Literature Review on
Active Participation and Human Rights
Research and Advocacy

Institute of Development Studies

May 2010

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

BINGOs = Big International NGOs
CEDAW = Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
ESC = Economic, Social and Cultural
HR = Human Rights
HRAs = Human Rights Approaches
HRBAs = Human Rights-Based Approaches
IDR's = Initial Design Reviews
INGO = International Non Governmental Organizations
NGO = Non Governmental Organizations
PAR = Participatory Action Research
PLA = Participatory Learning and Action
PME = Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
PRA = Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRAM = Participatory Rights Assessment Methodologies
RBAs = Rights-Based Approaches
RRA = Rapid Rural Appraisal
RSJ = rights and social justice
UNDHR = United Nations Declaration of Human Rights
WHO = World Health Organization

INTRODUCTION

As part of its current operational plan, Amnesty International has adopted 'Active Participation' and 'Engaging Partners' as cross-cutting thematic foci. It is exploring exactly how these concepts are understood by different actors in Amnesty International, and what their implications are for Amnesty International's work. This literature review is intended to serve as a basis for cultivating a deeper understanding of 'participation' and its relevance for the work of Amnesty International – in researching, advocacy/campaigning and, more broadly, in the day-to-day process of working with others. It draws on experience from a range of domains including international development work, human rights work, advocacy and campaigning work, social movements and popular education amongst others. Having said this, much of the material comes from the development field as experiences in this domain have been particularly well researched and documented.

The paper is divided into four sections. Each begins with a narrative that elaborates key concepts and issues, includes relevant illustrative figures, and concludes with a series of abstracts (broadly arranged in order of priority) of proposed texts for further reading and for general reference.

The first section introduces the concept of participation – its history, development, use and abuse – leading to its current range of meanings and applications in contemporary contexts of social change efforts. It then explores the overlap between approaches to social change based on development and those based on human rights, highlighting the historic separation and more recent overlaps, and drawing attention to what this means for the practice of social change. The second section provides an overview of participatory research and the various participatory methodologies that can be used for gathering information, drawing particular attention to how these approaches are different from more traditional methods of data collection. The third section explores participatory approaches to advocacy and campaigning. It emphasises the differences between engaging people in broad processes of social change, and narrower policy-influencing initiatives; and explores their implications for people's empowerment and ability to realise their rights and hold duty-bearers accountable in the long run. The final section is concerned with the organisational and operational factors that need to be addressed if more participatory processes are to be institutionalised both within and beyond the organisation. Throughout, reflections on and references to human rights education are provided, emphasising the potential links between this, participatory approaches in general, and empowerment in particular.

For all sources drawn on, citations are given in endnotes and full citation details are provided in a References list (Annex 1). Where possible, links are provided to online resources, both at the relevant point in the text and in the References list. Annex 2 offers a series of supplementary abstracts of documentary sources we consider highly relevant if not top priority, and longer, more detailed abstracts of some of the top-priority items already abstracted in brief in the main text.

This literature review has been compiled under limitations of time and resources. As such, it does not aim to provide a comprehensive guide to each theme but rather to map out some of the key relevant concepts and practices and stimulate discussion, both among clusters of staff involved in particular activities (e.g. research, campaigning, human rights education and interaction with membership), and across the

organization more broadly. We would encourage people to read it through the lens of their professional experience, as a resource to be applied and utilised with colleagues and other stakeholders. Read thus, we envisage that it will prompt application and adaptation, as well as uncovering areas for further inquiry, in the course of shaping future strategic developments

The review was commissioned by Amnesty International from the Participation, Power and Social Change team at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, for the purposes of capacity building. It was researched and written by André Ling with inputs from Rosemary McGee, John Gaventa and Maria Pantazidou. Views and opinions expressed in the literature review do not necessarily reflect those of Amnesty International.

SECTION 1: PARTICIPATION AND RIGHTS

It is helpful when considering participation to systematically ask **who** is participating **in what** – and more particularly – **whose process** for **which purpose** and on **what terms**.

There is extensive evidence that under appropriate conditions participation offers the possibility of social transformation. Yet it has become a contemporary 'buzzword'[i], with ambiguous meanings, and subjected to both good use and abuse. This section first outlines the history and uses of 'participation' – particularly in the field of development, which has been richly documented – and then explores the intersection between participation and human rights-based work (encompassing both 'civil and political' and 'economic social and cultural' rights). While a comprehensive history of either 'participation' or 'rights' (characterised as they are by contested and nuanced definitions and applications) is beyond the scope of this document, the following partial account should help to build an awareness of some of the salient developments that these concepts have undergone and their points of convergence in contemporary social justice work.

The concern with 'participation' in social change processes is commonly dated back to the 1960s-70s, building on the work of South American pioneers of participatory approaches to social transformation (most notably Paulo Freire[ii]). This early work was essentially a form of popular education that saw participation as a means of engaging the excluded and disempowered in processes of learning and social transformation that would enable them to become aware of and able to overcome the structures of oppression that shaped their lives. In one of its earliest incarnations then, participation was seen as holding potential for radical social change by empowering people to become conscious agents of change. These approaches resonate strongly with contemporary initiatives in the field of human rights education. However, while such experiments in social change were taking place in some quarters, participation remained largely absent from the mainstream development project – i.e. the framework within which international aid and assistance was conceptualised, packaged and delivered to the Third World by professionals and experts. Chambers' (1983) *Rural Development: Putting the Last First* critiqued this top-down, technocratic approach to development for being fundamentally flawed, objectifying the poor and vulnerable, and marginalising their voices and their knowledge. In essence, this served as a call for making participation of the excluded fundamental to the development project, thereby enhancing its transformative potential.

By the 1980-90s, a time when neo-liberal reforms (such as Structural Adjustment Programmes) were being introduced around the world, participation was being endorsed by major international aid, finance and development institutions which incorporated it into technical approaches to development. During this period, the language of 'beneficiaries' was introduced to describe those who were 'targeted' by 'participatory' development programmes and projects. The value of participation was seen as reducing costs, ensuring better implementation, and enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of interventions. Under the neo-liberal agenda, those who might have been seen as the subjects of development were largely seen as 'service users' or 'customers', whose relationship with 'development' was a passive one; as 'objects' of development. At the same time, local realities were increasingly becoming shaped by global economic processes as developing country governments adopted policies of liberalisation and deregulation, often severely worsening the plight of the poorest and most marginal sections of the population. During this

period, as the number and range of Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), social movements and other social change actors rapidly expanded, participation became a subject of increased contention. Notably, it was criticised as having been co-opted by dominant institutions that lacked sensitivity to the particular set of factors and conditions under which it could actually realise its potential contribution to social transformation (Hickey and Mohan, 2001).

LADDERS OF PARTICIPATION

A variety of typologies of participation have been developed in order to categorise the degree, level or form of participation that is taking place in a given context. One of the earliest is Arnstein's (1969) 'ladder of participation', developed in the context of public management in the UK. This ladder starts from 'manipulation' on the lowest rung and progressively advances though a series of levels, through 'consultation' and ultimately to 'citizen control'. White (2001) presents an alternative typology with four forms of participation: (1) nominal; (2) instrumental; (3) representative; and (4) transformative. Each form of participation can be seen to have a different meaning or function for either those at the 'top' (who seek the participation of others') or those at the 'bottom' (who seek to participate), affecting how and why people participate. White's framework (presented below) is particularly useful for helping those engaged in social change processes to be aware of the divergent forms and functions of participation, depending on who is participating in whose process.

Form	Top-Down	Bottom-Up	Function	Example
Nominal	Legitimation	Inclusion	Display	Women's groups are created by government agencies to demonstrate 'gender sensitivity' but lack any real substance. Women say they are members because it gets their names on official records, giving them access to other benefits.
Instrumental	Efficiency	Cost	Means	Getting people to participate in infrastructure projects can increase the efficiency of these projects by better aligning supply with demand expressed through participation. For people, participation becomes a necessary cost for getting what they need.
Representative	Sustainability	Leverage	Voice	Involving people in forming their own community based organisations for managing local development can enhance sustainability. Such platforms present people with the opportunity to shape

				decisions in ways that meet their interests.
Transformative	Empowerment	Empowerment	Means/End	External actors interact with people with the specific purpose of empowering them and equipping them with the capacity to bring about changes that matter to them. People organise themselves and use opportunities to bring about the changes they desire.

Adapted from White, S. (1996)

While the reforms of the 1990s saw the weakening of states of the global south and the entrenchment of a technocratic, market-based approach to development, it also saw increased attention given to 'good governance' and democratic decentralisation. 'Accountability', 'transparency' and 'partnership' became increasingly common terms used by a range of international aid and development actors. At the local level this shift resulted in an increased concern with participatory forms of governance and also saw increased investment and resources channelled to local governments. This also led to the creation of new arenas, mechanisms and, therefore, opportunities for people's participation at the local level. At the national and international levels it led to a growing role for civil society organisations in participating in policy-making processes. Evidently, the history of participation is not a linear one. While divergent trends and practices multiplied, contested definitions of participation were mobilised by those who sought to use it to further their agendas; be they radical and transformative or de-politicised and technical.

This period also saw the increasing confluence of activity in the domains of human rights and development. In 1986, the 'right to development' was adopted as a resolution by the UN. While non-binding, it did draw attention to the relationship between development and human rights – two hitherto largely disconnected fields. Subsequently, the language of rights began to find its way into the discourse of various development actors, including the World Bank – although concerns prevailed that this was little more than rhetoric. Despite the increased adoption of 'rights' language, the 'right to development' itself was sidelined, arguably because of the obligations it was feared it would place on Northern states to support the development of Southern states. Another key right is the 'right to participate', which is often considered integral to the attainment of other rights, be they civil and political or economic, social and cultural (ESC) rights. With the rise of the rights discourse, International Non Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and other development actors increasingly began to frame their work in terms of human rights. This often entailed challenging dominant patterns of development and seeking to shape policy-making processes on the basis of claims pertaining to the violation of human rights inherent in either the prevailing 'development' logic or persistent 'underdevelopment'. Both the right to development and the right to participation remain highly contested, both as concepts and because of the threat they are seen to present to the interests of more powerful actors.

These various trends amounted to an emerging convergence of governance, decentralisation and rights. As a result, some actors began to reclaim participation as 'agency' and as an active, engaged form of

citizenship. The focus on citizenship entailed moving beyond 'participation in projects' to 'participation as citizenship', thereby bringing into question the nature of the relationships between citizens as rights-holders on the one hand, and the State as duty-bearer on the other. More specifically, the logic of rights implied that rights violations resulted from the failure of both (a) duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations and (b) those whose rights were being denied to claim their rights. Rights could only be realised when both sides of the equation were balanced. While good policies and programmes might create opportunities for the fulfilment of rights, only active citizen participation could take up these opportunities and transform the social, cultural and political norms that were responsible for the routine violation of these rights.

Addressing this would inevitably involve engaging power relations seriously; in effect, rights made possible the re-politicisation of participation in development. Significantly, on the one hand, transitioning to a human rights framework has proved challenging for organisations traditionally engaged in a more service delivery- or needs-based approach to development, demanding a rethink of the basic understanding of what change is to be sought, with or by whom, and how it can be achieved. On the other hand, organisations involved in more traditional human rights work – much of which has centred on civil and political rather than ESC rights – are challenged by the need to reconsider the way that their work changes power relations in society and, more specifically, empowers those whose rights they seek to uphold. At the same time, it is clear that there is much that is complementary between development and rights approaches. The recent adoption of 'Rights-Based Approaches (RBAs)' to development by various prominent international development NGOs and official agencies, such as Oxfam, Care, ActionAid, the Department for International Development and the Swedish International Development Agency has generated a wealth of relevant experience on integrating human rights and development.

PRINCIPLES OF RIGHTS-BASED APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT

A broad-based approach to human rights and development stresses the importance of process in the realisation of rights. The five elements of the PANEL framework, used by United Nations bodies and increasingly adopted by national human rights commissions and international development organisations are:

(1) Participation

(2) Accountability of duty bearers and duties of rights holders

(3) Non-Discrimination/Inclusion

(4) Empowerment

(5) Linkages to human rights standards

RBAs draw on a common set of core principles, including participation, transparency, accountability, and inclusion of the most marginal, though they may be applied in different ways in different contexts. Participation holds a particularly critical position in RBAs because of the premise that exclusion from decision-making on matters that affect them is in itself a rights violation – or at least a major hindrance to people's ability to have control over decisions that affect their attainment of other rights. Consequently, RBAs are specifically concerned with finding ways of empowering those whose rights are denied to assess their condition, to identify the root causes of their marginalisation and to take action – individually or collectively – to define, claim and realise their rights. Being both an approach to changing situations and lives, and a set of desirable outcomes for all people, RBAs imply the fusion of means and ends and of

process and outcome. RBAs, it could be argued, have led to the reinvention of development as the progressive realisation of rights. At the same time, they help to relocate more traditional human rights work within a broader processual and participatory social change framework that embraces both civil and political as well as economic social and cultural rights.

HRA, HRBA AND RBAS: WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?[iii]

The use of terms such as Human Rights Approaches (HRAs), Human Rights-Based Approaches (HRBAs) and RBAs can generate some confusion. While there is no 'standard' definition, Piron (2005) has developed a framework that, while not absolutely shared by all analysts and commentators, can help in thinking about some of the key differences between HRAs or HRBAs on the one hand and RBAs on the other. According to her, HRAs and HRBAs tend to be grounded in universal and legalistic frameworks – namely the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR) and similar treaties. RBAs, on the other hand, are more localised, context-specific and particularistic, tending to focus on rights in relation to citizenship and treat the process of defining and claiming rights as a political process. While the adoption of different terminologies by different actors reflects different understandings and different approaches to practice, it is important to clarify what different actors understand by a given term. HRBAs and RBAs are best thought of as overlapping and complementary approaches each with distinct strengths and weaknesses.

With these shifts, the salience of both context-specificity, gender and power relations in shaping both the form that participation takes and its potential contribution to change is accorded increased attention. Consequently, there is a drive toward a more people-centred approach to development that pays specific attention to difference and to those who are most marginalised in a given context. Understanding the way that power plays out in different contexts has become a major concern, as has the recognition that without transforming power relations – either between citizens and the State (or other duty-bearers) or in society more generally, sustained social change and the realisation of rights is unattainable.

Many of those whose interests are supported in rights-based work are neither accustomed to thinking about their rights, nor are they usually aware of the legal provisions or conventions that exist to safeguard their rights. An educational process for enabling people to learn about their rights is, therefore, usually a requirement of participatory approaches to social change that seek to empower people to identify rights violations and claim their own rights. There are various routes to equipping people with such knowledge, including participatory research which is explored more comprehensively in the subsequent section. Another approach which can be integrated with participatory research is the provision of human rights education. Notably, however, knowing one's rights is a necessary but insufficient condition for realising them. The realisation of rights typically involves examining, challenging and transforming established power relations.

THINKING ABOUT POWER[iv]

Power can work in various ways and take a variety of forms. *Visible* power can easily be seen in day-to-day life as those considered more 'powerful' wield '*power over*' those who are 'powerless'. *Hidden power* is less easily apprehended, emanating from decisions – such as policy-making – taken behind closed doors. *Invisible power* is intimately connected with culture and identity, lurking in social and institutional norms that define what is possible and even conceivable for any given actor. If these possibilities are unevenly

distributed within society then clearly some actors are better positioned to use this power to serve their interests.

But power is not only something that can be used by the powerful. *Power to*, or 'agency' is the capacity of an individual to make something happen. The expansion of this form of power is key to enabling people to realise their rights. Acting alone, however, is unlikely to ever be adequate in bringing about social change, giving rise to the need to develop *power with*, which derives from solidarity and collective capacity. For individuals to be able to even contemplate engaging in struggles to bring about change, it is necessary for them to have *power within* – i.e. the inner strength and confidence required to overcome challenges and take on risks. These different forms of power work together.

The way that power manifests and is experienced is context-specific. While official decision-making spaces tend to be seen as characterised by unequal power relations, unofficial ones can be more equal, permitting people to express and interact more freely. One way of classifying spaces is to consider how a space arose, as this influences the terms on which participation in a given space is possible. Many of the spaces available for citizen participation in development and policy processes are *invited spaces*, created by governments or NGOs. In such spaces agendas are usually set by those who create the spaces. *Claimed spaces*, are those spaces that people create or demand for themselves on their own terms, permitting the creators greater influence in shaping them according to their interests. *Closed spaces* – such as those where much policy-making takes place – exclude those who are likely to be affected by the decisions taken in them.

Another classification divides spaces into intimate, personal and public – and it is quite possible for an individual to occupy a high position of power in say the public sphere (e.g. a female politician) while having limited power in the personal or intimate spheres (e.g. being subjected to domestic violence). It is also useful to recognise that such spaces exist at various levels from the local through to the national and the global. Different power relations may prevail at each level affecting the way that people can participate in processes of change. Essentially, if power is understood as being embedded in the relationships between different actors, then bringing about social change or realising rights entails transforming the power relations that characterise them.

The power cube offers a framework for analysing these issues and planning activism, education and social change efforts to modify power relations.

Online references, tools and guides on power:

http://www.powercube.net

http://democracy.carnegieuktrust.org.uk/democracy/power_tools

http://www.policy-powertools.org/

The following table captures a range of transitions and challenges faced by development NGOs in the 1990s. Some were causally related to their taking a participatory turn, and some were simultaneous with it and only indirectly related. There are obviously differences between development NGOs' adoption of participatory and RBAs and Amnesty's infusion of its rights work with participatory principles and practices, yet the implied shifts may prompt useful reflection in Amnesty International.

From		To
Serving beneficiaries	→	Empowering rights-holders, agents, citizens
Meeting basic needs	→	Realising rights, delivering accountability and good governance
Aggregated groups (e.g. communities)	→	A focus especially on the excluded
Symptoms	→	Underlying causes
Reducing material poverty	→	Changing power relations
"Donor"-"recipient" relationships	→	Partnerships; webs or networks of relationships
Projects, services	→	Policy processes
Practical, pragmatic	→	Strategic, political
Needs, things	→	Values, norms
Outputs, results	→	Skills, capacities

Abstracts

1. White (1996) *Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation*

White outlines four forms – or degrees – of participation: (1) nominal; (2) instrumental; (3) representative; and (4) transformative. She also outlines the different interests each of these serves depending on whether a top-down (i.e. by those who want others to participate in their process) or bottom-up (i.e. by those who participate in others' processes) view is taken of the particular participation situation. For each form of participation, participation can be seen to play a different function ranging from simply 'display' (for nominal participation) to 'means/end' (for transformative). The article emphasises that rather than merely being concerned with participation, it is necessary to engage with the question of *how* people are participating in a given process. White concludes that: (1) participation must be seen as a political process; (2) "while it has the potential to change patterns of dominance, [it] may also be the means through which existing power relations are entrenched and reproduced" (p.14); (3) "the form and function for participation itself becomes a focus for struggle." Critically, "the absence of conflict in many supposedly 'participatory' programmes is something that should raise suspicions" (p.15).

2. Cooke and Kothari (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny*

While the growth of 'participation' in development discourse can be traced from the 1970s onwards, its widespread use can be attributed to the endorsement of participation by a variety of international agencies, including the World Bank. In that mainstream guise, participation was typically understood as a means of reducing costs, benefiting from local knowledge and increasing efficiency and sustainability of development interventions. The new-found popularity of participation led to the rapid uptake of participatory methods and approaches across a wide variety of governmental institutions and NGOs. With this up-scaling, it was found that the values and practices required to realise the transformative potential of participation were often overlooked, often getting co-opted by – and therefore replicating – prevailing institutional prerogatives and social biases. Such issues are explored extensively in this book which, through a series of case studies, looks specifically at the ways in which participation has failed to deliver on its promises and even served to legitimise a perpetuation of the status quo.

3. Hickey & Mohan (2008) *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation*

Written as a response to *The New Tyranny* (above), this book sought to reclaim the relevance of 'participation' in processes of social transformation. Acknowledging that much that was done in the name of participation in development over the preceding 20-30 years failed to deliver on its transformative potential, the authors draw together a variety of case studies and reflections on practice based on experiences where participation has delivered on its transformative potential. More specifically, it looks at the particular conditions under which participation is able to contribute to change and the kinds of processes that can address issues of exclusion, injustice or unequal power relations. A cross-cutting feature of transformative participation is that it is inherently political, raising issues related to identity, inclusion/exclusion and power. Furthermore, the skills, capabilities, knowledge and support-base of individuals become integral to their capacity to participate in processes that enable them to influence others.

4. Cornwall and Gaventa (2001) *From Users and Choosers to Shapers and Makers*

In seeing 'participation as citizenship', the question of rights arises. While rights associated with citizenship have generally been conceived of as civil and political rights, increased recognition has recently been given to the importance of ESC rights – both intrinsically and as a means to attaining civil and political rights. Participation as citizenship then sees citizens as active agents in processes of both claiming and creating rights. This corresponds to a shift away from a more instrumental view of participation. Cornwall and Gaventa (2001) emphasise this in their paper *From Users and Choosers to Shapers and Makers*: which highlights the significance of a shift away from seeing people – and even citizens – as users or consumers of state services and towards a vision of them as active agents, with rights and responsibilities and a role in shaping policies and institutions, and creating a just and desirable society.

5. Gaventa and Valderrama (1999) *Background note prepared for workshop on Strengthening participation in local governance*

In this paper the authors first identify three broad conceptions of participation: (1) participation of societies/communities/citizens, usually in the activities of development agencies; (2) traditional political

participation of citizens in elections, lobbying, etc.; and (3) an emerging understanding, fuelled by the decentralisation of governance, of *citizenship as participation*. In all cases, a variety of participatory methods are required to enable people's participation in the given domain. The authors then go on to elaborate the particular relevance of seeing 'participation as citizenship' and 'citizenship as rights', for citizens to become agents, actively shaping outcomes in their particular contexts. Drawing on cases of democratic decentralisation in various countries, they identify some of the key barriers to citizen participation in local governance and some of the strategies and approaches that may help to overcome them.

6. Miller, VeneKlasen and Clark (2005) *Rights-Based Development: Linking Rights and Participation – Challenges in Thinking and Action.* IDS Bulletin 36 (1).

This short article provides a useful conceptual clarification of the meanings of 'participation', 'rights' and 'empowerment'. It also discusses the internal and external implications and challenges of building a shared understanding of those meanings and linking rights and participation into integrated change strategies, both for development and for human rights organisations. Apart from conceptual clarifications and strategic shifts, new skill-sets are needed as human rights organisations and rights groups move beyond strengthening the human rights framework and achieving legal reform and engage actively with ensuring that formal rights are recognized on the ground and people develop a sense of themselves as subjects of rights and the capacity to engage and reshape power. Understanding power dynamics, adult learning theory and practice and community organising are highlighted as key to successful capacity-building with local counterparts. The article also points out that 'adjustment in the pace of operations' inside organisations may be required so 'that people have space to analyse connections before they implement' and suggests 'investing in creating learning systems for capturing and integrating lessons from innovation and allowing space for some mistakes and learning by doing'.

7. Peter Uvin (2007) *From the right to development to the rights-based approach: how 'human rights' entered development.* Development in Practice: 17(4-5)

Uvin explores the relationship between rights and development, starting with the 'right to development', adopted as a United Nations resolution (i.e. not binding like a treaty) in 1986:

"The right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized."

While the right received further attention, it has generally been heavily criticized from both legal and political perspectives. Uvin highlights the rhetorical reference to rights and corresponding self-framing of activities of agencies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme as founded on or contributing to the realisation of rights without any substantive changes having taken place. However, he also notes that this discursive shift may signal that potential for further change is emerging. So far, it has not entailed a close examination of the tensions that exist between human rights and development. Uvin also notes the tendency to consider 'development cooperation' as contributing to ESC rights while failing to acknowledge that engaging with human rights means addressing the relationship between citizens and the state. So human rights is about: "having a 'social guarantee' (Shue 1980), which implies that it is about the way the interactions between citizens, states and corporations are structured, and how they affect the most marginal and weakest in society."

In relation to 'good governance', Uvin makes the case that the discourse of rights has largely been one of

repackaging, effectively implying the co-optation of 'human rights' as powerful agencies use the terms in ways that preserve existing institutional arrangement and priorities. He then examines the relationship between human rights, development and freedom, noting that Sen's contribution – essentially framing development as freedom – is not as ground-breaking as it may seem and, more critically, that it missed a genuine political analysis of the challenges inherent in its realisation. While numerous measures have been launched to strengthen the drive toward realising human rights, Uvin argues that it is only the creation of a 'rights-enabling economic environment' that can actually contribute to substantive change, rather than the creation of new human rights bodies and legislation. Some NGOs are pioneering the work on human rights through the adoption of 'RBAs'. Perhaps most significantly, RBAs address human rights at the level of both process and outcome, lead to the re-framing of issues in terms of rights (rather than needs), duties (rather than charity), embracing accountability and an array of axes for change beyond policy and legislation. He emphasises that RBAs are about political struggle: "If an RBA to development means empowering marginalised groups, challenging oppression and exclusion, and changing power relations, much of this task lies outside the legal arena, falling squarely in the political realm."

"If donors, be they governments, NGOs, or international organisations, profess attachment to human rights in their development aims, they must be willing to apply the rights agenda to all of their own actions (the inward focus), and to the global political economy of inequality within which they occupy such privileged places (the outward focus). In the absence of such moves, the human-rights focus is little more than the projection of power, and the world has enough of that already."

Uvin makes the case that all those working on human rights should apply the same principles within their organisations and in their relationships with partners. In particular attention must be given to participation in all aspects of work; without it the realisation of rights is undermined:

"It also calls for a broad commitment by aid agencies to give much greater priority to promoting local dialogues, to stimulate local knowledge-generation and research, to find ways of making people's voices heard by those in power – both out of respect for the dignity of people, and because they are the ones who have to live with the consequences of being wrong."

SECTION 2: PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES TO RESEARCHING RIGHTS

A helpful distinction for Amnesty International in thinking about research on rights, may be between (a) research as a tool for information-gathering and fact-finding prior to campaigning on behalf of those whose rights are being denied and (b) research as part of an ongoing and empowering process of building awareness and capacity of people to realise their rights themselves. The former corresponds to what development NGOs call 'policy research', and often deploys approaches from what we might call 'traditional social science research'. The latter is 'participatory research' or Participatory Learning and Action (PLA), which shares much in common with both popular education and human rights education. This section explores the difference between these two different approaches to research, and outline some of the key approaches, methods and tools that have been developed to support more participatory forms of research, including the monitoring of government policies.

Traditional social science research is typically carried out by expert or professional researchers who frame research questions, gather data on the researched, analyse the data and generate findings that can then be used to contribute to theory or to inform policy and practice. Such research tends to be founded on a concern for objectivity, characterised by efforts to ensure the researcher is distanced from those who are being researched. Typically, it entails pre-determined themes and questions for research, accords low importance to people's own categories and forms of knowledge, and affords little consideration to the effects (e.g. empowering or otherwise) on those who are being researched. While this may be something of a caricature, it permits a useful juxtaposition with participatory research.

Participatory research emerged from a field of practice that was specifically concerned with enabling people to bring about change in their social reality by analysing it, learning about it and acting on it. It is founded on a pedagogical approach that seeks to reduce the distance between the researcher and the researched, preferring instead to frame those involved as co-creators of knowledge – i.e. as co-researchers. As such, participatory research involves those who are supposed to benefit from the research in all stages: from identifying research priorities to gathering, analysing and using the knowledge that they generate. This leads to a process that combines knowledge, awareness and action[v], empowering people as they collectively make sense of their own situation and contribute to bringing about changes that they desire. Typically such change entails working with and transforming established power relations, making participatory research an inherently political activity well suited to addressing issues related to human rights. The political nature of participatory research means that it typically involves elements of risk and danger and innovative strategies must be adopted to find ways of working in such contexts. This is likely to be an even greater issue in contexts characterised by conflict or State violence, where there is a high prevalence of rights violations.

CASE STUDY: PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH (PAR) WITH SMALL-SCALE MINERS IN KENYA[vi]

This case study presents the reflections of the author on the application of PAR to strengthen the struggles for a group of small-scale miners from Kasighau in Kenya. These miners had been historically marginalised by the State and by more powerful mining companies, who severely constrained their activities. The research process involved the application of a wide range of participatory methodologies – mapping tools, workshops, group discussion techniques, and ad hoc and planned case studies – carried out over a period of months. However, the author emphasises that more important than the selection of methods is the paradigm in which they are implemented. It is a 'resistance' paradigm, which goes to great lengths to ensure that the research process is led by and sensitive to the needs of the miners. This is what made the research process truly effective.

While participatory research is more closely associated with movements, popular struggles and resistance, the wide range of participatory methods and tools that are currently widespread in development circles originate from the work of local and international development NGOs seeking to make community development more participatory. Such tools were initially conceived to provide a rapid way of gathering data on visits to communities e.g. Rapid Rural Assessment (RRA), and an array of simple visual and interactive tools (e.g. social mapping, wealth ranking, seasonal calendars) were developed to facilitate the collection of data. These are sometimes used in NGO fact-finding missions or 'policy research' as defined above.

Subject to critique and further development, (RRA) was eventually reinvented as Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), emphasising the importance of ensuring genuine participation and 'handing over the stick'. A wide range of PRA tools were developed with the intention of enhancing participants' involvement in shaping and framing the assessment. Increased attention was given to the attitudes and behaviours of those implementing PRA methodologies: securing genuine participation in such processes demands acknowledging, engaging with and actively seeking to overcome power imbalances inherent not only amongst participants but, equally critically, between the researcher-facilitator and the participants. Despite these intentions, however, PRA was often seen to have been co-opted, implemented as a *de facto* time-saving data-collection method in the implementation of projects by many development NGOs as well as international agencies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme. PLA was then coined to emphasise that unless these one-off information-gathering processes were linked to ongoing and cyclical participatory *processes* of learning and action, then their contribution to empowerment and change would remain limited.

PARTICIPATORY METHOD: TRIANGLE ANALYSIS

Triangle Analysis is a participatory tool that can be used to assess a given problem-situation and is well suited to approaches based on rights (legalistic or otherwise). It combines three elements – (1) *content* (what the laws are); (2) *structure* (how they are supposed to be implemented); and (3) *culture* (social norms that affect the way they are implemented). The status of all three dimensions should be explored together for any given issue (e.g. women's rights) in order to generate a balanced and useful assessment of what action is required to address that issue.

PARTICIPATORY METHOD: ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS AND ACTION

All social change interventions are based on a process of looping through these three elements, in processes of more or less quality and underpinned by different sets of values. Applied as part of a RBA, the *assessment* is of rights using disaggregated data, and can be based on PRA methods, such as social mapping, ranking, time-line analysis and stakeholder analysis. *Analysis* is based on causes, obligations/roles, resources and communication. Specific analytical tools can be used to make sense of the underlying issues and can be combined with capacity building processes that help participants to make sense of these issues (e.g. by analysis of problems of rights-violations by duty-bearers). Ensuing *actions* include advocacy, capacity building, mobilisation, etc.

A more detailed account of these methods and many others can be found in VeneKlasen and Miller's (2002) *A New Weave of Power, People & Politics: The Action Guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation*.

To date, the application of participatory methodologies specifically for assessing or researching human rights remains relatively under-developed. Having said this, participatory methodologies used in PRA or PLA are continuously undergoing innovation as new actors apply existing methods to new issues and contexts and as new methods are developed. Examples include participatory video, participatory photography, participatory theatre (e.g. forum theatre), etc. Different methods are suited to different kinds of purposes, issues and contexts. Adapting participatory methods to human rights issues is as much a matter of what methods are chosen as of how these methods are applied and what framework is used for determining the appropriate course of action based on knowledge that is generated. For example, within a rights-based framework data on food-security gathered through a PRA method such as a seasonal calendar would be used by the co-researchers ('external' and 'internal') as part of a process of uncovering the failure of duty-bearers to ensure food-security, rather than simply as a means of assessing how much food needs to be given to people. Clearly then, the framework for reflection upon and analysis of data generated through participatory processes is central to the effectiveness of such methods in empowering people to become agents of change.

PARTICIPATORY RIGHTS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY (PRAM)

"The Participatory Rights Assessment Methodologies (PRAMs) project was conceived as one response to the challenge of putting the Department for International Development's rights agenda into practice. PRAMs is seen as an instrument for supporting governments, civil society and other social actors, in understanding their rights and obligations and creating the institutional change necessary to ensure participation, inclusion and obligation for all human rights for all people. More specifically PRAMs aims to facilitate: (1) People's own identification and assessment of their rights; (2) Understanding and agreement between stakeholders of the obstacles poor people face in accessing those rights; (3) Identification of actions to support governments and other duty bearers in the protection, promotion and realisation of human rights; (4) Institutional change and the opening up of new channels of institutional engagement between citizens and duty bearers towards these ends." It uses an array of participatory methodologies to make this possible.

Source: Brocklesby & Crawford (2004) — see abstract

Another key set of processes for generating information and knowledge for social change is participatory monitoring – i.e. the routine collection of information by, rather than on behalf of, concerned people. Participatory monitoring is usually focused on government services, budgets and policies, though it can equally be applied to NGOs, corporations and other actors. As with participatory research processes, citizens are ideally involved not only in gathering the required information, but also identifying the issues they seek to address and what information is required for this. Through this process, people become more aware of the policies, programmes or practices that exist, their scope and nature, and the various issues pertaining to their implementation, thereby better positioning them to take action to bring about change. For example, citizens could be involved in participatory processes of monitoring violations of women's rights, or in monitoring social security payments made by local governments; children could be involved in monitoring instances of violence in schools. In one of the best-known applications, 'participatory budgeting', residents of a municipality or borough are involved in establishing public budget priorities and then monitoring budget execution. Such processes can be used to gather data over time that can be mobilised in different kinds of forums to raise public awareness and to hold duty-bearers to account for their performance. This can contribute to both ensuring better delivery of services and the creation of new policies and programmes to respond to needs that were otherwise not identified, thereby playing a significant role in contributing to participatory processes of advocacy and campaigning.

Adopting a participatory approach to research raises a wide range of ethical and practical challenges that need to be carefully thought through and negotiated. First is the question of whether a participatory approach to research is indeed desirable and feasible given the particular issue, goal and context in question. Second, if a participatory approach is to be adopted, then what form should it take and how participatory should it be? Third, what stages of the research process will be made participatory and which will not? The ladders and typologies of participation presented in Section 1 can be used for thinking through what form of participation is desired overall and in each stage. Before considering the selection of methods, attention should be given to the nature of the relationship between the external researcher and the participant-researchers, recognising that more important than the technical application of research methods is the capacity of the former to empower the latter throughout the research process. Actors intending to initiate a participatory research process should be aware that giving ownership of the research process to 'participants' entails making a significant deviation from traditional and established modes of knowledge and information production. On the one hand, this may raise methodological challenges or questions regarding the validity or 'objectivity' of the data generated (usually influenced by political factors). On the other, it demands acknowledging that participant-researchers become implicated in ways that may, in addition to empowering them, potentially raise their expectations or put them at risk of identification or persecution. The question of what approach to adopt under what circumstances is one that must be made in cognizance of the particular actors involved, the context they are living or working in and the particular changes that are being sought.

Trade-offs to be made in participatory research		
Knowledge	Vs.	Action
Extraction	Vs.	Reciprocity
Predictability	Vs.	Process
Protection	Vs.	Participation
Confidentiality	Vs.	Credit

Extracted in part from Brydon-Miller and Greenwood

The table below compares traditional, participatory and collaborative forms of research, noting the different roles of the external 'researcher' and the participants (or communities) at each stage of the research process.

Stages of research	Researcher-led (Traditional)	Participant-led (participatory)	Collaborative
Identification of research question or problem	Researcher	Community	Joint
Development of approach/method	Researcher	Community with researcher assistance	Joint
Entering the community	Researcher	Researcher invited by the community	Negotiation process
Gathering the data	Researcher	Community members	Joint – Division of labour
Analysis of the data	Researcher	Community members with help of researcher	Joint
Dissemination/follow-up	Researcher	Primarily for learning and action in the community	For community empowerment and for outside use/publication
Exiting the community	Researcher	Transfer of skills	Negotiated process

ABSTRACTS

1. Gaventa and Cornwall (2006) *Challenging the boundaries of the possible: Participation, Knowledge and Power*. IDS Bulletin 37(6)

Gaventa and Cornwall (2006) emphasise the critical role of knowledge in either sustaining or transforming material and social relations that reinforce inequalities and perpetuate injustice in society. People in marginal positions (e.g. those whose rights are denied) need to be empowered to create their own knowledge. This necessarily entails engaging with various forms of both power (see the section on power cube) and knowledge (situated, socially embedded, practical, experiential, etc.). While participatory methods are instrumental to the process of knowledge creation, it cannot be assumed that they produce knowledge that is truly 'of the lowers' because of questions pertaining to the specific conditions of its production (e.g. positionality of facilitators, mediation, mis-representation, etc.). If such issues are not overcome, then the contribution of participatory approaches is questionable. Therefore, PAR needs to engage with multiple and otherwise denied forms of knowledge and to integrate action and reflection in order to bring about change through deepening understanding.

2. Joanna Wheeler (2009) *Negotiating Access for Participatory Research with Armed Actors*. IDS Bulletin

In this paper, Wheeler recounts two experiences of adopting participatory research approaches in contexts dominated by armed actors (militias and drug-traffickers). In each case, she describes the challenges faced, the negotiations required and the implications for conducting participatory research with community leaders. In particular, she highlights the delicate balance to be struck between research ethics, security and rigour. She also reveals the different patterns of concern that different kinds of armed actors may have depending on the way that they maintain their position in society, indicating how this affects the kinds of compromises that this may entail for the participatory research process. This paper, and the others in the same Bulletin, are particularly relevant to those interested in conducting participatory research in contexts characterised by violent conflict.

3. Robert Chambers (2004) *Reflections and Directions: a personal note*. PLA Notes, Issue 50. pp.23-34

In this note, Chambers reviews the trajectory of RRA, PRA and PLA, highlighting key turning points, achievements, developments. In this regard, this document provides a useful overview of the participatory methods in development practice. He also notes some of the key lessons learned – both positive and negative – related to the use and spread of these methods. On the topic of rights he notes that while headway has been made in linking human rights and participatory processes (e.g. see PLA5011), "[f]or their part, Participatory Human Rights Assessments are in their infancy." He then advocates: (1) making them continuous, as part of an ongoing process; (2) linking them with Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) processes; and (3) involving 'uppers' (i.e. as researchers and facilitators) more intensively in fieldwork. This suggests that an opportunity exists for AI to play a leading role in developing the field of participatory human rights assessment.

4. Laura Cornish and Alison Dunn (2009) *Creating knowledge for action: the case for participatory communication in research*. Development in Practice 19(4-5)

This article explores the benefits of using participatory communication - "a citizen-led approach to both creating and expressing knowledge" - in research for social change. Evidence reveals that communication is key to the

effectiveness of research in contributing to change at various levels. The authors focus on two forms of research: (1) research that seeks to bring about change through people; and (2) research that seeks to generate information that can be used to influence policy processes and argue that in both cases participatory communication They "look at how participatory communication can play a role in strengthening civil society by creating greater opportunities for more marginalised voices to participate in dialogue, contest agendas, and negotiate their demands" (p.666). Participatory communication is "grounded in citizens' own forms of expression and understanding of their culture and context" (p.667). "a continual process of dialogue, listening, learning, and action between people" that "equally values non-textual ways of expressing experiences, for example through film, music, drama story-telling, and multimedia, as well as adapting or subverting mainstream media and text-based communication to specific contexts and needs". The authors provide a historical account of the co-evolution of participatory approaches to development and participatory communication, pointing out that while they share different origins, they both have a commitment to empowerment. Civil society is the arena for participatory communication and can be greatly strengthened by it if linked to a process of research: "it is in these spaces that citizens are able to interact, debate, contest, and renegotiate relationships". The article then looks at the conditions under which it is appropriate to introducer participatory communication approaches in research. Through a series of case studies with reflection on theory and practice, it explores:

- Challenging traditional research paradigms through participatory communication

- research as theory, as finding out, and as activism – and the contribution that participatory communication can make

- Theatre as participatory communication

- Participatory video

Participatory communication is grounded in a different set of values, and embraces alternative forms of knowledge and expression that are usually considered inferior. However, this is precisely what makes it more relevant to the people it is meant to benefit and therefore a more effective means of bringing about social change.

5. Mary Ann Brocklesby & Sheena Crawford *(2004) Operationalising the Rights Agenda: Department for International Development's Participatory Rights Assessment Methodologies (PRAMs) Project*

This report outlines the concept and experiences with the Department for International Development's PRAMs Project. PRAMs were conceived as a process that could be used to support a range of state and other social change actors in shifting from needs-based to rights-based approaches to development. Thus, PRAMs sought to go beyond the first and second-generation Participatory Poverty Assessments, which were generally extractive in nature and needs-focused. "By bringing a more specific rights and entitlements analytical framework, however, a PRAMs approach politicises analysis, highlighting power relations and processes of exclusion and discrimination" (p.5). PRAMs were piloted in Romania, Zambia, Malawi and Peru.

PRAMs start with a series of interlocking stages that seek to link processes of assessment with partnership building "in order to ensure that rights assessments could be integrated into a process of institutional reflection and change." The stages include: "scoping, partnership building, identification of entry point, and assessment" (p.7). The document provides guiding questions and pointers for thinking through each of these stages. A wide range of participatory assessment methods can be used for the assessment stage, and these are drawn from the large repertoire of participatory methods (e.g. mapping, stakeholder analysis, participatory and multi-stakeholder workshops and community dialogue).

Key lessons learned from the experience include the recognition that rights-based development is 'political', 'transformative', and requires a specific focus on changing individuals, groups, organisations, institutions and the relationships between them. This is to be achieved through the systematic application of participatory methodologies for assessment applied as part of a RBA and by working with a series of local partner NGOs. Key issues arising from the experience include the need for longer-term engagement, and the importance of having requisite capacities, skills and attitudes to support rights-based and transformative participatory approaches. Furthermore, under certain circumstances universal or international rights frameworks do not provide the most appropriate entry point for working with local partners – even though they may underpin the overall approach.

6. Gaby Ore (2008) *The Local Relevance of Human Rights*. IOB Discussion Paper

The specific purpose of the paper is to "offer an introduction on how local communities' use of human rights in the context of field studies can be researched." It puts forward a 'localising human rights framework' for "examining how [human] rights become relevant to the most excluded individuals and communities and [...] assessing local participation in human rights development and elaboration." The author frames 'localisation' as a programme to counter the negative effects of 'socio-economic globalisation', and situates the localisation of human rights as a key part of this. This means working alongside 'local communities who act to defend their rights, and – most importantly – examining the impact of these actions on the human rights framework'. The methodology for this research is based on studying local communities (ensuring sensitivity to issues of representation and internal inequalities/marginal groups) affected by globalisation. If networks of actors are critical for realising human rights, they are only able to do so when "the human rights experiences of communities set the agenda for the entire network" (De Feyeter 2007, p.83 in IOB 2008). However, there is a common danger that NGOs working for human rights often fail to include those they work with/for in key decision-making processes. There is, thus, a clear need to assess: power dynamics amongst network actors; the extent to which human rights claims reflect the actual priorities of the most excluded; the community's exposure to human rights language and standards; and the required capacity building.

Participation is key in the research processes, contributing to better quality data and also contributes to empowerment and awareness amongst the people concerned. This framework adopts the objectives of participatory forms of research and sees academics, etc. working alongside those affected, but does not include a capacity development component.

In order to measure empowerment and rights consciousness, the author distinguishes two concepts: 'rights empowerment' and 'rights consciousness'. The former assumes that people already have an understanding of rights and are using them to bring about changes in their community whereas the latter is more concerned with the extent to which people have internalised or adopted the rights framework as part of their world-view; it is also notably harder to assess than the former. Ultimately both elements must be looked at together, which means asking questions about: equity and equality; issues of representation; decision-making; agency and skill-building; and recognition and legitimacy of local leaders amongst network partners. Furthermore, it is necessary to assess the 'political space' within which such human rights efforts unfold. Often under adverse conditions, it becomes unsafe to ask certain questions and so proper assessment is required to decide on how to proceed.

The author then elaborates the methodology, based on: case studies drawing on quantitative and qualitative data; 'systematisation of experiences' based on participatory research principles; and participatory impact assessments. She then notes various key themes in the research process: inter-disciplinarity (balancing different disciplinary strengths, weaknesses and perspectives, and the need for knowledge brokers and translators who can facilitate communication across disciplines); use of quantitative and qualitative methods; research team composition (e.g. local and international; the need to engage the local from the outset in all stages of the research). Five tracks/stages

of the research process are identified: (1) from transgression to human rights claim; (2) from claim to human rights action; (3) fitting strategies to the institutional response and remedies sought; (4) assessing the institutional response's local and global implications; (5) charting the 'devolution' process.

7. Schnell, Anna & Erika Coetzee (2007) *Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organisations in Africa*. **CAFOD, Christian Aid & Trócaire. London**

This toolkit serves as a practical guide to supporting citizen engagement in monitoring government policies. Each chapter presents a different stage of this activity including identification of issues, policy analysis, stakeholder assessment, establishment of goals and objectives, development of monitoring priorities and indicators, budget monitoring and analysis, and gathering and using evidence to advocate for change. The toolkit provides over 25 tools that can be used at different stages for monitoring policies in a participatory manner, working with citizens and other stakeholders. It identifies some of the challenges and conditions required to making such monitoring processes genuinely participatory. At the end of each section, the toolkit provides a set of activities and guidelines for facilitators to use while conducting group discussions as part of the process of setting up a participatory policy monitoring process.

SECTION 3: PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES TO ADVOCACY & CAMPAIGNING

The preceding section presented participatory research as a pedagogical process that enables people to learn about their social and political reality and to identify means of realising their rights and bringing about the changes that they desire. Participatory research contains a strong action component and can be integrated closely with participatory approaches to advocacy and campaigning and to participatory approaches to learning/education, thereby constituting a single, ongoing and multifaceted empowering process of learning and action for social change.

Advocacy and campaigning can take a variety of forms. VeneKlasen and Miller identify several, including: public interest advocacy, policy advocacy, social justice advocacy, people-centred advocacy, participatory advocacy, and feminist advocacy. Each implies a different approach and emphasis, may be suited to different kinds of issues, contexts and objectives, and can be carried out in more or less participatory ways. The table below outlines some of the main categories of change that advocacy and campaigning may seek to bring about:

Desired Outcomes	How this transformation might be achieved
Changes to institutional policy and practice	- New or changed policies - Increased or improved implementation of policy - Resistance to and rejection of opponents attempts to alter and/or revoke policy or practice
Strengthened civil society capacity to hold institutions accountable for their actions	- Enhanced advocacy strength of civil society groups - Enhanced levels of coordination and collaboration between civil society groups directly buffeted by issues and other progressive forces - Engagement and influence over policy and decision making processes enhanced
Wider democratic space	- Greater legitimacy, acceptance and recognition of civil society groups by decision-makers - creation/development of mechanisms to facilitate citizen involvement in public policy formulation and implementation - Increased engagement and influence by civil society in decision-making
Changed individual/group behaviour	

Adapted from NCVO, Coe & Mayne, 2008, p.31

One particularly useful distinction is between 'public advocacy' and 'people-centred advocacy', as characterised by Samuel (2007). While both approaches have a clear mandate for contributing to change, the former is concerned primarily with influencing public policy or formulating legislation to make them better serve the poor and marginal, and the latter is concerned primarily with effecting social change, of which policy-change is only one – albeit significant – component. In both cases, 'research' plays a critical role in identifying issues, gathering evidence, formulating strategies, communicating messages and influencing other actors. Both may use participatory forms of research though this is more a characteristic of people-centred advocacy. Indeed, public advocacy tends to be expert-led, using largely non-participatory forms of research to generate evidence that can be mobilised strategically in a top-down manner to influence policy- and decision-making processes.

While such public advocacy efforts, in development or other social change fields, may well be effective in addressing specific issues on a case-by-case basis, their contribution to broader processes of empowerment and social change of the concerned people or groups may remain limited. The result is that in the long-term, marginalised people may not find themselves better able to claim and realise their rights. Another critical issue is that while changing policy is important in its own right, it is ultimately the implementation of a given policy that matters and this typically continues to be distorted by socio-cultural and political factors. Thus, without changing meanings, identities and power-relations within society, the contribution of advocacy efforts to sustained positive change remains seriously constrained. It is also worth noting that in many contexts the legitimacy of a campaign in the eyes of both the public and government or inter-governmental actors rests upon its mass-support base. Mustering such support ultimately depends on the quality of the relationship that is maintained with those whose interests are supposedly being served by the campaign and the extent to which the campaign accurately reflects their priorities and concerns.

A people-centred approach to advocacy, campaigning and education begins and ends with people: their issues, their priorities, their voices, their actions and their rights. Thus, all the 'moments' in a given participatory advocacy process – from identifying issues, prioritising them, researching them, identifying stakeholders, deciding on advocacy strategies, communicating for social change and evaluating process and progress – would ideally engage people. This 'moments' schema may be useful for thinking through points at which participation could be expanded or deepened. As with participatory research, decisions can be taken regarding which moments of the advocacy process should be made participatory and what form of participation should be sought on a case-by-case basis (e.g. with reference to ladders and typologies of participation). Such choices should be made based on careful consideration of the nature of the work, the specific context and the implications – both short-term and long-term – that adopting a participatory approach will have on the relationship with participants.

PARTICIPATORY METHOD: POLICY MAPPING

This exercise is used to collectively map the policy system by identifying which actors (institutions, individuals), interests and positions are mobilised at each of the different stages of a policy-making process (i.e. agenda-setting; formulation and enactment; implementation and enforcement; monitoring and evaluation). Particular attention should be paid to identifying differences between official and informal positions and views of the different actors that have been identified. A power mapping exercise can also be carried out to understand the dynamics that enable or constrain the different actors and the interests they represent. Once this has been done, clear objectives can be set for working on or with each of the different stakeholder groups, using insights from the mapping exercises to practical and informed possibilities for change.

In addition to familiarity with the kinds of participatory methods discussed in the preceding section, the ability to embrace popular and folk forms of communication that incorporate diverse ways of knowing and forms of expression (such as music, song, dance, drama, poetry, etc.) may enrich participatory advocacy and campaigning. Facilitating people to be the key players in their own campaign gives them the opportunity to participate in deeply empowering processes as they learn to assess their own predicament and find ways of working collectively to transform it. Furthermore, the arena for change and engagement in participatory advocacy extends beyond the usual closed doors of policy-making spaces or the centralised channels of communication that characterise mass media, to include public, community, local government, informal and even intimate spaces – indeed potentially all spaces where actors – both rights-holders and duty-bearers – interact with each other.

It cannot be assumed that people will have the existing skills and knowledge to carry out an advocacy or campaigning process from the outset. Rather, efforts should be made to facilitate the process in a manner that helps them to develop such capacities throughout the process, insofar as possible. Consequently, participatory campaigning is most feasible when approached as a long-term process of gradually enabling people to develop the individual and collective wherewithal to claim and obtain their rights. This can be supported by linking participatory advocacy with a pedagogical or learning process, such as that embodied in participatory research or potentially human rights education. This highlights the importance of ensuring that appropriate scoping and assessment is carried out to determine not only what degree and form of participation is feasible or appropriate for a given issue, context and set of partners but also the kind of capacity building support and process that is required to support partners throughout the advocacy and campaigning process.

PARTICIPATORY PROCESS: SOCIAL AUDITS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

Dating back to at least the 1950s, social audits have become increasingly popularised in recent years as a means of enabling citizens to hold governments to account. Typically a social audit entails government functionaries making budgetary and expenditure information public for all activities coming under their purview. By demanding transparency in this manner, citizens are able to gain a deeper understanding of the performance of their government. This allows cases of corruption and misallocation or misuse of funds to be identified and the responsible functionaries can, potentially, be brought to justice.

Source: http://www.fao.org/docrep/006/ad346e/ad346e09.htm

PARTICIPATORY PROCESS: CITIZENS' JURIES/INDEPENDENT PEOPLE'S TRIBUNALS

Citizens' Juries can be used as a means of drawing attention to issues of human rights or other policy violations that are otherwise not given appropriate public attention. Such events bring together groups of activists, lawyers, academics, and representatives of affected people in a large scale event that operates like a tribunal. People affected by various forms of injustice are invited to speak up and give accounts of their experiences, with someone (often a sympathetic judge or magistrate) acting as a judge and asking for evidence. Media coverage of the event is organised, to help challenge established narratives, policies, regulations, or practices. The process aims to combine evidence with critique and culminates in a series of recommendations or alternatives that can be proposed in order to change the government's policy. Notable Independent People's Tribunals have been conducted in India on the issue of displacement of indigenous people for mineral extraction (e.g. Kashipur in 2006 and more recently in the context of 'Operation Green Hunt' in 2010).

Given the scale of change that is typically sought – whether in practice or policy – campaigning demands the formation of coalitions and alliances with other actors. Indeed, working with other social change actors at various levels – from the local to the international – is generally seen as critical to the success of advocacy campaigns. It also makes possible the scaling-up of local efforts as diverse sets of actors facing or working on similar problems are able to formulate common agendas, share resources and knowledge and mobilise collectively across a broader geographical area. In some cases, supporting partners to organise themselves into their own coalitions and associations and developing the requisite leadership skills within these people's organisations will be key to creating a broad base for the movement and ensuring the sustainability of the change process. Ensuring that these people's organisations are able to network effectively with similar local groups and associations and that they receive adequate capacity building to this effect are both critical elements of processes intended to scale-up and sustain struggles for rights and social justice.

Working with a range of other actors, however, raises many challenges, for example because of ideological or cultural differences which can often be amplified when working under pressure in campaign mode. A first step is to conduct institutional and power analyses as these can help in determining which partners are the best ones to work with in a campaign process. Beyond this, some challenges can be overcome by collaboratively establishing clear ground-rules for working together, jointly developing a common understanding of the issues at stake and changes sought, and being prepared to make compromises in the interests of working together. The role of the lead organisation in a campaign process may also vary with time and context, depending on the kinds of roles taken up by the partner organisations. It is particularly important to ensure that the interests of those at the centre of the campaign are not sidelined by the dynamics and tensions that may emerge between more powerful members of the campaign coalitions. Finding effective ways of ensuring their participation and voice is, therefore, key. It should be anticipated that the capacity building of partners – particularly in terms of what it means to follow a RBA and to work in a genuinely participatory manner – should be an integral part of a campaign process. As with all programmes, PME of the process is key to learning from experience, ensuring accountability to partners and generating evidence to ensure legitimacy and encourage further support.

The table below is useful for thinking through the broad dimensions of success in advocacy campaigns that aim to be participatory as well as to change policy. Context specific indicators could be developed corresponding to each cell.

Level	The policy change	The broader environment
National	Specific reforms in law or policy framework	New patterns of decision-making and participation
Intermediate	Better programme implementation	Greater government accountability and capability
Local	Material improvement on quality of life	Sense of citizenship and capabilities to claim rights

Source: Gaventa & McGee (2010)

ABSTRACTS

1. VeneKlasen and Miller (2002) *A New Weave of Power, People & Politics: The Action Guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation*

'A New Weave' is a guide for "people and organisations grappling with issues of power, politics, and exclusion. It goes beyond the first generation of advocacy manuals to delve more deeply into questions of citizenship, constituency-building, social change, gender, and accountability" (p.1). The guide is divided into three parts. Part 1, *Understanding Politics*, deals with conceptual issues related to politics and advocacy, democracy and citizenship, power and empowerment, and strategies for empowerment. Part 2, *Planning Advocacy*, presents the tools, processes and politics for citizenship and action, effectively serving as a practical guide to all stages of planning a participatory advocacy campaign. Part 3, *Doing Advocacy*, explains the practical aspects of doing advocacy, paying particular attention to politics and what it takes to influence policy processes. It is probably the most comprehensive guide available for participatory advocacy and campaigning, combining theoretical discussions of key concepts, practical exercises, sets of tools and activities that can be used with participants, case studies of applications from a wide range of countries and reflections and insights from highly experienced practitioners in the field of rights-based advocacy and campaigning for social change.

2. Action Aid, Institute for Development Studies and Just Associates (2002) *Making Change Happen: Advocacy and Citizen Participation*

This short document is based on a workshop with activists from various countries reflecting on experiences of engaging in advocacy processes. It is structured around four key themes: (1) engagement in advocacy; (2) issue-based struggles vs. struggle-based issues; (3) questions of identity, representation and legitimacy in advocacy process; and (4) how to assess the success of advocacy efforts. More specifically, it explores key factors that can help to ensure the appropriate opportunities and approaches are selected and identified in an advocacy process. The

dynamics of engaging in an advocacy process are discussed, noting the diverse kinds of change that such processes may seek to contribute to and emphasising the importance of looking beyond policy change to social change and grounding change efforts in long-term struggles for social justice. Key operational issues are then explored as factors that can affect advocacy efforts, depending on the kinds of relationships and approaches that are adopted. Warning is given that care is needed to avoid undermining the advocacy process through insufficient sensitivity to issues of legitimacy and representation. Finally, the document concludes by emphasising the importance of monitoring, evaluating and learning from the process of seeking to bring about change and making such processes empowering so that the capacity of social change actors is enhanced. Paying particular attention to changes in power relations can help to make this a reality.

3. Cindy Clarke, Beth Harrison, Valerie Miller, Jethro Pettit and Lisa VeneKlasen (2002) *Overview – Making Change Happen: advocacy and citizen participation.* PLA Notes, 43. pp.4-8

This article provides an overview to the 43rd issue of PLA Notes, which coincided with the release of VeneKlasen and Miller's *A New Weave* (see above). After giving an introduction to the issue – focusing on the concept of advocacy and its different definitions and interpretations, the article reviews various developments in the field of advocacy from different regions of the world. These examples illustrate some of the different kinds of participatory campaigns that have been carried to date. The paper then outlines the lessons learned from these experiences and proposes the way forward. In terms of lessons, it emphasises that "[f]or sustainable results, efforts to influence policies should be more closely connected to social change movements that build critical awareness, understandings of basic human rights and long-term visions of social change among citizens" (p.7). Other key issues include understanding power; strengthening capacities – to assess power and be strategic about engagement – also noting that "in human rights work there is a need to build the direct advocacy of the marginalised groups, and to protect their rights to participate, to dissent, and to organise" (p.7). It also encourages an active conception of citizenship, seeing people as 'makers and shapers' of rights, and highlights danger of imposed 'definitions of citizenship'. Significantly, it argues for ensuring the accountability of states and for rethinking global security: "we need a vision of global security founded upon increasing equality and justice in the world, and upon the free and active involvement of all people in decisions which affect their lives." Key ways forward include: clear guidelines for engagement in policy processes; linking policy change efforts to strategies of social and economic transformation; capacity building for civil society to engage in advocacy; finding broader ways of defining and assessing success; giving due attention to issues of representation, legitimacy and identity.

4. John Samuel (2002) *What is people-centred advocacy?* PLA Notes, 43 pp.9-12

In this note, the author raises the need to see advocacy not just as a 'systemic process of influencing public policies' (which is necessary but not sufficient) but also as a 'more people-centred approach focused on social transformation'. He emphasises a 'people'- rather than 'citizen'-centred perspective, because this goes beyond the relationship of citizen-state to embrace the idea that the key lies in 'people-politics' holding 'state-politics' to account. This also means engaging with rights: "[p]eople-centred advocacy encompasses a rights-based approach to social change and transformation" (p.9). Specific kinds of political perspectives lend themselves to this form of advocacy, notably: "enabling and empowering the marginalised to speak for themselves"; "work[ing] to challenge and change unjust and unequal power relations [...] at every level of society"; and going "beyond a state-centred approach to social change and politics to one shaped and led by the people." To achieve this, principles of participation, communication and legitimacy must be integrated. Samuel identifies four key arenas for people-

centred advocacy, namely: people; decision-makers; networks and alliances; and the public. It is through working dynamically with all these arenas that the potential for people-centred advocacy to contribute to change is enhanced. It is critical to ensure that the advocacy efforts do not contribute to a 'policy mirage' whereby policy changes but people's lives do not.

5. Jethro Pettit and Sammy Musyoki (2004) *Rights, Advocacy and Participation – what's working?* **PLA Notes, No.50, pp.97-106**

This note, replete with useful tables and case studies, emphasises the link between participatory approaches and RBA, looking in particular at citizenship and advocacy. The authors review the performance of participatory approaches to date and emphasise the importance of dealing with issues of power, noting that power, rights and citizenship are closely related.

"*Official approaches to rights can miss important opportunities to hear real voices, but participatory approaches can evade the more universal dimensions of rights. Hence, there are lessons to learn from examples of power-sensitive, participatory approaches to realising rights. While some are rooted in human rights concepts and language, others do not necessarily use the language of rights and precede the official advent of 'the rights-based approach' [...] In a similar way, mainstreamed ideas about advocacy and citizen participation have been a mixed blessing. They have invited new spaces for citizen engagement in policy processes and governance, but with the risk that such spaces and processes will be confining – that prevailing relations of power and exclusion will limit the potential for real participation and change, even while participation is claimed to be present (Box 2).*" (p.99)

The authors advocate engaging more deeply with questions of power, exclusion and social change, by using appropriate tools to deepen critical reflection on such issues. They also argue that it is important not to lose sight of long-term change objectives while getting excited by participatory methods:

"*Participatory appraisal methods from the PRA/PLA tradition are strong for needs assessment and planning, and for recognising local and indigenous knowledge, but they do not always address the full range of activities arising in advocacy and rights processes. Methods and strategies derived from diverse traditions may be needed at various stages of a social and political change process, and much has been gained where lessons and tactics have been woven from the traditions of community organising, PAR, popular education, adult and non-formal education, legal rights education, women's rights advocacy, community organising, and popular communication, in addition to PRA/PLA (VeneKlasen et al, 2004). Much human rights and advocacy work has been over-professional and top-down in nature, and can learn from reflective and process-oriented community work that seeks to identify and build upon local priorities, knowledge and leadership.*"

The rest of the article explores: building knowledge and awareness; working with multiple actors; and State obligations and accountability. It identifies as key challenges for the future the instrumental and non-reflective uses of participatory methods; issues of professional dominance and legitimacy; the strengthening of community-base organisations and leadership; moving beyond the local and beyond the public sector (i.e. to include corporations); avoiding donor dependency and outdated project cycles; and giving due attention to the critical yet often overlooked issue of individual learning and change that underpins broader organisational and social change processes.

6. John Samuel (2007) *Public advocacy and people-centred advocacy: mobilising for social change*. **Development in Practice 17(4-5)**

This paper reviews the theory and practice of advocacy, warning against the danger of jumping on the advocacy 'bandwagon', and noting that ultimately the long-term success of an advocacy effort in contributing to social change depends on its relationship with mass-based movements and the extent to which resonates with the perceptions of those at the grassroots. Samuel identifies three broad approaches to advocacy: political, technical and managerial, each of which emphasises different sets of practices with different consequences. He argues that the particular background and culture of those involved in the advocacy effort will determine both what approach is adopted and what kind of changes can be attained, noting that this will also be shaped by an array of context-specific cultural, historical and institutional factors. He then distinguishes 'public' and 'people-centred' forms of advocacy, the former being focused on changing policies in favour of the poor and marginal and the second being more committed to social transformation and direct empowerment of people, including through changing public policies.

Samuels emphasises the critical role of public advocacy in empowering the marginal and excluded highlighting that it involves: "resisting unequal power relations (such as patriarchy) at *every* level"; "engaging institutions of governance to empower the marginalised"; "creating and using 'spaces' within the system, in order to change it"; "strategising the use of knowledge, skills, and opportunities to influence public policies"; and "bridging micro-level activism with macro-level policy initiatives". Identifies six sources of power that can be drawn on to shift societal power relations, namely the power of: citizens; information and knowledge; constitutional guarantees; grassroots experience and linkages; network alliances and solidarity; moral convictions, noting that "advocacy does not depend only on having information, but on being able to transform such information into knowledge by interpreting it with reference to specific values" (p.617). Samuel draws on Indian case studies to explore public advocacy, noting that mobilisation and mass-support is key to the success of efforts at public advocacy as this provides a source of legitimacy to those doing the lobbying.

People-centred advocacy has a much broader mission as it seeks to directly change society, for example through social-change communication. However, in the present era, interpersonal communication plays less role in shaping understanding and attitudes than does communication mediated by mass-media, which has the tendency of creating more buzz than attitudinal change and is often characterised by confused messages (e.g. WHO (World Health Organization) and UN have different positions on HIV/AIDS). Samuel then emphasises the importance of interactive or socially-mediated communication in which people become both the medium and the message through the process of engaging with relevant issues in an interactive process. He then argues for moving away from technologically or managerially mediated forms of communication and emphasises the importance of a folks-based approach to communication: the message should be clear and people should be the means through which it is transmitted. "A real danger of professional advocacy is that the real issues become diluted or marginalised in the labyrinth of strategies, tactics, and skills" (p.620).

7. Dave Dalton (2007) *Building National Campaigns – Activists, Alliances, and How Change Happens*. **Oxfam.**

Dalton reviews Oxfam's experience of campaigning on labour rights with partners in Colombia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka and the USA. Drawing on these case studies, it explores key elements of the national campaigning process, namely: (1) building an alliance; (2) developing a strategy; (3) incorporating gender equity; (4) using the media; and (5) developing policy. Key issues, questions and recommendations for practice are highlighted for each of these elements. Some notable examples include the strategic selection of allies based on complementary strengths, and an assessment of partners' relationship histories; using joint research with partners to build a common understanding of issues; establishing clear rules for working together, mutual respect, and readiness to compromise; ensuring a

clear vision, understanding of context and the mapping of resource availability prior to campaigning; developing strategies that build people's capacities and are focused on achievable outcomes; paying attention to preparation and follow-up after the campaign; taking gender seriously by recognising that other partners may not be gender-sensitive and that specific strategies to promote gender equality may be required; the need for a comprehensive power analysis of the media and ensuring clarity of both message and target audience; providing alternatives and agenda-setting, not just defining problems; and ensuring quality communication with others.

The booklet concludes with the following key lessons: "campaigning is a long-term process; innovation, imagination, flexibility, patience and persistence are all valuable qualities; alliances are necessary and effective, even though they may be hard work; a clear strategy will facilitate an effective campaign; alliances should use every possible means to communicate to all relevant audiences; changing ideas and beliefs is as important as changing policy and practice; all campaigns, even if not explicitly proposed to be about women's rights, should be informed by a rigorous gender analysis before research is done and before strategies are defined."

8. Gaventa, John and McGee, Rosemary Eds (2010) *Citizen Action and National Policy Reform: Making Change Happen*. Zed Books

This book presents a series of richly documented case studies describing a variety of successful efforts by citizens and their groups from a wide range of countries seeking to bring about policy changes at the national level. Based on extensive research into these change processes, and linking their findings with the already well-established literature on social movements, the editors set out a series of seven propositions about how citizen action can be scaled-up to influence national policies. These are (pp. 34-35):

- **Proposition 1:** Political opportunities are opened and closed through historic, dynamic and iterative processes. While political opportunities create possibilities for collective action for policy change, these openings
- themselves may have been created by prior mobilization.

- **Proposition 2:** Civil society engagement in policy processes is not enough by itself to make change happen. Competition for formal political power is also central, creating new impetus for reform and bringing key allies into positions of influence, often in synergy with collective
- action from below.

- **Proposition 3:** While international allies, covenants and norms of state behaviour can strengthen domestic openings for reform, they can also be the subject of fierce domestic opposition. Successful reform campaigns depend on careful navigation to link international pressures
- with differing and constantly changing local and national contexts.

- **Proposition 4:** Successful policy change occurs not through professional advocacy alone, but involves complex and highly developed mobilizing structures which link national reformers to local and faith-based groups, the media and repositories of expertise. Such structures are built over time, deeply grounded in the societies where they are found, and
- linked to the biographies of those who lead them.

- **Proposition 5:** Alliances between social actors and champions of

change inside the state are critical to make policy change happen. Social
mobilization structures provide opportunities for state-based reformers
to generate change from within, just as political opportunity structures
- provide spaces for social actors to do so from without.

- **Proposition 6:** Policy change on contentious issues requires contentious forms of mobilization. Contentiousness
  is a dynamic and contingent concept. Successful collective action must also be dynamic, with
the ability to frame issues carefully, adjust to changing circumstances
- and audiences, and draw upon a wide repertoire of strategies.

- **Proposition 7:** 'Success' can be understood in many different ways,
especially among the different actors in a broad-based campaign or
social movement. In general, robust and sustainable changes require
campaigns which link the national to the local and which pay attention
to the processes of empowering citizens and deepening democratic
- governance as well as to effecting policy change itself.

Of particular significance, the case studies emphasise the role of southern players – notably alliances and coalitions of actors that connect the local and the national – with international actors playing a more peripheral role. This may raise some important questions for thinking about the potential and capacity for bringing about social change that already exists at the national level and will have implications for international agencies looking to support struggles in the south.

9. Chapman Jennifer & Wameyo Amboka (2001) *Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study*. **ActionAid**

This document explores how the value of 'influencing and advocacy work', going beyond the traditional concern with 'projects' in development to a concern with democracy, transparency and accountability (of duty-bearers), can be meaningfully assessed. In order to do this, the authors explore the challenges faced in monitoring and evaluating various forms of participatory and coalition-based advocacy, and emphasise the need for culturally appropriate and gender-sensitive methods. This study is based on a review of the approaches and frameworks developed by several NGOs to assess their advocacy efforts and "aims to develop appropriate methodologies for assessing the value of advocacy work, methodologies that reinforce a transparent and co-operative way of working, and strengthen external agencies' role in helping to create space for marginal groups to have a voice in decision-making fora" (p.2).

Some of the notable challenges and complexities in monitoring and evaluating advocacy include: (1) establishing causal relationships; (2) assessing contribution given that 'outright victory' is unlikely and compromise often necessary; (3) dealing with the fact that goals may change over the course of the advocacy process; (4) retaining sensitivity to different dimensions of success – e.g. policy change vs. strengthening civil society; (5) negotiating between priorities of different stakeholders. Frameworks reviewed include Initial Design Reviews (IDR's) emphasis on measuring changes in each of policy (policies, practices, programs and behaviours of major institutions), civil society (strengthening of capacity to do advocacy), democracy (whether new channels are opened for civil society involvement to influence decisions in the future and changes in social aspects of culture such as gender), private sector and individual (e.g. 'psychological and attitudinal changes, especially those related to political awareness' (p.14)).

Another is USAID's framework based on a progression from '***citizen empowerment*** and ***citizenship building***' through to 'strengthening ***civil society*** and ***building social capital***' and finally 'influencing key ***policy outcomes***'. The authors

also provide various frameworks for evaluating the policy dimension. They present a framework for considering 'pathways of influence' in policy-change processes (p.25), which emphasises the importance of acknowledging multiple pathways of change. Another approach is to develop 'proximate indicators' that aim to capture more modest, intermediate changes that can signal progress rather than only being concerned with achievement of the final outcome. Others focus on a stage-wise assessment of progress from getting an issue onto the agenda through to change actually taking hold. The document also outlines the evaluation of capacity for people-centred advocacy, emphasising key issues such as empowerment, group capacity for advocacy, social capital, networks and movements and providing various tools and frameworks for assessing these. Different frameworks have different strengths and weaknesses and rather than thinking in terms of a best approach, it may be more useful to become familiar with a range of conceptual and practical tools and to draw on these to develop context-specific frameworks for carrying out and assessing people-centred advocacy processes.

SECTION 4: CULTIVATING AN ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE OF PARTICIPATION

The preceding sections have outlined some of the conceptual issues relating to participation as well as some of the key factors related to the practice of participatory research, empowerment through education and participatory advocacy. However, it is essential to recognise that adopting a more participatory approach to social change work – whether it is grounded in a human rights or a development framework – may well demand significant changes in organisational procedures and norms so as to accommodate the more dynamic, open and inclusive pattern of work and relationships that participation entails. This can generate tensions at the organisational level as ethical dilemmas arise and trade-offs have to be made. But it is through open and inclusive dialogue amongst key internal and external stakeholders, based on shared principles, that the necessary compromises can be negotiated so as to support the attainment of common objectives.

A transformative approach to participation is necessarily constructed as being in opposition to the prevailing dominant social, institutional or organisational orders. Resistance to change is a characteristic of institutions, sustained as they are by particular sets of power relations and the practices, ideologies and relationships that reproduce them. The co-option of terms such as 'participation', 'rights' and 'empowerment' when they become 'buzzwords' in the discourse of powerful institutions stands testimony to this.

Adopting a more participatory approach as an organisation, therefore, entails challenging established ways of working – not only in society, the state or corporations but more broadly in all relationships with others: 'the inward focus' referred to by Uvin (see above). This includes both internal actors – such as staff or members – and external actors – including partner organisations and the individuals and groups whose dignity provides the very basis for working together. Inevitably, it entails re-considering and transforming one's own organisational practices, processes and routines. There is also a very critical individual dimension to such change as organisational change only takes place when individuals are also changing – in this case by adopting the mindsets, attitudes, skills and behaviours that are required for making a more participatory form of practice a reality.

At the risk of caricaturing, some of the implications of becoming a more participatory organization, in terms of shifts in vision, practices and approaches, might be represented as follows:

From		To
Beneficiaries, objects, targets, stakeholders	→	Partners, rights-holding citizens, agents of change, subjects
Legalistic-universalistic conception of human rights based on international framework	→	Combination of legalistic and particular rights based on interplay between local, national and international conceptions and frameworks (human + citizenship rights)
Legal focus	→	Legal and social focus
Campaigning on behalf of people	→	Empowering people to carry out their own campaigns
"Public" advocacy	→	"People-centred" advocacy[vii]
Short-term engagements or interventions, tightly project-bound funding	→	Long-term processes of engagement and support for multi-year processes
Conventional project cycle management tools or Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	→	Participatory appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of activities and impacts
Traditional, extractive research; research as information-gathering/fact-finding prior to planning	→	Participatory research as an ongoing, empowering process of building knowledge and awareness to inform action for change by participants
Centralised	→	Decentralised
Simple, linear, top-down, controllable vision of how change happens	→	Complex, messy, bottom-up and not entirely controllable vision of how change happens

Project cycles, planning or programming logics and budgets, which tend to reflect linear, top-down, rationalist and technical models of change, often obstruct the adoption of more participatory approaches. A project is usually conceived by experts who draw on various sources of information to formulate a plan of action on the basis of which a budget can be calculated. While this may be suited to certain kinds of project, evidence from a wide range of fields shows that social change is a highly complex process and that efforts to achieve it may be severely constrained by traditional approaches to project management. A major source of this complexity is the diversity of actors and relationships that are involved in social change processes. Consequently, finding ways of securing the participation of key stakeholders and 'partners' in all stages of the project cycle – including planning, implementation and review – can make a substantial contribution to building greater responsiveness into project design. It can also help to ensure that those affected by the project experience a sense of commitment to and ownership of the project in the longer-term as well as of incorporating the experiences of partner groups into the learning process.

By sharing knowledge more collectively across the network of concerned actors involved in change processes, their collective capacity for contributing to change can be enhanced. Consequently, the documentation and dissemination of experiences, tools and frameworks that integrate participatory approaches with human rights work is critical for the further development of the field, which remains as yet largely undocumented. At a more operational level, participatory approaches to planning, monitoring and evaluation can play a critical role in contributing to knowledge sharing, for example through the introduction of PRA and PLA-types of approaches that ensure partners have a clear role in identifying priorities, defining indicators and measuring achievements. The adoption of Participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation and appraisal systems often raises significant challenges as those accustomed to more traditional, linear or expert-based tools find it difficult to understand or make the shift. However, a diversity of tools, such as Outcome Mapping[viii], exist to support participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation and are particularly suited to dealing with complex, multi-stakeholder change processes. Of course, the usual disclaimer concerning the need to be sensitive to power-imbalances holds in the adoption of all such participatory methods.

Beyond the immediate practical benefits that can be derived from adopting a more participatory approach to learning and change, there are strong ethical and consistency reasons for doing so. In particular, there is a need for organisations involved in social change processes, often working on behalf, for or with people and groups who are perceived as somehow weaker than them, to ensure downwards accountability. Relatively well-resourced Northern organisations, staffed by well-educated professionals, wield considerable power in the international arena, particularly compared to those whose interests they claim to uphold. While this relationship is evidently structurally unequal, the introduction and maintenance of effective accountability mechanisms provides a critical avenue for feedback to be provided. This can help to avoid the kind of institutional blind-spots that may inadvertently leave partners disconnected or disappointed – potentially undermining the very goal of the project.

This is all the more relevant for organisations that have adopted a human rights mandate. Coherence between the principles that they struggle for and the principles that govern their internal behaviour and relationships are important to their credibility, legitimacy and reputation.

It is useful here to draw on the experiences of some of the big international NGOs (BINGOs), particularly those which have adopted RBAs and have been seeking ways of decentralising their operations – in some cases embracing these two kinds of change as explicitly connected to each other. Some of these decentralisation processes are intended to generate more context-specific and effective strategies via the devolution of decision-making, empowerment and capacity-strengthening of their southern country offices and local partners.

OXFAM: DECENTRALISATION AND EMPOWERMENT OF NATIONAL OFFICES

"Oxfam shared a story of change precipitated by the arrival of a new director who sensed a lack of clarity and focus in its country programmes. The idea of developing National Change Strategies was introduced to country programmes not as a top-down, machine-like directive, but in a light touch way – as an invitation with guidelines that emphasised process rather than product. The initiative did not generate the significant resistance or rupture that was anticipated, partly because the timing was right, but also because it was undertaken in a culturally appropriate way and not presented as a major new initiative that may have created fear in some parts of the organisation. On the contrary, the approach to national change strategies has shifted power relations within Oxfam and re-empowered country offices as an important unit, putting them back in the driving seat in a way that appears consistent with a progressive social change agenda. However, it was noted that the light touch approach meant that the quality of the outcomes varied across country programmes and that a more tightly controlled process may have generated more consistent, good quality outcomes."

Source: Shutt (2009)

Perhaps one of the critical challenges inherent in working with others, particularly under more participatory and partnership-based modes of engagement, is the issue of exit. When a programme, project or campaign ends, what happens to the partners – be they individuals, communities or other organisations? While this question is relevant for all interventions involving others, it is of particular concern in more participatory processes as these, by definition, elicit greater partner involvement and tend to result in both higher expectations and greater capacity for further engagement. Thinking about the end of the project at the outset and being transparent about it in communication with partners becomes a critical element of ensuring downward accountability and avoiding future disappointment. Furthermore, within a participatory framework a variety of steps can be taken so as to help ensure that partners are better positioned to work in a more independent manner in the future. Adopting participatory approaches to research, empowerment through human rights education, advocacy and campaigning work can make a substantial contribution to this as the skills, knowledge, leadership, networks and alliances that are developed through such participatory processes can be put to work by the partner organisations in the future. However, rather than taking this for granted, specific attention should be given to ensuring this happens throughout the project process. Furthermore, depending on the nature of the project, specific organisational development support should also be considered, for example in terms of financial management, project planning or communications.

Becoming a more participatory organisation demands embracing complexity, recognising that standardised approaches will not deliver *all* the kinds of changes that are hoped for. Through enabling participatory processes, networks of concerned actors are able to work together, engage in dialogue, negotiate priorities and reflect collectively on their experiences that the possibility of change emerges. Engaging in such activities inevitably places strains on organisations, especially those that are large and bureaucratic. Working in the face of complexity demands agility, flexibility and the ability to be responsive to rapidly changing contexts and short windows of opportunity, as well as to work with diverse sets of partners who may hold different views and positions. It also means being prepared to let go of a degree of control at times. Organisational procedures and systems developed under assumptions of change as a controllable or

at least linear and predictable process will inevitably present barriers to efforts to embrace a more participatory paradigm.

Organizations and institutions are made up of individuals. The individual mindsets of those involved in adopting participatory approaches are therefore critical to their successful adoption. The failure to give due attention to supporting individual processes of learning and change in personal attitudes, behaviours and practices, can often prove a significant barrier to broader organisational and institutional change and should not be overlooked at the expense of broader changes in systems. The two go hand-in-hand.

Consequently, any organisation seeking to adopt more participatory approaches to human rights work (as with Human Rights and RBAs to development) will need to dedicate adequate time and space for internal reflection and dialogue on what changes are sought, the logic underlying these changes, and the implications of such changes on all manner of operational issues. While dialogue may initially be based more on conceptual issues, it is collective reflection on experiences – internally and with partners – that will contribute the most to learning how to embrace a more participatory approach tailored to an organization's particular identity, capacities and skills. Thus, piloting new ways of working in collaboration with others, using these experiences in iterative fashion as a basis for collective reflection, and paying particular attention to issues such as those set out in this document – notably power relations – can help to support the mainstreaming of more participatory approaches.

ABSTRACTS

1. ICHR (2003) *DESERVING TRUST: ISSUES OF ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS NGOs*

This document explores the need for human rights NGOs to ensure accountability to those they work with/for and outlines the ways that this is possible. It emphasises that NGOs run the risk of seeing themselves as somehow 'clean' whereas in practice they are vulnerable to the same kinds of problematic dynamics that arise wherever there are unequal relations of power. It is only through persistent work to ensure accountability that these issues can be kept in check. This issue is of particular relevance to HR-based NGOs which, given the contested nature of their work, can expect to be challenged by a wide range of actors (governments, international agencies, the media, corporations, etc). At the same time, Human Rights NGOs tend to be less prepared for the demands that may be made of them than their more traditional development NGO counterparts. The report explores the concept of accountability, emphasising the need for multiple lines of accountability with diverse sets of actors. It then traces out the implications for 'accountability' of some of the core principles that characterise Human Rights work, namely: (1) loyalty to the values of human rights; (2) belief in the accountability of power; (3) belief in the rule of law; (4) commitment to impartiality and independence; (5) commitment to truthfulness and accuracy; (6) effectiveness. Finally, it examines issues of both internal and external organisational accountability, the role that donors and governments can play in enhancing accountability and the key contemporary issues that characterise accountability.

2. Care Newsletter – April 2003 – *Promoting Rights and Responsibilities*

Care's April 2003 thematic newsletter focuses on the organisation's efforts at promoting 'rights and social justice' (RSJ). It is of particular relevance as it showcases the processes through which Care International and its various Country Offices have sought to incorporate RBAs into their work. Notable national examples include Malawi, Bangladesh, Kenya and India. In Bangladesh, Care Bangladesh's (Care-B) work focused on two excluded groups: women and slum dwellers. Initially an RSJ Direction team was formed to oversee the RSJ work and conduct capacity building exercises and facilitate the introduction of RBAs into Care-B's work. Subsequently a resource group was formed and trained to extend further orientation and capacity building support to Care-B's partners, carry out ongoing assessments and promotion of RSJ work. As part of this process, a variety of reflection workshops were carried out to learn from Care-B's own and others' experiences of working on RSJ and to understand the implications of adopting such an approach. This has included linking with other organisations with experience of RBAs. In addition to such organisational processes, certain key projects have been selected for application of RBAs and case studies are given of each of these. In other countries, somewhat different approaches have been adopted, though all focus on training, capacity building, establishing partnerships, and applying the approach to specific contexts in order to learn from experience. In India, Care sought support from the National Centre for Advocacy Studies to facilitate the requisite organisational reflection. Key challenges identified from Care-India's experience include: "top-down, target-driven and inward looking projects, sectoral management structures, overwhelming dependence on imported food and service delivery projects, lack of strategic partnerships and alliances, lack of institutional ownership among staff, and inadequate institutional capacity and organisational culture for adopting RBAs." Engaging in rights-based approaches demands addressing such operational issues.

3. Daniel Start *et al* **(2007)** *Oxfam GB in Partnership – A Global Strategic Evaluation, Full Report*. **Oxfam GB. Available at**

http://oxfam.intelli-direct.com/e/d.dll?m=234&url=http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/learning/partnershipevaluation/downloads/partnershipevaluation.pdf

This document is based on an evaluation of how Oxfam works in partnership, looking specifically to understand existing practices, identify what works and what doesn't, and to examine changes in and emerging opportunities for Oxfam's approach to partnership. Five key debates were identified:

1. What is Oxfam GB's added value beyond 'donorship'?

2. How deep should Oxfam GB go?

3. How can Oxfam GB reduce the burden of partner accountability?

4. How does Oxfam GB strike a balance between empowerment and compliance?

5. How can Oxfam GB remain involved without taking the space?

In its assessment, Oxfam identified 'administrative and management capacity; advocacy, influencing and credibility; information, knowledge and networking; facilitation, reflection and moral support' as its key added value in partnerships. The report presents a typology of participation. It also looks at accountability of partners to Oxfam GB, and of Oxfam GB to partners. In relation to the ways partners account to Oxfam GB it is recognised that partners' reports deserve more systematic feedback, field visits and verbal debriefs should be employed more alongside or instead of paper-based reporting, and report templates and guidelines should be simplified, clarified and

streamlined; also emphasised are the benefits of discussing capacity development issues in partnerships at the outset of a collaboration. Partner organisations identified several issues that they felt needed to be addressed for Oxfam GB to be adequately accountable to them, including Oxfam's responsiveness to constructive criticism, the lack of clarity about the duration of Oxfam's commitment to a given partnership, and the need for both formal mechanisms for dispute resolution and interventions to avoid disputes arising to begin with. In terms of establishing more equal forms of partnership, Oxfam notes the importance of taking measures to address the power imbalance inherent in its relationship with others. These include: 'softening dominant cultures and attitudes', ensuring 'transparency and information-sharing', 'sharing risks and rewards', 'sharing and recognising real costs'. The report then emphasises the importance of shared values, cultures, rapport, and trust, noting that different understandings about development, partnership and professional styles and decision-making processes can be key factors that generate tensions. The authors then identify 4 different forms of partnership: facilitating multiple partnerships, building smaller organisations, working with government, and private-sector partnerships, noting that each entails something quite different. Ultimately, building a "participatory partnership culture requires committed leadership, rewards for partnership performance, investment in skills, and most of all: staff time. (p.9)"

4. Laura Roper and Jethro Pettit (2002) *Development and the Learning Organisation: an introduction. Development in Practice Vol 12(3-4).*

In this article (an introduction to a special double edition of Development in Practice focusing on learning and change in development organisations), the authors introduce and contrast the concepts of the 'learning organisation' and 'organisational learning', arguing that both are of great relevance to those working in development and social change organisations. The 'learning organisation', a concept most closely associated with the work of Peter Senge, emphasises the creation of a particular kind of organisation, namely one in which: different kinds of knowledge and learning styles are valued; dialogue and different perspectives are encouraged to promote creativity; organisational barriers are removed and collective working is promoted; leadership is fostered throughout the organisation and internal distinctions of roles are reduced. Learning organisations clearly take learning seriously and question both the gap between rhetoric and practice and their very 'raison d'être' as part of their ongoing learning process.

Organisational learning is somewhat different, drawing on diverse streams including management science, sociology, psychology and behavioural studies. While much of the concerned literature is drawn from the private sector, there are significant areas of overlap with development – and particularly participatory forms of development. Examples, include the concern with realising human potential, the linking of learning and action to bring about change, the importance and ways of embracing change, the importance of changing internal structures and systems to support learning and change. Having said that, it tends to overlook issues of power relations, which are endemic to development efforts.

The paper explores "the complexity of development processes; the complexity of accountability demands and duties; the complexity of measurement; and self-inflicted complexity." Framing development as non-linear and unpredictable, the authors highlight the importance of recognising complexity and avoiding simplistic approaches to learning or bringing about change. They then discuss the multiple channels of accountability – upwards, downwards and horizontal – that characterise development NGOs, noting how this raises considerable challenges. Unless appropriate systems for measuring and learning from change are developed, navigating complex change processes will remain highly problematic.

5. Jethro Pettit (2006) *Power and Pedagogy: Learning Reflective Practice for Development.* **IDS Bulletin 37 (6).**
Institute of Development Studies, UK

This article explores what it means 'to learn about power in development work'. More specifically, it asks: "How can those who are trying to bring about social justice and equitable development in their societies, such as voluntary and public sector workers, learn about power in ways that will help them act more effectively? How can they appreciate some of the more embedded and internalised forms of power [...] and learn to shift the ways in which power reproduces itself within themselves and society?" It is noted that learning about such forms of power requires the adoption of multiple learning methodologies, including reflective practice and cycle between lived experience and different forms of 'reflection, expression, conceptualisation and practical action'. Methods such as creative writing, story-telling and drama can be used to facilitate access to and communication of experiences of power and powerlessness.

Developing sensitivity to power means engaging with the personal; the identities and values that shape one's interactions with others in the world and the ways that this plays into or transforms existing power relations in society. Pettit outlines diverse theories of power and then proceeds to present a comparable diversity of dimensions of learning that may be appropriate for dealing with the complex, multi-valent nature of power. These entail embracing and working with diverse forms of knowledge – presentational, experiential, propositional and practical – and using theoretical frameworks for analysing power to construct pedagogical methods that make possible a deeper exploration and understanding of power in the search for social justice. In particular, reflective practice provides a means of bringing one's own participation with others and the power relations this implies into question, thereby making it a subject of conscious change rather than an unconscious factor that perpetuates inequalities.

6. Cathy Shutt (2009) *Changing the World by Changing Ourselves: Reflections from a Bunch of BINGOs.* **IDS Practice Paper Vol. 2009(3)**

This paper takes a critical look at the changing context, roles and internal issues that characterise BINGOs at present, focusing on how they can be more effective in contributing to 'progressive social change' in light of these factors. Such change is understood as "shifts in power relations; greater realisation of rights; and enhanced economic, political and social justice for poor and vulnerable people." It is based on a series of reflective workshops with representatives of several BINGOs and contains case studies and reflections on issues and experiences. In particular, it "explores the types of changes that BINGOs are trying to achieve, the approaches they use – their models of change, and challenges and tensions commonly perceived to prevent BINGOs pursuing more radical change agendas."

Key tensions explored include: (1) size (and particularly the tension between scaling up and focusing specifically on rights); (2) balancing between a poverty-focus and a rights-focus, given constraints of what donors are ready to support; (3) balancing universality and context-specificity, for example in issues related to rights; (4) ensuring that those whose voices are heard are truly representative of the most marginal; (5) corporate engagement – notably the implications of tension over a welfare versus a social justice approach, as well as the impact on BINGO reputations that arise from association with corporates; (6) management issues – particularly those related to effectiveness and accountability; (7) relationships with southern partners – particularly relations of power which are mediated by factors such as top-down reporting mechanisms and attempts to decentralise.

Particular attention is then given to the way that BINGOs respond to external influences and also the way that they operate internally. In the case of the latter, different ways of thinking about organisations are explored, as is their applicability for BINGOs in making operational and organisational changes in order contribute more effectively to

'progressive social change'. Bringing about organisational change demands "a number of delicate balances: between analysis of internal and external environmental factors; between over- and under-ambition in change plans; between allowing constructive spaces for critical voices and avoiding them being dominated by negative resistance; between tight hierarchy and control and loose management that allows diversity and experimentation; and between pushing central change processes emanating from Northern offices that may dominate Southern agendas, and allowing change to be the result of the random anarchy of autonomous country programmes."

In conclusion, Shutt notes that the questions all these BINGO representatives were asking were, on the one hand, about the nature of their political project; and, on the other, about their own role and the suitability of their organisational architecture for contributing to that change – as both individual organisations and as a sector. There was a broad call for taking this dialogue both deeper and to a wider set of partner organisations.

7. Robert Chambers (2001) *Chapter 5: Power, Knowledge and Policy Influence: reflections on an experience* in Brock, Karen & Rosemary McGee 2002 (Eds), Knowing Poverty: Critical Reflections on Participatory Research and Policy. London: Earthscan

This paper presents the author's reflections on his personal experience of 'research analysis and representation' as part of a team for the World Bank's participatory 'Consultations with the Poor' project. This project, covering 23 countries sought to influence and inform the World Development Report 2000/01 and "presented methodological, epistemological and ethical challenges, dilemmas and trade-offs which are common to much policy-oriented research." This paper engages with these complexities and can serve as a useful tool for those involved in similarly powerful positions with respect to those whose voices they seek to capture and represent as a means to influencing policy- and decision-making processes. Some of the key practical trade-offs that have to be made include:

- *Time and resources vs. scale and representativeness*
- *Scale and financial resources, time, training, fieldwork and in-country analysis – and generally having to take on more work than is reasonable*
- *Scale, time, resources and orientation versus community-level follow-up – and the danger of raising expectations that will present challenges in the future*
- *Scale, number of aspects and open-endedness vs. analysability – also influencing the extent to which the researchers' own categories would prevail over the people's categories*

The process of collating, analysing, selecting and using data that has been collected is full of ethical dilemmas and trade-offs, particularly when working with qualitative data. For example, in deciding which parts of a series of statements will be kept and which will be cut-off, the meaning of the final quote can be changed drastically. How are such decisions to be made? Who has the legitimacy to make them? And to what extent can the need to influence policy justify such choices? Raising such ethical and practical issues, and many others, the author then identifies a series of practical lessons, including: (1) assessing thoroughly whether or not to engage; (2) reflecting self-critically throughout the process, for example through writing a diary; (3) optimising trade-offs such as those outlined above; (4) adopting, inventing and using win-win methods, for example by using a wide repertoire of communication methods and mediums that are more inclusive. The paper ends by emphasising the importance of acknowledging and reflecting critically upon the complex and subtle interplay of power and knowledge throughout the process in all interactions with others and with the data. This demands overcoming constraints of personal fear and of being open about biases within the team of collaborators involved in the project.

ANNEX 1: REFERENCES

Ackerman, J. (2005) *Human Rights and Social Accountability. Social Development Papers. Participation and Civic Engagement.* Paper No. 86. World Bank. Available at: http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/gouvernance/HumanRightsandSocial0AccountabilityFINAL.pdfAvailable at: http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/gouvernance/HumanRightsandSocial0AccountabilityFINAL.pdf

ActionAid, Institute for Development Studies and Just Associates (2002) *Making Change Happen: Advocacy and Citizen Participation*

ActionAid (2003) *Action Aid in Practice: Understanding and Learning About Methods and Approaches of Rights and Empowerment.* Workshop Report. November 17 - 22, 2003, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Brocklesby, M. & Crawford, S. *(2004) Operationalising the Rights Agenda: DFID's Participatory Rights Assessment Methodologies (PRAMs) Project*

Care Newsletter – April 2003 – *Promoting Rights and Responsibilities*

Chambers, R. (1983) *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*

Chambers, R. (2001) *Chapter 5: Power, Knowledge and Policy Influence: reflections on an experience* in Brock, Karen & Rosemary McGee 2002 (Eds), Knowing Poverty: Critical Reflections on Participatory Research and Policy. London: Earthscan

Chambers, R. (2004) *Reflections and Directions: a personal note.* PLA Notes, Issue 50. pp.23-34

Clarke, C., Harrison, B., Miller, V., Pettit, J & VeneKlasen, L. (2002) *Overview – Making Change Happen: advocacy and citizen participation.* PLA Notes, 43. pp.4-8. Available at: http://www.planotes.org/documents/plan_04301.pdfAvailable at: http://www.planotes.org/documents/plan_04301.pdf

Coe, J. and Mayne, R. (2008) *Campaigning Effectiveness: Is your campaign making a difference?* National Council for Voluntary Organisations

Cooke & Kothari (2001) Participation: The New Tyranny. Zed Books

Cornish, L. & Dunn, A (2009) *Creating knowledge for action: the case for participatory communication in research.* Development in Practice 19(4-5)

Cornwall, A. & Brock, K. (2005) *What Do Buzzwords Do for Development Policy? A critical look at 'participation', 'empowerment' and 'poverty reduction'.* Third World Quarterly Vol 26, No.7

Cornwall & Gaventa (2001) *From Users and Choosers to Shapers and Makers.* IDS Working Paper. Available at: http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0708/DOC2894.pdf and also at

http://cdi.mecon.gov.ar/biblio/doc/ids/wp127.pdfhttp://cdi.mecon.gov.ar/biblio/doc/ids/wp127.pdf

Dalton, D. (2007) *Building National Campaigns – Activists, Alliances, and How Change Happens*. Oxfam.

Elson, D. (2006) *Budgeting for Women's Rights: Monitoring Government Budgets for Compliance with CEDAW*. UNIFEM. Available at: http://www.gender-budgets.org/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=doc_download&gid=638&Itemid=189

Eyben, R (2010) 'Empowerment and Pro-Poor Growth: Draft Policy Guidance Note' prepared for OECD DAC Poverty Network Task Team on Empowerment, April

Eyben, R. (2003) *The Rise of Rights – Rights-based approaches to international development*. IDS Policy Briefing, Issue 17, May 2003. Available at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=DDB9E54A-5056-8171-7BD508C832A54C3DAvailable at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=DDB9E54A-5056-8171-7BD508C832A54C3D

Freire, P. (1967) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*

Friis-Hansen, E. & Kyed, H. M. (2009) *Participation, Decentralization and Human Rights: A Review of Approaches for Strengthening Voice and Accountability in Local Governance*. Social Development Department, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network. THE WORLD BANK. Available at: http://www.diis.dk/graphics/Subweb/Fremtidens-bistand/Local%20governance%20_DIIS_%20%20-%20FINAL%20_2_.pdfAvailable at: http://www.diis.dk/graphics/Subweb/Fremtidens-bistand/Local%20governance%20_DIIS_%20%20-%20FINAL%20_2_.pdf

Gaventa (2004) *Perspectives on Participation and Citizenship.* Available at: http://cims-rwanda.org/downloads/Participation_Citizenship_Governance.pdf Available at: http://cims-rwanda.org/downloads/Participation_Citizenship_Governance.pdf

Gaventa, J. & Cornwall, A. (2006) *Challenging the boundaries of the possible: Participation, Knowledge and Power.* IDS Bulletin 37(6)

Gaventa, J (2006) *Finding the Spaces for Change:*

 A Power Analysis

. IDS Bulletin 37 (6)

Gaventa, J. & McGee, R (2010) *Citizen Action and National Policy Reform: Making Change Happen.* Zed Books.

Gaventa, J. & Valderrama (1999) *Background note prepared for workshop on Strengthening participation in local governance*. Available at: http://www.pnet.ids.ac.uk/docs/Other/participation%20citzienship%20and%20local%20governance_gaventa.pdfAvailable at: http://www.pnet.ids.ac.uk/docs/Other/participation%20citzienship%20and%20local%20governance

_gaventa.pdf

Gready, P. & Ensor, J (2005) *Reinventing Development? Translating Rights-based Approaches from Theory into Practice*. Zed Books

Groves, L. & Hinton, R. (eds) (2005) *Inclusive Aid – Changing Power and Relationships in International Development.* Earthscan

Guijt, Irene (2008) *Critical Readings on Assessing and Learning for Social Change: A Review*. Institute for Development Studies. Available at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?file=db21.pdfAvailable at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?file=db21.pdf

Hickey & Mohan (2008) *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation.* Zed Books

ICHR (2003) *Deserving Trust: Issues of Accountability for Human Rights NGOs.* Available at: http://credo.md/arhiva/documente/HumanRightsNGOAccountability.do Available at: http://credo.md/arhiva/documente/HumanRightsNGOAccountability.doc

ILO (2005) *Tools for Prevention – Participatory Monitoring: Guidelines for practitioners in the fight against human trafficking*. International Labour Organization. Available at: http://www.oit.org/public/english/region/asro/bangkok/child/trafficking/downloads/pmtools.pdfAvailable at: http://www.oit.org/public/english/region/asro/bangkok/child/trafficking/downloads/pmtools.pdf

Jennifer, C. & Amboka, W. (2001) *Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study.* ActionAid

Leal, P. and Opp, R. (1999) *Participation and Development in an Age of Globalisation Development Express.* International Development Information Centre

Miller, VeneKlasen and Clark (2005) *Rights-Based Development: Linking Rights and Participation – Challenges in Thinking and Action.* IDS Bulletin 36 (1).

Mwasaru, M. (2007) *Assessing Social Change through Participatory Action Research: The Case of Kasighau Small-Scale Miners, Kenya.* IDS

Ore, G. (2008) *The Local Relevance of Human Rights. IOB Discussion Paper*

Oxfam 2008, *The Partnership Companion: 5. Capacity building and exit planning*, Oxford: Oxfam

Parks, W. et al (????) *Who Measures Change? An Introduction to Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Communication for Social Change.* Communication for Social Change Consortium.

Pettit, J. & Musyoki, S. (2004) *Rights, Advocacy and Participation – what's working?* PLA Notes, No.50, pp.97-106. Available at: http://www.planotes.org/documents/plan_05011.pdfAvailable at: http://www.planotes.org/documents/plan_05011.pdf

Pettit, J. (2006) *Power and Pedagogy: Learning Reflective Practice for Development.* IDS Bulletin 37 (6). Institute of Development Studies, UK

Piron, L. (2005) Rights-based Approaches and Bilateral Aid Agencies: More Than a Metaphor? IDS Bulletin, 36(1).

Roper, L. & Pettit, J. (2002) *Development and the Learning Organisation: an introduction*. Development in Practice Vol 12(3-4).

Start, D. *et al* (2007) *Oxfam GB in Partnership – A Global Strategic Evaluation, Full Report*. Oxfam GB. Available at http://oxfam.intelli-direct.com/e/d.dll?m=234&url=http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/learning/partnershipevaluation/downloads/partnershipevaluation.pdf

Samuel, J. (2002) *What is people-centred advocacy?* PLA Notes, 43 pp.9-12. Available at: http://www.planotes.org/documents/plan_04302.pdfAvailable at: http://www.planotes.org/documents/plan_04302.pdf

Samuel, J. (2007) *Public advocacy and people-centred advocacy: mobilising for social change*. Development in Practice 17(4-5)

Schnell, A. & Erika Coetzee (2007) *Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organisations in Africa.* CAFOD, Christian Aid & Trócaire. London

Shutt, C. (2009) *Changing the World by Changing Ourselves: Reflections from a Bunch of BINGOs*. IDS Practice Paper Vol. 2009(3). Available at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=FD6EB736-E982-E7B3-0A9697E1CC836EBAvailable at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=FD6EB736-E982-E7B3-0A9697E1CC836EB4

UNDP (2006) *Indicators for Human Rights Based Approaches to Development in UNDP Programming: A Users' Guide*. UNDP. Available at: http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs/HR_guides_HRBA_Indicators.pdfAvailable at: http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs/HR_guides_HRBA_Indicators.pdf

Uvin, P. (2007) *From the right to development to the rights-based approach: how 'human rights' entered development.* Development in Practice: 17(4-5)

VeneKlasen & Miller (2002) *A New Weave of Power, People & Politics: The Action Guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation*

Wheeler, J. (2009) *Negotiating Access for Participatory Research with Armed Actors.* IDS Bulletin 40 (3)

White, S. (1996) *Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation*. Development in Practice, Vol 6, Issue 1.

ANNEX 2: SUPPLEMENTARY ABSTRACTS

SECTION 1

Gaventa, J. (2004) *Perspectives on Participation and Citizenship*

This paper begins by noting a crisis of legitimacy of institutions among citizens, connected to issues of corruption, lack of responsiveness, and disconnection from local needs and realities. Gaventa identifies four broad trends pertaining to citizenship and participation in response to this: (1) opening of policy to citizens as 'users and choosers'; (2) new forms of democratic decentralisation creating new spaces for citizen participation in local governance; (3) innovation of new opportunities for citizen participation in the north in response to reduced engagement in traditional spaces; (4) discourse on the 'right' of citizens to participate. Various innovative approaches to linking citizens and states have emerged characterised by (1) more active and participatory participation; (2) inclusion; (3) multiple stakeholders; and (4) accountability. What matters the most, however, is how participation is understood and practiced; and Gaventa provides an historical typology: (1) Freirian radical roots of 'participation from below', as 'the demands of the excluded' seeking control or change; (2) participation of 'beneficiaries' and 'users' – as adopted by the development or aid sector and broadly depoliticised; (3) participation as stakeholder involvement – remains depoliticised; (4) participation as exercising the rights of citizenship – in response to this de-politicisation, finding ways of ensuring that citizens are able to shape decisions that affect them and secure their various rights.

Citizen participation overlaps with governance and it is argued that the right to participation is a requirement for full citizenship, as it means that people become agents. However, working with 'participation' with diverse sets of actors implies working with contested definitions, thus highlighting the importance of finding appropriate definitions. Practical challenges – four broad questions that need to be asked in any instance of participation – are (a) whose voices; (b) whose space; (c) what purpose of participation; (d) whose power is affected by it. Finally, not all participation is good, and the premise under which it is advocated for matters. Barriers to participation – such as economic inequality – also threaten to undermine the value of the new democratic spaces that have been created; as does the fact that many policy issues remain out-of-bounds (also because of donor-supported neo-liberal policies that restrict what is possible). Participatory budgeting is one area that has seen progress on this front – especially at the local level - and offers considerable potential. There is also a need for more documentation and evidence of the performance/contribution of increased citizen participation in governance processes to give momentum to such efforts.

Esbern Friis-Hansen & Helene Maria Kyed (2009) *Participation, Decentralization and Human Rights: A Review of Approaches for Strengthening Voice and Accountability in Local Governance.* **Social Development Department, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network, World Bank**

Explores the synergies for 'local governance resulting from interactions between decentralisation, popular participation and a rights-based approach', particularly how an integrative approach can be applied at the municipality level to enhance downward accountability (of govt.), more equitable distribution of benefits, and more participation in local governance. Distinguishes three types of HR-based work: (1) top-down, universalist, legalistic; (2) bottom-up, particularlist, empowerment; and (3) middle-way, progressive, mediating approach for gradual realisation of rights based on HR principles. The report emphasises experiences with the third kind, whose key

principles are participation, accountability, non-discrimination and transparency. It claims such approaches are more suited to wider transformative processes by linking local issues with national policy processes and connecting an array of actors across all levels. This is made possible through "the creation of shared spaces for dialogue and collaboration and multi-stakeholder trainings in rights and obligations [...] The middle-ground HRBA seeks to gradually insert HR principles in processes and outcomes by being context sensitive, based on careful analysis of political power structures, institutions, available resources and values." In terms of decentralisation, the report focuses particularly on devolution and notes the significant contribution that such reforms have made to building the technical capacity of local government officials. Furthermore, the rise of participatory governance approaches contributes to enhancing transparency and accountability and serves to combine more traditional participatory community development processes with decentralisation efforts. Middle-ground HRBA provides a framework for enhancing both decentralisation and community development approaches, with each helping to compensate for the short-comings in the other. After discussing these synergies in further depth, the report presents four case studies of integrated applications of HRBA with decentralisation and community development, that indicates the contribution of each when used in a synergistic manner:

"The four cases indicate that each of the three intervention models add specific value to the whole: (i) the middle-ground (H)RBA informs a consistent focus on equity (non-discrimination/inclusion of the marginalized), national government responsibilities, and a conceptualization of the citizen–LG relationship. It is based on each set of actors becoming aware of and exercising their respective rights and obligations in local governance processes; (ii) decentralization (devolution) provides the overall institutional framework for local governance with, at least formally, devolved powers to local constituencies, and it brings into focus the capacity-building and transformation of Local Government Initiatives (LGIs) and the creation of sub-district level institutions that are necessary to make downward accountability relations and citizens' demands meaningful and sustainable through institutionalization; (iii) participatory governance contributes with valuable tools of citizen mobilization regarding rights claims and demands to LGIs. These tools can also strengthen emerging social accountability mechanisms at local government level."

While an integrative approach holds great promise, it also demands 'considerable donor investment' and requires 'longer-term program time frames'.

Pablo Leal and Robert Opp (1999) *Participation and Development in an Age of Globalisation Development Express.* **International Development Information Centre**

This text outlines the concept and history of participation, tracing out its evolution from its roots in community development and PAR to its adoption in the form of participatory development. It also notes some of the setbacks faced by the participation project and the way that the changing global context and trends towards localisation have created the space for participation to make a comeback, albeit in a new form. The authors present an alternative definition of participation as: "*the process which facilitates the permanent ability to identify and analyze problems, formulate and plan solutions, mobilize resources and implement them in all areas of people's developmental needs as they seek to gain control over the processes that affect their lives."* (p.7). They also note that governance must also be rethought to make it more citizen-centred. They conclude that "development discourse and practice must accept the transformative power of participation by recognising the issues of power and empowerment" (p.9) and that "mainstream actors must listen, learn, and find more innovative ways to support civil and grassroots experience, adopting more authentic and committed participatory practice" (p.9).

ENDNOTES

[i] Andrea Cornwall and Karen Brock (2005) *What Do Buzzwords Do for Development Policy? A critical look at 'participation', 'empowerment' and 'poverty reduction'.* Third World Quarterly Vol 26, No.7

[ii] Paulo Freire (1967) Pedgagogy of the Oppressed

[iii] Laure-Hélène Piron (2005) *Rights-based Approaches and Bilateral Aid Agencies: More Than a Metaphor?* IDS Bulletin, 36(1). See in particular the table outlining strengths and weaknesses of both approaches on p.25

[IV] Gaventa, J (2006) *Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis*, IDS Bulletin 37 and http://www.powercube.net

[v] Gaventa, J. & Cornwall, A. (2006) *Challenging the boundaries of the possible: Participation, Knowledge and Power.* IDS Bulletin 37(6)

[vi] Mwambi Mwasaru (2007) *Assessing Social Change through Participatory Action Research: The Case of Kasighau Small-Scale Miners, Kenya.* IDS

[vii] John Samuel (2007) *Public advocacy and people-centred advocacy: mobilising for social change.* Development in Practice 17(4-5). See abstracts in section 3 for detailed summary.

[viii] Earl, S. et al., (2001) *Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs.* IDRC