.

Willingness to stay on course, irrespective on initial cynicism (e.g., CRCs); need to transcend the technicality of SA mechanisms and link them with political structures and processes; need to recognize traditional spaces of public debates (non-formal media).

How to institutionalize and sustain participation; this would probably enable citizen engagement and mobilization; the most effective approach seems to be at a local level where the results are more concrete and service providers closer.

Using existing social networks; examining existing institutional framework; using various media to disseminate information but using social networks to obtain feedback.

There are many existing models that attempt to capture behavior/attitude change processes. This work should draw on these models.

Building strong civil society, working on coalitions between organizations with civil society, crafting frames and narratives that interpret in an empowering way; emphasize the “we” and not the “me” as a way of lowering the costs and diversifying the risks of participation.

No time in this session to raise the question of what might be called “selective engagement.” When some societal group gets engaged at the cost of other groups, e.g., Hindus engaged in the Indian community while Muslims are left out. Countless examples here. Accountability in this kind of context could be very destructive. Challenge is how to ensure some kind of pluralistic accountability.

Identify clearly the players. Allow communities to explore creatively ways to use SA tools; start from “felt need;” and start from work of the community.

Lowering costs of collective action by creating an enabling public space.

Media interventions. Dissemination of information gathered through the implementation of various SA tools will help in mobilization of public will. Using traditional ways to ensure accountability in formulation of public will.

It depends on political situation. One should first understand very well the political context. Leadership matters strongly. People will be mobilized and active if leadership will trust people. Media shall be more balanced and market-based approaches can impede the mobilization issues.

Creating space for expression is important to bring people together. Develop media access where possible, if commercial media is accessible, even better. If not, alternatives can be used successfully. Leadership and mediation by civil society organizations matters. Know the conditions/environment you work in.

Can IT and educational technology be used to help developing countries overcome cultural values that prevent people from demanding accountability from government? Example: Uganda PETS—PTA members not too willing to question teachers re: where funds for schools have not been used. Example: culture of silence.

Media, whether commercial or not, can often foster and inspire citizen engagement but it all depends on country and context.

On a gigantic scale, people engage voluntarily to create public goods. For example, restoring the graveyard in Malawi (Chris K.'s story). Can we strengthen public accountability by tying citizens' review of their government to ordinary, daily voluntary public work?



## **SESSION V: ACHIEVING BEHAVIOR CHANGE IN PUBLIC OFFICIALS THROUGH MOBILIZED PUBLIC OPINION**

This session explored approaches and techniques used in mobilizing public opinion in order to ensure behavior change among public officials, which would thereby lead to more accountable government.

The first speaker stressed that accountability is necessary for the proper functioning of any rights regime. An access to information regime, responsive government, and an active part of civil society that specializes in this type of politics are all preconditions for the successful adoption of SA mechanisms. Moreover, SA works best within the cultural and institutional context of a representative democracy. Corollary contextual requirements include cultural, social, and institutional conditions conducive to accountability and access.

The second speaker related experiences in deploying Citizen Report Cards in India and Kenya. The process included the following key components: locating institutional anchors; building awareness and creating consensus; deploying dissemination strategies through media coverage and sponsored campaigns; taking stock of internal champions and external triggers; and codifying good practices.

The third speaker talked about the need to couple public scrutiny with open and inclusive policymaking. A cross-nationally comparative analysis of 40 SA projects was carried out using an approach measuring the following: scrutiny of government; proximity of citizens and government; and citizen engagement.

Additional ideas that arose during the open forum include:

- The need for an active journalism profession free from fear and able to mediate the supply and demand sides of governance.
- The need to take stock of conditions for systemic change (e.g., leadership for progressive change within government apparatus to overcome strongholds of resistance).
- Garnering support of international financial institutions.
- Depending on nature of behavior change, timeframes can range from immediate to as long as three generations; must match length of time given for behavior sought to theory of behavior change. Sometimes, people have good reasons for not changing, such as cultural norms.
- Translators are essential to attaining wide buy-in.
- Observatories/networks/third sectors are good for documenting, housing, disseminating, and monitoring changes.
- Continual learning should be institutionalized in institutions and incorporated in governance processes.
- SA mechanisms can provide a potential win-win situation for all major stakeholders.

**Enrique Peruzzotti** of Torcuato Di Tella University in Argentina stressed that accountability is necessarily based on a rights regime. Access to information coupled with a responsive government is a crucial precondition to the exercise of accountability. Another precondition is an active part of civil society that specializes in this type of politics and has autonomous sources of information. Society needs a social infrastructure for the exercise of SA (i.e., professionalized NGOs and social movements). Agencies of control should be shared among and bolstered by wide networks of societal actors. This type of network includes international regimes and organizations.

The gap between politicians and citizens is reduced by accountability mechanisms. Accountability must be exercised primarily by actors who are external to government. Negotiated interaction between actors assumes asymmetry of power, that is, one party has the authority or right to impose sanctions. While



some institutional arrangements are formal (e.g., voting), others are informal (e.g., civil society action). SA works best within the cultural and institutional context of a representative democracy.

The corollary contextual requirements include the following: 1) cultural—politics of accountability and a culture of rights; citizens should remain cognizant of the right to demand better services; 2) social—acceptance of political processes; for this, professional NGOs are crucial and need to be supported; 3) institutional preconditions—access to information regime; this type of regime provides entry points within government agencies that exercise control.

**Gopakumar Thampi** of the Public Affairs Foundation based in Bangalore related experiences in deploying CRCs in India and Kenya. The process included the following key components: 1) locating institutional anchors—national and local consortia—as a result, visibility increased in India; 2) awareness building and consensus creation on what tool and approach are by use of the “Critical 8” (see session 1 for elaboration on this point); 3) dissemination strategies through media coverage and sponsored campaigns—this is how findings were internalized in the Kenyan experience; 4) the locus of reforms has to be seen as residing in internal and external factors; 5) learning-from-experience has to be codified in good practices.

The power of SA mechanism is derived from moving from anecdotal to factual, and the ability to differentiate “noise” from “voice.” Effective context setting and consensus creation require sponsors of SA tools to be open and honest about what each tool is designed to do (and not do). It should also be noted that neutrality and objectivity create buy-in among various stakeholders.

Successful SA initiatives have external triggers and internal champions. That is, the clamor of public opinion is a trigger, but the critical processes of adopting and using the tool effectively depend on key internal actors. Strategic communication should advance knowledge and understanding of incentives and disincentives (“pats and slaps”).

**Joanne Caddy**, policy analyst at OECD’s Directorate for Public Governance and Territorial Development, underscored the importance of going beyond public scrutiny into the realm of policy. SA processes should include open and inclusive policymaking. Civic engagement is a prerequisite for the work of reform around the world. The OECD focuses on the functions of information, consultation, and participation, in contrast to organizations such as the World Bank, which focus heavily on the development of tools.

Informed by these principles, a comparative analysis was carried out on 40 SA projects/programs. A novel comparative approach was adopted with the following key components: 1) scrutiny (initiatives that aim to enhance assessment, analysis, and review of government actions); 2) proximity (initiatives that aim to reduce distance between citizens and government by identifying citizen needs and preferences); 3) engagement (initiatives that aim to incorporate citizens into decision-making processes).

The study found that the main barriers to the success of SA can be summarized in a duality: some actors are willing but unable to support and carry out reform, while others are able but unwilling. Inability is usually linked to various types of political constraints. Unwillingness often arises from negative past experiences (i.e., people develop distrust in using their voice). Some considerations for moving forward are summarized through the following questions: How can reforms harness multiplier effects? Does support for and the effective use of SA tools conserve resources? What are the rights and responsibilities undergirding SA? How much does context matter?

According to University of Kentucky Professor **Chike Anyaegbunam**, understanding the determinants of behavior change that supports SA is a transdisciplinary issue. As such, it is well served by adopting a social ecology model, which spans individual, interpersonal, organizational, community, and public policy levels of intervention and analysis. Furthermore, publics and their opinions can be described in various ways: latent, aware, and/or active. The largest challenge is moving public opinion from latent to active. This can be achieved by adopting a three-dimensional conception of communication: top-down (from the government to local stakeholders); bottom-up (from local stakeholders to the government), and horizontal (through social networks).



Obstacles to successful SA implementation include: 1) noninvolvement of local stakeholders in planning and program formulation; 2) a low sense of power and political efficacy on the part of reformers; 3) ineffective capacity building methods, and 4) inadequate promotion of SA efforts.

### **Approaches & Techniques**

The following is a list of approaches and techniques for achieving behavior change in public officials through mobilized public opinion:

## APPROACHES

Take stock of horizontal and vertical accountability mechanisms	This approach provides a systematic way of thinking about accountability; in terms of horizontal mechanisms (workings and interactions of the complex machinery of internal controls established by representative democracy) and vertical mechanisms (electoral and social actions of non-state actors, including the intermediate place of civil society).
Comprehensive five-pronged framework	This broad analytical approach is comprised of the following five components: cultural, social, institutional conditions, the quality of the public sphere, and international regimes.
Initiatives from below and initiatives from above	The building of SA mechanisms can follow two different roads: it can be the product of autonomous initiatives from below of actors who view themselves as carriers of rights or, alternatively, can be promoted by more powerful actors from above interested in building a social and institutional environment conducive to the exercise of accountability.
Cultivating collaboration	Collaborative approaches negotiated between civil society and government have led to successful adoption of SA mechanisms.
Cultivate an evaluative culture	Evaluation must become an essential rather than an optional component of SA initiatives if their full impacts are to be asserted and current practice improved.
Ensure feedback and follow-up	SA initiators must demonstrate how participants' contributions and input are being used in order to maintain public interest and involvement.
Adopt a three-dimensional communication paradigm	The three dimensions are top-down (from the government to local stakeholders); bottom-up (from local stakeholders to government), and horizontal (through social networks).
Adopt a systems perspective through a social ecological model of analysis	The five levels of the social ecological model are the following: social structure, policy and systems; community; institutional/organizational; interpersonal; and individual.
Assess type of public being engaged	Different types of publics require different interventions. For example, a latent public needs to be moved to an awareness stage before any sort of action is expected of them.

## TECHNIQUES

Identifying an organizational anchor	Work with an institutional anchor (e.g., government official and/or agency) provides legitimacy to the exercise of SA mechanisms and brings in clear ownership within the government.
Finding institutional champions	Make repeated presentations of the SA tool to potential institutional champions and stress its neutrality and diagnostic power.



Hold brainstorming sessions with stakeholders	Design highly interactive and focused brainstorming sessions with a small team of staff from each relevant department. Make sure that the group is representative of all levels within the organization. Create consensus on the diagnosis of problems and generate specific reform measures. Discuss these widely to create broad ownership.
Present alternative tools to stakeholders	Present multiple tools and allow participants to discuss the utility, replicability, and contextual fit of the tools, and select the one they deem best for the evaluative task.
Hold multistakeholder workshops on the tools	Consult with stakeholders on the following: concept, methodology, outcomes, and applications. This provides a space to understand, discuss, and critique the tool. Collectively evaluate the merit and contextual fit of the tool.
Select local drivers carefully	The civil society field is extremely competitive and the selection of a “lead organization” needs to be managed in an open and transparent manner.
Circulate draft findings	Draft reports should be circulated to each relevant service/ministry in order to provide them the opportunity to pose questions and clarifications.
Form stakeholder alliances at the national and local levels	Facilitate a balance between national level dialogue as well as local responsiveness.
Institutionalize findings through government response and action	Include a government response step in the process, sometime after the tool’s findings are made public.
Prepare media in advance and educate them on the details of the tools	Preparatory sessions for the media before press conferences ensure that key messages are understood, reported, and articulated in a positive and constructive manner. Also, a holistic understanding on the part of journalists will allow them to report on positive and negative findings, be sensitive to shades of gray, and convey findings in a value-neutral manner.
Deploy mobile digital schools toward public opinion mobilization	These schools consist of the following: mobile teacher (MT4 player); a place where people already gather; course content in the form of an oral library (A/V based); trained mentors; collective learning process; and cascade effect through community sharing.

#### FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS’ RESPONSE CARDS

**Q: *Is mobilized public opinion a sufficient condition for achieving behavior change in public officials? What else may be necessary?***

It is a necessary but not sufficient condition among other factors necessary for achieving change are: correct choice of the target (what should be changed and who among officials can change things); taking into account the interests of public officials and institutions they represent; system of incentives and sanctions, public officials can face; times and timing; culture, especially political culture.

Mobilized public opinion is important but not sufficient for behavior change in public officials. Need also incentives/sanctions, international pressure, use of judiciary, or other institutionalized systems.

Public opinion alone is not enough. The public official has to want to change and has to be in conditions in which change is possible. From a behavioral perspective this requires incentives and/or sanctions. However, it also requires cognitive change if it is to be sustained. The education and culture of public servants need to have a change orientation or a focus on learning and continued improvement. In addition, government has a responsibility, if not a *raison d’etre*, to consider competing proposals for change and argument for the “do nothing” option in order to take policy decisions in the public interest. This requires responding to public opinion(s) and to pressure from other



interest groups with a fair and transparent assessment of the options, and published reasons for decisions. These processes need to be reinforced by internal checks and balances (the legislator, opposition parties, ombudsman, judicial review) and by external watchdogs (the media, civil society monitoring).

Recognition of diversity and unequal demands among publics; incentives, sanctions, and enforcement of existing regulations; present win-win solutions, institutionalize the mechanisms that lead to behavior change. Session was quite complete—best of the workshop.

No. Strong sanctions—penalties which directly affect the pockets of public officials, changes behavior immediately. In the context of macro-level issues like economic liberalization, etc., good governance is a pre-condition for attracting capital/investment etc. So public officials are forced to make changes in their behavior.

Necessary, indeed crucial, but not sufficient. Need to invest in systemic public administration change so that traditional accountability systems (e.g., internal audit, external audit, parliamentary oversight) are strengthened, and not undermined, by attention to external social accountability pressures. Need to understand how to change formal structures/processes to open up spaces for citizens but also how to ensure “win-win” scenarios that can enable public officials to see that public engagement can help them to do their jobs better.

No, public opinion is necessary but not sufficient. There are the necessary conditions, such as a strong judiciary system, an enabling environment, etc. There’s also a methodological consideration: to go from individual change to cultural/societal change. We need to plan long term, so that change sticks in the structure of society.

Need structures of support for long-term change; legal conditions should include transparency and access to information; effective sanctions; incentives (institutional, formal, and informal) are useful. We should acknowledge a difference between distinct types (and levels) of public officials.

Embedding public opinion in institutional structures and processes (e.g., social audit, performance appraisal).

## **SESSION VI: BRAINSTORMING AND ACTION STEPS**

The final session focused on highlighting key insights from participants on two specific points:

1. the main issues arising from each of the discussion topics and
2. recommended areas for action, as well as effective approaches and techniques for overcoming challenges.

Following is a summary of the group presentations made during the plenary session:

### ***Session One: Analyzing Public Sphere/Political Context***

Participants emphasized the importance of understanding the public sphere, the political conditions that impinge on democratic processes and participatory spaces that allow citizens to freely express and demand for government accountability and action in delivering meaningful change. The two most important messages that came out of the discussions are: (1) the power of information will empower the people; and (2) context matters, but can any political context be navigated?

While the final measure of success in SA can be clearly defined as holding authority accountable, access to information, political plurality, inclusive participation, and democratic spaces for citizen engagement were identified as critical levers in creating conditions that foster accountability and sustained participation.

A conducive environment warrants interventions to improve the policy and regulatory framework, as well as citizen capacity to demand accountability. On the policy/supply side, critical elements are:

1. access to information, as a rights-based legal framework accompanied by whistleblower protection;



2. media support and active engagement of professional media on SA and the need to diagnose practical problems confronting media professionals;
3. support for legal activism, as a means for civil society organizations to legally challenge acts of authority.

On the demand-side, the important mechanisms are:

1. development of networks, both formal and informal, to enable effective and strategic information-sharing mechanisms that boost civil society capacity to generate evidence-based research;
2. strategic use of the media, as well as creative, interactive, visually based content to promote citizen interest and activism. In India, a film on Gandhi revived strong deeply held values and raised awareness and inspired civic activism, especially among the youth. Context and translation are important. Without translation, it is hard to encourage civic engagement.

### ***Session Two: Gaining Official Support in Social Accountability***

While some participants emphasized that not all SA mechanisms require official support (or permission), there was broad recognition of the importance of the state's positive posture toward SA objectives. It opens up avenues for the state to listen, to acknowledge their public responsibilities, and to respond to citizens' demand for action. The ability to gain official support places the burden on civil society, on their willingness and capacity to engage with government, to negotiate change and manage conflict under adversarial conditions.

The participants highlighted two key elements that can bolster civil society efforts in gaining official support for SA. First is the importance of strategic positioning. This involves an examination of the posture and attitude of civil society organizations, as well as the manner in which they choose to engage along a continuum ranging from an adversarial to a cooperative role. What position or posture will result in a favorable outcome?

In addition, the willingness and capacity of CSOs to form broader coalitions with other organizations (religious, trade unions, etc.) can help amplify their voice and strengthen collective efforts in demanding response from the government. Taking on a collaborative approach should also include seeking allies and champions within government, recognizing that it is not a monolithic institution. CSOs also need to gain a better understanding of the role of oversight institutions (ombudsman, judiciary, etc.) in SA. They can identify ways to mobilize support of the political, legal, and judicial systems particularly in implementing and enforcing sanctions needed to strengthen the impact of SA mechanisms. Strong advocacy efforts and strategic use of the media should underpin SA initiatives to keep issues alive, maintain citizen interest, and sustain reform momentum.

The second important ingredient is the credibility of civil society organizations. Credibility builds trust and confidence and is central to developing strong partnerships. It establishes the foundation for openness and willingness on the part of government to listen and respond to civil society initiatives needing state support. Collaboration between the state and civil society is a two-way street that demands accountability and transparency from both parties. In mobilizing civil society to gain official support, participants identified the challenge of adapting approaches relevant to country-specific contexts. This underscores the importance of developing a methodology that can guide effective priority setting, which participants believe is a challenge that CommGAP is uniquely placed to support.

### ***Session Three: Building Citizen Competence***

In discussing the issues of citizen competence, the focus was both on the "how" and the "what." Participants highlighted the importance of strategic interventions at three levels: (1) institutional, (2)



individual, and (3) social. At the institutional level, partnerships with educational institutions (schools and universities) are essential to establish the linkages that reinforce values and capacities that enhance citizen knowledge and build confidence. At the individual level, developing personal skills and competencies should build on core strengths and roles of specific groups and segments of the population (e.g., youth, women, unorganized groups). At the social level, building a strong network of coalitions through competent and capable social networks, both formal and informal, bolsters the impact of collective action.

Specific recommendations presented include:

1. Get youth involved. Be inclusive, include marginalized groups, minority, women, etc.;
2. Teach students, minority groups, etc., about government issues and how to create entertaining radio program about government;
3. Develop skills in knowing how to ask the right questions, demand for answers, gain access to information (comprehensible information), hold officials to account, assert for their rights in the face of oppression, repression, fear, and require reliability standards;
4. Master tools for creating and using spaces for civic discourse;
5. Declare a SA Day to bring heightened citizen awareness on the successes of SA efforts and challenges that need to be addressed;
6. Make people self-efficacious; educate them in effective engagement and in the exercise of citizen voice;
7. Build skills in public speaking, discussion, debate;
8. Develop an understanding of how institutions work, their roles and responsibilities, and where to seek assistance when they fail to perform;
9. Mobilize the media, train *animateurs* (community media);
10. Introduce creative ways of teaching and developing citizen competence, combining education and entertainment in various tools, such as introducing civic processes in board/video games, comic books, radio, and TV, as well as using narrative formats, soap opera, and theater to build citizen knowledge and skills.

Key messages about citizen competence can be summarized under three headings: (1) competence in information seeking (rights, process, and methods) through formal institutions at all level of education (primary, secondary, and post-secondary); (2) competence of independent and professional media infrastructure, which precedes governance literacy; and (3) “Citizen-ness” is a set of key communication skills.

#### **Session Four: Mobilizing Public Will and Inspiring Civic Activism**

Discussions on mobilizing public will and overcoming obstacles to engagement crystallized four important issues and relevant recommendations for CommGAP to support SA objectives.

First, media plays a central role, but they can also hinder rather than help the process and outcomes of SA. The question is “how do we get media to adopt and operate as a public service model, responsibly serving the public interest, and help create a conducive environment that promotes the objectives of SA?” The recommendation is to “find the right mix of regulation and incentives to create and sustain an enabling environment.”

Second, improve horizontal forms of communication and explore the use of new communication technologies. The recommendation is to strike the right balance between creating a favorable political and regulatory environment and the right set of incentives to infrastructure that can facilitate access to information technology.



Third, while civil society organizations are critical partners of government in SA, there is the risk of co-optation, where they operate as an arm of government. The recommendation is to find ways to encourage formation of a new breed of NGOs, develop creative measures to reduce barriers to their formation, and guarantee their credibility and commitment to uphold the principles of integrity, transparency, and accountability.

Fourth, build as a movement something sustainable to keep the focus on SA. On the development community side, the World Bank and international donors should continue to keep the spotlight on accountability and governance and the contributions that communication can provide in the process. In addition, the World Bank should push SA, media training, and strategic communication as integral parts of a core curriculum for its training programs.

### ***Session Five: Achieving Behavior Change among Public Officials***

While behavior change was clearly recognized as a long-term process, effective means to address it can involve both short-term and long-term measures. Participants identified two levels of critical interventions: one requires focusing on systemic/institutional change and the second is influencing change at the individual level.

Specific recommendations for CommGAP include:

1. Focus on activities that support both supply and demand side of governance and accountability and in areas where the most impact can be gained. Establishing criteria for choosing activities that affect both demand and supply sides can help in focusing on priority areas.
2. Conduct comparative analysis of similar tools and the results achieved in various contexts.
3. Focus on the normal practice, and not just good or best practice, in looking at practical experiences in SA. How well and how easily can these be applied in different settings? What are the negative impacts of efforts that were not anticipated in the early stages of design or implementation?
4. Recognize the critical role of state and grassroots intermediaries. Know when it is best to let the local people take over their own development. Investigate the magic of communities at work without the influence of external interventions.
5. Develop simple and participatory evaluation tools and frameworks that effectively measure our performance relative to what are we trying to achieve.
6. Develop new media and the promise of local communities generating the content themselves. Use powerful audio-visual formats.
7. Target capacity-building efforts at public officials and civil society groups. For public officials, capacity building could consider the following: in-service training and not just induction training; tracking alumni and find out if and how the training influenced changes in the way they conduct their work; an award system to celebrate what is achieved enhances incentives for better performance; secondment arrangements to facilitate development of tacit knowledge; mentoring and peer-to-peer learning create opportunities for knowledge sharing and provide real-time answers to operational problems; and mapping available competencies and expertise can be developed as a useful roster of resource people that can be tapped to support SA initiatives.



### Definitions of some of the more widely used Social Accountability Tools

- **Citizen's Report Cards (CRCs)** are participatory surveys that solicit user feedback on the performance of public services. CRCs can significantly enhance public accountability through the extensive media coverage and civil society advocacy that accompanies the process.
- **Community Score Cards (CSCs)** combines the participatory quantitative surveys used in the CRC with village meetings whereby citizens are empowered to provide immediate feedback to service providers in face-to-face meetings.
- **Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS)** are a quantitative survey that tracks the flow of public funds to determine the extent to which resources actually reach the target groups. The unit of observation is typically a service facility rather than a household or an enterprise. The survey collects information on transfer procedures, amounts and timing of released resources.
- **Participatory Budgeting** is a process through which citizens participate directly in the different phases of the budget formulation, decision making, and monitoring of budget execution. PB can be instrumental in increasing public expenditure transparency and in improving budget targeting.
- **Social Audit** is a process that collects information on the resources of an organization and this information is analyzed in terms of how resources are used for social objectives and shared publicly in a participatory process.



## PRESENTERS' BIOS

**Chike Anyaegbunam** is Associate Professor at the University of Kentucky with joint appointments in the Colleges of Communications and Public Health, where he teaches Integrated Strategic Communication, Marketing Research, Communication Theory, and Participatory Communication.

He specializes in designing strategic communication programs for projects related to empowerment and civic engagement, health, the environment, agricultural safety and health, and economic development. He is currently the director of the CDC/NIOSH-funded social marketing program to promote tractor safety in the United States.

Chike earned his Ph.D. in Journalism and Mass Communication from the University of Iowa, 1994, with Development Support Communication as a special focus, and has worked for a variety of national and international projects sponsored by the World Bank, FAO, UNICEF, USAID, the Pfizer and Robert Wood Johnson Foundations, and the National Cancer Institute (NCI) through the Appalachian Cancer Network.

He was the 1992-93 editor of the *Journal of Communication Inquiry* and is the lead author of a widely used book on participatory rural communication appraisal <http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/y5793e/y5793e00.htm>. He has also co-authored articles published in several academic journals and book chapters on participatory rural communication research, including a chapter in the *First Mile of Connectivity* <http://www.fao.org/docrep/X0295E/X0295E00.htm>. Since 1975, Chike has lived and/or worked in several countries, including Italy, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Mozambique, USA, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

**Harry Blair**, Associate Chair, Senior Research Scholar and Lecturer in Political Science at Yale University, has focused his research and applied work over the last fifteen years on democratization issues, primarily civil society and decentralization. Earlier he had concentrated on South Asian politics and rural development, mainly in India and Bangladesh.

On democratization, he has worked in Eastern Europe (principally Balkan countries), Latin America, and Southeast Asia, as well as South Asia. As a consultant, he has served with DFID, FAO, the Ford Foundation, SIDA, UNDESA, UNDP, USAID, and the World Bank. Before coming to Yale, he held academic positions at Bucknell, Colgate, Columbia, Cornell and Rutgers Universities. He holds a Ph.D. from Duke University. His most current publications deal with gauging civil society advocacy, post-conflict state-building, participatory local governance, and Bangladesh political parties. These and other recent writing may be found on the Internet at <<http://pantheon.yale.edu/~hb94>>.

**Joanne Caddy** is a Policy Analyst at the OECD's Directorate for Public Governance and Territorial Development (GOV). She is currently responsible for leading work on "Open and Inclusive Policy Making," which examines OECD country experience in fostering public engagement. In 2006, she was seconded to the New Zealand State Services Commission (SSC) for a year, where she served as a Senior Advisor and helped draft the SSC "Guide to Online Participation." This Guide was written on a wiki, with inputs from a broad community of practice, and was published online in 2007.

Her contributions to the field of public participation include the following OECD reports: *Citizens as Partners: Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-making* (2001) (and accompanying handbook of the same title); *Open Government: Fostering Dialogue with Civil Society* (2003), *Promises and Problems of E-democracy: Challenges of Online Citizen Engagement* (2004), *Evaluating Public Participation in Policy Making* (2005).

From 1998-2000, she worked for SIGMA, a joint program providing support to public administration reform in Central and Eastern European countries, based at the OECD and financed mainly by EU-Phare.



She earned a B.A. in Natural Sciences at Cambridge University (UK), an M.A. in Political Science at The Johns Hopkins University (USA), and a doctorate in Political Science at the European University Institute (Italy).

**George Cheriyān** is the Associate Director of CUTS International, Indian, an NGO pursuing social justice and economic equity within and across borders. He heads one of the program centers, CUTS Center for Consumer Action, Research & Training (CUTS CART), based in Jaipur, India. He has more than 20 years of experience in working in the development/NGO sector. Good Governance and SA is his area of interest, and he is presently managing the implementation of two SA projects in partnership with the World Bank and the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF), along with various other projects.

George is a member United Nations Roster of Consultants on Sustainable Development since 1995 and a member of International Resource Team of the World Bank Institute on Sustainable Development, Washington, D.C., since January 2007. In this capacity, he is overseeing the training programs on SA tools in various South Asian countries. He is also a Member of the State Advisory Committee of the Rajasthan Electricity Regulatory Commission (RERC) since March 2007.

He has written and published a number of articles in leading national news dailies, news magazines, journals, periodicals, etc., and edited books. His publications includes a research paper titled “Enforcing right to food in India: Bottlenecks in delivering the expected outcomes” as part of the International Project on “Hunger & Food Security” of the United Nations University-World Institute of Development Economics and Research (UNU-WIDER) November 2006.

**Varuzhan Hoktanyan** is Vice-Chair of Transparency International (TI) Armenia (Armenian chapter of Transparency International), which promotes effective public policy and good governance in order to prevent corruption, strengthen democracy, and contribute to the development and stability in the region. He is currently involved as a Political Party Expert in a project, which aims to advocate changes in the Armenian electoral legislation on the threshold of February 2008 presidential elections in Armenia.

He is also involved in the development of civil society organizations’ recommendations to the new anti-corruption strategy of Armenia the drafting of which now is in process. He is the co-author of a number of TI Armenia’s publications, such as Monitoring of the Parties’ Campaign Finances During the 2003 Parliamentary Elections” (2003), “National Integrity Systems Transparency International Country Study Report: Armenia 2003” (2004), and “Anti-Corruption Policy in Armenia” (2006). From 2003 to 2007 he directed several projects his organization implemented in the general secondary education area of one of the provinces of Armenia (Shirak province). Methodologies used in these projects were based on the application of a number of SA tools, such as community scorecard, public budget tracking, and participatory and transparent monitoring.

Since 2002 he has been teaching Political Science to Bachelor-degree students at the State Engineering University of Armenia.

**Shanto Iyengar** holds the Chandler Chair in Communication at Stanford University where he is also Professor of Political Science. His areas of expertise include the role of mass media in democratic societies, public opinion, and political participation. He is currently a Visiting Postdoctoral Fellow at the Sage Center for the Study of the Mind, University of California-Santa Barbara.

Iyengar received his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Iowa and completed postdoctoral training in Psychology at Yale University through the support of the National Institute of Mental Health. Prior to joining the Stanford faculty, he taught at the University of California-Los Angeles and the State University of New York-Stony Brook. Iyengar is the author of several books, including *News That Matters, Is Anyone Responsible?* and *Media Politics: A Citizen’s Guide*. Since 2006, Iyengar has contributed a research column for Washingtonpost.com.

**Christopher F. Kamlongera** is Professor of Drama and Theatre Arts at the University of Malawi and Director of the SADC Centre of Communication for Development (previously in Harare, Zimbabwe but



now relocated and registered as The African Centre of Communication for Development in Malawi). He received his Ph.D. from the School of English, University of Leeds (UK) in 1984 and has lectured at the University of Malawi from which he took a leave of absence to work for the SADC Centre of Communication for Development (1997-2007).

He has edited and published several books and articles on theatre for development, English language, and communication for development. He has served on the Steering Committee of the first World Bank Congress on Communication for Development and has served as consultant for FAO, the World Bank, CTA, OXFAM and Swedish Cooperative Centre, among several other development agencies.

**William M. Keith** is Professor of Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin. Professor Keith has taught at Oregon State University, Northwestern University, and the University of Oslo. He has also lectured frequently on democracy and speech pedagogy at Duke University, Indiana University, Kansas State University, and the University of Washington. He has published widely in the rhetoric of science, argumentation, and deliberative democracy. He co-edited *Rhetorical Hermeneutics* with Alan Gross (SUNY Press, 1998) and most recently *Discussion as Democracy* (Lexington Books, 2007).

**Taeku Lee** is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkeley. His primary research interests are in racial and ethnic politics, public opinion and survey research methods, social movements and political behavior. His book, *Mobilizing Public Opinion* (2002), received the American Political Science Association's J. David Greenstone Award and the Southern Political Science Association's V.O. Key Award. He co-edited a volume on immigrant political incorporation titled *Transforming Politics, Transforming America* (2006) and recently completed a book on political party identification and the politics of race and immigration. Lee is now at work on a new book on the uses and meanings of "race" and "identity" in the social sciences and is co-editing a volume for the Oxford Handbook of American Politics series. At Berkeley, Lee is Director of the IGS Center on the Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration and Chair of the Diversity and Democracy Cluster of the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative.

Prior to coming to Berkeley, Lee was Assistant Professor at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. He was born in South Korea, grew up in Malaysia and New York City, and is a product of K-12 public schools, the University of Michigan (A.B.), Harvard University (M.P.P.), and the University of Chicago (Ph.D.).

**Peter Levine** ([www.peterlevine.ws](http://www.peterlevine.ws)) is Director of CIRCLE, The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, in the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy. Levine graduated from Yale in 1989 with a degree in Philosophy. He studied Philosophy at Oxford on a Rhodes scholarship, receiving his doctorate in 1992. From 1991 until 1993, he was a research associate at Common Cause. In September 1993, he joined the University of Maryland. In the late 1990s, he was Deputy Director of the National Commission on Civic Renewal, chaired by Senator Sam Nunn and William Bennett. He is a member of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium's steering committee ([www.deliberative-democracy.net](http://www.deliberative-democracy.net)), a co-founder of the National Alliance for Civic Education ([www.cived.org](http://www.cived.org)), and former chair of the Executive Committee of the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools ([www.civicmissionofschoools.org](http://www.civicmissionofschoools.org)).

Levine is the author of *The Future of Democracy: Developing the Next Generation of American Citizens* (University Press of New England, June 2007), three other scholarly books on philosophy and politics, and a novel. He also co-edited *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook* (2006) with John Gastil and co-organized the writing of *The Civic Mission of Schools*, a report released by Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE in 2003 ([www.civicmissionofschoools.org](http://www.civicmissionofschoools.org)).

**Mary Myers** is a freelance consultant specialising in radio in Africa. She is British and works from home near Salisbury, in the heart of the English countryside. She holds a Ph.D. from Reading University, and her thesis subject was educational radio for rural women in Eritrea. She has worked with the UK's Department for International Development on many projects, papers, and publications since going



freelance in 1996. From 2002 to 2003 she was an adviser on communications and media within DFID's Social Development Division. Currently she has a long-term contract as Media Adviser to DFID in the Democratic Republic of Congo, so she travels regularly in and out of Kinshasa. She has written DFID's guidelines on *Monitoring and Evaluating Information and Communication for Development Programmes* and she authored the background paper on communications in development for Tony Blair's Commission for Africa.

She has travelled and worked in more than 20 countries in Africa, but most recently she has carried out trainings, evaluations, feasibility studies, desk studies, and monitoring missions in Malawi, Sierra Leone, DRC, Uganda, and Madagascar. She not only works for DFID, but also other NGOs and bilateral and multilateral agencies. Her current interests include the use of edu-tainment in development communications, using radio for better governance, media regulation, and evaluating the impact of media interventions in developing countries.

**Redempto Santander Parafina** (a.k.a. DonDon) has made significant accomplishments as a youth leader in his advocacy for participatory governance. As Director of Government Watch (G-Watch), a corruption-prevention project of the Ateneo School of Government, he has engaged various public and non-government institutions and coordinated the participation of volunteer citizens in monitoring government programs, such as the textbook delivery and school building construction programs. His effort to involve youth, especially the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, in the monitoring initiatives is considered a notable contribution. The impact of his work is well recognized, and his continuing engagements are considered a model of effective partnership for good governance.

Among the governance networks in the Philippines where DonDon makes important representation are the Transparency and Accountability Network (TAN) and the Coalition Against Corruption (CAC). He is also an associate of the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF), an international civil society organization advocating good governance.

DonDon is involved in various civic and academic groups. He is currently the chairman of the Ten Outstanding Boy Scouts of the Philippines Association and Auditor of the Medieval Studies Society of the Philippines. In 2006, he was included in the list of Rotary Youth Leadership Awardees. He studied Philosophy at the University of the Philippines.

**Samuel Paul** is the founder and chairperson of the Board of Public Affairs Centre (PAC) in Bangalore that pioneered the use of citizen report cards. He was for many years Professor of Economics and later Director of the Indian Institute of Management in Ahmedabad. He has been a special adviser to the United Nations Commission on Transnational Corporations, World Bank, ILO, and other international agencies.

Samuel Paul is the author of several books and has taught at the Harvard Business School, Kennedy School of Government, and Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public Affairs. He is a recipient of both national and international awards. His latest book (co-author) is titled, *Who Benefits from India's Public Services?* (Academic Foundation, New Delhi, 2006).

At present, Paul is a member of the Committee on the Indian Prime Minister's Awards for Excellence in Government, Karnataka Government's high-powered Committee on "Greater Bangalore," and World Bank's Advisory Council for South Asia. He established the Public Affairs Foundation three years ago as a sister organization of PAC to provide advisory services within India and abroad.

**Enrique Peruzzotti** (Ph.D. in Sociology, New School for Social Research) is Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science and International Studies of the Torcuato Di Tella University in Buenos Aires. He has recently co-edited the volume *Enforcing the Rule of Law: Social Accountability in the New Latin American Democracies* (Pittsburgh University Press). He has published articles on SA, democratic theory, and democratization in *Global Governance*, *Citizenship Studies*, *Journal of Democracy*, *Constellations An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory*, *Thesis Eleven*, *Revista*



*Mexicana de Sociología, Journal of Latin American Studies, Política y Gobierno, Journal of Human Development, Metapolítica*, as well as numerous articles on edited volumes.

In 2003-4 he was visiting fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Studies. He has also been a Visiting Fellow at the Rockefeller Foundation Center in Bellagio, Fulbright Fellow at the University of Columbia, visiting fellow at Cornell University, the University of New Mexico, and at the Latin American Institute of the University of London. He is a recurring visiting professor at the Doctorate program in Social Science of FLACSO, Ecuador. In 2008, he will be a visiting fellow at the ESRC Non-Governmental Public Action Programme, London School of Economics. He has worked as a consultant for the IDB, PNUD, and the Ford Foundation.

**Jorge Romero León** has been Executive Director of Fundar, Centre for Analysis and Research since January 2007. He holds an M.A. in Political Science from the New School for Social Research, in New York, where he is also a Ph.D. candidate. His areas of specialization include democratic theory, identity politics, sovereignty, and accountability. His professional expertise extends to the areas of public policy, budget practices, and SA mechanisms.

He has worked in Fundar since 2000 on projects related to budget and policy analysis, monitoring the legislative branch, and the dynamics of legislative committees and budget negotiations. He has also worked as advisor and information coordinator in the Senate for the minority *Partido Acción Nacional* in 1998; and as advisor and project coordinator in the Ministry of the Interior and the Mexican Institute of Social Security in 1999 and 2001.

**Gopakumar Thampi** heads the Public Affairs Foundation, a non-profit company, and the Public Affairs Centre, a non-profit, Civil Society organization, both based in Bangalore. Gopakumar holds a doctorate in Entrepreneurial Studies and post-graduate qualifications in Economics, Journalism and Mass Communication. He is also an alumnus of the European Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution based in Austria, having completed an Advanced Diploma Course on Peace and Conflict Resolution.

Developing concepts and approaches to strengthen accountability of institutions in the governance and development sector constitute the core of Gopakumar's current professional experience. A large part of this work has been carried through applications of participatory monitoring systems and public advocacy tools in South Asia, Africa, East and Central Asia. Gopakumar was a former Head of the Asia Desk at the Transparency International Secretariat in Berlin.

**Laura Zommer** graduated in Communications Sciences and Attorney-at-Law from Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA). She is currently Communications Director for the Center for the Implementation of Public Policies Promoting Equity and Growth (CIPPEC), Professor of Rights to Information at UBA's Social Sciences Faculty, and contributor to *Enfoques*, the Sunday supplement of *La Nación* newspaper. Previously she was Cabinet Chief at the Secretariat for Interior Security of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights (2003-2004) and was a writer specializing in General Information and Politics at *La Nación* (1997-2003). For her work as a journalist, she obtained a grant to the *El País* of Madrid; received the "Argentine Attorney Award" from the Asociación de Entidades Periodísticas Argentinas (ADEPA) in 2005; the "Italian Young Journalist Prize" in 2002; the "In-depth Journalist Award" from Inter-American Press Association (IAPA), Houston, 1999; and the "Public Good" award from ADEPA, 1998.