



Governance Reform under Real World Conditions: A Dialogue on Communication Challenges

May 30 - 31, 2007 – Washington, DC

SUMMARY REPORT

Governance reform efforts have been dominated by technocratic analyses and prescriptions. While necessary, and often first rate, technocratic solutions alone have been ineffective in delivering real change or lasting results. This is primarily because reform programs are delivered not in controlled environments, but under complex, diverse, socio-political and economic conditions. In political societies, country ownership of reform programs cannot be assumed, public opinion will not necessarily be benign, and coalitions of support may be scarce or nonexistent. Technocratic solutions, therefore, must be accompanied by strategies to understand and address obstacles to reform.

This report provides a summary of the workshop held in Washington, D.C., on May 30 and 31, 2007, to gather knowledge and recommendations on the use of information and communication to support governance reform under real world conditions. The two-day dialogue gathered leading academics, development and private sector professionals, and other opinion leaders, to discuss research, case studies, and examples of good practice for future work in this area.

The dialogue focused on the key issues of governance, in particular 1) the effective, transparent operations of the government and the public sector, and 2) the related involvement and influence of civil society stakeholders. The dialogue sought to answer key questions about how information and communication systems can improve the feasibility of governance reforms.

The dialogue focused on the following challenges faced by governance reform efforts:

- How do we use political analysis to guide communication strategy in governance reform?
- How do we secure political will—demonstrated by broad leadership support for change? What are the best methods for reaching out to political leaders, policy makers and legislators?
- How do we gain the support of public sector middle managers who are often the strongest opponents of change, and foster among them a stronger culture of public service?
- How do we build broad coalitions of pro-change influentials? What do we do about powerful vested interests?
- How do we help reformers transform indifferent, or even hostile, public opinion into support for reform objectives?
- How do we instigate citizen demand for good governance and accountability in order to sustain governance reform?

This report has been organized in six sections corresponding to the six sessions of the workshop. Each section of this report has the following components: a general summary of the panel



presentations and discussions, a digest of each presentation, and descriptions of approaches and techniques pertaining to each session.

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

Approach: A general way of addressing an issue or problem.

Technique: A particular method of accomplishing a desired objective.

SESSION ONE

The first panel was tasked to discuss the use of political analysis in guiding communication strategies in the area of governance reform. The session featured theoretical approaches to analyzing stakeholder participation, dialogic communication, and the public sphere as well as practical findings from projects in a developing country context.

The session began with a presentation on the distinction between dialogic and monologic communication. The speaker emphasized the need to think about ways in which stakeholders at the community level can engage government officials and the institutional authority structures in which they are embedded. Toward this objective, dialogic communication can provide guiding principles and inform training strategies.

The second speaker presented a scholarly analysis of the public sphere in order to map out relationships among stakeholders of reform initiatives. He stressed that political analysis should include taking stock of the communicative environment in particular contexts. For this, the speaker suggested creating a “communication report card” that will measure self-reported perceptions of citizens regarding their own capacities to voice concerns and opinions to people in authority.

The third speaker presented lessons learned from four reform initiatives in India. These experiences underscored the need for political analysis to be carried out in an ongoing basis throughout the entire project cycle. The speaker also suggested that journalistic interviews be employed as a tool to understand stakeholder opinions, attitudes, and beliefs regarding particular reforms.

Additional points were raised during the plenary discussion, which clustered around the following themes:

- First, political analyses require in-depth understanding of country and community contexts in order to tease out factors holding back reform.
- Second, being a multi-dimensional endeavor, political analyses should include civil society, government, and private sector actors from various institutional levels and should be ongoing endeavors throughout project cycles. These analyses should cover institutional arrangements, rules of the game, and power relations.
- Third, political analyses should aid in the crafting of communication strategies that build constituencies of reform. These constituencies should be selected based on their potential of becoming reform proponents and demanders for accountability, answerability, and good governance.
- Fourth, interactions between horizontal (dialogic) and vertical (monologic) dimensions can be instructive for sequencing reform initiatives.



- Fifth, political analyses can be carried out in different gradations of specificity -- from in-depth individual narratives to macro country-level indicators.

Summary of Presentations

Georgetown University's **J.P. Singh** presented a model of two-way, deliberative, or dialogic communication and contrasted it with monologic, persuasive, instrumental or strategic communication. Under the dialogic model, the encounter among interlocutors is transformative, characterized by cooperative problem solving. In contrast, under the monologic model, speakers have set positions and aim to persuade others through strategic means. Most development communication scholarship is about the latter.

Dialogic communication, according to Singh, is not just about crafting effective messages, enabling voice, and cultivating the capacity to aspire. It is about actors in communication in the context of their entire lives. Modes of communication that have the capacity to capture this broad conception of human experience include novels, drama, theatre productions, and film.

Singh related a story from India about a women's group that voiced their concerns to a local official about the government encroaching upon cattle grazing land – a decision made in order to address the unsustainable consumption of natural resources. The official claimed this decision was not under his jurisdiction and that they needed bring their concerns to another agency. While the women were not able to follow through on his advice, they nonetheless felt empowered because they had voiced their position to a person of authority.

In Singh's view, under the dialogic model, the women would have had the opportunity to have a frank discussion with authorities to figure out a compromise between protecting the women's rights to graze their cattle and avoiding the tragedy of the commons. From a practical liberal approach, the key question is this: What kinds of preparation do local stakeholders need to engage authorities toward positive negotiated outcomes?

Tom Jacobson of Temple University presented a version of political analysis based on Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action, which includes a culturally sensitive treatment of rights and speech, cultural respect, dignity, and pluralism. An analysis of the role of the Habermasian public sphere in cultural change would start with considering the ways in which societies can engage in rapid cultural change while preserving democratic processes.

Jacobson suggested that applying Habermas' theory to political analysis would raise two key considerations. First, this theory enables an attempt at broad justification for discursive democracy, i.e., an in-depth exploration of the relationships between democracy and governance, on one hand, and stakeholder voice and legitimation, on the other. Legality of institutions in which authority is vested is based on people's belief that they have been listened to by their governments.

Corollary questions would then include the following: When do people know they have been listened to? Are polls and surveys useful in determining whether stakeholders believe that they have ownership of reform processes? Jacobson suggested the adoption of what he calls "communication report cards", a type of survey instrument meant to determine whether citizens believe the government has been deliberative and open to the opinions of its constituencies. Second, adopting Habermas' theory as a framework enables an analysis of the structural aspects of the public sphere. Within this sphere, do opportunities exist for deliberative discourse and what venues are available for private citizens meet to discuss matters of public concern?

Contemporary analysis of the public sphere would also include considering the production and circulation of messages, the role of the mass media and new information and communication



technologies, the public opinion industry and the ways in which these modes of communication provide citizens access to decision-making bodies.

Jacobson referred workshop participants to a document published by the Overseas Development Institute entitled *Mapping Political Contexts: A Toolkit for Civil Society Organizations*, which outlines tools for political projects and country assistance planners with regard to which stakeholders should be listened and spoken to and in what sequence.

The World Bank's **Sumir Lal** presented four papers on governance reform from the Bank's operational experiences in India. Lal discussed these reform efforts from a practical, empirical, and on-the-ground perspective. The primary methodology in carrying out these studies was journalistic, i.e., efforts centered on meeting stakeholders individually and asking them in-depth questions.

Principles of good practice arising from these studies include the need for stakeholders to agree on the nature and definition of the problem and negotiate a solution. Political analyses should begin upstream and continue throughout the project cycle and should include assessments of winners and losers, sustainability of reform, sequencing of steps, and contextual risks (e.g., governance environment), sector risks (e.g., weak counterparts with low credibility), and risks of conflict within and between communities. Specific actions for each stakeholder group aimed at enhancing engagement, consultation, transparency, and communication need to be crafted and implemented as early as feasible.

In addition, reform efforts require identification of and partnership with reform-minded politicians and bureaucrat champions. Internalization by departments and agencies will aid in the sustainability of reforms. Opponents should be co-opted or isolated and new allied interest groups should be created.

Approaches and Techniques

The following is a list of approaches and techniques for using political analysis to guide communication strategies in governance reform.

Approaches

- **Stakeholder empowerment through dialogic participation**

Dialogic participation's primary objective is the empowerment of grassroots stakeholders in engaging the policymaking process. The type of political analysis needed in support of this approach revolves around mapping political and social relationships among various levels of governance and assessing the participatory capacity of local communities, particularly in terms of engaging local and national elites in policymaking processes.

This approach can be implemented by employing a subset of the following techniques: multi-stakeholder analysis; communication report cards, journalistic interviews; assessing participatory culture; using narrative formats to tell reform stories; and training programs geared toward engaging authorities.

- **Build support through monologic persuasion**

This essentially top-down approach toward reform is viewed as necessary in building support for a change initiative crafted by technical experts. Monologic persuasion requires that social psychological mechanisms of opinion, attitude, and behavior change be harnessed toward the diffusion and adoption of a reform initiative. In this vein, political analysis assists the reformer in



charting out paths of influence through which a reform will wend its way within and among segments of a target population.

This approach can be implemented through a combination of the following techniques: multi-level stakeholder analysis and using narrative formats to tell reform stories.

- **Legitimation of authority for change**

The principle underpinning this approach promotes the view that authority gains legitimacy when citizens believe that their voices are heard by elites and count in the decision-making processes of governance. Political analysis guides this approach by mapping out relationships among various groups, especially between government and civil society, and identifying communicative interactions among stakeholders that lead to broad-based support for reform.

This approach is associated with the following techniques: multi-level stakeholder analysis; communication report cards; and training programs geared toward engaging authorities.

- **Journalistic appraisal of interest groups**

This approach demands that reform agents take seriously the views of individual stakeholders from various interest groups. In particular, individuals from various interest groups need to be treated as key informants in the reform process. Political analysis should guide selection of groups and individuals to be interviewed, and information gathered from these interviews should guide all stages of the reform effort.

This approach can be implemented by using interviews that incorporate a combination of closed- and open-ended questions, with emphasis on the latter. It would be helpful to select interviewees based on an initial multi-level stakeholder analysis.

- **Assess the place of participation in cultures**

Grassroots participation may be desired as a comprehensive component of a reform initiative or limited to particular stages of the change process. The cultures of societies and communities vary widely with regard to the open participation of particular population segments in policy decision-making forums. Sensitivity to these differences will help reformers in terms of sequencing which groups should be involved at what stages, as well as the ways in which participation can help or hinder the reform process. Taking stock of trade-offs between participation and efficiency is an essential element of this approach.

This approach can be implemented by use of the following techniques: multi-level stakeholder analysis; communication report cards; journalistic interviews; and training local stakeholders to effectively engage authorities.

Techniques

- **Multi-level stakeholder analysis**

Mapping out various stakeholder groups and key individuals involves drawing linkages among them to improve understanding and generating insights regarding the political, social, and cultural landscape in which reform processes play out. Particular care needs to be taken in assessing relative power relationships among groups and individuals as these provide opportunities and constraints to reform agents in moving a reform agenda forward.



- **Communication report cards**

Similar to citizen report cards, this technique aims to measure the communicative environment of a given society. Individuals will be asked to assess the amount and quality of information they receive regarding governance as well as their own ability to voice their opinions and concerns to elected official, bureaucrats, and other leadership groups. In addition, individual perceptions of policy elites' openness to citizen opinions and demands will be measured.

- **Journalistic interviews**

Key informants from various stakeholder groups will be asked open-ended questions regarding proposed reform and issues related to reform objectives. These interviewees will come from a broad sample of interest groups, and will be asked to represent their own point of view as well as that of the larger groups to which they belong.

- **Using narrative communication formats**

Situating reform efforts in the larger cultural environments requires modes of communication that can capture the depth and breadth of human experience. For this, reform narratives should be created and presented through theatre and film productions as well as short story formats.

- **Training local stakeholders to effectively engage authorities**

It is imperative that individuals and organizations on the ground are equipped to engage people of authority at the local, state, and national levels. Training programs should include modules in leadership, negotiation, and understanding governance structures.

Feedback from Participants' Response Cards

The content of information that is communicated is usually biased/not acceptable to those opposing the program of reforms. How can one deal with the legitimacy of a government to provide acceptable/convincing information for communication? (Krhoda)

If promoting better governance risks being perceived as politically motivated, and hence threatening, does it make sense to promote it for its own sake, as a norm or standard that provides tangible benefits in education, healthcare, etc? After all, backers do set criteria for lending. Communicating more clearly about these norms and standards could generate a healthy emulation and take some of the politics out of the equation. Building legitimacy around the norms should deflect some of the antagonism created by the perception that the Bank is "interventionist". (de Quelen)

We should not underestimate the human dimension of policymakers responsible for policy reforms. 100% of politicians want to be re-elected, 99.5% of them would like to become prime minister or president. I am not at all convinced that politicians/decision makers are fully knowledgeable about the untapped opportunities and support they may get from their own constituencies. When they get to power they "inherit" vested interests. We can use communication in an opportunistic "politically sensitive" way to break this crystallized cycle and expand the horizons of politicians to better balance short- and long-term objectives and make better use of their power to enable processes of change involving the masses. The economic interests then will react and adapt to the change, readjusting the balance of power and reflecting the views of a much higher and better represented group of people/interests. (Mazzei)

Political analysis should be broader in its scope and go beyond being a simple information piece for the communication strategy, but rather be used as a tool to assess the reform, identifying obstacles and possible alternatives to technical solutions. Yet the political analysis needs to also include elements informing future communication strategies. (Santi)

Can political analysis help us identify who we need to communicate with, and what kinds of communication are needed (given the embedded nature of politics in the context)? Can political analysis



help us understand the different pressures we will face in different stages of a reform intervention and who, how communication can help us through those pressures? (Andrews)

Do the analysis BEFORE a communication campaign is employed, paying special attention to cultural considerations and potential negative outcomes. (Post)

Determine which stakeholder groups are essential to reform; determine self-interest of stakeholder groups then educate them; form coalitions of like-minded stakeholders; weaken, fragment, dispirit or convert opponent stakeholder groups; take the rest of the week off. (Masty)

Analysis of winners and losers and how perceived losers can be persuaded. How to reconcile polar opposite views on the reform agenda. (Anwar Shah)

Maybe a more useful way of framing the question would be: "How do we use political analysis and communication research to guide communication and the overall strategy to support governance reform?" (Mefalopulos)

Political analysis and communication are essentially the same thing just different ends of a continuum. Therefore, communication needs to be integral to governance reform programs. (Mitchell)

How to define the spectrum of activities that fall under political analysis and provide operational advice to Bank teams working on governance reform as to what sort of analysis is optimal to their circumstances. (Jorgensen)

Political analysis shows us that the economic playing field is not uniform or even. There are many players/stakeholders with contesting interests. Dialogue is not a panacea, but if employed strategically it can be used in the attempt to reconcile differences and sometimes to reduce resentments when stakeholder expectations are not fully met. (Jacobson)

We need to move beyond thinking of political analysis as being a stage we need to go through before developing a communication strategy. Rather, both need to happen simultaneously and we need to recognize that they intertwine in different configurations over time. Explore the living connection between them over time. Political analysis is communication analysis, in the sense that the stories people tell and the language they use reveal the political and power dimensions of a community. (Barge)

Find a way to collect more voices that are trying to participate in the political reform process. Listen to the thousands of actors [?] blogs, websites, message boards, list-serves and other means enabled by ICT. The voices you hear will be the voices of the young and those on the fringes but also the voices of the future. (Noble)

Recognizing that opposition groups go deeper than political opposition and/or issue oppositions, and in order to strengthen subsidiarity, it is critical to focus on unheard and under-represented groups and thereby recognize that using the journalist function (a professional journalist is not needed) to capture case studies as critical listening and analytic data, and also respecting such groups, is a critical element in a non-static analysis. (Cohen)

Critical that political analysis is dynamic not static. It should be started early and repeated often. It should map all key interest groups and establish the "rules of the game" – the deep structure/context. For political analysis to be effective, it must employ local knowledge and local expertise. (Uzzell)

Political analysis should be based on information that comes from the field (country) not applying a template. However, you need a methodology to organize all the information that usually is messy. Awareness of this approach from World Bank staff in the country should be very helpful. Keep in mind that politicians are acting on and looking for short-term goals so political analysis could change rapidly. (Ausejo)

At the Bank we do use it "dialogically" and sometimes for a monologic purposes (to throw in two terms used this morning).

Create platforms for consensus building to strengthen the interface of state and non-state actors. Take stock of national vision, presidential manifestos, and mid-term poverty reduction and investment programs as input material for political analysis. Identify reform champions as communication agents, and



take stock of political and governance structures as well as arrangements. (Malinga)

I don't think the question has actually been addressed in the session. To even begin to answer, I would unpack the question: Which specific governance reforms are we talking about? Effective judiciary and support for rule of law? A strong civil society? An ethical, non-corrupt leadership? Then, pick one: for instance voice and influence of civil society, and think specifically about the political analysis involved: Who are the actors? Where are the institutional avenues? Organizational capacity? Advocacy capacity? Inclusion/representativeness of civil society leaders? Sustainability of CSOs? Relationship with government and donors? Then, within the resulting analysis, determine where a communication strategy can have the most strategic influence. That's just the beginning. (Kalathil)

The Bank works with governments, with serving administrations, and needs to learn and understand that reform processes should and will outlive a government. Political analysis should be used to shape a communication strategy that makes reform allies beyond the current government/administration and makes the reform agenda a national priority with shared ownership by a wide spectrum of political actors. (MacLean)

Understanding the social and cultural context through political analysis is essential. Too much analysis prior to a project is done by economists. Be robust. Do not believe all you are told. Clients often trade one donor off against another. Include the opposition – today's champion could be voted out tomorrow and the project could collapse because opposition despises all that has gone before. (Usher)

Recognize and avoid static political analysis. Seek to understand local issues; drill down to the people on the ground through informed contacts and cover all interest groups. Employ case stories as well as case studies; and expand stakeholder analysis to include the diaspora. (Lardner)

As I was one of the presenters for this session, I was happy to see my ideas of dialogic communication resonate with everyone. It now opens spaces for deliberation and problem-solving at all stages of project implementation, even where the initial parameters are set. This for me is the analytics. Practically and methodologically, I think that a set of valid and reliable techniques can be used to initiate and sustain dialogues. These include: narrative-based approaches prior to and during dialogues (e.g., storytelling); elite interviews (with formal training); dramatization and role play; and locating capacity and resources through mapping of civil society and government. (Singh)

Relate different levels of political analysis: 1.) Structured process – impact of development on social groups, differentiate between those advantaged and those disadvantaged in the process in order to 2.) identify the main political problems that can be seen to emerge from predicaments and contradictions of 1 above; 3.) Understand through intensive field study how affected groups narrate their predicaments and the ways that narrative creates knowledge and power; 4.) differentiate between levels of problems and linkages between active and latent groups, leading to programmatic strategies. (Apter)

In a symphony orchestra you have a Conductor (team leader with reform agenda); Orchestra (various stakeholders), Notes (political analysis/communication strategy). Without the notes, you will just hear noise. With the right notes, you will hear wonderful music. (David)

Understand the actors and their motivations. Use this to develop an initial communication strategy that can help build a ground-up demand for reform. Keep track of the actors, new players and the impact of the reform on them. Use this to refine the reform and communication tactics as you go along (Lal).

SESSION TWO

Session two focused on securing political will demonstrated by broad leadership support for change. More specifically, the session aimed to draw out the best methods for reaching out to political leaders, policy makers, and legislators in the reform process. Also, the importance of cultivating broader support from mass publics was discussed.

The first speaker presented a model of governance reform that identifies what are often found to be necessary conditions for successful reform efforts. According to this model, spaces for reform are found in the intersection of the following: acceptance of reform objectives by leaders, ability of



reform managers to implement policy changes, and organizational structures investing reformers with requisite authority.

The second speaker underscored the need to clearly differentiate political will from public will. She also drew linkages between securing political will and the potential contributions of theory and research in communication, policy studies, and the allied social sciences. In particular, she discussed agenda-building dynamics, public opinion processes, and the agenda-setting function of the media.

The third speaker emphasized the notion that politicians are stakeholders themselves and have their own self interests. Reform efforts, therefore, should address these interests when possible. Also, leaders whose interests coincide with reform objectives can be found both within and outside formal structures of governance.

The following points were raised during the plenary discussion following the presentations: First, while self interest of leaders and other informal decision makers plays a large part in cultivating political will, a place at the table should be reserved for altruism and the desire to do good for its own sake. Second, political will can be sustained by way of accountability mechanisms that anchor performance evaluation on specific reform targets. Third, a distinction must be made between political will exercised within the rules of the game (e.g., liberal democracy) and political will employed in the pursuit of totalitarian designs. Fourth, participatory dialogic approaches are oftentimes imagined to bring about warm and friendly outcomes but theories of dialogue do not presume like purposes among interlocutors. Contention arising from such encounters could lead to fragmentation and dissipation of political will. Fifth, reformers should find ways in which diasporas, who perceive the home country from a distance, can provide information regarding the country's standing in the world. Reformers can use this information and invoke international norms in support of reforms. Lastly, political will should be seen as an *outcome of*, and not a mere *input to* coalitions.

Summary of Presentations

Matthew Andrews of Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government presented a model for reform that incorporates acceptance, ability, and authority as its three primary elements. Andrews suggested that reforms often fail because of a lack of commitment, political will, and capacity. Conversely, reforms are successful when opportunity spaces open up due to the confluence of the following: acceptance that there exists a problem requiring a solution; people who are willing to carry out reforms have the requisite ability to do so; and that organizational structures invest these people with the necessary authority.

Andrews broadly defined politicians to include elected officials, bureaucrats, CSO/NGO leaders, and people of relative means and influence from other sectors of society. The likelihood of successful reform is based less on what these politicians say and more on what they do. Reform spaces enable political action, and failure is usually associated with the lack of such openings.

While reform spaces are necessary conditions for successful reforms, they are not sufficient. Politicians must be convinced to lend their support and for this to occur, the backing of reform champions and their networks is vital. There is also the need for connectors who link these champions with each other, since politicians rarely step out on their own. Andrews contends that politicians willing to support change are not as rare as widely believed, but they require interpersonal linkages with like-minded others to emerge from the woodwork.

Michigan State University's **Lori Ann Post** made a case for the need to clearly differentiate between political will and public will. According to Post, political will is closely associated with the interests of elites, while public will pertains to the desires of mass publics. Reform campaigns are sometimes initiated from the top-down via political will, and at other times from the bottom-up,



with public will brought to bear in cultivating political will. Regardless of a reform's origin, interested parties must define the issue, raise the policy profile, and drive policy implementation.

Post contends that problems in governance are socially constructed, and it is therefore essential to determine public perception of such problems. Knowledge of these perceptions will enable reform agents to define a policy problem and provide examples that resonate with public perceptions. Strengthening an argument in support of reform requires evidence, such as statistical data, that serve to reinforce chosen definitions. Finally, a solution framed by the chosen problem definition should be proposed (e.g., propose a global solution to a global problem). Drawing on social science research will inform these efforts. Relevant areas of study include agenda building and setting, framing, and public opinion processes.

According to Adam Smith International's **Steve Masty**, it is not possible to create political will, only to create conditions that will facilitate it. Political will, argued Masty, can only come from within a person. If to be harnessed toward governance reform, political will has dimensions that require serious consideration, such as the individual personalities of reform leaders and conditions under which these leaders operate. Also, reformers must remain cognizant of the fact that politicians are stakeholders themselves.

Masty suggests that if politicians do not have, or do not display political will, other people in parallel systems of governance (e.g., trusted community leaders) can serve as reform advocates. It is essential to identify leaders who will support reform by taking stock of their own self interests. Cultivating political will requires identifying these self interests, building coalitions among leaders, and shifting the balance of power toward sustainable reform.

Approaches and Techniques

The following is a list of approaches and techniques toward securing political will as demonstrated by broad leadership support for change.

Approaches

- **Open up spaces for reform**

Spaces for reform are found in the intersection of three factors: acceptance of the reform by interest group leaders; the ability of middle managers to carry out the reform's prescriptions; and that these managers wield sufficient authority to bring about change. When these three factors overlap, then the likelihood of a successful reform effort increases.

Techniques associated with this approach include the following: generate broad acceptance among leaders of reform objectives; ensure that middle managers have the ability to carry out reform; and ensure that organizational structures provide authority to reformers.

- **Establish interpersonal linkages among reform-minded leaders**

This approach prescribes that reform-minded leaders be linked to each other via "connectors", i.e., people whose social networks span what may be disparate communities of practice. Based on a belief that these leaders will be willing to risk political and social capital if they know they will not be alone in supporting change, it is imperative to establish linkages among them throughout the reform process in order to sustain leadership support. It is possible that the connector role will be played by various individuals at different stages of the reform effort.

This approach can be implemented through the following techniques: gain the support of reform champions and connectors; and ensure that organizational structures provide authority to reformers.



- **Harness public will to generate political will**

Clearly differentiating public will from political will is essential in harnessing the former in support of the latter. Cultivating public will through agenda building processes and raising issue salience will enable political will to emerge. Driving policy change requires sensitivity to the issue attention cycle and securing political support for preferred policy solutions. Through these interlinked processes, the desires of constituencies (public will) will create a reform-oriented environment that will place pressure on leaders to support reforms.

This approach can be implemented by the following techniques: harnessing the dynamics of agenda building and framing processes; securing consistent and intensive media coverage; and gaining the support of reform champions and connectors.

- **Recognize leaders as stakeholders**

The idea that leaders are stakeholders stems from the belief that self interest is the primary driver in political life. In this view, leaders will be convinced about lending their support to reform efforts if cast in terms of their own self interests. Key to this approach is mapping out incentives and disincentives among leadership groups, and identifying common themes as well as discontinuities. Armed with this knowledge, persuasive messages can then be crafted in order to obtain leadership support.

Techniques associated with this approach include: harnessing agenda building and framing processes; securing consistent and intensive media coverage; and generating broad acceptance among leaders of reform objectives.

Techniques

- **Map agenda building dynamics**

Understanding the ways in which issues earn their places on policy agendas equips the reformer with the capacity to bring resources to bear in support of this objective. The two principles underpinning this technique are scarcity of space on the policy agenda and the need to refresh perceptions of the policy in order to hold attention of various stakeholders. Implied by these two principles is that a reform initiative must supplant other initiatives and must be redefined when necessary in order to maintain stakeholder interest.

- **Frame problem in terms of the sought after reform**

Once a problem has been framed (defined) in terms supportive of the reform effort, evidence ranging from anecdotes to statistical data and analysis should subsequently be presented in support of this frame. Suggested policy solutions should likewise address the problem based on the frame adopted.

- **Convince media practitioners/journalists to support reform objectives and provide media-friendly messages to secure consistent and intensive media coverage**

Members of the public rank issues on the policy agenda based in large part on the issue agenda of the news media, i.e., what the news media present as the most important issues of the day drive audience perceptions and opinions on relative issue importance. It is essential, therefore, to convince media practitioners of the rightness of the cause and communicate the reform's arguments in media friendly terms (e.g., celebrity endorser, personal examples, sound bites). According to some communication scholars, in order to gain traction in the public mind, reformers should attempt to maintain media coverage of the issue as an important news item for at least five to seven weeks.



- **Persuade leaders to adopt reform objectives as their own**

Acceptance of a reform initiative is requisite to understanding the objectives and technicalities of the initiative. It is necessary, therefore, for leaders to gain in-depth understanding of these issues. They should also be asked to share their concerns about the reform and if possible, these concerns should be incorporated in revision of goals and objectives. To facilitate the scaling up of the process, leaders should be considered members of communities of practice who may very well share interests with others who are in similar positions of influence.

- **Change work routines to enable middle managers to carry out reform policies**

While middle managers generally wish to stay in the good graces of senior managers who champion reform, it is possible that the prescriptions of an endorsed reform initiative do not fall within the limits of middle managers' abilities. For example, new procedures may take too much time or put the middle manager in a tough position among subordinates and clients. It is imperative therefore, that reform agents and senior managers consult with middle managers, who are usually the implementers on the ground, about whether reform components are feasible and practical.

- **Change organizational structures to provide reform-minded politicians the requisite authority to carry out reform policies**

In addition to being within the limits of organizational capacities, a reform initiative must fit the organizational structure, particularly in terms of whether individuals tasked to carry out reform components are vested with the requisite authority to implement change initiatives. Deficiencies in authority need to be addressed prior to reform implementation.

- **Identify and enlist support of reform champions and connectors**

In order to raise awareness among leadership circles, support from high-level champions in elected posts as well as the bureaucracy needs to be secured. These people should lend their prestige and visibility to the reform initiative throughout the project cycle. "Connectors" who will provide interpersonal linkages among reform-minded champions should also be identified and brought in as partners in the reform initiative. High visibility and peer support are both necessary in generating excitement and sustaining commitments in reform efforts.

Feedback from Participants' Response Cards

Build stakeholder demand for change and politicians will respond accordingly. (Masty)

Political will is tied to pressure. Pressure is not a bad thing, as it creates an environment where new learning can occur. Pay attention to institutions and organizations that can create pressure that other groups cannot or will not exercise. (Barge)

Follow the "What's in it for me" formula. Show impact of legislators' constituents on the kind of support or lack of support; provide various forces (NGOs, etc.) to show that the legislator is not alone in the quest for reform; provide opportunities for greater discussion off the Congress floor with various stakeholders (this will allow for gradual meeting of minds); put administration and opposition legislators into a race to show who are the true reform champions.

Politicians are valuable for what they do. We need to identify who we need and what they need to do to create space for reform. A key ingredient is coalition building and networks. A key figure in the networks is the 'connector'...helping this person to communicate is critical. (Andrews)

Understand the various contending forces that can create the space for reform. Understand and exploit the fact that self interests drive stakeholders who in turn drive politicians. Consider that enlightened self interest fairly approximates reforms. (Lardner)



I would enlarge the question to include CSOs (including NGOs & CBOs). What they are thinking about, organizing around and acting on in concert creates demand-driven reform. Political will comes out of people engaged in serious dialogue who do not agree but expect and want to deal with an urgent public problem. Getting to the point of decisionmakers acting requires a willingness on their part to be listeners. That mostly requires organized pressure. (Cohen)

I doubt that there are general answers to these questions. Too much depends on time, place, manner, and quality of leadership. To answer the question as it stands would produce bland self-evident ideas. Give us a case. Be specific.

One must begin with the view of the individual or group as having or not having an interest. Interests develop through a process of knowing and information processing. Dialogic communication can start from the premise that a pro- or anti-reform person may have multiple or ill-defined interests, which can be mobilized or not to speak to the problem in question. (Singh)

The political leadership quite often is not aware of some of the problems facing the country. Dialogue and sharing correct information are important for gaining support if it is in the best interest of stakeholders.

Translate aspirational vision ideas into concrete things that make a difference for your beneficiaries. It's got to mean something to them within a reasonable amount of time. Translate policy into specific tangible, measurable results.

Crisis will develop the conditions for political will, expressed by broad leadership (and followship) support for change. Political competition and the vote are the best ways to reach out to political leaders, etc.

By better linking the political leaders sphere with the grassroots voice/needs and demands. A two step process: 1.) facilitating dialogue at a decentralized level which establishes platforms for dialogue of standing nature which can be 2) translated back to the policymaking level.

Looking for political will among leaders is a short-term strategy. Looking for political will among the public citizenry is a longer-term strategy. A responsive representative democracy has a longer-term strategy, recognizing that the latter drive the former. I should think that the Bank would look for will among the citizens. If it's not there, then self-interest among the leadership will be found elsewhere, with any luck.

All development is political – a failure to recognize this fact will seriously affect the success of programs. By appealing to the self-interest of individuals – be they politicians, policymakers or legislators – it should be possible to engage interest and support for change. Political will cannot be created, only the conditions for political will to succeed. All politicians have stakeholder groups they are accountable to. By understanding key stakeholder concerns and matching these against development goals it should be possible to make the case to politicians as to why they should support dialogue. (Uzzell)

By ensuring that information flows now only from the top down but from the bottom up; that there is accountability to the people for satisfying and addressing the needs they have expressed. (Papagiannis)

We can't create political will but we can create the conditions for it.

Explicitly recognize that leaders and indeed those who are led are best motivated by self-interest. Therefore, we need to align change with politician's/bureaucrats' self-interest. (Usher)

By appearing on the national media's agenda.

Connect them with other reform-minded politicians and groups (civil society/private sector) to show them there is a critical mass supporting change. Pro-reform people, constituencies are traditionally disorganized against vested interests. (de Quelen)

Understand the incentives. Make sure stakeholders understand the problem so there is pressure for reform; the pressure will create the political will. The best methods for reaching out to political leaders is through media, influencers, and directly. (Lal)

It ultimately lies with empowering and educating the people as to how to effectively act in society in their own self-interest. Empowerment + education = action.



“Walk the talk”. There should be a change champion with capacity of power brokerage. Create forums/platforms for consensus building, improve feedback mechanisms, including constructive criticism. Explain a national development action which has a relevant and appropriate desired state. It should be qualitative and quantitative. (Malinga)

Private sector techniques (marketing/communication/sales) have already been adapted to health issues. Social marketing aims at influencing the voluntary behavior of a target group. It is now time to develop those techniques further and adapt them to political/economic reforms. See paper by Andreasen and Herzberg, *Social Marketing for Economic Reform*. Resource allocation decisions were not discussed in the session, but deserve some thought: where would you put your money or political capital on this matrix, if you had to distribute 100 points?

		Issue Predisposition		
		For	Undecided	Against
Likelihood to Engage	Very	A	B	C
	Maybe	D	E	F
	No	G	H	I

Diaspora – outside leaders demonstrate their commonness by discussions of shared problems. Politicians – self interest, altruism, enlightened self-interest, public good, economic change ratings (e.g., Moody’s). In many developing nations, the leaders live in fear for their lives; for brokers of change, the possibility of alienating key opposition leaders beyond the point that negotiation is no longer an option. Thus, approaching political leaders is simply not enough; one must incorporate the opposition. The change movement must bring all players to the table or risk being a pawn in the internal struggle for power. If the reform organizer can broker change, where each major constituency faction has a significant benefit to call its own, then you have an opportunity to create lasting change, at least on the elite level. Secondly, depending on the media philosophy (they must be courted) of the country, one must engage media simultaneously, feeding them stories for all groups.

SESSION THREE

The third session addressed the challenge of gaining the support of public sector middle managers, who are often the strongest opponents of change, and fostering among them a stronger culture of public service.

The session featured theoretical frameworks as well as practical solutions to dealing with the issue of generating the support of middle managers for reform. The first speaker presented the concept of appreciative inquiry. This approach calls for seeing the change process from the perspective of middle managers as a first step towards tackling this issue. The speaker emphasized the need to frame issues positively, build on the achievements of the organization to spur forward movement, and create a space for middle managers to actively participate in and contribute to the change process, instead of being pawns and scapegoats for senior management. This would empower middle managers, encouraging them to not only support reform, but also own it.

The second speaker talked about the situation in Peru where the lack of knowledge of strategic communication and lack of strong leadership support prevented middle managers from being effective change agents. He urged that middle managers be trained in strategic communication and given leadership support to enable them to take risks, make mistakes, and develop innovative solutions.



The third speaker talked about Rwanda's experience in public sector reform and presented a demand-driven approach to empowering middle managers in reform and engendering support for reform among them. He emphasized the importance of the commitment of senior management, empowerment of middle managers to effect change, and broad-base consensus for change among both internal and external stakeholders as the techniques to help tackle this challenge.

Much of the plenary discussion focused on the tension between the monologic and dialogic communication approaches. Participants agreed that context matters, and that different contexts require different communication approaches, whether used in isolation, in tandem, or sequentially. There was consensus that the discussion is not so much about the efficacy of the monologic or dialogic approach under different circumstances, but about how best to use the available approaches to garner support of middle managers for reform. As J. Kevin Barge explained, it is about "creating a context in which our actions are viewed as making a contribution," and how we "engage with different frameworks to bring life to the system." Reform is ultimately about change. Providing middle managers with space to be effective in the change process not only generates their support and ownership of change, but also helps foster among them a stronger culture of public service.

Summary of Presentations

J. Kevin Barge of the University of Georgia presented the approach of working appreciatively, or appreciative inquiry, which is an example of dialogic communication. He began the presentation by outlining the reasons why middle managers resist change. In a public administration system, middle managers are literally caught in the middle between upper management and lower level employees. While middle managers are tasked with implementing change, they are not the creators of change, which leaves them without a clear vision of the future—or, as Barge calls, the "memory of the future"—needed to guide them to the end objective. Thus, the change process presents them with ambiguity and uncertainty, leaving middle managers feeling disempowered, vulnerable, and frustrated, and leading them to resist change. In addition, the traditional, problem-focused approach to implementing change is essentially a "blame discourse" focusing on execution failures. As middle managers are the ones tasked to execute, talk of reform only increases the level of defensiveness in middle managers.

Appreciative inquiry is a departure from this traditional approach to change, focusing instead on what already works well, as well as on achievements, social capital, and competencies. It frames issues affirmatively, asking what people do well and what they take pride in, and building on it. It also enables the creation of space for middle managers by involving them in conversations and asking them to participate in developing their vision of the future. To illustrate, Barge discussed the case of the US Navy Appreciative Inquiry Summit where the approach was applied. It was a success because the approach was based on the principle of inclusion, listening and learning from both internal and external stakeholders, and recognizing that "multiple expertise" exists.

Flavio Ausejo, an independent consultant, presented a leadership-driven and cooperative approach to the challenge. Ausejo suggested that two ways to gain support of middle managers for reform include changing the way in which they engage with the population by training them in strategic communication, and giving them administrative support. Support can come in the form of time, as middle managers are normally too busy with day-to-day business to focus on reform, as well as in explicit commitment for reform coming from the senior level. Such support is needed for middle managers to take risks, feel free to make mistakes, and try new and innovative approaches. Strong leadership is also needed to guide middle managers and for them to feel that they are working not in isolation but in cooperation.

Peter Malinga of the Government of Rwanda presented a demand-driven, partnership approach focused on the empowerment of middle managers, augmented by explicit senior management commitment. He cited five possible reasons for middle managers' resistance to change, including:



apathy, political inclination, inadequate ownership induced by supply-driven change agenda, weak capacity, and human and financial resource constraints. Malinga then described the experience of Rwanda, which has been implementing various public sector reforms since 1994. Rwanda has advocated for civil servants to work towards results like private sector shareholders. Rwanda has also developed a new capacity building framework, and obtained senior management buy-in through networking and middle management ownership through consultations and capacity-building.

Malinga suggested seven techniques to generating support of middle managers for reform, including gaining senior management commitment, understanding the nature of organizational culture, providing change drivers with sufficient power and authority, getting the recognition by internal and external stakeholders of the need to change, securing a credible change champion, obtaining human and financial resources to effect change, and acknowledging successful change efforts.

Approaches and Techniques

The following is a list of approaches and techniques for dealing with the challenge of generating the support of middle managers for reform, and fostering among them a stronger culture of public service.

Approaches

- **Work appreciatively (Appreciative Inquiry)**

The concept of appreciative inquiry, or working appreciatively, is an example of a dialogic approach to achieving reform by consensus. It is based on a commitment to be inclusive and guided by three principles: 1) appreciation of the expertise brought by all stakeholders; 2) focusing on the positive and what already works in an organization; and 3) collective development of a vision for the future.

This approach represents a fundamental departure from the traditional approaches to change agencies, which focus on the problems, leading to a blame discourse. Instead, appreciative inquiry shifts the attention to what works well. Appreciative inquiry has the potential to enable a dynamic culture change within an organization by empowering middle managers to own the change process and become the agents of change.

The techniques that can support this approach include: principle of inclusion and appreciation for multiple expertise; framing the dialogue positively to create forward movement; creation of space for visioning, experimentation, and innovation; sense of teamwork and collective responsibility; and creating momentum for reform.

- **Shock therapy, or frank talk**

Shock therapy, or frank talk, is an example of a monologic approach that involves senior management making a decision and communicating that decision to the lower ranks in a top-down fashion. Despite its negative reputation, the monologic approach is legitimate and more appropriate than the dialogic approach in cases where the reform objective has already been pre-determined, or where the capacity of the middle management is low. Specifically with respect to addressing the challenge of building middle management support for reform, the use of monologic communication may work more effectively in situations where the civil service is known to be dysfunctional or corrupt. A strong message from the leadership that sends the message that it is serious about reform can be an effective instrument for generating support for change among middle managers.



The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include strong leadership commitment to reform and clear roles and responsibilities within organizations.

- **Combine monologic and dialogic approaches**

There are situations in which the use of a combination of monologic and dialogic approaches would be most suitable in generating the support of middle managers for change. Several variations of the combination approach include: 1) the use of the monologic approach to set the broad parameters, followed by dialogue, 2) the employment of monologue as an input to the dialogue, and 3) the application of the two at different stages of the reform process.

The first two variations are about sequencing. In using monologue followed by dialogue, senior management can set the broad parameters for change, but allows the real dialogue to emerge at the middle management level. The approach to use monologue as an input to the dialogue would be appropriate if the capacity of middle managers and other stakeholders is initially too low to produce a meaningful dialogue right away. In this case, the more capable stakeholders can guide the discussion in a monologic manner until the capacity of middle managers can be sufficiently raised, paving the way for the dialogic approach to take over. The third variation is the use of the monologic and dialogic approaches at different stages of the reform process. In the Philippines procurement reform project, for example, both the monologic and dialogic approaches were employed at various times depending on which approach was deemed more appropriate.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach are as follows: guide the debate when the capacity is low; principle of inclusion and appreciation for “multiple expertise;” strong leadership commitment to reform; clear roles and responsibilities within organizations; build capacity of middle managers; and create momentum for reform.

Techniques

- **Involve stakeholders and appreciate “multiple expertise” in implementing reform**

This technique is about involving all relevant stakeholders in the reform process. At its core are the acknowledgement of and appreciation for the wisdom that everyone brings to the table. The technique also calls for listening deeply to concerns of all stakeholders, both internal and external, and embracing the opportunity to learn from the critics.

Consulting and involving middle managers in the reform process help position the approach in such a way as to fully engage middle managers as the agents of change and empower them in the process, thus creating a sense of ownership and buy-in among them.

- **Frame the dialogue positively to create forward movement**

This technique emphasizes that discussions about change be focused on areas of excellence in an organization, that is, what already works well as opposed to what does not. Framing the dialogue affirmatively, the technique leads stakeholders to identify what they take pride in and building on it as they try to move forward in making improvements within their organization.

This particular technique develops the positive core to accentuate the middle managers' achievements, positive wisdom, social capital, and competencies. It results in stretching their imaginations and expanding on their capacity to achieve tangible results.

- **Create opportunities for visioning, experimentation, and innovation**

A technique for securing buy in and ownership of middle managers for reform is to create space and opportunities for them to develop their own vision of the organization's future, instead of



merely executing what upper management says. This image of the future is what Barge calls the “memory of the future,” needed to guide middle managers to the end objective of reform. By giving middle managers the responsibility to develop their own vision for the future, the collective envisioning exercise enables them to have a clear understanding of the direction in which to move their organization. This technique tackles the challenge of inadequate ownership of reform by middle managers due to reform being supply-driven as opposed to demand-driven.

In addition, creating space also means allowing middle managers to take risks, make mistakes, and develop new approaches based on lessons learned from those mistakes. It is all a part of building an enabling environment, in which experimentation and innovation are the norm, and open dialogue and feedback lead to constant improvements in the overall change process.

- **Foster a sense of teamwork and collective responsibility**

Instilling in middle managers a sense of teamwork, a sense of “all of us in this together,” and working in cooperation as opposed to isolation creates ownership of reform and positive dynamics in general. The concept of collective responsibility is a powerful tool to energize and mobilize a group of people.

- **Signal leadership commitment to reform to demonstrate political will**

Strong leadership commitment is necessary for middle managers to not only know that the reform has real support and hence their efforts at change would be fully backed, but also get guidance from the leadership. Leadership could show its commitment to reform by sending a strong message, clearly articulating its recognition of the need to change and its will to effect that change. It was suggested that for middle managers, it would also be useful to have a change champion, as well as access to power brokers.

- **Define clear roles and responsibilities within organizations**

Middle managers need to have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities, as well as those of other partners involved in the reform effort. Toward this end, middle managers should be involved in the crafting of their own Terms of Reference, and be given information about who is responsible for which aspect of the reform. Once the roles and responsibilities of each individual are clearly spelled out, it is imperative that the middle manager be given sufficient power and authority to implement change.

It was suggested that the establishment of a change institution that coordinates change efforts may also be helpful in guiding reform.

- **Train middle managers in cross-level, horizontal interactions and strategic communication, and develop a holistic capacity-building framework**

One of the major constraints faced in generating support for change among middle managers is their lack of capacity to be active and effective change agents.

The first area in which middle managers need training is in the concept of interacting with other middle managers. In many countries, due to the government’s organizational structure or cultural traditions, middle managers neither talk to each other nor believe that they are allowed to do so. It would be useful to teach and encourage cross-level, horizontal interactions among middle managers, which could lead to further mobilization, not to mention information diffusion, awareness-raising, innovation, and partnerships.

Other suggestions for capacity building included training middle managers in strategic communication to interact more effectively with the public, and developing a capacity-building



framework that is multi-sectoral in nature, in contrast to the traditional ad-hoc, stand-alone programs.

- **Use a set of recommendations to guide dialogue with middle managers when their capacity is low**

Low capacity levels of middle managers can hamper their effective engagement in dialogue about change. Sometimes discussions must be guided from the more capable stakeholders to ensure that the resulting decisions are derived from meaningful and informed exchange of ideas.

In a decentralization project in Albania, a technique of using both the monologic and dialogic approaches was used to address this challenge. A panel of experts produced “options papers,” outlining various options that the stakeholders could choose from, as a starting point for guiding the stakeholders in discussions about reform. These options papers helped raise awareness and understanding of the lesser informed stakeholders, enabling them to participate more effectively in conversations.

- **Use educational and awareness-raising materials to create momentum for reform**

Once momentum starts to build, it is difficult to stop and even more difficult still to reverse. In the Philippines procurement reform, support for reform among middle managers gained momentum, helped by the clever and gradual use of educational awareness-raising materials. Initially, the project team packaged the salient features of the new procurement bill into screensavers, which turned out to be a very effective awareness-raising tool to inform middle managers about the reform. Video-based tutorials with more information about the law were produced, providing middle managers with more information and preparing them for dialogue. This was followed by workshops, which provided middle managers an opportunity for real exchange.

Legislators, seeing the support of middle managers, felt pressured to support the bill themselves. The reform process was able to mobilize support and create momentum for reform to the point that those who did not back the bill were seen as corrupt. Creating momentum for reform is a powerful enabler for generating and sustaining middle manager support that is necessary to carry out reform.

Feedback from Participants' Response Cards

Involve them as a full partner in the process of deciding what reforms to undertake.

They have to credibly believe that reform is necessary, inevitable, and ultimately useful for the majority of them.

Establish a critical mass within the middle level managers and ensure that you have political support for such a change. Use appreciative inquiry to build stronger support.

Are they the strongest opponents to change? Or is it the structures in which they find themselves that limit their authority to engage, contribute and change?

Avoid overloading middle managers with reform agenda. Consider providing them bite-size information to gradually show them how the reform can impact their lives. Help them accept joint ownership of the reform agenda by allowing mechanisms to listen to their areas of concern. Approach? Monologue/dialogue/shock treatment can be used as required. Think of using a set of golf clubs, each one has a purpose. (David)

Continuously generate an inspiring memory of the future. Keep your eye on the ball – reform – not just dialogue for its own sake.

Manage discussions from getting carried away by balancing political considerations with expert options.



Recognize that we need to create energy and momentum in the system to create change. This means using monologue and dialogue in ways that honor people's contributions and enable collaboration and forward movement. (Barge)

Humanize the public sector managers and understand the context and conditions under which they live and work. Use a mix of monologue and dialogic communication techniques to work through the process and goals but also remain flexible as the process and goals change. (Singh)

A combination of dialogue and monologue should be employed to engage middle managers. To some extent "strong man" leadership is often critical together with effective engagement, dialogue and understanding. By seeking to understand concerns together with a development agenda it should be possible to engage middle management. The context must dictate the most appropriate engagement mechanism. (Uzzell)

Don't approach the task as "reform", as they may be more likely to react and form barriers. Instead, frame it as an issue of "improving", "expanding" and "enhancing" on issues that resonate with middle managers.

Many middle managers are cynical about change because they have seen many failed initiatives imposed from above with which they have no involvement. They should be tasked with owning reform, otherwise they will stop reform using the "say yes and do nothing" tactic. Secondly, they fear reform because they do not have the skills required to operationalize policy. The paralyzing effect of fear can be diminished by training.

It's about incentives. Focus on constructing a series of incentives for the desired behavior that sequentially reinforce each other toward the ultimate reform outcome.

Many different strategies are possible but one which has been tried with some success is taking some more interesting managers and giving them a year's leave in a special program that provides intensive training in strategies, budgets, defining problems, evaluation, process, sources of dynamism, larger political and economic context, etc. Of course who designs the program and how it is run....I have some ideas about that. (Apter)

By ensuring that the broader environment for public discourse exists in the country we should not expect middle managers to contribute to the discussion/discourse on reform if there does not already exist certain basic principles/protections for speaking up.

A strategy of culture change in organizations that recognizes that in hierarchical organizations those with authority to create a context of incentives to respect the work of middle managers in their place between the different levels – higher and lower hierarchy at the same time – so that a language and approaches of working appreciatively occurs in the context of creating "a memory of the future". (Cohen)

Different stages of the reform require different approaches. Sometimes, the urgency approach is more useful in order to gain support from public sector middle managers.

Articulately explain the desired state – "change for what?" – the reform package should have the right process of inclusive discussion with the middle managers. Change should be championed/spearheaded in a credible and objective manner. Institutionalize performance management, which should be participatory.

Educate (monologue) on problems to be addressed by reform. Discuss (dialogue) options for reform and build ownership. Introduce case studies as more proof. Introduce incentives and rewards for exceptional support. Use grapevines to convey disincentives for non-cooperation. Create a sense of government will and inevitability of change. Make uncooperative staff feel selfish, putting their own needs above country, children, etc. (Masty)

Set measurable criteria for the program so they can take ownership and pride in activities. Key performance indicators provide an objective framework and motivation. Communicate a sense of momentum and how what they do is part of a broader movement, a bigger wave, make them feel they are part of the mainstream – the future mainstream. (de Quelen)

Ultimately, a directive on top for change (monologic). Teams of facilitators will then engage middle



managers in a series of discussions, with each area or sector. Typically we met with two or three people at a time, with two facilitators and used an oral history approach. Previously we had a key informant to identify each individual, their party affiliation, any known vested interests which they promote. We listened and probed their assumptions. The facilitators played “good cop” (very empathetic)/“bad cop” (critical probing). In this way, an exchange was created, supported by one facilitator and challenged by the other, and in this way the group would find themselves defending the indefensible. Summary meetings of the two facilitators were points of agreement should move forward, those that should be challenged reinvented many civil servants must be protected from party change in government to prevent politically motivated action and/or poor performance.

SESSION FOUR

The fourth session explored the issue of how to build broad coalitions of pro-change influentials, and what to do about powerful vested interests.

The session presented practical recommendations based on experiences from around the world in dealing with the challenge of building coalitions for reform and tackling vested interests. The first speaker presented stakeholder mapping as the primary technique for understanding the local context and developing strategies for building coalitions. The second speaker described the experience of Kenya in implementing water sector reform. He attributed the success of the reform to it being consensus-based and stakeholder driven, as all relevant stakeholders coalesced around the water crisis to support the reform and participate in it. The third speaker called for a partnership paradigm for building coalitions, urging for broader and deeper engagement with civil society, and suggested a number of ways in which this can be achieved.

Both the Kenya water reform and Philippines procurement reform experiences attest to the power of momentum created through coalition-building. In Kenya, the supporters of reform mobilized into a coalition, creating a momentum toward change that was hard to reverse. Similarly, in the Philippines, the entire public administration system had come to back the new procurement bill to the extent that it was not politically feasible to oppose it. In the end, the groups of change agents built an environment where maintaining the status quo was not an option.

Summary of Presentations

Robert de Quelen of EON, a stakeholder relationships firm in the Philippines, presented stakeholder mapping as an approach to finding the sources of influence—the influentials—who “drive reality.” His firm conducts stakeholder mapping, or political analysis, first before any attempts to develop or implement a reform program. A “process of determining the type, degree, tools and context of influences” among stakeholders, stakeholder mapping is a scientific approach based on research with a four-step sequence to 1) identify, 2) locate and profile, 3) engage, and 4) map stakeholders. In conducting the mapping, the objective is to determine the areas of conflict and convergence among the interests held by various stakeholder groups. The findings of this exercise lead to a visual map of dynamics, which shows the flows of influence. In turn, this information becomes the basis on which to develop an integrated stakeholder engagement roadmap.

De Quelen suggested that Information and Communication Technology (ICT) today still cannot push reform effectively, but that it is a good tool to show case studies and potentially mobilize coalitions. In terms of the techniques for building coalitions, he emphasized research as a first step toward building a case for reform and as a repository of norms, case studies, and a benchmarking index. Research should be followed by setting norms, communicating, stakeholder mapping, building key performance indicators, building the case, implementing, and monitoring.

George Krhoda of the University of Nairobi presented a consensus-based, stakeholder-driven approach to building coalitions around a reform. He discussed the experience of Kenya in water resources management, where since the late 1990s chronic water shortages had created a



consensus among the citizenry that a reform was imperative. The new government campaigned on the platform of good governance and improved public service delivery. Under the new government, the water ministry built political awareness about water sector reform to respond to stakeholder demand for action and transparency in the process. Thus, by the time the reform began, water was considered “everyone’s business”. The success of the reform was due to broad-based consensus on the need to reform, stakeholder mobilization around reform, the formation of a policy-making steering committee comprised of key stakeholders, and the establishment of an independent implementation unit free of government manipulation or intervention. As a result, water resource management and service provision was successfully decentralized.

Peter Schechter of Chlopak, Leonard, Schechter and Associates called for a broader and deeper approach to coalition building and stakeholder engagement, keeping in mind that ICT has radically transformed the way in which the world operates. By broader engagement, he meant reaching out to civil society that represents increasingly legitimate and credible voices in public debate, and in so doing, being creative in talking about issues and in identifying like-minded individuals. By deeper civil society engagement in coalition-building, Schechter meant focusing on building partnerships as an outcome of the process of engagement. Finally, he discussed the importance of research as a starting point for a thorough, effective, and meaningful interaction with the civil society. Research makes it possible to identify and test messages, and understand what is or is not politically feasible for creating a powerful coalition that can mobilize for change.

Approaches and Techniques

The following is a list of approaches and techniques for dealing with the challenge of building broad coalitions of pro-change influentials and tackling powerful vested interests.

Approaches

- **Focus on influentials**

This approach seeks to determine the sources of influence, called the influentials, in a society. The influentials, similar to opinion leaders, command a level of respect and authority in their field of expertise and are able to sway opinion of others. Because reform is about changing the status quo, overcoming resistance to and promoting support for change would be better facilitated with the support of influentials for that change.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: research; stakeholder mapping; issue-framing and branding; and raising awareness of key stakeholders on issues.

- **Focus on networks and connectors**

This network-based approach seeks to identify a connector, also known as broker or resource linker, who Matthew Andrews explains “sits at the center of relationships and basically manages constituencies whose engagement is necessary for effective reform.” The connector is an individual in networks who crosses organizational boundaries. Andrews contends that the connector role can be played by various individuals at different stages of the reform effort.

This approach to building coalitions assumes that networks and coalitions already exist and that there are connectors within these networks who wield influence, bring people together, and can effect change. It recognizes the power of the networks and the often invisible connectors within them.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: research; network analysis; consulting directly with the affected parties; creating an enabling environment through



empowering structures and transparency within coalitions; and training technicians in government to work in networks rather than in isolation.

- **Use broad-based coalitions to get on the policy agenda**

Coalitions are powerful when the issues they advocate for reach the top of the policymaking agenda through consensus of affected stakeholders. For example, the success of the coalition-building experience in the Kenya water sector reform can be attributed to the broad-based consensus on the need for reform that pro-change agents were able to generate. From the beginning, the focus of the discussion was on how, not if, to implement the reform.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach are: research; issue-framing, branding, and advocacy; raising awareness of stakeholders on key issues; inclusion and decentralization for ownership and sustainability; creating momentum for change through a sense of urgency and maintaining it; building capacity of all stakeholders to communicate; and using Information and Communications Technology (ICT) appropriate to the local context.

- **Engage and partner with civil society in creative ways**

Increasingly, civil society is seen to represent legitimate and credible voices in public debate and policymaking. This approach takes into account that broader and deeper engagement and partnership with civil society are necessary to build effective coalitions for reform.

Recognizing the need to talk about issues in new and creative ways is particularly important for engaging more broadly with civil society to build coalitions. In working with organizations, the focus should not only be on the process of engagement, but also on the outcomes to be achieved on the basis of partnerships with civil society.

In identifying like-minded individuals for building coalitions, it would be useful to not only pick the easiest and most obvious individuals or groups to mobilize, but also be creative in searching for them, keeping in mind that coalitions are not necessarily issue-specific and may be found in unlikely places. It would also be useful to consider both the national and international NGOs. While the legitimacy of international coalitions is sometimes questioned, they should not be disregarded simply because they are not indigenous. Often vociferous, international coalitions can play an important role mobilizing groups around an issue.

Several techniques to pursuing this approach include: research; issue-framing, branding, and advocacy; creating a new stakeholder group if needed; creating an enabling environment through empowering structures and transparency within coalitions; creating momentum for change through a sense of urgency and maintain it; building capacity of all stakeholders to communicate; and using Information and Communications Technology (ICT) appropriate to the local context.

Techniques

- **Understanding the local context through extensive research**

Conducting research to understand the local context is the first and most important step in any attempts at change. It is critical to go into the reform process without an established set of prescriptions and strive to understand what brings stakeholders together or apart in a particular setting.

In addressing the challenge of building coalitions and tackling vested interests, research identifies the stakeholders, assesses their positions, and determines the political feasibility of interventions. It provides the basis on which to develop a strategy for a thorough and effective engagement with all stakeholders. In terms of designing a strategy for tackling vested interests, it would be



important to talk to the opposition to understand their perspective. Ultimately, the success of any effort at building a powerful coalition that mobilizes for change rests upon the quality of the research.

- **Stakeholder mapping**

As De Quelen explained, stakeholder mapping is a “process of determining the type, degree, tools and context of influences” among stakeholders. It is a research-based technique to find the sources of influence—or influentials—in a given society. Following a four-step sequence to a) identify, b) locate and profile, c) engage, and d) map stakeholders, research defines stakeholder perspectives on a topic, leading to the determination of areas of conflict, convergence, and neutrality among the interests held by various stakeholders. The findings of the research contribute to the development of a visual map of dynamics, showing the flows of influence among stakeholders and leading to the identification of the influentials.

- **Network analysis**

Network analysis is the main technique for identifying the connector, also known as broker or resource linker. This analysis uses interviews to determine who links individuals and groups in an organization or institution. Andrews explained that often connectors are found in the most unlikely places, such as in the Head of Young Auditor’s Association in Georgia, or a cashier in Bolivia. Mapping the system of networks with the connectors would be a useful exercise in starting the process of building coalitions for change.

The basis of network analysis is the understanding that networks and coalitions always exist, and they exist in forms that are not always obvious or intuitive. Sometimes they can be dangerous because they exist in opposition to one’s cause. In assessing the local environment for coalition-building, therefore, it would be important to keep in mind that various types of coalitions exist, they form most often due to resource dependency and uncertainty, and hence they are not necessarily issue-specific. Weak ties as well as informal networks and relationships are also relevant to the discussions about coalitions. It would be useful to consider the strength of these ties when conducting research.

- **Issue-framing and branding of a reform initiative**

Once the messengers have been identified through stakeholder mapping and network analysis, the message needs to be framed appropriately in order to brand an issue. The development of an advocacy strategy would build awareness and promote support for the issue within society. A concrete agenda with measurable goals is needed to give clarity about the coalition’s objectives and activities. In addition, the messenger needs to send a message that gives a clear vision of the reform that would help mobilize affected stakeholders, while being mindful that expectations must be met.

- **Consult directly with the affected parties**

In building coalitions, it is important to cut out intermediaries and consult directly with stakeholders to get their input and ideas. For example, in one of the indigenous peoples programs at the World Bank it was found that, contrary to expectations, indigenous people wanted the private sector, not NGOs, on their decision-making committee.

- **Create a new stakeholder group if needed**

When the search for existing groups with similar objectives or interests does not yield results, another option is to try to create a new stakeholder group. In coalition building, it may be prudent to frame the issue loosely to bring as many people together as possible to the initial discussion. This would be in contrast to identifying salient issues upfront, which might narrow the pool of potential



coalition members even prior to the first gathering. The ultimate objective would be to create a network of strategic relationships to push for change.

- **Conduct information campaigns and regular consultations to promote transparency and ownership**

Holding regular consultations with coalition members and creating a platform for consensus-building would provide a forum for agreeing on a common objective, defining a reform program, mobilizing support, building committed constituencies, and establishing partnerships. Building trust among coalition members through an enabling environment with an empowering structure is critical for creating sustainable ownership of reform. Transparency through regular communication is an important technique within this effort.

As stakeholders can more easily coalesce and mobilize around issues if they are better informed, information campaigns also address this issue. For example, Krhoda described the severity of the situation in Kenya's water sector that led citizens to demand clarity from the government about what was being done to address it. This need generated public interest in the sector. To respond to this interest, government conducted awareness-raising efforts focusing on providing information on the major issues bedeviling the water sector. The more the stakeholders were informed, the more they mobilized around reform and felt they had a stake and a role to play in it.

- **Create multi-stakeholder policymaking group and independent implementation body to ensure ownership and sustainability**

Broad-based ownership of reform can be built through inclusion and decentralization. In the case of Kenya, the principle of inclusion was applied through the formation of a policy-making steering committee comprised of all key stakeholders. In addition, a separate implementation unit independent of the ministry was established, ensuring that even if the government changed, the water reform process would continue. The independence of the government also led to public confidence and trust that the process would be transparent and free of government manipulation or intervention. The management of water resources was subsequently decentralized, which reinforced ownership of the initiative.

- **Link the issue to change in legislation to create a sense of urgency and momentum for change**

The attention span of individuals is often short-lived. In building coalitions around change, therefore, it is critical to keep the issue alive by creating a sense of urgency and building on that momentum. Linking an issue to a change in legislation is one way to achieve this because there is a definite end towards which the coalition members can aspire.

- **Train technicians in government to work in networks rather than in isolation**

Building coalitions within government can be challenging because many civil servants are technicians who are used to working in isolation rather than in networks. While coalition-building efforts should target technicians, they are more challenging to mobilize into coalitions due to their tendency to work in silos. It would be useful, therefore, to train the technicians to communicate and work in a team or network.

- **Use Information and Communications Technology (ICT) appropriate to the local context**

If ICT adoption is high in a country, ICT may be a useful tool to help push reform. In terms of mobilizing support for reform, ICT also could be particularly useful for the purposes of raising awareness and educating, as well as sharing case studies and success stories. An example of a successful application of ICT for coalition building is the development and use of screensavers



and video tutorials to raise awareness and build support among civil servants for a new procurement law in the Philippines.

However, ICT should be used with an understanding of its limitations, as it is still too premature for it to play the central role in pushing reform. The emergence of various modes of communication today provides challenges and opportunities for communicating with stakeholders.

Feedback from Participants' Response Cards

Be convincing, be committed and be knowledgeable. Research is very important. Build and create awareness around the issues (e.g., poor service delivery or corruption). Deliver results and not just "talk".

Create platform for consensus building with an aim of having integrated and comprehensive national planning and policymaking. Support the creation of peer groups drawing technicians from critical functions like planning, accounting, auditing, budgeting, and human resources management who will then have consultative forums and cause change from within public institutions. Address specific country contexts (e.g., post conflict countries) and assess the vested interests in regard to coalitions. (Malinga)

Develop a winning narrative, a story of change leading to success, which everybody wants to be part of. Expose the vested interests, which by definition only benefit the few. (MacLean)

Regarding the big picture, a stronger coalition is needed that combines the donor organizations and academia. However, academic research on development communication fell apart in the 1980s and 90s. It is fragmented. The academic study of development communication needs support from donors and other development organizations. This could ensure that academic training and research focuses on needs. (Jacobson)

Economic reform touches many interests: political, business, citizens' jobs, etc. Therefore, to be effective, you need to form coalitions defined by the attack or opportunity of the reform. The coalitions are defined by "interest". With respect to governance reform, coalitions are much less important and in general will be hostile of change. Need strong leadership from prime minister and communicate process of reform, report on civil servants and practice of support post reform.

I think the World Bank needs to learn to explain the problems caused by the lack of reform better. This requires much more sophisticated use of media and informal channels and probably simpler, more-authentic language than often used. Present the problem and coalitions are more likely to emerge without having to be built. The Bank can be honest broker here.

There is a well-established literature and practice on this and we don't need to reinvent it. We need to be more realistic about the time, resources, and strategic analysis that are needed to take on vested interests. The Bank's inability to use its funds to support process for change is a problem – we are incredibly cheap about this.

Start with material interests and build coalitions with communication dialogues and monologic strategic campaigns that help people understand their material interests.

Understand that the "pro-change influentials" might not be aware that they are pro-change influentials. Organize the unknown coalitions. (Lardner)

Do the pro-change influentials have connection to the powerful vested interests? If so, are these links familial, corporate, or political? Or all of the above? If influentials have a mobilized support network then network leverage becomes possible when answers to the questions are yes. If influentials do not have a mobilized support network and the answers to both questions are negative, then conflict rather than coalition is more likely. (Apter)

The key is to empower those who will benefit from the reform. Once they are given the ideas, tools, and strategies for reform, they will make it happen.

Do not underestimate the power of training for all parties revolving in the universe around an issue. Check arrogance at the door and localize the issue so that pro-change influentials internalize the issue and see



their self interest represented in the outcomes. (Papagiannis)

There are many tools that you can apply, but context is crucial to tailor tools in order to give your outcomes at the moment to build coalitions of pro-change. Research is crucial. You need to be open-minded in order to see and to realize the vested interest in stakeholders involved in coalitions. (Ausego)

Surface the problem. Get agreement that there is something that needs changing in order to get indifferent and unlikely allies to coalesce. Co-opt, whittle away gradually, and isolate vested interests and surround them by new interest groups with a stake in the change. Transparency and accountability systems are essential. (Lal)

Focus on articulating the interests (material, values, and issues) that characterize a network of stakeholders. But don't forget that you are part of the system and acknowledge how you position and are positioned by the system/network of stakeholders. (Barge)

In order to build an effective coalition of pro-change individuals it is first key to define the goals and objectives. Once these are identified we then identify the key stakeholders with a stake in the success or failure of reform. We then link stakeholders with similar interests and, if need be, establish coalitions to support reform. If need be, pro-change coalitions can be used to support reform and or balance the vested interest groups. (Uzzell)

Focus on building coalitions that organize for issues that are clear and present. At the same time be realistic about difficulties in organizing and sustaining coalitions. Address it by facing the difficulties up front. As issues advance that challenge a specific status quo, work to build unlikely alliances to advance the issue that enable groups to work through differences to a common and significant goal. Public space has to be created and used to allow people to come together. (Cohen)

Maximize use of internet search engines by getting information about reform issues easily found even by those opposed or lukewarm who can become better informed on why and how these reforms affect their lives. Spend time with key editors and anchors to convert them to support your reform agenda. Their multiplier effect is crucial. Provide as much sunlight on them as possible. This is the best disinfectant. (David)

You may not need coalitions as only one person may be the problem. Need "enhanced communication environment" a systems and systematic approach to communication sector. Is it feasible to isolate vested interests – should we even engage? Recognize political risk is dynamic and highly contextual and we must assume nothing when we walk into a country/project. (Mitchell)

Building coalitions needs a deep understanding of where pro-change reformers are in the reform scale. Get them to a shared understanding of the issues and commitment to support a common agenda. Also important is the sustainability of the coalition, which in real world terms requires resources to sustain relationships and support to reform. Research + Shared Agenda + Relationships = Sustainable coalitions. Powerful vested interests need to be understood – what drives the powerful vested interests? What incentive will make them view reform in a positive way (appreciative inquiry)? This can be done most effectively by getting them engaged, listening to their views and getting their input.

I agree with the comment made during the session about not reinventing the wheel. Building coalitions for governance reform is being done in the NGO, private and even donor sectors, albeit in a more explicit, overtly political way. I think the Bank twists itself into knots over this issue because of long-standing sensitivities noted in its founding charter over involvement in politics. I'd suggest looking at the democracy promotion work for good examples of this type of work: NBI, IRI, TAF IES, donors such as DFID and USAID, International IDEA, OSI and others then tweaking so that it so they fit the Bank's sensitivities. There's plenty of room to build on this work rather than starting from square one.

It depends on who the vested interests are. If they are powerful individuals, smoke them out (let people know what they do and why). If they are organizations (private or public), neutralize or convert them. If they are the resisting silent majority/middle managers, then change management. Employ a 4-step approach: 1. set benchmarks; 2. build the case for reform; 3. implement it; and 4. monitor (funding for follow up). Engage academia into researching concept of "intangible collateral". (de Quelen)



SESSION FIVE

The fifth session addressed the issue of how we can help reformers transform indifferent, or even hostile, public opinion into support for reform objectives.

The session featured speakers whose ideas ranged from using culturally sensitive narrative frames to the latest technology in order to transform public opinion. The session began with a presentation that focused on the cultural aspect of reforms, and how reformers need to be well versed about the culture of the community where their message is being targeted. The second speaker stressed that the perspective of the people who will be affected by reforms should be given utmost importance. The third speaker had a structured plan of how reformers should arm themselves to argue in favor of a particular reform scheme. The last speaker concentrated on the advantages of using technology to enhance support for reforms.

The speakers approached the issue of changing public opinion with the realization that the stakeholders cannot be taken for granted, and the burden is on reformers to communicate intelligently, keeping the context and issues in perspective. The speakers made important contributions towards how the pro-reform message can be strengthened or communicated in a manner that the stakeholders accept and understand more easily. While some speakers placed more emphasis on the content and structure of the pro-reform message, others were more focused on what the overall communication strategy of the reformers should be and how to build and use communications infrastructure.

Summary of Presentations

University of Alabama's **Karen Johnson-Cartee** presented a model of public opinion transformation that she terms Global Transformational Framing, a method of framing that changes world views. Johnson-Cartee began by explaining the importance of dialogic philosophy, a concept that was discussed many times during the conference. In this case, she was referring to the need to be aware of the culture of the community being addressed through a persuasive message. In her recommended model, leader cohorts immerse themselves in a foreign culture and understand the "social frames or the frame of reference or world view" of that culture. Also, the foreign community is studied using Noelle Neumann's Personality Strength Scale to identify the key influencers in that community. The three generic groups of influential people identified by Johnson-Cartee are Change Agents, Outreach Workers, and Key Stakeholders. Next, the first two groups of influencers form Participatory Reform Groups, such as forums, summits, and schools, and Participatory Traditional Media, such as newspapers and folk media, which are aimed at reform. Furthermore, these groups introduce culturally sensitive materials, reform narratives, and reform frames into the foreign community. Johnson-Cartee also referred to the work of Walter Fisher on the power of narratives to produce social reforms.

Jeremy D. Rosner, Senior Vice President and a Partner at Greenberg Quinlan Rosner, asserted that the people's perspective as well as their worries and suggestions should be taken seriously. Rosner began by suggesting that the topic of the session should be reframed, because the real problem is in dealing with the hostility among elites towards the public, rather than hostile public opinion. To create support for reforms, Rosner had a number of recommendations, which include: connect with the mood of the country; do not talk politics all the time; engage in dialogue with the public; look at micro details; provide narrative explanations of the proposed reform schemes to the public; start the reform process early; train ministers and spokespeople; and when facing hostile public opinion, reframe the argument for reforms instead of trying to argue against the dominant public opinion.

Rey Anthony G. David Jr., a Consultant to the Secretary, Department of Finance in the Philippines, focused on how to enhance the strength of a reform scheme. Using the equation



6R=1R, which is also somewhat like an acronym, he explained that the results on the right hand side of the equation can be produced by a combination of research, reason, resources, record, and review that form the left hand side of the equation. In addition, David explained each of the six Rs : thoroughly research the social domain being influenced by the reform (an important aspect of this research is linkage analysis, which identifies the various stakeholders and indicates whether a particular stakeholder supports or opposes the reform); give those being affected by the reform sufficient reasons that justify the reform scheme; reach important stakeholders with the right kind of messages; be armed with enough resources; record the discourse (for example, arguments made for and against it) surrounding the reform scheme, so these can be accessed in the future; and review the reforms even after the necessary legislation has been passed.

Phil Noble, founder of Politiconline.com and Phil Noble & Associates, Inc., discussed how technology can revolutionize development work. Noble began with reference to Moore's law, which predicted a doubling of computing power and a 50 percent reduction in computing costs every two years since 1965. This helped him establish his thesis that currently technology is easily available and even ordinary citizens can communicate with the masses by creating messages at home. To increase support for social reforms, Noble suggested using technology to monitor reforms, reach out to a greater number of people, build networks, and mobilize a global audience.

Approaches and Techniques

The following is a list of approaches and techniques, of dealing with the issue of transforming indifferent or hostile public opinion, presented in this session.

Approaches

- **Make the case**

This approach calls for reformers to actively campaign for the proposed reform scheme in order to transform indifferent, or even hostile, public opinion into support for reform objectives. In other words, the campaign itself will be an argument in favor of implementing the reforms. Making the case thus implies that the reformers take an active stance in communicating their agenda and its importance in order to transform public opinion. That is, the reformers assume the burden of explaining the worthiness of the proposed scheme. It is also crucial, moreover, that the reformers arm themselves with the appropriate tools to help them win their battle against indifferent or hostile public opinion.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: communicate the costs of not implementing and benefits of implementing the reform scheme; provide citizens easy access to information that explains the reform scheme; gather sufficient material resources to support the pro-reform campaign; record the ongoing arguments so they can be referred to in the future; communicate in language that is easily understandable; use appropriate communication tools that reach the right people; use narratives to argue in favor of reforms; use strategic frames to argue in favor of reforms; use trigger devices such as natural catastrophes, unanticipated human tragedies, technological repercussions, societal imbalance, and ecological change to argue in favor of reforms; use condensation symbols, such as catchphrases, exemplars, and metaphors; use ICTs to monitor reforms.

- **Cultural empathy**

This approach suggests that reformers empathize with and understand the perspectives of those being influenced by the reform scheme. Reformers using this approach try to understand the reasons why people would support or oppose a proposed reform scheme and develop and communicate about the reform program in terms that resonate with the affected stakeholders.



The use of locally influential people and local media to transmit messages that are culturally sensitive would be particularly useful.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: opinion research, especially focus groups; use culturally relevant narratives to explain reforms; communicate in language that is easily understandable; issue framing; create participatory reform groups (forums, summits, schools etc.) to increase awareness about reforms; use trigger devices to argue in favor of reforms; and use condensation symbols, such as catchphrases, exemplars, and metaphors.

- **Use dialogue to create a participatory environment**

This approach calls for reformers to engage in dialogue with those affected by the proposed reform scheme. Instead of relying on one-way or monologic communication, this approach uses two-way communication that flows between the reformers and the affected stakeholder groups. Through engaging stakeholders in dialogue, reformers give stakeholders the space for engagement in the reform process instead of simply being recipients of information about reform. To create a participatory environment, reformers could get involved in public deliberation, dialogue, and communal engagement in civil society institutions. Dialogue can also be fostered through ICTs.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach are as follows: create participatory reform groups (forums, summits, schools etc.) to increase awareness about reforms; provide citizens easy access to information that explains the reform scheme; communicate in language that is easily understandable; use appropriate communication tools that reach the right people; respond to the citizen's demands and needs; and use ICTs to build networks and mobilize people.

Techniques

- **Strength of Personality (PS) scale**

A research technique for identifying influentials who can mobilize public opinion around an issue is the Strength of Personality (PS) scale, developed in 1983 by the German scholar Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann of the Allensbach Institute. This scale evaluates the ability of an individual to influence others, based on the results of a questionnaire that asks respondents to give a self-assessment of their perceived personal influence. This technique can also be used for mobilizing networks and coalitions (Session 4).

- **Create participatory reform groups (forums, summits, schools, etc.) to increase awareness about reforms and build stakeholder ownership of reform**

This technique creates participatory institutions or reform groups where information regarding reform schemes can be disseminated and discussed to build understanding of the goals of the reforms. These reform groups should ideally be moderated or supervised by individuals from within the community being targeted by the reform scheme so the information regarding reform schemes can be presented in culturally familiar terms.

- **Use strategic frames to argue in favor of or explain reforms**

As commonly acknowledged by communication scholars, a frame can be defined as a pattern or structure for understanding the world around us. Frames can be used strategically to present an issue in a manner that benefits a particular political platform. This technique, recommended by Johnson-Cartee, suggests that reformers use strategic frames to communicate the pro-reform messages.



- **Reframe the issue rather than argue against hostility**

This technique is useful for handling anti-reform public opinion. When people are hostile to a proposed reform initiative, the technique recommends that the pro-reform argument be reframed to curtail the hostility, rather than using the initial argument to talk against the negative opinion. Reframing the pro-reform argument requires taking into consideration the anti-reform argument.

- **Communicate the benefits/costs of implementing/not implementing reform**

This technique makes people aware of what they would lose if reform were not implemented, i.e., the material or monetary losses they would continue to incur and of which they may not even be aware, in order to increase pro-reform public opinion.

- **Communicate in language that is easily understandable through the use of condensation symbols and narratives to generate support for reform**

This technique recommends that the reformers speak in a language that is easily understandable by and resonates with the people being affected by the reforms. Instead of technical jargon, the use of commonly used terms can be more useful in reaching out to the larger public.

The use of condensation symbols and narratives is closely linked to this technique. A condensation symbol, such as a catchphrase, exemplar, and metaphor, is a piece of communication that connotes beliefs, feelings, values, and world views of a particular community. It is usually more connotative than denotative and is a piece of symbolic communication. One example, presented by Johnson-Cartee, is the phrase 'family values' that evokes a range of positive associations for conservative Americans.

Similarly, the use of narratives can also be effective at reaching out to certain stakeholder groups. A narrative can be defined as a story about events, told in the sequence in which they occurred. Narratives are commonly used in many communities to transmit cultural histories, values, and norms, and are thus useful in communicating more effectively with certain communities.

- **Use appropriate media to reach the affected stakeholders**

In communicating with the affected stakeholders, reformers should carefully choose the communication tools or media to reach them. For instance, depending on the local context, a particular medium might be more suitable for communicating messages than others. One example of this technique is the use of glass coasters to communicate the ban against drinking and driving in Singapore. Another is the use of the media that a given stakeholder group has relied on traditionally. The existing familiarity with this media will contribute to stakeholders' understanding of the new reform initiative.

- **Use trigger devices such as natural catastrophes, unanticipated human tragedies, and ecological change to argue in favor of reforms**

A trigger device is an event that surprises the audience and transforms social problems into serious issues. One example, presented by Johnson-Cartee, is the reference to a natural catastrophe—like Hurricane Katrina—while transmitting a pro-reform message, in order to highlight an issue related to the planned reform that is embedded in the catastrophe.

- **Use ICTs to build networks and mobilize people**

This is a technique of using the power and reach of ICTs to create networks of pro-reform campaigners, through electronic mail, cellular phones, instant messaging devices, and the Internet.



Feedback from Participants' Response Cards

Know your message! Know your media! Know your audience! Are you relevant? (Papagiannis)

Frame the issues in clear moral choices that people can identify with. Appeal to their enlightened self-interest. Establish the opportunity cost that supports reform. (Lardner)

Listen up! (research, research). Link reform to the real concerns of real people. Increase optimism and efficacy. Build coalitions for change, then get out of the way!

Anticipate all scenarios and research, plan and avail resources to resolve the issues. Often it is useful to use all forms of media, depending on the cultural context.

Educate reformers, the public and educators.

The World Bank could focus on doing things that provide tangible, immediate benefits in people's lives and not just bureaucratic reform that people cannot relate to. Vested interests have an easy job organizing anti-reform campaigns because "reform" is perceived as a destabilizing, top down, bureaucratic process rather than a promise of cyclical change. To gain trust, deliver more. (de Quelen)

Provide them with the right vision and message to sponsor change/reform to defeat poverty. (MacLean)

We can communicate all day but if reform does not reflect a stakeholder's interest, communication will have no effect. Fortunately, stakeholder interest may reflect values of empathy, patriotism, ethics, prudence, etc. in addition to classical economic self-interest. Identify stakeholder interest, inform and engage them, and then form coalitions. (Masty)

Focus on the material factors producing poverty in people's lives. I think dialogic communication can help us get to this focus. Otherwise, we're in the danger of politicizing things/frames that may not resonate with people. (Singh)

Expose indifferent ministers/officials to hostile public opinion with the internet/mobile phone technology – they will soon get the message.

By meaningfully involving the publics in a structured and adaptive decision-making process. (Mazzei)

Framing becomes the key tool. Reformers need to frame issues that connect with multiple stakeholders. Moreover, when we shift to the internet, how do we frame issues and create links that foster thoughtful deliberation and engagement on an issue, versus a vent. (Barge)

Understand their situation first. Listen before we develop the solution. Adapt it to their needs in an interactive way building understanding of the problem/need. Put real-time effort and real resources into the reform campaigns, and keep it up after the reform is launched.

Strengthen feedback machinery for the public (i.e., the use of live radio talk shows is very popular in Africa, because of the oral tradition culture) to get reforms subjected to open, constructive criticism. This is an arena for testing the ground and preparing a soft landing for a reform which may be good but not popular. Use non-traditional communication channels like the clergy to psyche the mind of the public into accepting reforms aimed at good governance and accountability. The clergy are good role models and can be good change champions. Use the trust they enjoy to generate support from the public. Use public accountability tools like citizens or community score cards so that the public are not just by-standers but are "active participants" in shaping the national reform agenda. (Malinga)

Recognize that elites are a principal promoter by intent or inertia. Provide the tools of capacity building and strengthening that enable citizens to reflect the mood of the country so decision makers listen. One intervention is to build the capacity of a number of investigative journalists. One effect is to bring alternatives to public discussion. Consider the building up of radio even if it has to be powered from another country. (Cohen)

Do as Jeremy Rosner suggests.....Simply paying attention to it up-front will help in many instances. This is



a matter of staging, or not waiting until too late for this to be useful. And use best practices. Regarding hostile opinion, when possible, include opposition in deliberation, through repeated, long discussions.

Indifferent or hostile public opinion may have a number of causes, each requiring a specific and focused response. However, often indifferences or hostilities result from a lack of understanding, incorrect or wrong information. By identifying both the information and relevance to different stakeholders it should be able to frame information for specific stakeholders. By engaging the publics and explaining why reform is relevant to individuals and groups, it should be possible to change indifference to support and hostility to indifference or even support. (Uzzell)

SESSION SIX

The sixth session addressed the issue of how to instigate citizen demand for good governance and accountability, in order to sustain governance reform.

The session began with a presentation about a television program produced by the British Broadcasting Corporation World Service Trust (BBC WST), called Bangladesh *Sanglap* (Dialogue), which has enabled Bangladeshi citizens to interact with politicians on television and publicly demand accountability. The second speaker talked about another innovation, a technique called Deliberative Polling®, and the third speaker talked about the importance of mobilizing people in groups so they can jointly demand better governance. Finally, the fourth speaker emphasized the need for understanding the local context, engaging in dialogue with all relevant stakeholders including the opposition, and developing a theory to explain and address challenges in implementing reform. Participants then engaged in an informal and lively discussion, sharing a number of anecdotes from their experiences around the world. This discussion further underscored the tensions between universals and particulars and between theory and practice, both of which were leitmotifs running through all of the discussions, with the challenge being the ability or possibility of striking the right balance.

Summary of Presentations

David Prosser, Executive Producer of Bangladesh *Sanglap* (Dialogue), primarily spoke about his program, which allows citizens to question politicians regarding the latter's governance work, and asserted that such programs can increase the awareness among ordinary citizens that even they can demand better governance. A short video clip on Bangladesh *Sanglap* was shown to the audience, and Prosser mentioned that if similar programs are used in other settings to instigate citizen demand for good governance, then one should adhere to a few principles: the program should maintain a neutral political platform; the debate must be constructive, instead of leading to violence; the language should be easily understandable and free of the jargon that is commonly used by the development community; the audience has to be recruited carefully, so it is representative of the larger population; and the audience has to be researched regularly, so their demands, dislikes, and preferences are known.

Stanford University's **James S. Fishkin** discussed his technique of Deliberative Polling® and talked about how informed deliberation can increase citizen demand for good governance. Deliberative polls are sessions where a group of people chosen through scientific random sampling meet to discuss a particular issue about which they are provided information before the deliberation starts. Fishkin asserted that deliberative polling, if practiced widely, can reinvent Athenian democracy, or the democratic theory developed in ancient Athens, which believed in giving voice to the ordinary person.

Salient features of the deliberative polling technique are as follows: the sample is representative of the population from which it is drawn from; the deliberative poll leads to changes in public opinion on politics and policy; questionnaires can demonstrate that the respondents gained information by participating in deliberative polling; analysis can demonstrate that the change in



public opinion is caused by the gain in information; the change in public opinion, however, does not correlate with any socio-demographic factors, such as education and gender; deliberation leads to stronger opinions, which is also termed single peaked preferences; the pre-deliberation group opinions do not get reinforced towards the extremes; and the group's opinion is not unduly influenced by the more privileged, due to education or income, for example, members of the group.

David Cohen, Co-Founder of the Advocacy Institute, stressed the need to organize citizens into groups. Cohen made a number of recommendations for how to increase citizen demand for good governance, including: form citizen's organizations that function autonomously from the government and have the capacity to take actions, such as scrutinizing public budgets; take actions that provide citizens training to face the potential risks of demanding better governance and challenging the political status quo; create physical spaces that can be used for argument, dialogue, and dissemination of information regarding governance; engage in consultation with the marginalized members of society so they can voice their concerns; use the media for intervention, and train journalists, including investigative journalists, regarding the work of development organizations (it is also helpful, moreover, if development organizations can build their own media outlets); and listen to people who attend capacity building meetings and use that language to spread the message about reforms.

Yale University's **David E. Apter** discussed the importance of engaging in dialogue and recognizing the existence of multiple worldviews, among other issues. After starting off with cautionary words, which communicated his skepticism about whether it is at all possible to sustain governance reform, he made a number of recommendations: look at a problem in the local context where it exists, and understand that context by gathering detailed information about it; use theory to understand the specific problems and situations that might be encountered in the reform process; engage citizens in collective discussions, among themselves and with relevant social and political institutions; tailor reforms to specific local problems; engage in collaborative dialogue with the people; and engage the political opposition in the dialogue for reform.

Approaches and Techniques

The following are a list of approaches and techniques, of dealing with the issue of instigating citizen demand for good governance and accountability, in order to sustain governance reform.

Approaches

- **Use collective action or citizens' groups**

This approach is based on forming citizens' groups to instigate demand for good governance and accountability, in order to sustain governance reform. Adopting an approach of using collective action, thus, implies that citizens interact with the government as a group, instead of interacting at an individual level.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach are as follows: form citizens' organizations that function autonomously from the government; provide citizens training to face the risks of demanding better governance; create physical spaces for argument and dialogue regarding and dissemination of information about governance; use ICTs to build networks; provide citizens easy access to information that explains the reform scheme; communicate in language that is easily understandable; strengthening relationship with media for advocacy and intervention.



- **Deliberation**

This approach engages citizens in deliberation to instigate their demand for good governance and accountability, and to ensure sustainability of governance reform. The deliberative process leads citizens to express their views on specific policies related to governance. The deliberative approach is grounded in the rationale that when citizens are allowed to discuss governance issues, they become not only more informed about these issues, but also aware that they have the ability to demand better governance.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: Fishkin's Deliberative Poll® to create physical spaces for argument and dialogue regarding and dissemination of information about governance; organize deliberative opinion polls; use media, such as television programs, for deliberation; and mediate deliberation so that competing demands can be resolved, the demands are realistic, the outcome is not violent, and the deliberation is not dominated by privileged groups.

- **Engage in dialogue**

This approach seeks to engage reformers in dialogue with those being influenced by the reform to generate public support for reform objectives. Instead of using one-way or monologic communication, which is sent by the reformers to stakeholders, this approach employs a two-way model, in which information flows back and forth between the reformers and the various stakeholder groups. This approach allows affected stakeholders to voice their support or disapproval of the planned reforms.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: provide citizens easy access to information that explains the reform scheme; communicate in language that is easily understandable; use appropriate communication tools that reach the right people; respond to the citizen's demands and needs; and gather sufficient material resources to support the pro-reform campaign.

- **Use subsidiarity or small governance units**

This approach derives from the political philosophy that small governance units should exercise power. In other words, demand for governance should be instigated at the local level and within relatively small units of governance, which may vary from laundry to medical facilities.

The techniques that can be used to implement this approach include: frame the governance issues in terms of the local setting; research the local setting where governance reforms might be implemented; engage in consultation with the marginalized members of society; communicate in language that is easily understandable; provide citizens training to face the risks of demanding better governance.

Techniques

- **Research the local setting and frame the issues accordingly**

This technique recommends that proper research be carried out to understand the local setting where reforms will be implemented. It is based on the understanding that reform related work, whether instigating citizen demand or actual implementation of reforms, can be carried out properly only when the local context has been understood thoroughly. In addition, instead of generalizing the governance issues under scrutiny, issues should also be framed accordingly, taking into account the local context and nuances.



- **Create physical spaces for argument, dialogue, and dissemination of information about governance**

This technique suggests that citizens be allowed to congregate in physical spaces where they can receive information about governance and engage in arguments and dialogue about issues related to governance. It is expected that such spaces will be useful for instigating demand for better governance.

- **Form citizens' organizations that function autonomously from the government**

This technique recommends that citizens be organized into groups that are autonomous from the government and have the authority to scrutinize governance and demand better governance.

- **Mediate deliberation so that competing demands can be resolved, the demands are realistic, the outcome is not violent, and the deliberation is not dominated by privileged groups**

This is a technique of ensuring that deliberations lead to constructive outcomes, and it is geared towards controlling certain possible problems that might arise in deliberative environments, such as a deliberative opinion poll or a television program.

- **Organize a Deliberative Poll®**

This technique, developed by Fishkin, is a form of public consultation that uses randomly selected and representative groups of citizens to assess how public opinion would change if they became better informed and more engaged about an issue. In the process, the sample is first polled on a given issue. This is followed by participants deliberating on that issue and being provided with more information about it. At the end of the deliberations, the sample is polled again to assess the change in their opinions. Because the sample is highly representative, the conclusions the sample draws represent those that would be reached by the broader public, if they became more informed.

Fishkin's technique has certain salient features, many of which can be used when organizing a deliberative poll. First, the sample is extremely representative of the population from which it is drawn. Second, the deliberative poll leads to changes in public opinion on politics and policy. Third, questionnaires can demonstrate that the respondents gained information by participating in deliberative polling. Fourth, analysis can demonstrate that the change in public opinion is caused by the gain in information. Fifth, the change in public opinion, however, does not correlate with any socio-demographic factors, such as education and gender. Sixth, deliberation leads to stronger opinions, which is also termed single peaked preferences. Seventh, the pre-deliberation group opinions do not get reinforced towards the extremes. Eighth, the group's opinion is not unduly influenced by the more privileged, due to education or income, for example, members of the group.

- **Engage in consultation with the marginalized members of society**

This technique recommends that the pro-reform advocates keep in touch with those who are marginalized from mainstream society. This will allow the reformers to be aware of the demands of the marginalized members as well.

- **Provide citizens training to face the risks of demanding better governance**

When citizens demand better governance, they are subject to various physical and psychological risks, such as the threat of attacked by a corrupt politician. This technique recommends that the pro-reform advocates train citizens to empower them to deal with the risks they might face by demanding better governance.



- **Use media, such as television programs, for deliberation and dialogue**

This is a technique of creating deliberative environments within existing media. For example, a television program, such as Bangladesh *Sanglap* (Dialogue) that is produced by BBC WST, can be used as a forum where citizens engage in dialogue with politicians and voice their demands regarding governance. Similarly, the radio and newspapers can be used to instigate citizen demand for better governance, by allowing citizens to voice their concerns.

While creating such deliberative forums, a few principles should be followed. First, it should maintain a neutral political platform so the debate can be constructive. Second, the participants have to be recruited carefully so that the group is somewhat representative of the larger population. Third, the population has to be researched regularly to determine the degree to which their participation in such debates or dialogues leads to a continued practice of demanding accountability and their perceptions as to whether the level of government accountability has increased or remained unchanged.

Feedback from Participants' Response Cards

Make participation worthwhile. Questions asked are recorded and followed up. Give individual citizens some action/responsibility for following up and reporting back.

Is there any toolkit for this? How local context could impact in general tools for instigating citizen demand?

Give citizens information that empowers (on budgets, service delivery, etc.). Spread mobilization and advocacy skills among CSOs, NGOs, and so on. Develop free, plural and independent media systems and access to information laws. Constitutional liberties securely protected are the *sin qua non*.

Sustainability is key. Address issues at the level that is closest to the people's daily lives. Information and education campaigns on what they are missing out on by not getting quality basic services. (de Quelen)

Use social science to improve and experiment with institutional designs.

A focus on the internet is odd for developing countries where other modes should get first emphasis. Consulting the public under good conditions may lead to and embody a useful reform. (Fishkin)

Identify as best as possible stakeholders interest in results of change. All interest motivates by self and family interests. Tangible interests are strongest. Give all stakeholders an action or a response mechanism that register their views in political space, builds psychological ownership. (Masty)

Focus on demand side of governance, not supply. Integrate communication into governance programs and view it as a sector. Push, push, push information. (Mitchell)

By providing people with information but also tools and, in some cases, resources to be able to demand accountability.

I really liked Professors Apter's and Fishkin's approaches. Understand world views (Apter) and then use information and knowledge to empower people (Fishkin) to deliberate. I'd add that dialogic communication and structuring situations where we can deliberate are key. (Singh)

Establishing spaces of participation free to experiment with new types of relationships among stakeholders. Providing appropriate information (different at different levels). There is the need for spaces of political "hope" as the space to let grow future political will. Inclusive and multidisciplinary mobilization (let's dream the alternative, then we'll find the technical solution). Creating messages from the bottom up. Top down public information flow. Be lucky!

Prepare "Citizen's Guides" and "Service Delivery Directory". Citizens will then know what services to demand and expect. They can then effectively respond to a service delivery satisfaction survey. This is an evidence-based tool for citizen participation. Provide platforms for citizens to provide feedback and views



on governance and accountability:

- National consultative meeting which include diaspora in the case of developing countries;
- Grassroots village meetings based on community programs (e.g., communal cleaning of roads, bridges, etc.)
- Establish hotline addresses (email or phone) in critical offices (Office of the President, Auditor General, etc)
- Get the local leaders to sign performance contracts and create awareness among the citizens about the agreed upon targets so that the leaders can be held accountability. Kind of like participatory governance. (Malinga)

Make information available – information regarding services from government officials, responsibility of citizens, government budget and activities. Empower citizens to ask questions regarding their situation. Organize complaint/suggestion boxes, hotlines for reporting officials' lack of oversight.

By creating forums for the provision of transparent information, for questions and for understanding. Critical is the provision of information. If people are aware of flows of money, power, patronage, etc. they are placed in a position where they can hold government to account. Uzzell)

The first suggestion is to start by transforming the supposed reformers into more open, less hostile to public opinion. Making sure reforms fully reflect people's needs, attitudes, and perceptions before they are fully designed. (Santi)

Nimmo and Savage (1976) talk about real vs. ideal, with the real being the reality and the ideal as the people's self-described optimum manner of actions. Asking the society what is the moral compass of the society, then the campaign shows through (See News for a Change, Wallack and Dorfman 1999) the very real consequences that corruption, favoritism, bribery, patronage etc., ultimately costs individuals in the society. (Johnson-Cartee)

The World Bank, politicians, and power elites should recognize citizens as stakeholders who challenge power, and run risks to bend power. Focus on strengthening capacity of journalists, including investigative journalists. See behind what's on the surface; autonomy of NGOs, transparency, including institutional arrangements on right to know, create and understand public space. It sets the stage for developing a language of governance reform and anti-corruption. (Cohen)

Read my paper. (Apter)

Sustained transparent and meaningful dialogue and consultation undertaken in a culturally appropriate context.



**Governance Reform under Real World Conditions:
A Dialogue on Communication Challenges**

Panelists

Prof. Matthew Andrews	Harvard Kennedy School of Government
Prof. David Apter	Yale University
Flavio Ausejo	Independent Consultant
Prof. J. Kevin Barge	University of Georgia
David Cohen	Experience Corps
Rey Anthony G. David, Jr.	Great Wall Advertising, PR Solutions Management Corporation
Robert de Quelen	EON The Stakeholder Relationships Firm, Philippines
Prof. Jim Fishkin	Stanford University
Prof. Tom Jacobson	Temple University
Prof. Karen Johnson-Cartee	University of Alabama
Prof. George Krhoda	University of Nairobi
Sumir Lal	World Bank
Peter Malinga	Human Resources and Institutional Capacity Development Agency (HIDA), Government of Rwanda
Steve Masty	Adam Smith International
Phil Noble	Politicsonline.com and Phil Noble & Associates, Inc.
Prof. Lori Ann Post	Michigan State University
David Prosser	BBC World Service Trust
Jeremy Rosner	Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research
Peter Schechter	Chlopak, Leonard, Schechter and Associates
Prof. J.P. Singh	Georgetown University

World Bank Session Chairs and Discussants

Bhuvan Bhatnagar	East Asia & Pacific Region, Social Development Sector Unit
Jose Edgardo Campos	South Asia Region, Poverty Reduction & Economic Management
Ronnie Hammad	Africa Region, Results & Learning Unit
Erika Jorgenson	Operations Policy & Country Services, Country Economics Unit
Sahr Kpundeh	Africa Region, Public Sector Reform & Capacity Unit
Stephen J. Lintner	Operations Policy & Country Services, Quality Assurance & Compliance
Ronald MacLean	World Bank Institute, Sustainable Development Division
Vijayendra Rao	Development Economics, Development Research Group
Gary Reid	Europe & Central Asia Region, Poverty Reduction & Economic Management Unit
Anwar Shah	World Bank Institute, Poverty Reduction & Economic Management
Stefanie Teggemann	Africa Region, Public Sector Reform & Capacity Unit



Annex 2

Participants' Bios

MATT ANDREWS is Assistant Professor of Public Policy at the Kennedy School, Harvard University. His research focuses on public sector reform, particularly budgeting and financial management reform, and participatory governance in developing and transitional governments. Recent articles focus on forging a theoretical understanding of the non-technical factors influencing success in reform processes. Specific emphasis lies on the informal institutional context of reform, as well as leadership structures within government-wide networks. This research developed out of his work in the provincial government of Kwa-Zulu Natal in South Africa and more recently from his tenure as a Public Sector Specialist working in the Europe and Central Asia Region of the World Bank. He brings this experience to courses on public management and development. He holds a BCom (Hons) degree from the University of Natal, Durban (South Africa), an MSc from the University of London, and a PhD in Public Administration from the Maxwell School, Syracuse University.

DAVID E. APTER is the Henry J. Heinz Professor Emeritus of Comparative Political and Social Development and Senior Research Scientist at Yale University. He has taught at Northwestern University, The University of Chicago (where he was the Executive Secretary of the Committee for the Comparative Study of New Nations), the University of California, (where he was director of the Institute of International Studies), and Yale University where he holds a joint appointment in political science and sociology and served as Director of the Social Science Division, Chair of Sociology, and was a founding fellow of the Whitney Humanities Center. He has done field research on development, democratization and political violence in Africa, Latin America, Japan, and China. His book, *Choice and the Politics of Allocation* (Yale University Press) received the Woodrow Wilson award for the best book of the year in political science and international studies. He is the author of many books and articles including *Ghana in Transition*; *The Political Kingdom in Uganda*; and *The Politics of Modernization, Against the State*; He is the first honoree to receive the new Dogan prize for interdisciplinary work in the social sciences given by the international Social Science Council and UNESCO, 2006.

FLAVIO AUSEJO is an Independent consultant in public policy, public management and citizen participation, with emphasis on strategic planning for public and public-private organizations, and stakeholders mapping as well as designing strategic communications plans. He has done consultancies for the Inter-American Development Bank, German Technical Cooperation (gtz-PROAGUA), the World Bank, Water regulatory authority (SUNASS), San Martin Regional Government, ProCobre –a non-profit organization and ProInversión (the government agency in charge of promoting private participation). He has been a speaker in international events, including Water Week 2007, speaker by invitation for the World Bank on the subject of civil society participation in the tariff process. February 27, 2007. His publications include: *Trends in the Regulation of the Telecommunications Services in Peru*, 1999 [Dissertation]; *The Regulatory Space in the Water Sector: The Case of Peru*, 1998; "The Reorganization of the National Social Security", in *Implementación de Políticas Públicas en el Perú*, 1995, Augusto Alvarez and Gabriel Ortiz de Zevallos, editors; and several articles about privatization and regulatory issues in telecommunications, energy and infrastructure, in "Perú Económico" and "Semana Económica".

J. KEVIN BARGE is an Associate Professor of Speech Communication at the University of Georgia. He is also a member of the Public Dialogue Consortium, a group of scholars and practitioners devoted to developing new forms of communicative practice that facilitate communities working through polarized and polarizing issues. His major research interests center on developing a systemic constructionist approach to management and leadership and exploring the relationship between discourse and public deliberation. His research has been published in *The Academy of Management Review*, *Management Communication Quarterly*, *Communication Theory*, *Communication Studies*, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *Communication Quarterly*, and *Western Journal of Communication*.

Barge has served on a number of national and international editorial boards for journals such as *Communication Monographs*, *Management Communication Quarterly*, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, and *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*. Barge is a former editor of *Communication Studies*. He has authored three textbooks, *Human Communication: Motivation, Knowledge, and Skills* (Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2001), *Managing Group Life: Communicating in Decision-Making Groups* (Houghton-Mifflin, 1997) and *Leadership: Communication Skills for Groups and Organizations* (St. Martins Press, 1994). Before moving to the University of Georgia, he was named Mortar Board Outstanding University Professor Board, Centennial Professor, and directed the Summer Teaching Institute, a faculty development intensive summer workshop while at Baylor University.



DAVID COHEN is a senior advisor to Experience Corps and a senior fellow at Civic Ventures. He is also the president of Global Integrity and a co-founder of the Advocacy Institute. He has been an advocate and strategist on major social justice and political reform issues in the United States since the early 1960s. These include issues of institutional reform and democratic governance. He played a leading role in the fight for Congress to end its support for the Vietnam War. From 1984 to 1992, he led the Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control to stop the U.S. nuclear arms build-up by supporting arms control agreements and reducing the military budget. He served as president of Common Cause, the largest voluntary membership organization in the United States working on government accountability issues. Advocacy practitioners around the world have translated his writings on advocacy, civil society, and lobbying into many different languages. His writings have appeared as essays in college textbooks, in major U.S. newspapers, think tanks, university publications and encyclopedias. Cohen also co-authored *Advocacy for Social Justice: A Global Action and Reflection Guide*. His most recent publication is an essay in *Hurricane Katrina: Response and Responsibilities*, entitled "The Aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: Coming to Grips with US Failure".

REY DAVID is a Consultant to the Secretary, Department of Finance, the Philippines. Previously, he was consultant to the president of Land Bank of the Philippines. He is President & CEO and Member of the Board of Directors of Great Wall Advertising, Inc., one of the country's pioneering advertising agencies, founded in 1948 by Anthony and Lucy David. Great Wall is responsible for building brands like Sarsi, Hunt's, Blend 45, Payless noodles, Jack & Jill fun snacks, Japan Airlines, Isuzu, Goldilocks, Philip Morris). David is President and Director of THINK TANK, INC., a consulting firm specializing in political and economic environment scanning, policy advocacy and legislative counseling. He is Chairman of ProSolutions Management Corporation, a public relations firm that handles accounts like Microsoft, ESPN, Isuzu, Philippine Ports Authority, and Coca Cola. He also serves as the current Director of the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC).

ROBERT DE QUELEN is Deputy Managing Director in charge of business development and corporate public relations for EON. Based in the Philippines since 2002, he has close to 20 years of experience in global public relations in both Europe and Asia. This includes three years in Singapore as Regional Director for the IT and Telecoms clients of Edelman, the global affiliate of EON and the world's third largest Public Relations network. Working for clients from various industries and in different cultures enabled de Quelen to acquire comprehensive expertise in building multi-sectoral stakeholder relations programs for corporate and not-for-profit clients. He has been an active participant to the League of Corporate Foundation's Communication Committee, with a strong focus on bringing together representatives of the business circles with NGOs and local government units. The strong emphasis on Corporate Social Responsibility in the Philippines is conducive to using innovative tools and methodologies which are now being implemented successfully for such EON clients as The Asia Foundation, USAID, and the Asian Development Bank.

JAMES S. FISHKIN holds the Janet M. Peck Chair in International Communication at Stanford University, where he holds a joint appointment as Professor of Communication and Political Science. He is also Director of Stanford's new Center for Deliberative Democracy and Chair of the Department of Communication. Fishkin received his B.A. from Yale in 1970 and holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Yale as well as a second Ph.D. in Philosophy from Cambridge. He is the author of a number of books including *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform* (1991), *The Dialogue of Justice* (1992), and *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy* (1995). He has co-authored with Bruce Ackerman *Deliberation Day* (Yale Press, 2004).

He is best known for developing Deliberative Polling®, a practice of public consultation that employs random samples of the citizenry to explore how opinions would change if they were more informed. Professor Fishkin and his collaborators have conducted Deliberative Polls in the US, Britain, Australia, Denmark, Bulgaria, China, Greece and other countries. Fishkin has been a Visiting Fellow Commoner at Trinity College, Cambridge, as well as a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, a Fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at the Smithsonian Institution, and a Guggenheim Fellow.

TOM JACOBSON is Professor and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the School of Communications and Theater, Temple University. He has authored and numerous publications and book chapters, including *Theoretical Approaches to Participatory Communication* (Cresskill, NJ: The Hampton Press, 1999), which he edited with Servaes; *Participatory Communication Research for Social Change*, New Delhi: Sage Publications 1996, with Servaes, J. & White, S.A.; "Media Development and Speech in the Public Sphere," in *Media Matters: Perspectives on Advancing Governance & Development*, from the Global Forum for Media Development: Internews Europe (2006). Jacobson is a member of numerous associations, including the International Association for Media and Communication Research; International Communication Association; and the National Communication Association. He has organized numerous conferences and seminars, including most recently the University of Pennsylvania Global Communications Project, "Assessing Participation in Communication Interventions," A Panel of the Participatory Communication Research Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, 50th Annual Conference in Paris from July 25-27, 2007.



KAREN JOHNSON-CARTEE is a tenured professor of advertising and public relations and communication studies in the College of Communication and Information Sciences at the University of Alabama. She specializes in political communication research with an emphasis on political advertising, political public relations, and political news. Her work has been published in *New Perspectives on Political Advertising*, *Journalism Quarterly*, *Newspaper Research Journal*, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, *Southern Political Science Review*, and *ASJMC Insights*. She is co-author of *Negative Political Advertising: Coming of Age*, and *The Manipulation of the American Voter: Modern Political Campaign Commercials and Inside Political Campaigns: Theory and Practice*, published as part of the Praeger Series on Political Communication. She has served as a political media consultant for numerous international, federal, state and local campaigns.

Dr. Cartee has taught courses in a variety of areas including: broadcast news analysis, international communication, mass communication and society, political communication, political campaign communication, strategic planning of persuasive communication, organizational communication, the American Presidency, and Congress, Elections, and Public Opinion. She was named the University's Outstanding Young Scholar for 1985-86, and she was nominated for the National American Association of University Women Award in 1985. Dr. Cartee has received the Knox Hagood Faculty award for excellence in teaching, research and service, and she has received outstanding teaching awards from the Golden Key National Honor Society and Omicron Delta Kappa.

GEORGE KRHODA was the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources until December 2006. He was formerly Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Associate Professor of Geography, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, College of Education and External Studies, and Chairman, Department of Geography, University of Nairobi. He is a hydrologist and water specialist by training. His major areas of research are hydrology, groundwater modeling, natural resources management, environmental assessments, environmental impact assessment, modeling and computer application in water resources planning and development, scenarios for environmental recovery, and project management and evaluation. Professor Krhoda has worked in various capacities for the World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF, UNEP, the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Nairobi, and African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS).

Krhoda's numerous publications include "Water Resources", in *Kenya's Coast Handbook: Culture, Resources and Development in the East African Litoral*, (eds.) Jan Horweg, Dick Foeken and R.A Obudho (1999), *African Studies Centre, Leiden The Netherlands*, pp.345-359; *Changing Patterns in Water Resource Tenure in Kenya and Mechanisms for Resolving Emerging Conflicts*; East African Regional Seminar for Journalists, African Centre for Technology studies (ACTS), (March, 1999); and *Taking Over: Community Water Management in Kenya*, African Centre for Technology studies, ACTS Press (1999).

SUMIR LAL is Head of Internal Communications at the World Bank. Before this, he served as advisor for external affairs in the Bank's New Delhi office from 2000 to 2006, where he pioneered the use of political analysis in complex Bank operations, provided strategic advice to the South Asia Regional Management team and the Bank's Country Director for India, and specialized in risk communications in infrastructure and reform projects. His analysis of the politics of power sector reform in India, *Can Good Economics Ever Be Good Politics?* (World Bank, 2006), was among the first Bank studies to address the political dimensions of ongoing Bank work. Prior to joining the World Bank, Lal was a political journalist in India. During his 18-year journalism career, he held senior editorial positions in a number of leading Indian publications such as *The Telegraph of Kolkata*, *The Hindustan Times*, *The Times of India*, and *The Pioneer of New Delhi*.

PETER MALINGA is an Information, Education and Communication Specialist (IECS) at Human Resources and Institutional Capacity Development Agency (HIDA) in Kigali, Rwanda, which is managing a Government Multi-Sector Capacity Building Programme (MSCBP). He is the interim President of the Public Relations Association of Rwanda (PRAR), a member of the East African Public Relations Association (EAPRA), and a Council Member of the Federation of African Public Relations Association (FAPRA). He has also taught at the National University of Rwanda and the Kigali Institute of Science and Technology (KIST). He has been a public relations practitioner and communications lecturer for the past eight years.

STEVE MASTY is a public policy communications consultant based in London. He has written speeches for several US Presidents and heads of state in Africa, South Asia, and Latin America. After nearly a decade in journalism as a columnist and foreign correspondent, he spent the past 20 years in overseas development including heading CARE International's emergency relief programs in Kabul during the siege of the mid-1990s. Advising development programs on stakeholder communications over four continents for the past decade, he has pioneered many strategic communications tools on a wide variety of issues from economic reform to forestry to work in the social sector. He has directed nearly a dozen video documentaries for stakeholder education, and is an accomplished graphic artist and book illustrator. He has written more than 1,000 published articles, chiefly on politics and policy, and is the author of *The Muslim and the Microphone: Miscommunication in the War on Terror* (Social Affairs Unit, London, 2006).



PHIL NOBLE is one of the top experts in the US and internationally on the use of the Internet in the civic sector – media, politics, governments and non-profits. He is the founder of PoliticsOnline and its affiliated company Phil Noble & Associates, an international public affairs consulting firm. PoliticsOnline is responsible for over a dozen major global innovations and industry firsts. They have developed major e-democracy and interactive projects for such clients as the BBC, the European Union, the United Nations, Amnesty International, and numerous political parties, NGOs, media companies, and corporations. He is a veteran of more than 350 political campaigns and public affairs projects in 40 states and 35 countries, and he has worked to elect the head of state in 15 countries. He and his companies have received numerous awards and recognitions for their work in the US and internationally.

LORI POST is the Assistant Dean for Research in the College of Communication Arts and Science; Assistant Professor in Telecommunication, Information Studies & Media; and Senior Research Fellow at Outreach and Engagement at Michigan State University. She directs several research projects on the impact of emerging media and technology on public health. She is the co-author of *Mobilizing Public Will for Social Change*, which examines the theory and strategies of public will campaigns and offers tangible criteria for their evaluation. It provides strategies for use in mobilizing the public will through an integration of models of agenda building, social problem construction, issues management, social movements, media advocacy, and social capital.

DAVID PROSSER is Projects Manager for the BBC World Service Trust, the international development arm of the BBC. He is the Executive Producer of Bangladesh *Sanglap* ('Dialogue'), a major governance initiative supported by DFID. Bangladesh *Sanglap* is a series of discussion programs on television and radio with a weekly audience of 7 million. The programs have set a new standard for political debate in the country and allow ordinary people a rare opportunity to question politicians and national figures face-to-face. Prosser is an award-winning producer who has made some 50 documentaries for BBC. He has won Britain's premier radio award – a Gold Sony – on two occasions for documentaries on homophobia in Jamaica and paramilitary involvement in Northern Ireland's drugs scene. He has also won two Silver Sony Awards and was a finalist in the Prix Italia and New York Festival Radio Awards. He founded All Out Productions, one of Britain's most successful independent radio production companies.

JEREMY D. ROSNER is Senior Vice President and a partner at Greenberg Quinlan Rosner (GQR), one of the world's leading consultancies for political parties, candidates, governments, NGOs, and corporate leaders. Since joining GQR in 1998, Rosner directed public opinion research and provided strategic advice for dozens of leaders, governments, and campaigns in the US, Europe, and Latin America. Previously, he served as Special Adviser to President Clinton and Secretary of State Albright, leading the Administration's drive to add Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to the NATO Alliance. From 1993-94, Rosner was Special Assistant to President Clinton, serving as Counselor and Senior Director for Legislative Affairs on the staff of the National Security Council. From 1994 to 1997 he was a Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and directed research on the role of public opinion on US foreign policy. He holds a Masters degree in Public Policy from Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and a BA in Politics from Brandeis University. He is a doctoral candidate at the University of Maryland's School of Public Affairs.

PETER SCHECHTER is a partner at Chlopak, Leonard, Schechter and Associates. He specializes in the management of international business and public policy communications. He has helped major corporations to manage difficult international matters. He has been a strategic advisor for Zenith Electronics Corporation on Brazil, Argentina and Chile's decision to adopt a standard for digital television and helped Arthur Andersen offices outside the United States react to the Enron crisis. He has also served as principal advisor in key initiatives for the United Nations Foundation, the World Bank and the World Health Organization and has assisted countries such as Colombia, Ecuador, Spain, Peru, and Portugal in business and tourism promotion programs. Schechter has helped governments implement communications to mobilize public support for a variety of policy initiatives in different countries. In the past years, the governments of Brazil, Georgia, Serbia and Nicaragua retained him to create public education initiatives on issues such as economic reform, land reform, environmental preservation efforts and the rights of indigenous peoples.

Beyond corporate and public policy work, Schechter also served as principal consultant to a number of elections worldwide. This includes work for the Social Democratic Party of Nigeria, President Ernesto Zedillo in Mexico, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso in Brazil, and Presidents Alvaro Uribe and Cesar Gaviria in Colombia. He served previously as senior staff for the Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance and worked at National Public Radio and the Inter-American Development Bank. A graduate of the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, Schechter is fluent in six languages.

J.P. SINGH is Assistant Professor of Communication, Culture, and Technology at Georgetown University. He teaches and researches international trade and negotiations, international development, qualitative research methods, and International cultural policies. He is the author of "Leapfrogging Development? The Political Economy of Telecommunications Restructuring" (SUNY, 1999) and co-editor (with James N. Rosenau) of "Information Technologies and Global Politics: The Changing Scope of Power and Governance" (SUNY, 2002). His current book



project is titled "Negotiating the Global Information Economy". He was Co-Principal Investigator for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: A People Looking Forward, a 300 page report submitted to the U.S. President in 2001. Refereed article publications include those in Information Technology and International Development, Journal of International Communication, Telecommunications Policy, Info, International Negotiation, Prometheus, Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication, Encyclopedia of International Media and Communications, and several edited collections.

Dr. Singh holds several appointments related to his research interests. He is the Editor-in-Chief for Review of Policy Research, an official journal of the Policy Studies Organization, published by Blackwell. He is also a political consultant for Voice of America's Hindi broadcasts and appears regularly on their radio and television shows. He was a Visiting Scholar at the World Trade Organization in Geneva in 2004 and a Visiting Fellow at the New America Foundation (2002-04) in Washington, DC. He also holds several positions in professional associations. He chairs the Science, Technology and Environmental Politics section of the American Political Science Association. He is the President of the International Communication section of the International Studies Association. He is also a Vice President of the Policy Studies Organization. Grants and fellowships include those from the Social Science Research Council, World Bank, World Trade Organization, Ford Foundation, White House, and The Asia Society. He was one of the lead people involved in the World Bank-CCT e-commerce development project "Cottage Industry Global Marketplace" implemented in Himachal Pradesh, India, from 2000 to 2003.