

**MEASURING CHANGE  
AND RESULTS IN  
VOICE AND  
ACCOUNTABILITY WORK**

*SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT DIRECT  
Jeremy Holland and Allyson Thirkell  
with Emmanuel Trepanier and Lucy Earle*



**DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Working Paper 34

**MEASURING CHANGE and RESULTS in  
VOICE and ACCOUNTABILITY WORK**

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT DIRECT**

**Jeremy Holland and Allyson Thirkell  
with Emmanuel Trepanier and Lucy Earle**

December 2009



<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>List of abbreviations</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The importance of measuring work on Voice and Accountability</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Challenges	2
2.2 Conceptualising V&A	2
<b>3. A framework for measuring Voice and Accountability</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Building on DFID’s governance approach	4
3.2 Mapping V&A interventions using the CAR framework	5
3.3 Mapping existing interventions on to the CAR framework	7
<b>4. Towards a set of Voice &amp; Accountability indicators</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Mapping indicators	9
<b>5. ‘How To’ Guidance on V&amp;A indicators</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Management Issues checklist	19
5.2 Management Logframe checklist	25
5.3 Adapting the CAR framework to measure V&A outcomes	26
<b>6. Concluding comments</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>References and web sources</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>List of Annexes</b>	
Annex A – The ODI Voice and Accountability Framework	30
Annex B – Global Measurements of Voice and Accountability	31
Annex C – Case study summaries	41

**List of Figures**

Figure 3.1. The DFID CAR Framework.....4  
Figure 3.2. Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions of Accountability .....6  
Figure 4.1. An illustration of V&A mapping on to the results chain .....11  
Figure 5.1. A graphic representation of V&A in the CAR framework.....26  
Figure 5.2. Mapping project outputs on to the CAR framework: FMRP Bangladesh27

**List of Tables**

Table 3.1. Mapping the case studies onto the CAR framework.....8  
Table 4.1. Mapping V&A indicators .....12  
Table 5.1. DFID Media for Democracy and Accountability in DRC: Selected  
Outputs, Indicators and Means of Verification (MOV) mapped on to the CAR  
framework.....28

**List of Boxes**

Box 5.1. Indicator Standards.....21  
Box 5.2. Quantitative data for measuring V&A behavioural changes .....22  
Box 5.3. DFID DRC Media Project .....23

## **Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to colleagues in the Department for International Development (DFID) for their time and inputs into the development of this paper. We are particularly grateful to Lina Payne and Tim Robertson from DFID's Evaluation Department for their guidance and insights.

We are also grateful to the DFID staff who contributed ideas and material central to producing this report; namely: Jo Abbott, Rosamund Ebdon, Esther Forgan, Graham Gass, Heidi Granger, Frances Harper, Charlotte Heath, Than Thi Thien Huong, Stefan Kossoff, Rabya Nizam, Mark Robinson, Leo Thomas, Ellen Wratten, and Samantha Yates.

Thanks also to DFID and project management staff interviewed for case study material; Olivier Lechien (Medias pour la democratie, DRC) and Monir Moniruzzaman (DFID Bangladesh).

We benefited greatly from the contributions of Emmanuel Trepanier and Lucy Earle (Social Development Direct) to the conceptual development of the paper and for their work on the Annex material.





## **Executive Summary**

- S.1. Citizens' capacity to express and exercise their views is a vital part of poverty reduction. States that can be held accountable for their actions are more likely to respond to the different needs and demands of the public.
- S.2. Citizen voice and accountability (V&A) work has emerged as a priority in the international development agenda, and is part of the broader debate about the importance of governance in improving prospects for poor people. Yet the evidence of its impact on development outcomes is fairly limited.
- S.3. This Working Paper from DFID's Evaluation Department offers a menu of V&A indicators, and suggests steps for building monitoring and evaluation frameworks for V&A interventions. It provides a check list of management issues, and some ideas for data collection. It does not attempt to make any judgement about the indicators identified, as this work will be further developed under DFID's 'Suggested Indicators for Governance' work, due in 2010.
- S.4. The paper is intended for DFID advisers and managers working on V&A initiatives at the country level. It will also be of use to people outside DFID who are interested in understanding how V&A work contributes to development outcomes; or who want more information about data collection methods for V&A measurement.
- S.5. V&A interventions range from work with governments on policy and reform processes, to activities at community level on civic education and rights awareness. DFID supports a significant amount of V&A work through government and non-state actors, in sector programmes and in work with civil society organisations including the media. We now need to establish the evidence base to show what change has resulted.
- S.6. This paper follows on from a DAC evaluation on Citizens' Voice and Accountability in 2008, which identified a lack of good indicators for measuring change in V&A. The authors have drawn on programme literature from the World Bank, UNIFEM and a range of DFID's civil society, rights and governance programmes, to bring together examples of indicators that have been successfully used. They have also examined a number of established governance indexes to highlight possible V&A data source (see Annex B).
- S.7. There are many challenges to measuring change through V&A interventions, particularly because progress often involves intangible changes in power relationships. Measures need to take into account some of the costs, as well as benefits, of poor people's voices being heard; and to show up the obstacles that prevent poor people from engaging effectively. The paper highlights the importance of context, and the need to develop indicators and mechanisms that reflect local social and political factors.
- S.8. The 2008 DAC Citizen Voice and Accountability Evaluation highlighted the importance of working on different dimensions of V&A work in order to achieve impact. This paper underlines the importance of joint planning with donors and government to design more holistic programmes that work on both demand and supply sides. It also highlights the need to use existing data sets, and government or donor processes that may already be happening at the country level, to avoid establishing parallel monitoring mechanisms.



























	Input ↑	Process ↑	Output ↑	V&A Output ↑	Outcome ↑	Impact
<b>Change:</b> <b>Capability:</b> <b>Informal institutional change</b>	Funding Physical resources	Awareness raising/ sensitisation activities	Awareness raised	Social norms of behaviour change	Social, political and economic freedoms supported by behaviour and attitude shifts	Voice and Accountability facilitated
<b>Indicator</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality (for example, predict-ability) of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of attitude change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of behavioural change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indexes listed in Annex B (see above)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Accountability and Responsiveness indicators below</li> </ul>
<b>Instrument</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource monitoring tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity reporting tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception scoring survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception scoring survey</li> <li>Key informant perception scoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See instruments listed below</li> </ul>

Change:	Input	Process	Output	V&A Output	Outcome	Impact
<b>Vertical accountability: Direct engagement</b>	Funding Physical resources	Training/capacity building Network building	Capacity to engage	Direct collective or individual civic engagement with the state	Access to resources or service provision	Improved social, economic and political well-being
<b>Indicator</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality (for example, predictability) of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of training/capacity building activity</li> <li>Level and quality of network building activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of awareness of rights/choice</li> <li>Level of budget/policy literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of participation/ membership</li> <li>Level and quality of networks</li> <li>Level and quality of interaction</li> <li>Level of citizen monitoring/ oversight</li> <li>Level and quality of monitoring evidence generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progressive policies implemented/ pro-poor budgets allocated</li> <li>Resource/asset entitlements secured</li> <li>Procedures changed</li> <li>Services delivered and accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Income poverty levels</li> <li>Health/education levels</li> <li>Political participation levels</li> </ul>
<b>Instrument</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource monitoring tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity reporting tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception scoring survey</li> <li>Key informant scoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group/ Network monitoring data</li> <li>Perception scoring survey</li> <li>Key informant scoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sector MIS</li> <li>Provider survey</li> <li>User satisfaction survey</li> <li>Key informant feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National surveys</li> <li>Project surveys</li> </ul>

	Input ↑	Process ↑	Output ↑	V&A Output ↑	Outcome ↑	Impact
<b>Change:</b> <b>Vertical accountability:</b> <b>Political participation</b>	Funding Physical resources	Training/ capacity building	Capacity to participate	Participation in electoral processes	Access to resources or service provision	Improved social, economic and political well-being
<b>Indicator</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality (for example, predictability) of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of training/ capacity building activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of political literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of political participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progressive policies implemented/ pro-poor budgets allocated</li> <li>Resource/asset entitlements secured</li> <li>Procedures changed</li> <li>Services delivered and accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MDG indicators</li> </ul>
<b>Instrument</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource monitoring tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity reporting tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Election data</li> <li>Voter perception survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sector MIS</li> <li>Provider survey</li> <li>User satisfaction survey</li> <li>Key informant feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National surveys</li> <li>Project surveys</li> </ul>







Change:	Input	Process	Output	V & A Output	Outcome	Impact
<b>Horizontal responsiveness:</b>	Funding Physical resources	Training/capacity building Procedural strengthening	Capacity to respond to state scrutiny	Providing timely and accessible policy/budget information Responding to official scrutiny promptly, and with corrective measures implemented	Access to resources or service provision	Improved social, economic and political well-being
<b>Indicator</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality (for example, predictability) of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and quality of training/capacity building/procedural strengthening activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incidence and quality of information provision and responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progressive policies implemented/pro-poor budgets allocated</li> <li>Resource/asset entitlements secured</li> <li>Procedures changed</li> <li>Services delivered and accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Income poverty levels</li> <li>Health/education levels</li> <li>Political participation levels</li> </ul>
<b>Instrument</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource monitoring tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity reporting tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key informant scoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey monitoring of observable events</li> <li>Key informant scoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sector MIS</li> <li>Provider survey</li> <li>User satisfaction survey</li> <li>Key informant feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National surveys</li> <li>Project surveys</li> </ul>



























































































































