

***“Fe Womble ou Fe Kombit?”*: Political Advocacy and CSOs in Haiti --
Baseline Data and Preliminary Progress**

By Dr. Zeric Kay Smith

USAID/Haiti JD&G Base-Line Indicators Team Leader

Senior Associate
Management Systems International
Washington, DC

* Creole for public protest, and communal work or political meetings respectively.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction: Womble and Kombit	2
“Indicators as Programmatic Tools” or “No Thanks, I am Having an Optional Root Canal”	2
What Impact Should Civil Society Have on Democracy?: Is CSO Advocacy Just a Proxy for Class Status?.....	3
Operationalizing Advocacy with the Advocay Index.....	5
From Advocay Index to Survey Instrument	5
Sampling Frame and Elevated Base-Line	5
Sample Criteria.....	6
Rural/Urban Dimension of Sample.....	8
Control Factors.....	8
Survey Team, Field Conditions, and Sample Size.....	8
Base-Line Data on Advocacy Capacity	9
Model Specification and Results.....	10
Recommendations for Future Data Gathering.....	13
Appendix A Most Common Primary Objectives.....	A-1
Appendix B Survey Instrument (Creole).....	B-1
Appendix C Code Book.....	C-1
Appendix D Regression Analysis, A Primer for Indicators Work.....	D-1
Appendix E Raw Data.....	E-1

Introduction: *Womble* and *Kombit*

There are at least two models of political advocacy that have contemporary currency in Haiti. When a group feels aggrieved, wants to make a point about an issue that concerns them, or wants to sway public opinion, they may well *fe womble* (pronounced fey wumbley). That is, engage in a public march or protest. While most instances of womble are not particularly violent, they can sometimes get out of hand. Much more commonly they seem to serve to reduce the pressures put on some groups by their most militant supporters. The impact of womble on political democracy seems ambiguous. It could be viewed as a form of political advocacy, harmless public expression, or a dangerous precursor to more violent forms of political expression. *Kombit* is another possible form of advocacy which occurs in a Haiti specific context, and it captures two complimentary events. Communal agricultural work in rural areas is called *kombit*. A large number of farmers will work a single field to benefit a particular farmer. In addition to this act of communal work, *kombit* also describes a political meeting. Gathering to hear a political speech or to organize politically may have much in common with communal agricultural work at a conceptual if not a practical level. Communities must produce appropriate political institutions as well as sufficient food. To the extent that *kombit* represents a communal approach to politics, it may provide another important model of political advocacy in Haiti. This report is far from a treatise on Creole orthography, but the double meaning of *Kombit*, and its contrast with *Womble* seem to provide a meaningful illustration of how variable the act of political advocacy can be in Haiti. In addition, the linking of communal work and political work in the same word captures a benign and even hopeful aspect of politics that is often missing in discussions of contemporary Haitian politics.

“Indicators as Programmatic Tools” or “No Thanks, I am Having an Optional Root Canal”

If indicators have the common effect of causing you to flee to more appealing tasks then you have come to the right place. This report hopes to demonstrate that far from being the thankless task of pointy headed intellectuals and wannabe social scientists, indicators can and should serve precise programmatic interests. The MSI JD&G Indicators Project began with a two-hour workshop in which we reviewed the basic model of social scientific enquiry. This was done to familiarize all those involved in the indicators development process with some of the fundamental principles of logic on which indicators rely. A brief review of these points seems in order as we move from data gathering to data analysis and interpretation for the first indicator of interest, CSO advocacy capacity.

The importance of a guiding theory (defined as a set of basic assumptions about how a particular phenomena works) can not be over-stated. By supplying an explanation of how an event occurs, a theory spells out a causal mechanism. Our theory about the role of CSOs in democratic development is central to the interventions that are pursued to support CSOs and should also be accounted for in attempts to measure how such interventions impact on CSOs particularly, and the quality of Haitian democratic practice more generally. Without such a guiding theory to structure our inquiry, we are left to cast about for the most convenient or the most obvious explanations without a systematic consideration of how each part of an explanation relates to its other constituent parts. With a strong theory we can confidently set about the task of testing the validity of a theory through: a) set of hypotheses and operationalized hypothesis b)

a selected method of inquiry c) observation of a set of events, and finally d) analysis of the data and interpretation of results.

In each indicator for the JD&G project, I have been developing a research protocol which outlines the specific methods through which data is to be gathered, recorded, and then analyzed. This protocol is the guarantee of replicability from year to year for each of these indicators. The research protocol for the CSO Advocacy indicator was developed in close consultation with JD&G technical officer Sharon Bean and with crucial support for identifying a sampling frame from the team at MSI / Asosye.

What Impact Should Civil Society Have on Democracy?: Is CSO Advocacy Just a Proxy for Class Status?

The CSO indicator draws heavily on civil society theory -- a set of assumptions about how civil society influences democratic institutions. Civil society is assumed to support democracy in two distinct ways. First, an active and independent civil society plays a “watch-dog” function through which it protects citizens from the abuses of state power. In this way, civil society provides a counterweight to authoritarian states and ultimately serves to press for democratization. This function of civil society has been most often cited in relation to democratic transitions in the third world. Yet a focus on this function of civil society often tends to point analytical attention to institutions of the state rather than to civil society organizations themselves. It is almost a truism that meaningful transitions to democracy are more than just the democratization of state institutions. While this is an important component of how CS may influence democracy, it is not the only empirical question at hand. We may be able to gain some knowledge about how any given civil society operates in practice by looking at how it counteracts the state, but a more full notion of civil society is needed in order to understand how it impacts on democracy. Further, support for and capacity building of CSOs needs to be more carefully targeted at particular group types than a broad focus on civil society as a “watch-dog” allows.

The second way we would expect civil society to have an influence on new and developing democracies is at the levels of the CSOs themselves and the individual citizens who participate in them. Theories of civic participation stress the importance of associational activity in support of democracy because participation in the realm of civil society-based associations is assumed to increase both an individuals “...motivation and ... capacity to take part in political life” (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995, 3). Participation in civil society-based groups should accomplish these goals in a number of ways by: 1) teaching skills that translate easily to political arenas; 2) promoting a host of productive political attitudes (trust, reciprocity, tolerance); 3) exposing participants to political stimuli; and 4) creating a network of groups that improve the capacity for common political action (Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978, Pateman 1970 and Putnam 1993 as cited in Seligson 1999, 343). Various social groupings are seen to participate in a web of interconnected associations; in doing so these activities increase the social capital of the

society at large, while at the same time creating the “active, public-spirited citizenry” who cooperate and trust in a “civil” society (Putnam with Leonardi and Nanetti 1993).¹

If we are able to examine the constituent parts of civil society, we should then be able to make empirical judgments as to the particular contributions each might make in building democracy. It should be possible to determine the variable contributions of different types of groups, some of which will likely fulfill the promise of democracy builders, while others will certainly prove less democratic. Which groups, if any, contribute to a civil society supportive of democratic institutions? By systematic evaluations of this sort, we can begin to use the concept of civil society as an analytical lens to aid us in focusing on the roles of the variety of groups which periodically inhabit it. *While all of these are important issues, the central question that the CSO Advocacy indicator is explicitly designed to answer is what is the impact of ongoing AID interventions that are targeted at increasing the advocacy capacity of CSOs in Haiti?* Our theory places this particular question in the wider context of civil society’s potential contributions to democratic transitions and democratic consolidation. Further, CS theory allows us to view advocacy both in terms of the “watchdog” functions and the group and individual level transformations that may occur in the context of CSO activity.

Some critics counter that CSOs like other participants in contemporary democratization simply serve as a proxy for middle-class interests and do not really represent the aspirations of a broad popular and democratic movement. In fact as we refined the survey instrument for this indicator, this precise question came up. By measuring CSO capacity to perform advocacy are we simply taping into attributes that are most likely to be present in middle-class and upper-class groups. Lobbying politicians, letter writing, information gathering, submitting draft legislation, monitoring policy implementation ... all of these activities are measured as advocacy but all seem to require a level of sophistication and resources that are likely to be present most often among middle and upper-class CSOs. Further, it is likely that most grass-roots CSOs don’t consider “advocacy” per se as something that they engage in at all. Instead, they may be more likely to simply pursue the particular (usually development oriented) goals of their group. In order to deal with this issue, the operationalization of the Advocacy Index tried to account for the particular interests and goals of each CSO interviewed and then concentrate on advocacy activities that emerge as a function of pursuing the primary goals of each CSO. In this way, we believe that we are able to meet, at least in part, the critique that “advocacy” is merely a proxy for class status.

¹Some critics of Putnam echo those of civil society theory in general. Particularly relevant is the point that social capital can be turned to nefarious ends as well as positive ones so that high degrees of social capital might result in a “civic virtue” that is not always so virtuous. (This critique was noted at the Round Table Discussion entitled “Do Trust, Civic Engagement, the Strengthening of Intermediate Institutions, Reciprocity, Rebuilding our Social Capital, Bowling Together and Other Cultural Approaches to Improving Democratic Governance Hold Real Promise?” at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, August, 1996, San Francisco, CA.)

Operationalizing Advocacy with the Advocay Index

The current AID/Haiti Performance Monitoring Plan identifies as IR 5.1 “Targeted Haitian Civil Society Organizations Progress in Developing their Capacity to Advocate for Policy Change”. Advocacy is seen as the *sine qua non* of CSO contributions to democracy. The degree to which CSOs “articulate their objectives; collect information; formulate policy positions; obtain and allocate resources; publicize; network; and lobby and monitor policy positions and government actions” are all seen to have an impact on the quality of Haitian democracy. Advocacy capacity was operationalized using a survey instrument designed by the contractor which includes at least one question on each component of advocacy as identified in the Advocacy Index. As mentioned above, a focus on the identification of a group’s “primary issue” and then the pursuit of advocacy as pertains to that issue itself makes good analytical sense. This seems to be a more accurate way to tap into advocacy strength than a simple general measure of abstract advocacy capacity. This is so because it accounts for a level of interest and commitment to the issue at hand that can then be held constant for all groups. In other words, the advocacy capacity of any group can always be a function of group interest. If the group is not interested in an issue, then even one that has a high level of capacity will not exercise it and thus not appear to have much advocacy capacity. By looking at the primary issues, we provide a means by which many less explicitly politically orient groups can demonstrate their advocacy capacity in non-politically charged ways.² Nonetheless, our theory still indicates that these activities can have important political import in both the short and longer terms.

From Advocay Index to Survey Instrument

Copies of the survey instrument in Creole and a copy of the survey code book in English can be found in the appendixes of this report. Each survey question draws on particular components of the advocacy index as presented in the USAID/Haiti Performance Monitoring Plan under SO 5 “More Genuinely Inclusive Democratic Governance” IR 1 “Civil Society Organizations Positively Influence Policies”. The index is only slightly modified as discussed above so that each group is asked about advocacy aimed at their primary issue/s. The index includes data points on each of seven advocacy elements: 1) Articulates Objectives; 2) Collects Information and Input; 3) Consultative Policy Position; 4) Obtain/Allocate Resources; 5) Coalition and Network Building; 6) Political Action; and 7) Follow-up Action. These elements each have between three and five sub-elements and survey questions all respond to particular sub-elements.

Sampling Frame and Elevated Base-Line

The basic design of this project relies on the idea of a base-line. The base-line serves as a pre-intervention control. What would things be like for CSOs in Haiti if USAID/Haiti never existed? In principle, the answer is our baseline. However, the CSO indicator is not going to represent a true base-line. This is because there has been an ongoing set of interventions and so the base-line is likely to be elevated above what we would otherwise expect given ongoing

² Appendix A includes a table that summarizes the number of groups which focus on the five most popular primary objectives.

interventions. We need to consider some of the implications of an elevated base-line. If we have reason to believe that interventions have the same impact from start to finish over a number of years, then an elevated base-line poses no problem at all. We simply assume that each year (or other time period) has had a comparable impact and count back the number of years the intervention has been ongoing to get an idea of the true base-line. Unfortunately, things are never that straight forward. If (as seems likely in this case) it could be expected that CSOs respond and change quickly at first (as they make the changes that come easily) and then more slowly as time goes on (as they deal with more difficult and profound changes) then an elevated base-line will result in losing a measure of quite a bit of progress early in the intervention period. This can be dealt with in a number of different ways.

Manipulation of the sampling frame is one method. If we can establish a sampling universe that includes both treated and non-treated groups and then ensure that exposure to treatment is not a function of some other systematic factor, we can make reasonable comparisons between groups that have been exposed to USAID interventions and those that have not. A more detailed discussion of how this was accomplished is found below in the Sample Criteria section of the report.

Another way to deal with an elevated base-line is through careful qualitative work. Particularly, this could be accomplished through systematic examination of printed documents from earlier periods, reliance on reports that emerged from previous projects, etc. Other methods might include participant observation studies of a representative set of groups that allow detailed examination of group development and current group operation. Mission is strongly advised to systematically employ these type of supplementary research strategies to adequately deal with the possible problems of an elevated base-line and to account (and take any credit that might be reasonably due) for progress in advocacy that has already taken place. It may be that a research strategy which stresses more qualitative and case specific knowledge could be paired with the advocacy index in the future to account for some of these differences. In fact, ASOCYE/MSI has suggested just such a strategy as a potential follow-up to the survey that they have recently administered.

Sample Criteria

The sample was drawn to allow for comparisons on the basis of level/degree of treatment (treatment - level of exposure to ASOSYE interventions). Thus, not only are we able to draw on this data to establish a base-line to measure the impact of programming in the future, it may also be used to draw some conclusions about past programming efficacy. This said, it is also important to recognize the limitations of the methodology given the relatively small number of groups surveyed and the complexity of the sampling problem faced in this case. Because the groups that are exposed to ASOSYE interventions are likely to be the strongest and most organizationally capable groups that exist in the geographical areas, there is a pre-treatment selection bias. This means that a direct comparison between treated groups and non-treated groups in the same areas would yield a biased result in favor of the treated groups. That is, prior to treatment, the treated groups are already generally typified by stronger capacity and so we would fully expect them to be stronger on a number of dimensions in the wake of treatment. Further, the level of difference is not known and thus we must rely on a general strategy of

comparison that examines similar group types in *different geographic* areas. Some areas have seen markedly more treatment (ASOSYE activity) than others. By controlling basic factors like socio-economic level, geography, culture, etc. we should be able to isolate the independent impact of the treatment on levels of advocacy. The areas we chose to sample in were identified on the basis of the following criteria:

- 1) Level of previous and ongoing ASOSYE activity: In each matched pair one area must represent a high level of activity and the other a low level. The scoring of each area was determined in consultations with ASOSYE staff and JD&G AID-Haiti technical officers.
- 2) Socioeconomic, geographic, and cultural similarity: Both areas in the matched pair must represent a reasonably close match on these dimensions so as to provide confidence that any differences on the dependent variable are in fact due differences in exposure to treatment. Sufficient similarity was determined in consultations with JD&G AID-Haiti technical officers and Haitian social scientists who make up part of the CSO research team.
- 3) Maximize geographic representation of the sample: The geographical coverage of the sample as a whole was considered an important factor in identifying areas of comparison.
- 4) Limitations imposed by available resources: As in all social science research some compromises must be made to accommodate the level of resources available to gather data. Thus, extremely isolated areas that performed strongly on other criteria were eliminated because they could not be sampled within the confines of an already generous base-line indicators budget. (The otherwise well qualified areas of Jérémie and Les Cayes were eliminated on this criteria.)

In response to these criteria, five geographical areas were identified in which samples were taken. The areas are identified in Table 1.

Table 1 Geographic Regions and Sampling Criteria

<i>Area Name</i>	<i>Level of ASOSYE Activity</i>	<i>Geography</i>	<i>Socio-Economic</i>	<i>Limits on Resources</i>	<i>Sample Subset</i>
Port-de-Paix	Low	North/Coast	Medium	OK	A
Cap-Haïtien	High	North/Coast	Medium	OK	A
Miragoâne	Very Low	South/Coast	High	OK	B
Jacmel	High	Far South/Coast	Medium	OK	B
Port-au-Prince	High	Central Coast	High	OK	C

Rural/Urban Dimension of Sample

In each area with the exception of Port-au-Prince, at least six groups were interviewed. In the Port-au-Prince area a total of at least 12 groups were sampled. Each area has at least three urban groups and three rural groups in the sample, in Port-au-Prince the sample is at least 9 urban and 3 rural/semi-rural. This sampling strategy corresponds to the targeting levels of ASOSYE interventions as mandated by AID/Haiti. It does not necessarily reflect the actual level of group activity along the rural/urban dimension. Instead, it purposefully over-samples rural groups to ensure a large enough sample size for statistically meaningful results. Even so, with a total sample size of 45, there are some limits on the significance levels of certain findings.

Control Factors

A number of standard control factors are employed which allow the sample to be analytically disaggregated. Factors such as members and leaders age, gender, socio-economic status, and employment, as well as issues of group focus, size, organizational structure, and substantive orientation of the group are all considered as control factors that could help explain differences in advocacy capacity. This allows the analysis to hold these factors as constants while looking to the influences of exposure to treatment on the level of advocacy of interviewed groups. The use of summary statistics, descriptive statistics, and basic OLS regression techniques are employed to draw inferential conclusions from the data.

Survey Team, Field Conditions, and Sample Size

The survey team consisted of two experienced Haitian researchers. The senior member of the team has an advanced degree in Sociology and both have a long record of survey research in Haiti. Both researchers are fluent in Creole, French, and English. The survey was administered between September 16, 1999 and Oct. 15, 1999 in the five areas identified in Table 1 above.

The field conditions in which the researchers operated required some modifications to the sampling protocol. The initial protocol called for the in-field creation of a CSO list in the two areas where no list was available and then randomly sampling from that list. In fact, this was not logistically feasible given the time constraints under which the survey team was operating. In addition to time constraints, they were also faced with an initial suspicion and distrust. Given Haiti's unfortunate history of political instability and military repression, strangers in a small town who are asking about community groups could well be perceived to have nefarious motives. To dispel this distrust and to accomplish the interviews within the allotted time frame, a "snowball" sampling technique was employed in two areas. This means the researchers made initial contacts with groups via contacts in other regions or through interview facilitators who were used in each area. From these initial contacts the groups that were interviewed provided lists of other CSOs that the respondents were aware of. The interviewers then chose randomly from the suggested groups and continued to the next interview. This method allowed the interviewers to overcome the problems of distrust and time constraints.

A snowball sample creates a level of non-randomness in the sample. This is most likely to have an impact on the level of Coalition and Network Building measure where we would probably see a higher level in the areas where a snowball was used. This is because the sampling method itself almost insures that only groups which have some contacts with other groups will be included in the sampling universe. In virtually all other conceivable areas of interest for this indicator, the bias created by this method should not dramatically alter results.

The difficulties encountered in locating groups where a randomized list was not available is balanced to some degree by an extremely high level of survey completion. This allowed for a sample much larger than had originally anticipated by AID (15/20 as per original SOW), or planned for (30-35 as per CSO research protocol). In fact the number of surveys completed and coded for inclusion in this report is 45. The high response and completion rates can be credited to interviewer professionalism and competence. Of greatest importance, the number of surveys provides for greater statistical validity and makes multivariate statistical analysis possible. This in turn allows us to use a very flexible methodological tool (regression analysis) to help us sort out the impacts of interventions and other input variables on our dependent variable (level of Advocacy).

Base-Line Data on Advocacy Capacity

Prior to a discussion of the regression equation models and results, let us briefly examine the base-line figure for 1999 in each of seven advocacy areas which has been compiled and appears in Table 2. An aggregate of these areas, the Advocacy Index Score, is also included in the table. Each of these figures is a mean score taken from the responses from all survey respondents.

Table 2 Advocacy Base-line Data

<i>Advocacy Area</i>	<i>Mean Calculated as a Function of:</i>	<i>Base-line Mean (Min/Max)</i>
Articulates Objectives	Sum questions 10, 10_1, 11,12_2, 13_A, 14 , & 15, (total number of responses)	4.17 (1/9)
Collects Information and Input	Sum questions 16 and 18 (total number of responses)	2.58 (1/6)
Consultative Policy Position	Sum of questions 17 (recoded response 1=.25, 2= 1, 3=.75, 4=1, 5=.5, 9=value coded individually), 19, 23, (total number of responses) and 25 (coded by contractor 1= policy position closely matches primary issue[13_A], .5= policy position roughly matches primary issue, 0= policy position does not match primary issue)	3.36 (2/4)
Obtain and Allocate Resources	Sum questions 28-30 (total number of responses)	4.27 (2/8)

Network & Coalition Building	Sum of questions 31_1-31_4, 32_1-32_4, and 33-34 total number of responses)	5.76 (0/12)
Political Actions	Sum of question 35 (total number of responses)	1.64 (0/5)
Follow-up Actions	Sum of question 36 (total number of responses)	1.64 (0/5)
Advocacy Index Scale Aggregate	Sum of DVs from regressions 1-7	23.42 (12.5/38)

Model Specification and Results

Beyond the task of establishing base-line measures, this report is also trying to provide some level of knowledge about *the impact of ongoing AID interventions that are targeted at increasing the advocacy capacity of CSOs in Haiti*. Thus advocacy capacity is our dependent variable (the phenomenon that needs to be explained) and the influence of all of the control variables (independent variables) is compared with that of the key control variable, exposure to ASOSYE. This comparison is accomplished with a series of eight regression equations. Each of the first seven uses one component of the advocacy scale as the dependent variable. The final equation (8) uses the combined or aggregated Advocacy Index Scale as the dependent variable. The results of these eight regression equations are presented below in Table 1.

Preliminary data analysis allowed the elimination of a host of other control variables that proved to have little to contribute to the explanation of what influences advocacy levels. The factors that were found to be of little analytical use included the sex of a groups leaders, geographic differences, and group-types with the exception of groups most interested in civic education as a primary goal. The other variables were eliminated in these final equations in order to preserve degrees of freedom and to simplify the analysis.

Table 3 Areas of Advocacy Capacity Regressed Against Asosye Exposure and Control Variables.

Control Variables	Equation 1 Articulate Obj.	Equation 2 Info & Input	Equation 3 Policy Positions	Equation 4 Resources	Equation 5 Netwks&Coalis.	Equation 6 Political Action	Equation 7 Follow-up	Equation 8 Adv. Ind. Scale
ASOSYE Exposure	<i>-.034</i> (.113)	NO	<i>-.034</i> (.036)	<i>-.120*</i> (.068)	<i>.520***</i> (.153)	NO	NO	<i>.341</i> (.303)
Rural/Urban	<i>-1.90**</i> (.816)	VARIABLES	<i>-.337</i> (.260)	<i>-1.67***</i> (.494)	<i>-.224</i> (1.11)	VARIABLES	VARIABLES	<i>-4.947**</i> (2.195)
Leadership Education	<i>.272*</i> (.142)	SIGNIFICANT	<i>.016</i> (.045)	<i>.197**</i> (.086)	<i>-.056</i> (.192)	SIGNIFICANT	SIGNIFICANT	<i>.522</i> (.382)
Member Literate %	<i>.748**</i> (.311)	IN	<i>.108</i> (.099)	<i>.641***</i> (.188)	<i>-.235</i> (.421)	IN	IN	<i>1.533*</i> (.836)
Member Sex % women	<i>.485</i> (1.31)	THIS	<i>-.945**</i> (.415)	<i>1.93**</i> (.790)	<i>.315972</i> (1.77)	THIS	THIS	<i>.912</i> (3.51)
Group Focus Civic Ed	<i>.009</i> (.921)	EQUATION	<i>-.154</i> (.293)	<i>.763</i> (.558)	<i>-4.25***</i> (1.25)	EQUATION	EQUATION	<i>-5.07**</i> (2.48)
Adjusted R ²	<i>.105</i>	<i>-.097</i>	<i>.168</i>	<i>.214</i>	<i>.253</i>	<i>-.102</i>	<i>-.105</i>	<i>.136</i>
Unstandardized coefficients italicized, standard errors in parentheses *p≤.10 **p≤.05 ***p≤.01								

We should first note that there are three equations which yield no usable statistical inferences (Equations 2, 6, and 7). This means we can not draw any useful conclusions on the basis of these three findings. In general the rest of the equations contribute modestly in explaining differences among CSO advocacy capacity. For the combined scale in Equation 8, an adjusted R^2 score of .136 indicates that we are only able to explain a bit more than 13 percent of the variance in advocacy capacity. At the highest levels (equations 4 and 5) we see R^2 scores of .21 and .25 respectively which give us more satisfactory but still limited explanatory power. On the whole this lets us know that there are other important factors at work that are not considered in this analysis and again points to the importance of more in-depth study of CSO advocacy in general and of Haitian CSOs in particular.

The most important finding that emerges out of this series of regressions is the ambiguous performance of our key independent variable, Asosye exposure. Over all, there is a marked absence of influence that reported exposure to Asosye has had on the advocacy levels of those groups that participated in the survey. In one instance (Network & Coalition Building) Asosye exposure is responsible for rises in the levels of advocacy capacity (statistical significance is indicated by astrisks and positive correlation by the figures in italics). Recall that because of the sampling method used for some of the surveys, we should be cautious in interpreting this particular finding. Snowball sampling taps into established networks and thus could over-represent networking capacity. At the same time it is also arguable that much of the Asosye training program builds networks and thus could be responsible for positive results in this area. Conversely, in the case of Regression 4 (Obtain & Allocate Resources) the data suggests that exposure to Asosye activities actually lowers Advocacy scores. This seems curious unless we argue that by participation in Asosye training, CSOs get the false impression that Asosye itself will be source for development resources and thus they abandon other methods for obtaining resources. This analysts does not think this is a particularly plausible explanation and it is likely that there are other important factors at work that would explain this finding.

Three other findings deserve brief mention. First, we find that rural groups have systematically higher advocacy scores than urban groups. This may seem counterintuitive unless one takes into account that the need for advocacy by rural groups may be greater and the pay-off may also be greater. Thus motivation to pursue advocacy may increase among rural groups. It may also be true that a focus on rural groups by funding agencies (including AID) has had the intended effect of building group capacity to advocate. Without time sensitive data however, such a conclusion would be premature at best. Second we note that the percentage of literate members has a positive impact on advocacy capacity. This is entirely consistent with numerous studies of political behavior around the world. Education provides crucial tools that allow for participation and empower citizens thus we would expect greater degrees of advocacy among those who are more educated. This implies that literacy training at least could be an important investment that contributes directly to the goal of strengthening democratic accountability in Haiti. Finally the finding that groups who focus on Civic Education have a *lower* advocacy capacity than other groups is a bit puzzling. This analyst is at a loss as to why groups that want to encourage citizen participation in the political process are themselves less able to advocate for that goal within the political arena. At least this finding provides an important target for future intervention and training. Investment in Civic Education groups is clearly needed and since there seems to be so much room for improvement, they would likely demonstrate a good deal of progress over a short time.

On the whole, we would expect to see more compelling findings but there are a number of reasons why the results we have obtained may make sense. First, there are plausible explanations for almost all of the findings noted in the regression equations. For example, none of the Asosye interventions have targeted obtaining and allocating resources explicitly. Thus it may be entirely unrealistic to expect exposure to have a positive impact on this component of advocacy. More broadly though, the hope that our sampling method could capture past gains in advocacy that occurred in the early years of Asosye intervention may have proved overly optimistic. While we have tried to control for the problem of sampling a population for data on an ongoing intervention, it may be that the methods devised are unable to sort out the complexity of interactions that one might expect to be operative over the four years that Asosye activity has been ongoing. The base-line data now provides a means of making annual measures on the selected criteria and the precision of results should increase dramatically in future years.

Programmatic implications suggest a need to continue focus on CS and advocacy but with a renewed realization that advocacy can only reasonably be expected to be demonstrated in an issue specific context. Most CSOs are oriented toward their particular group goals first and only pursue advocacy that may have a politically significant impact as an outgrowth of their “primary” issues. Second, a renewed focus on “pre-advocacy” may make good sense given the general low scores of most all groups.

Recommendations for Future Data Gathering

The usefulness and accuracy of this indicator will depend on careful record keeping and ongoing analysis. In coming years JD&G must determine the nature and method for gathering annual data. The most precise and useful data would come from a panel study in which the same groups are polled each year. This allows the study to control very precisely for any changes that occur from year to year. Alternatively a new sample could be generated year by year but with the limited sampling universe this may not make much practical sense. Further because the population of surveyed groups is likely to remain small (40-45) the capacity of regression analysis will be more challenged than in a panel study. One drawback of a panel study is that if a particular non-treated group gets annual requests for surveys, they may well begin to wonder (and rightly so) why they should donate time and energy to respond to surveys when they are not included in training programs. It thus may make sense to give surveyed groups some sort of incentive for continued participation. This might be in the form of invitations to Asosye administered trainings. By monitoring the progress of such previously untreated groups closely, AID/Haiti will be able to have a greater degree of confidence that this set of interventions makes a difference in the quality of advocacy among Haitian CSOs and in turn the quality of Haitian democracy.

Appendix A

Most Common Primary Objectives

<i>Primary Issue</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Civic Education	5	11.1
Commerce/wholesale	5	11.1
Cooperative Credit	5	11.1
Education/Schooling	9	20.0
Women's Rights	4	8.9

Appendix B - Survey Instrument (Creole)

Ankèt sou Oganizasyon Sosyete Sivil an Ayiti: Kouman gwoup yo ap mennen aksyon pou chanjman yo vle

Enfòmasyon pou Anketè a bay (fòk enfòmasyon yo ka pemet sipevizè rejwenn menm enfomatè yo, si l ta vle)

Depatman _____ Awondisman _____

Vil _____ Komin _____

Seksyon _____ Lokalite/Bitasyon _____

Non Enfomatè a _____

Relasyon Enfomatè a ak Sosyete Sivil: _____

Ki kote e ki jan ou te rive pale ak Enfomatè a? _____

Ki jan ou te rive jwenn enfomatè-a pou ou pale avè-l (ki jan ou te jwenn adrès enfomatè-a)?

Ki Oganizasyon ?

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gwoupman devlopman | <input type="checkbox"/> Konsèy kominotè | <input type="checkbox"/> Gwoupman fanm |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ONG | <input type="checkbox"/> Gwoupman agrikól | <input type="checkbox"/> Gwoup jèn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asosyasyon | <input type="checkbox"/> Mouvman | <input type="checkbox"/> Gwoup kredi |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Koperativ | <input type="checkbox"/> Sendika | |

Enfòmasyon sou fason kesyonè a ranpli

Kómanse: _____ Fini: _____

- Acheve
- Inacheve

Rezon

- Kolaborasyon pa fèt
- Refize kontinye
- Moun k'ap reponn nan manke enfòmasyon
- Lót

Anketè: Prezante tèt ou

Bonjou/Bonswa. Mwen rele... Genyen yon òganizasyon ki rele MSI kap mennen yon ti anketè sou òganizasyon sosyete sivil la nan peyi-a. Yo ta renmen bay yo plis jarèt pou yo kap rive jwen bi yo vize-a. Nap mande-w pou ou ta bay patisipasyon nan anketè la. Tout ti brase lide nou pral fè la-a, fèt pou rete ant nou menm. Nou remesye-w pou ti tan sa-a ke-w pral akode nou pou nou ka poze kèk ti kesyon sou òganizasyon

Seksyon 1: Idantifikasyon

1. Non Òganizasyon an: _____
2. Sig Òganizasyon an: _____
3. Dat Òganizasyon an fome: _____
4. Ban nou kèk enfòmasyon sou komite direktè òganizasyon an :

Fonksyon	Non	Sèks		Laj	Edikasyon	Pwofesyon	Travay
		G	f				
1. Prezidan							
2. v. prezidan							
3. Sekretè							
4. Trezorye							
5. Konseye							
6. Delege							
7.							

5. Eske pifò manm nan òganizasyon an gen mwens ke 30 an osinon plis ke 30an?
Mwens ke 30an _____ Plis ke 30an _____
6. Ki pousantay manm òganizasyon an ki konn li ak ekri ? (*fè yon kwa nan kare devan bon repons la*)
__ Tout
__ Pi fò
__ Apeprè mwaye
__ Kèk manb
__ Okenn
__ Pa konnen

Seksyon 2: Bi Òganizasyon

7. Konbyen manb ki genyen nan Oganizasyon an?

Manb aktif _____

(Aktif = manb ki dakò ak bi òganizasyon an, ki gen kat e ki patisipe regilyèman nan tout reinyon ak tout lòt aktivite òganizasyon an)

Manb aderan _____

(Aderan =manb ki dakò ak bi òganizasyon an, ki gen kat, men ki pa patisipe regilyèman nan sa kap fet)

8. Konbyen fanm ki nan òganizasyon an?

Aktif _____

Aderan _____

9. Ki bi fondal natal óganizasyon-an? *(make bon repons la)*

10. ___ pou remanbre kominote a

___ pou defann dwa nou

___ fè presyon sou gouvènman

___ pou pèmèt kominote a rezoud pwoblèm li menm

___ paske kominote a pat ko gen óganizasyon

___lót (presize) _____

11. Eske òganizasyon gen estati osinon règleman pou manm yo?

Wi_ Non_ (ale nan kesyon 11)

11b) Mwen ta renmen wè yo?*(Anketè jete yon kout je nan dokiman yo epitou make sa ou jwen)*

___ Règleman pou manm yo *(Règleman pou manm yo suiv kap pèmet yo konprann kijan pou yo fonksyone chak jou tankou lòd dijou, lè pou yo fè eleksyon, e latrye).*

___ Estati *(Pouvwa, Obligasyon manm yo, estrikti ak bi òganizasyon, e latrye)*

___ Yon dokiman ki gen regleman ak estati ansanm

11. Eske oganizasyon an gen yon rekonesans legal?

Wi_ non_ (ale nan kesyon 13)

12. *(Si li di wi, mande l)* Eske ou ka pèmet mwen wè papyè-a, tanpri?

12.1. Dat Leta rekonèt li: Jou_____/Mwa_____/Ane_____

12.2. *(Anketè, gade dokiman an epitou make sa ou jwenn)*

___ Se yon lèt ki soti nan men yon eli lokal yo (tankou majistra a)

___ Se yon lèt ki soti nan Ministè Afè Sosyal osinon Ministè Planifikasyon ak Kooperasyon Ekstèn

13. Nan ki domèn òganizasyon lan ap feraye?

(Anketè, pa li lis bay enfomatè-a; make tout repons enfomatè-a bay)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Komès ak lòt bò dlo | <input type="checkbox"/> Chèche dyòb pou moun | <input type="checkbox"/> Dlo potab |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Komès andedan peyi-a | <input type="checkbox"/> Anviwonman | <input type="checkbox"/> Sante piblik |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Atizana | <input type="checkbox"/> Erozyon & Konsèvasyon sòl | <input type="checkbox"/> Relijyon |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Edikasyon sivik | <input type="checkbox"/> Sante pou Fanmi | <input type="checkbox"/> Sanitasyon |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Komès en gro | <input type="checkbox"/> La Kilti ak Irigasyon | <input type="checkbox"/> SIDA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Komès en detay | <input type="checkbox"/> Pêch | <input type="checkbox"/> Spò |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kooperativ kredi | <input type="checkbox"/> Dwa moun | <input type="checkbox"/> Transpò |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kooperativ travayè | <input type="checkbox"/> Endistri | <input type="checkbox"/> Sendika |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aktivite kiltirel | <input type="checkbox"/> Refom agre | <input type="checkbox"/> Dwa fanm |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Edikasyon/Lekol | <input type="checkbox"/> Pwomosyon pwodui (Marketing) | <input type="checkbox"/> Politik |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elvaj | <input type="checkbox"/> Nitrityon | <input type="checkbox"/> Lot domen(presize l _____) |

Nan tout sa ou soti di la yo, mwen ta renmen ou dim kiles ki pi enterese oganizasyon ou lan
(Ankete, ekri sali di ou la nan liy lan) _____

Nou pral pale de sije ki pi enterese oganizasyon ou lan.

14. Eske oganizasyon an genyen yon plan travay pou tout ane a?

Wi Non

15. (Si wi) Eske mwen ka wel, si l vou ple?

(Make sa ou jwen nan plan travay la)

Plan dakasyon an idantifye priorite gwoup la (bi prensipal)

Plan dakasyon an idantifye lot ti vizyon oganizasyon an

Plan dakasyon an idantifye kile oganizasyon ap fe chak aktivite yos

Seksyon 3: Sous Enfomasyon

16. Le nou konsidere sije ki pi enterese oganizasyon an, ki kote ou tal cheche enfomasyon sou sije sayo? (Make tout sa l di ou)

Oganizasyon ki fe pati Gouvenman an

ONG (Lokal)

ONG (Entenasyonal)

Oganizasyon prive (presize) _____

Lot (presize) _____

Nou pa janm al cheche enfomasyon sou sije sayo _____

17. Kouman oganizasyon an te rive chwazi sije sayo kom pryorite?
(*Tanpri, presize*)_____

Section 4: Policy Formation

18. Ki jan mann yo brase lide sou sije ki pi enterese oganizasyon an? (*Ankete make tout sayo di*)

<input type="checkbox"/> Nan Asanble Jeneral (General Assembly)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anons Piblik
<input type="checkbox"/> Pa Let	<input type="checkbox"/> Pót vwa
<input type="checkbox"/> Pot a pot (Face to face)	<input type="checkbox"/> Youn di lòt
<input type="checkbox"/> Pa radyo (Radio)	<input type="checkbox"/> Telefón
<input type="checkbox"/> Nou pa brase lide	<input type="checkbox"/> Lòt jan _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Nan reinyon yo	

19. Konbyen fwa nan ane a, nou genyen Asanble Jeneral? (Make tout sayo di ou)

Chak semenn
 Chak mwa
 Chak twa mwa
 Chak si mwa
 Chak ane
 Nou pa janm fe-l
 Lòt(*presize*)_____

20. Konbyen ki kon patisipe nan Asanble Jeneral la?_____

21. Konbyen fanm ki kon patisipe nan Asanble Jeneral la ?_____

22. De kisa nou pale jeneralman nan Asanble Jeneral la?

23. Chak kile nou fe reinyon odine yo? (Make yon sel repons. Pa li repons yo) Chak semenn

Chak mwa
 Chak twa mwa
 Chak si mwa
 Chak ane
 Lòt repons (*presize*)_____

24. De kisa nou kon pale nan reinyon yo?

25. Kisa oganizasyon an ta renmen realize nan sije ki pi enterese l yo?

26. Kiles ou panse ki ta dwe ede-n realize sa ki enterese oganizasyon an? (*Make tout sayo di ou*)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prezidan peyi a | <input type="checkbox"/> Eli lokal yo (Kasek, Majistra) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | <input type="checkbox"/> Lot Mandate (Senate, Depite) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oganizasyon Aysyen lot bo dlo | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Baye de Fon Entenasyonal | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG Entenasyonal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oganizasyon Relijye | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG lokal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lot repons (<i>Presize</i>) _____ | |

Section 5: Resous

27. Kijan oganizasyon an te rive jwen kob, poul mennen aksyon li vle mennen yo, pou chanjman ke l swete yo? (*Ankete Make tout sa l di ou*)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gouvenman | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG lokal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manm oganizasyon an | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG Entenasyonal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pati Politik | <input type="checkbox"/> Oganizasyon relijye |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lot repons (<i>Presize</i>) _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nou pat jwenn kob | |

28. Nan men kiles jwen lot ed ki pa kob pou pwoje ki pi enterese oganizasyon (takou moun ki vle bay kouraj yo, materyel, yon sevis kelkonk, e latrye)? (*Ankete, make sayo di ou.*)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gouvenman | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG lokal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manm oganizasyon an | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG Entenasyonal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pati Politik | <input type="checkbox"/> Oganizasyon relijye |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Lot repons (<i>Presize</i>) _____ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Nou pat jwenn kob |

29. Ki demach oganizasyon pral fe poul ka jwen kob poul realize pwoje ki pi enpotan pou li yo?.

30. Ki demach oganizasyon pral fe poul ka jwen ed an materyel poul realize pwoje ki pi enpotan pou li yo?.

Section 6: Relasyon ak Lot Sekte

31. Eske ou konnen lot gwoupman, lot oganizasyon ki pataje menm entere ave ou nan pwoje ki pi enterese oganizasyon pa ou la? (*Tanpri, bay non yo*)

Gwoup 1
Gwoup 2
Gwoup 3
Gwoup 4

32. Ki lot oganizasyon nou te motive pou pote kole ak oganizasyon pa nou an nan sa nap defan lan?

Gwoup 1
Gwoup 2
Gwoup 3
Gwoup 4

__Pat fe sa ditou

33. Nan lot oganizasyon ki pote kole avek ou, kijan nou yon fe konnen sa lot ap fe?
(*Ankete, Make repons yo*)

- __Nan rankont
- __Nan brase lide yon ak lot
- __Yon itilize sa lot genyen
- __Nan fe plan ansanm
- __Nan aktivite nou mennen ansanm
- __Nan Kanpay pou sansibilize moun
- __Anons Piblic (nan mache, legliz, gage, e latrye)
- __Travay konsa konsa (informel)
- __Lot repons (*Presize*)

34. Eske òganizasyon an fè pati: (Make tout repons yo ba ou)
- __Yon Konfederasyon? __Yon Asosyasyon (plizye gwoup nan yon Federasyon)
- __Yon Federasyon? __Yon Pati Politik?

Seksyon 7: Aksyon

35. Eske oganizasyon an kon ankouraje manm li yo fe yon seri aksyon kap pemet yo realize chanjman yap cheche a, tankou:
- __Ekri let __Oganize mach pou di non
- __Fe womble __Ekri politisyen yo oswa lot gwo chabrak
- __Fe sigjesyon bay Depite ak SenateDraft __Bay kotizasyon pou yon pati osman yon
- __Al fe rankont ak lide politik oswa lot Ki demach oganizasyon pral fe poul ka jwen kob poul realize pwoje ki pi enpotan pou li yo?.

Seksyon 8: Swivi

36. Yon fwa ke oganizasyon pran yon desizyon , ki aksyon manm yo mennen pou ba desizyon jaret? (Anket Make tout repons yo ba ou)
- __Gade kouman yap mete desizyon an an pratik
- __Ankouraje realizasyon nouvo desizyon an, tankou
- __Ekri let
- __Fe womble
- __Oganize mach pou di non
- __Ekri politisyen yo oswa lot gwo chabrak
- __Fe sigjesyon bay Depite ak SenateDraft
- __Bay kotizasyon pou yon pati osman yon
- __ Eseye bloke yon lwa ki pa nan entere oganizasyon an
- __Pran yon lot chimen ki rankontre ak vizyon oganizasyon an
- __Pote kek chanjman nan bi oganizasyon an
- __Lot repons (*Presize*)

Ou konnen gen òganizasyon ki fè fòmasyon, lòt fè devlopman, mwen ta renmen mandew kèk kesyon sou sa ou konnen sou sa?

37. Eske ou konn yon òganizasyon yo rele ASOSYE?

Wi Non

38. Si wi, nan ki Aktivite Asosye òganizasyon-an patisipe deja?

Deba sou Anviwonman? Wi non

Deba sou Desantralizasyon? Wi non

Deba sou Kwasans Ekonomik? Wi non

CEDAC Fòmasyon nan Aksyon Sivik/nan Pledwari? Wi non

CEDAC Fòmasyon nan Rezolisyon konfli? Wi non

CEDAC Fòmasyon sou Lidèship? Wi non

Appendix C - Code Book

File Type: SPSS Data File
 Created: 30 NOV 99 11:02:58 - 167 variables and 45 cases
 N of Cases: 45

Total # of Defined Variable Elements: 386

Data Are Not Weighted

File Contains Case Data

Variable Information:

Name		Position
ID#	Survey Identification Number Format: F8.2	1
DEPT	Department Format: F8.2	2
	Value Label	
	1.00 West	
	2.00 Grand' Anse	
	3.00 South East	
	4.00 North West	
	5.00 North	
ARROND	arrondissement Format: A25	3
CITY	city Format: A25	7
COMMUNE	Commune Format: A25	11
SECTION	Section Format: A25	15
LOCALITY	Locality Format: A25	19
RURURB	Rural or Urban Format: F8.2	23
	Value Label	
	.00 Rural	
	1.00 Urban	
NAME_INF	Name of Informant Format: A24	24
RELGROUP	Relation of informant to group Format: A25	27
FIND	How informant found?	31

	Format: A75	
ORGTYP	Organization Type Format: F8.2	41
	Value Label	
	1.00 Development Group	
	2.00 ONG	
	3.00 Association	
	4.00 Cooperative	
	5.00 Community Council	
	6.00 Agricultural Group	
	7.00 Movement	
	8.00 Union	
	9.00 Women's Group	
	10.00 Youth Group	
	11.00 Communal Credit Group	
DURATION	Duration of interview in hours and minutes Format: F8.2	42
COMPLETE	Completed survey Format: F8.2	43
	Value Label	
	.00 Not completed	
	1.00 Completed	
REASON	Reason for noncompletion Format: F8.2	44
	Value Label	
	1.00 Non-cooperation	
	2.00 Refused to continue	
	3.00 Could not respond or lack of information	
	4.00 Other reason	
DATE_3	Date organization was created Format: DATE11	45
PROF_41A	Sex of President Format: F8.2	46
	Value Label	
	1.00 Male	
	2.00 Female	
PROF_41B	Age of President Format: F8.2	47
PROF_41C	President education level in years of schooling Format: F8.2	48
	Value Label	
	1.00 Enfantin 1	
	2.00 Enfantin 2	
	3.00 Preparatoire 1	
	4.00 Preparatoire 2	

	5.00	Elementaire 1	
	6.00	Elementaire 2	
	7.00	Moyen 1	
	8.00	Moyen 2	
	9.00	Sixieme	
	10.00	Cinquieme	
	11.00	Quatrieme	
	12.00	3'eme	
	13.00	Seconde	
	14.00	Bac I - Rheto	
	15.00	Bac II - Philo (Terminal)	
	16.00	University (16 or greater)	
PROF_41D	Presidt	Profession	49
	Format:	A40	
PROF_41E	Prdt	Occupation	54
	Format:	A40	
PROF_42A	Sex of Vice Pres		59
	Format:	F8.2	
	Value	Label	
	1.00	Male	
	2.00	Female	
PROF_42B	Age of Vice Pres.		60
	Format:	F8.2	
PROF_42C	Vice Pres Edu (see var "PROF_41C" for value labels)		61
	Format:	F8.2	
PROF_42D	Vice Pres Profession		62
	Format:	A40	
PROF_42E	Vice pres Occupation		67
	Format:	A40	
PROF_43A	Sex of Secretary		72
	Format:	F8.2	
	Value	Label	
	1.00	Male	
	2.00	Female	
PROF_43B	Age of Secretary		73
	Format:	F8.2	
PROF_43C	Secretary educ		74
	Format:	F8.2	
PROF_43D	Secretary Profession		75
	Format:	A40	
PROF_43E	Secretary Occupation		80
	Format:	A40	
PROF_44A	Sex of Treasurer		85
	Format:	F8.2	
	Value	Label	

	1.00	male	
	2.00	female	
PROF_44B	Age of Treasurer		86
	Format: F8.2		
PROF_44C	Treasurer educ		87
	Format: F8.2		
PROF_44D	Treasurer Profession		88
	Format: A40		
PROF_44E	Treasurer Occupation		93
	Format: A40		
PROF_45A	Sex of Advisor		98
	Format: F8.2		
	Value	Label	
	1.00	Male	
	2.00	Female	
PROF_45B	Age of Advisor		99
	Format: F8.2		
PROF_45C	Advisor educ		100
	Format: F8.2		
PROF_45D	Advisor Profession		101
	Format: A40		
PROF_45E	Advisor Occupation		106
	Format: A40		
PROF_46A	Sex of Delegate		111
	Format: F8.2		
	Value	Label	
	1.00	Male	
	2.00	Female	
PROF_46B	Age of delegate		112
	Format: F8.2		
PROF_46C	Delegate educ		113
	Format: F8.2		
PROF_46D	Delegate Profession		114
	Format: A40		
PROF_46E	Delegate Occupation		119
	Format: A40		
PROF_47A	Sex of Others		124
	Format: F8.2		
	Value	Label	
	1.00	Male	

	2.00	Female	
PROF_47B	Age of Others		125
	Format:	F8.2	
PROF_47C	Others educ		126
	Format:	F8.2	
PROF_47D	Others Profession		127
	Format:	A40	
PROF_47E	Others Occupation		132
	Format:	A40	
Q5	Org. Age profile		137
	Format:	F8.2	
	Value	Label	
	1.00	less than 30	
	2.00	more than 30	
Q6	% of literate members		138
	Format:	F8.2	
	Value	Label	
	.00	none	
	1.00	all	
	2.00	Most	
	3.00	about 50%	
	4.00	some members	
	9.00	don't know	
Q7_1	Total Active Members		139
	Format:	F8.2	
Q7_2	Total Adherent members		140
	Format:	F8.2	
Q8_1	Total active women		141
	Format:	F8.2	
Q8_2	Total adherent women		142
	Format:	F8.2	
Q9_1	Why was organization founded?		143
	Format:	F8.2	
	Value	Label	
	1.00	build community support	
	2.00	defend human rights	
	3.00	lobby government	
	4.00	allow com. to solve its own problems	
	5.00	no existing org. before	
	9.00	Other responses	
Q9_2	Why was organization founded? (2nd response, values same as		144
	Format:	F8.2	
Q9_3	Why was organization founded? (3rd response values same as 9		145
	Format:	F8.2	

Q9_4	Why was organization founded? (4th response, values same as Format: F8.2	146
Q9_5	Why was organization founded? ("Other" response specified) Format: A40	147
Q10	Existence of Statutes/rules? Format: F8.2	152
	Value Label	
	1.00 yes	
	2.00 no	
Q10_1	Statutes Arrangement Format: F8.2	153
	Value Label	
	1.00 Rules only	
	2.00 Statutes only	
	3.00 Rules and Statutes together	
Q11	Legal Recognition Format: F8.2	154
	Value Label	
	1.00 yes	
	2.00 no	
Q12_1	Date of Recognition Format: DATE11	155
Q12_2	Recognized by Format: F8.2	156
	Value Label	
	1.00 local officials	
	2.00 ministerial level officials	
	3.00 both	
	9.00 Other	
Q13	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest?Which is Format: F8.2	157
	Value Label	
	1.00 Agricultural Commerce/export	
	2.00 Agricultural Commerce/local	
	3.00 Artisan	
	4.00 Civic Education	
	5.00 Commerce/wholesale	
	6.00 Commerce/retail	
	7.00 Cooperative Credit	
	8.00 Cooperative Work	
	9.00 Cultural Activities	
	10.00 Education/Schooling	
	11.00 Animal Husbandry	
	12.00 Employment	
	13.00 Environment	

14.00	Erosion and Soil Conservation	
15.00	Family Health	
16.00	Farming & Irrigation	
17.00	Fishing	
18.00	Human Rights	
19.00	Industry	
20.00	Land Reform	
21.00	Marketing	
22.00	Nutrition	
23.00	Potable Water	
24.00	Public Health	
25.00	Religion	
26.00	Sanitation	
27.00	AIDs	
28.00	Sports	
29.00	Transportation	
30.00	Union/Trade Union	
31.00	Women's Rights	
32.00	Other Responses	
33.00	Politics	
Q13_1	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest? (2nd re Format: F8.2	158
Q13_2	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest? (3rd re Format: F8.2	159
Q13_3	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest? (4th re Format: F8.2	160
Q13_4	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest? (5th re Format: F8.2	161
Q13_5	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest? (5th re Format: F8.2	162
Q13_6	Which issues are of Primary Organizational Interest? (6th re Format: F8.2	163
Q13_1A	Other primary issues Format: A40	164
Q13_1B	Other "primary" organizational interests Format: A40	169
Q13_A	Organization's "Premier Issue" (variable code the same as q1 Format: F8.2	174
Q14	Does the organization have a yearly work plan? Format: F8.2	175
	Value Label	
	.00 no	
	1.00 yes	
Q15	Qualitative nature of workplan Format: F8.2	176
	Value Label	
	1.00 identifies essential priority	
	2.00 identifies secondary objectives	

	3.00	includes a time-line for accomplishing goals	
	4.00	Priorities, secondary objectives, and time-line	
	9.00	Other	
Q16	Where has organization looked for information about "premier Format: F8.2		177
	Value	Label	
	1.00	government	
	2.00	local NGO	
	3.00	int'l NGO	
	4.00	private organization	
	5.00	no search so far	
	6.00	mixed local	
	7.00	mixed int'l	
	8.00	local AND international	
	9.00	Other	
Q16_1	Other source of information Format: F8.2		178
Q17	How was orgs. premier issue arrived at? Format: F8.2		179
	Value	Label	
	1.00	by the leading committee	
	2.00	by consensus among all	
	3.00	ideas come from leaders and members vote	
	4.00	ideas come from members and all members vote	
	5.00	ideas come from members and leaders decide	
	6.00	ideas came from outside the group (funding source)	
	9.00	other	
Q18_1	How does org. share information about premier issue? (1st re Format: F8.2		180
	Value	Label	
	1.00	general assembly	
	2.00	letter	
	3.00	face to face	
	4.00	radio	
	5.00	don't share information	
	6.00	regular meeting	
	7.00	occasionally	
	8.00	announcement	
	9.00	other	
	10.00	bull horn	
	11.00	word of mouth	
	12.00	phone	
Q18_2	How does org. share information about premier issue? (2nd re Format: F8.2		181
Q18_3	How does org. share information about premier issue? (3rd re Format: F8.2		182
Q18_4	How does org. share information about premier issue? (4th re Format: F8.2		183
Q19	How often does the org hold G.A.?		184

	Format: F8.2	
	Value Label	
	1.00 every week	
	2.00 every month	
	3.00 every three month	
	4.00 every six month	
	5.00 every Year	
	6.00 Never	
	9.00 Other	
Q20	General Assembly total particip. Format: F8.2	185
Q21	General Ass. Total Women Format: F8.2	186
Q22	Describe the normal " ordre du jour" of your General Assembl Format: A100	187
Q23	How often does org. have Reg. mtg? Format: F8.2	200
	Value Label	
	1.00 weekly	
	2.00 every fort night	
	3.00 monthly	
	4.00 every three months	
	5.00 every six months	
	6.00 every Year	
	9.00 Other	
Q24	Typical agenda of Regular Meetings Format: A80	201
Q25	What would org. like to see done in regards to premier issue Format: A80	211
Q26_1	Who should help the org to achieve the goal related to the p Format: F8.2	221
	Value Label	
	1.00 president/govmnt	
	2.00 Other offices (Senate, Deputies)	
	3.00 Int'l financial org.	
	4.00 religious org.	
	5.00 local official	
	6.00 the Diaspora	
	7.00 int'l ONG	
	8.00 local ONG	
	9.00 Other	
	10.00 only local sources	
	11.00 only Int' l sources	
	12.00 local AND int' l	
Q26_2	Who should help the org to achieve the goal related to the p Format: F8.2	222
Q26_3	Who should help the org to achieve the goal related to the p Format: F8.2	223

Q26_4	Who should help the org to achieve the goal related to the p Format: F8.2	224
Q26_5	* No label * Format: F8.2	225
Q26_6	* No label * Format: F8.2	226
Q26_7	* No label * Format: F8.2	227
Q26_8	* No label * Format: F8.2	228
Q27_1	How have you gotten fin. support for premier issue? (1st res Format: F8.2	229
	Value Label	
	1.00 government	
	2.00 organization members	
	3.00 political party	
	4.00 None	
	5.00 local NGO	
	6.00 Int'l NGO	
	7.00 religious organization	
	9.00 Other	
	10.00 only local	
	11.00 only international	
	12.00 local AND int'l	
Q27_2	How have you gotten fin. support for premier issue? (2nd res Format: F8.2	230
Q27_3	How have you gotten fin. support for premier issue? (3rd res Format: F8.2	231
Q27_4	* No label * Format: F8.2	232
Q28_1	What are your sources for other material resources to promot Format: F8.2	233
	Value Label	
	1.00 government	
	2.00 Org. members	
	3.00 political party	
	4.00 None	
	5.00 local NGO	
	6.00 Int'l NGO	
	7.00 religious organization	
	9.00 other	
	10.00 only local	
	11.00 only int'l	
	12.00 local AND int'l	
Q28_2	What are your sources for other material resources to promot Format: F8.2	234
Q28_3	What are your sources for other material resources to promot	235

	Format: F8.2	
Q29	What steps would the org. take to get financial support to p Format: A85	236
Q30	What steps would the org. take to get financial support to p Format: A85	247
Q31	Does the org. know other org sharing same interests? Format: F8.2	258
	Value Label	
	1.00 yes	
	2.00 no	
Q31_1	Name of Org_1 Format: A75	259
Q31_2	Name of Org_2 Format: A75	269
Q31_3	Name of Org_3 Format: A75	279
Q31_4	Name of Org_4 Format: A80	289
Q32	Has your org. encouraged other to join? Format: F8.2	299
	Value Label	
	1.00 yes	
	2.00 no	
Q32_1	Other groups that have been asked to participate_1 Format: A80	300
Q32_2	Other groups that have been asked to participate_2 Format: A80	310
Q32_3	Other groups that have been asked to participate_3 Format: A80	320
Q32_4	Motivated org_4 Format: A80	330
Q33_1	If you work w/other groups, how do you coordinate your activ Format: F8.2	340
	Value Label	
	1.00 joint meetings	
	2.00 exchange information	
	3.00 sharing resources	
	4.00 planing activities	
	5.00 communal work	
	6.00 public information campaign	
	7.00 public annoucements	
	8.00 informal contacts	
	9.00 Other	

Q33_2	If you work w/other groups, how do you coordinate your activ Format: F8.2	341
Q33_3	If you work w/other groups, how do you coordinate your activ Format: F8.2	342
Q33_4	If you work w/other groups, how do you coordinate your activ Format: F8.2	343
Q34_1	Is your organization part of one of the following?(1st answe Format: F8.2	344
	Value Label	
	1.00 Confederation	
	2.00 Federation	
	3.00 Association	
	4.00 Political Party	
	9.00 Other responses	
Q34_2	Is your organization part of one of the following?(2nd answe Format: F8.2	345
Q34_3	Is your organization part of one of the following?(3rd answe Format: F8.2	346
Q35_1	Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	347
	Value Label	
	1.00 News release	
	2.00 Hold a public meeting (womble)	
	3.00 draft model legislation for national assembly	
	4.00 gone to meet politicians....	
	5.00 organized a march or protest	
	6.00 written letters to politicians...	
	7.00 contribute resources to a political party	
	9.00 Other	
Q35_2	Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	348
Q35_3	Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	349
Q35_4	Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	350
Q35_5	Has your group carried out or encouraged the following Format: F8.2	351
Q36_1	Have you carried out any of the activities after a decision Format: F8.2	352
	Value Label	
	1.00 monitor the implementation of policy	
	2.10 written news release	
	2.20 holding public meeting	
	2.30 organized march or protest	
	2.40 written letters to politicians...	
	2.50 contribution of resources to a party	

	2.60	meeting with politicians	
	2.70	draft model legislation	
	3.00	tried to block the implementation of a new policy	
	4.00	made new plans to achieve stated goals	
	5.00	alter goals themselves	
	9.00	Other responses	
Q36_2		Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	353
Q36_3		Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	354
Q36_4		Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	355
Q36_5		Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	356
Q36_6		Has your group carried out or encouraged the following in su Format: F8.2	357
Q37		Have you heard about ASOSYE? Format: F8.2	358
	Value	Label	
	1.00	yes	
	2.00	no	
Q38_1		Has your organiz. participated in debate on National Environ Format: F8.2	359
	Value	Label	
	1.00	yes	
	2.00	no	
Q38_2		Has your org. participated in Decentralization debate? Format: F8.2	360
	Value	Label	
	1.00	yes	
	2.00	no	
Q38_3		Has your org. participated in Econ. Growth debate? Format: F8.2	361
	Value	Label	
	1.00	yes	
	2.00	no	
Q38_4		Has your org. participated in Civic Action debate? Format: F8.2	362
	Value	Label	
	1.00	yes	
	2.00	no	
Q38_5		Has your org. participated in Conflict Resolution debate?	363

	Format: F8.2	
	Value Label	
	1.00 yes	
	2.00 no	
Q38_6	Has your org. participated in Leadership Training? Format: F8.2	364
	Value Label	
	1.00 yes	
	2.00 no	
ASOSYE	Asosye Exposure Level (sum q37 & q38) Format: F8.2	365
	Value Label	
	.00 No exposure	
	7.00 Highest level of exposure	
DVAR_1	Articulates Objectives Format: F8.2	366
	Value Label	
	.00 None	
	9.00 Maximum	
DVAR_2	Collects Information & Input Format: F8.2	367
	Value Label	
	.00 None	
	6.00 Maximum	
DVAR_3	Policy formed in consultative fasion Format: F8.2	368
	Value Label	
	.00 no consultation	
	4.00 high consultation	
DVAR_4	Obtain and Allocate resources (sum q28-q30) Format: F8.2	369
	Value Label	
	.00 none	
	9.00 Highest	
DVAR_5	Network & Coalition Building Format: F8.2	370
	Value Label	
	.00 none	
	15.00 highest	

DVAR_6	Political Action (sum of q35) Format: F8.2	371
	Value Label	
	.00 none	
	5.00 highest	
DVAR_7	Follow up actions Format: F8.2	372
	Value Label	
	.00 None	
	5.00 Maximum	
DVAR_8	Advocacy Index Scale Format: F8.2	373
	Value Label	
	.00 Lowest	
	38.00 Highest in Sample	
Q17ADVO	Advocacy policy formation code q17 Format: F8.2	374
PLCYFORM	Match between primary issue and policy formation Format: F8.2	375
	Value Label	
	.00 little or no linkage between primary issue and policy	
	.50 rough match between primary issue and policy position	
	1.00 strong and specific linkage between primary issue and policy	
CIVED	Civic Education Groups Format: F8.2	376
COMWHOL	Commerce/ Wholesale Groups Format: F8.2	377
COOPCRED	Cooperativ Credit Groups Format: F8.2	378
EDSCHOL	Education/Schooling Format: F8.2	379
WORIGHTS	Women's Rights Format: F8.2	380
LEADSEXM	Percentage of group leadership male Format: F8.2	381
MEMBSEX	Percentage of Group Membership Female Format: F8.2	382
LEADSEXF	Percentage of group leadership women Format: F8.2	383
LEADEDU	Education level of group leaders in years (mean) Format: F8.2	384

ASOHIGH	Asosye High Intervention Zones Format: F8.2	385
LITMEMB	Percentage of literate members Format: F8.2	386

Appendix D - Regression Analysis, A Primer for Indicators Work

How to Read Regression Tables

When reading regression results, at a minimum one must pay attention to two sets of numbers. The first is the level of significance which in this report is reported by asterixs. The T score tells us the likelihood that the relationship between the independent and dependent variables is a random or chance occurrence. Social scientists regularly accept T scores of .01, .05, and .10 as statistically significant findings. A T score of .01 tells us that we could expect to find this same result through random error fewer than one time in 10,000. In analysis of significance levels in political science research, King argues against an overly strict interpretation of significance levels. "I know of no political science research in which it makes sense to use a precise critical value. Any coefficient that is significant at the 0.05 level is as useful in this discipline as if it were 0.06 or 0.04. To delete and refuse to interpret a coefficient which is 0.01 ...above a significance level makes little sense (King 1986, 684). For the purposes of this study, I have adopted the position that significance at or below the 0.10 level will be considered substantively relevant. In other words, results at this level have a less than 10 percent chance of being the result of random error.

The second set of crucial figures are the regression coefficient scores which indicate the strength of the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. The coefficient is read such that each movement of 1 unit on the independent variable in question is associated with a movement of x on the dependent variable. So in Table 3 Equation 1, a 1 unit movement on the Leadership Education measure (independent variable) results in a .27 increase on the measure of Articulating Objectives (dependent variable). A group increases .27 on the advocacy scale for every increase in one year of education by its leaders. This is true when the effects of all the other variables in the equation are held constant. The higher this score, the greater the influence. One must be extremely cautious however when comparing coefficients of different independent variables. This is because they are not strictly comparable. There are two reasons this is so: first, they usually measure things on different numerical scales and so a two number scale such as Rural/Urban will tend to have a much smaller coefficient than an multi-numeric scale like education score which is measured in numbers of years. Secondly, the objects of measurement, even if they are measured on the same scale, are often conceptually incompatible. It may have very little meaning to directly compare the influence of leadership age and primary goal focus on Civic Education as they have little in common conceptually. It is up to the analyst to make a plausible argument why any set of variables are comparable and in the absence of such an argument, it is unwise to accept comparability *prima faci*..

**Appendix E - Raw Data (Provided in electronic format,
Excel and SPSS formats)**