



Power Dynamics and Agency in the Policy Space: How Coordinated Actions by Power-conscious Citizens Shape Policy Participation in Sub-Saharan Africa?

Napo Tchassante-Tchedre

Master Degree in Sociology and Master Degree in Public Policy and Social Change
Social Consultant and Independent Researcher
Lomé, TOGO

E-mail: napoother@yahoo.fr

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v8i8.2921>

Abstract

It has become commonplace for states throughout Africa, as it is elsewhere, to work with CSOs on several projects in various policy sectors. This engagement of the state with CSOs is referred to as participatory governance. The works of academics and scholars on participation frequently focused on, inter alia, power, policy, agency, organization, and benefits, with a view to highlight the connections between these factors. To contribute to examine participation in policy making by CSOs in sub-Saharan Africa, this paper asks the following question. Power dynamics and agency in the policy space: How coordinated actions by power-conscious citizens shape policy participation in Sub-Saharan Africa? While acknowledging the influence of a host of factors on participatory policy making in Sub-Saharan Africa, our paper focuses on the relationships between power dynamics and agency in the policy space by CSOs, with a view to highlight the way their interplay may shape access to policy making for citizens. Using a documentary analysis, the paper extracts and aggregates relevant data, and then analyzes them. CSOs, the paper came up with, use coalition formation by networking with others to put pressure on state, use familiarity with policy cycle to navigate their way through the policy making process, and resort to expertise in the policy sector to make contributions.

Keywords: *Power Dynamics; Participation; Policy Space; Policy Making; Agency; Civil Society Organization (CSOS); State; Sub-Saharan Africa*

Introduction

Literature on citizens' participation in public policy have emerged decades ago, addressing as well power-consciousness of citizens as promotion of participation in the process of policy-making. 'Participation, in our context, is the way power and responsibility are shared among the state and the different social groups and classes in the process we call 'development' (Mallya 2009). Power dynamics refers to the balance of power between two or more people when they engage with each other (van Schoor, 2023). And, agency refers to the work of actors to create, transform, maintain or disrupt a policy.

Policy is defined as a ‘purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors’ (Anderson, 1975). In addressing participation, it is relevant to distinguish between organic participation whereby CSOs act independently of governments, and outside institutionalized arena, in such networks as forums, which is referred to as claimed policy space, and induced participation promoted through policy action by governments and implemented by bureaucracies, giving invited policy space. And, as it received growing attention by various stakeholders in policy governance and development projects, participation currently provides a conceptual framework for policy governance as well as project coordination at national and international levels. Grew, henceforth, a literature by academics and scholars on advocating articulation of development and policy governance with citizens’ engagement as a way of enhancing benefits. Many academics and scholars in politics and policy have ever since addressed, in their works, either on the normative or the empirical ground, the effects of this move to engage citizens’ participation in development projects and policy governance. Appeared, in this wealth of literature on policy governance and development projects, those arguments approaching participation as a means, and those approaching it as an end in itself. It became, then, commonplace practice for anyone addressing the subject of citizens’ participation to approach it, based on trends in literature, as either a means or an end in itself. With an initial focus on the arguments that citizens’ participation secures outcomes that are better tailored and more economically efficient, this literature has gone through a shift of focus as it is more and more emphasizing the argument that a key benefit of citizens’ participation is, actually, the process of participation itself.

The works of academics and scholars on participation frequently focused on, inter alia, power, policy, agency, organization and benefits, with a view to highlight the connections between these factors. The scope and level of this participation, as it is, may be affected by such factors as country power dynamics, policy cycle, and level of agency. To contribute to examining participation in policy making by CSOs, this paper asks the following question. Power dynamics and agency in the policy space: How coordinated actions by power-conscious citizens shape policy participation in Sub-Saharan Africa? While acknowledging the influence of a host of factors on public policies in Sub-Saharan Africa, our paper focusses on the relationships between power dynamics and agency of CSOs in the policy space, with a view to highlight the way their interplay may shape access to policy making for citizens. In addressing this question, the paper is divided into four sections: (i) statement of the problem, (ii) state-of-the-art literature, (iii) Research design, and (iv) Results and discussion.

1-/Statement of the Problem

It has become commonplace for states throughout Africa, as it is elsewhere, to work with CSOs on several projects in various policy sectors. Policy, Van der Waladt (2002) points out, is seen as a series of related decisions taken after liaison with public managers and political office-bearers that convert the specific needs of the community into objectives to be pursued by public institutions. Public policy is, thus, the product of the policy-making process (Masango 2001). And policy-making process is, Anderson 1997 put it, a comprehensive process involving several participants, such as legislatures, public officials, political parties, interest groups and individual citizens. And this process is constituted, Van der Waladt & Du Toit (2002) advances, of five phases, which are: agenda-setting, policy development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The engagement of the state with CSOs is referred to as participatory governance. ‘Participatory governance’ is the extent and capacity of citizens to work with the state decision-making and operation of social systems (Yogesh & Gergen, 2016). This involvement of CSOs finds its rationale in the Dialogue and Dissent Theory of Change, which holds that CSOs can contribute to inclusive and sustainable development. By articulating and communicating the voice of the people, this theory posits, CSOs can address important inequalities in society (van Wessel et al.2018).

The transformation of the OAU to the AU created a more favorable environment for robust engagement with non-state actors, including CSOs in the processes and interventions of the AU¹. By creating a more favorable environment for engagement with non-state actors, including CSOs in the processes and interventions, AU grants access to policy space by CSOs. Policy space refers to the boundaries within which decision-makers can make policies (Rosanna Jackson, 2021). And policy space is accessed through a legally and institutionally defined policy participation venue where take place interchanges between various players in policy-making process. Institutions matter advocates argue that institutions can affect policy making. There are, in any country, power relations. “Power is a relation, not an attribute of actors” (Crozier & Friedberg 1977). “Power relations are dynamic and potentially reversible relationships in which actors’ positions can change over time, depending on variations in mutual exercise of influence between involved actors” (Ongolo & Krott 2025). And, these power dynamics can affect access to policy making. Power dynamics, in policy making, originate in citizens becoming power-conscious. Power-consciousness may be defined as awareness and understanding by individuals or groups of their own power position within a political space, and their perception and interpretation of the causes of their perceived advantages or disadvantages. Power-consciousness, such as defined, originates in individuals and groups, as policy agents, coming to the realization that they have, as citizens, personal and collective authority, granted either by law or by custom, to alter in their favor the current balance of power in the policy making (Aberbach, 2014).

‘Encounters between the state and its citizens are power-laden and fraught with competing interests’ (Gutheil 2022). There are, according to psychologists French & Raven (1959), seven different types of power: coercive, expert, formal, connective, informational, reference, and reward (van Schoor 2023). For coercive power, Kelley & Thibaut (1978) fate control, or the control over another's outcomes gives reference. Power rests on capacity to coerce and capacity to reward the behavior of a person (Weber 1978). As such, it is broadly accepted that power is a complex phenomenon and interaction process of influence (Ongolo & Krott 2025). This kind of power originates in situations of dependency in public space. Power refers, also, to information in a specific field, which may be a set of knowledge or facts about specific issues, processes or actors (Mallya 2009). This definition of power by Mallya (2009) refers to as well expert power as informational power. The one who has expertise and information, this definition implies, has power over the one who does not. “Power refers to the ability of a disciplining authority or action to change the ideas of people through a persuasive or dissuasive use of knowledge and information without any apparent coercion” (Ongolo & Krott 2025).

Power relationship, as Castells (2007) puts it, involves existence of information asymmetry between the dominating actor and the subordinate, giving the former authority over the latter. As “information is asymmetric, unevenly shared among different levels, people outside government and bureaucracy may hold information to which the latter have no or incomplete access. Participatory Governance (PG) aims to overcome this problem by introducing maximum transparency and sharing of information in a process that includes all stakeholders (government, bureaucrats, intended beneficiaries, i.e. “primary stakeholders” and their organizations, and possibly others) and leads to joint decision making, wherever feasible. Thus, the first rationale for participatory governance is more complete and better information “(Schneider 1999). Information can, depending on the objectives and actors’ interests at stake, take the form of selected knowledge including within the scientific domain (Böcher & Krott 2016). “Information is not just a technical matter, there is also a socio-political dimension to it” (Schneider 1999). This information can be used as a fundamental element in education and construction of discourse (Popkewitz & Brenman 1997). The fact that various kinds of information are held and supplied by various stakeholders in a participatory process increases the chances of them taking ownership in, and becoming committed to the outcome of the decision-making process” (Schneider 1999). Although many CSOs do not have an explicit focus on changing policy, they are important reservoirs of research expertise (Pollard & Court 2005). For instance, understanding how government

¹ AMANI AFRICA REPORT No18

departments work, how policies are made, and what the full implications of their policies could be for the people is one such knowledge. Also, knowledge of the legal and institutional frameworks as set by national law and international treaties for creating CSOs as well as knowing venues for participatory policy-making is another information that gives power to its owner. This information raises awareness of those citizens that give the trouble to acquire them. And, this second type of power is the one the paper concerns itself with. CSOs, Salamon, Solokowski & List (2003) observe, are ‘empowerment-oriented’. “In discussing participation of CSOs in policy making, the issues of ownership and empowerment and their relations to participation is crucial” (Abdulai & Quantson 2008). While empowerment implies to give somebody power or authority”, “power” means the ability, knowledge and skill to do something (Kinyashi 2006). In the context of policy making, empowerment may be defined as the “expansion of assets and capabilities of poor people to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control, and hold accountable, institutions that affect their lives” World Bank 2002. The culture of participation could be described as a lifestyle that upholds the principle of participation while it can also be handed down from generation to generation; thus culture is very relevant to public participation (Masango 2001). In addition to the culture of participation, the effectiveness of participation may depend upon the availability and effective utilization of skills such as public speaking and civil society organization (Banovetz 1972). The ability to generate reflective understanding of their situation enabled individuals within civil society to act as agents for change (Pollard & Court 2005). CSOs channel people's participation into economic and social activities and organise them into more powerful groups to influence public policies and gain access to public resources, especially for the poor (UNDP 1994). By participation is meant the process of bringing groups, often deprived groups, to the table (Fetterman 2005). The most important purpose of CSOs, Shoki (2009) contends, has remained to be representation of those out of state power. All the above-mentioned arguments provide the rationale for using power-conscious citizens, in this paper, to refer to CSOs.

CSOs have various ideological and organizational backgrounds, represent sections of society, and operate in a diversity of contexts. There are highly diverse representative roles, and they are related to dynamics between CSOs and their environments (van Wessel et al 2019). CSOs, by Najam (1999) identification, can take up to five roles, which are defined by activities they engaged in. And, the representative roles listed are as follows: monitor, advocate, innovator, service provider, capacity builder. The policy process, as it appears in the literature on public administration, usually comprises: agenda setting, policy formulation, decision making, policy implementation, and policy evaluation (Pollard & Court 2005). As the policy-making process unfolds these roles, the author continues, can be played during phases of the policy process (Najam 1999). There are three degrees of participation, ranging from consultation through collaboration to co-creation². Consultation, the lowest degree of participation, is used to receive feedback on proposed changes or new initiatives, and gives limited influence to participants on the proposed policies or initiatives. Collaboration, the middle degree, allows to collect views and share decision-making power, with intensive dialogue and moderate to high levels of influence on final decisions. Co-creation, the third and most intense degree, is where the policymakers, citizens/stakeholders shape or co-design policy as a joint effort. The degree of participation does not, however, depend on policy stage, but rather on the purpose of engagement with CSOs and how they can contribute to a policy process. The policy-making process occurs in an environment characterized by various social, economic and cultural factors that will influence the different decisions that are made. CSOs engagement depends on the nature of the political context. The political context in which CSOs operate, Grugel (1999) argues, will affect their capacity to influence policy. And, this factor becomes the critical crosscutting issue that CSOs must negotiate in order to influence policy effectively (Pollard & Court 2005). Arise, then, the following questions: How do CSOs manage to navigate their ways through

² Christian Erven, Stijn Zegel, Tatjana Guznajeva, Kleitia Zeqo, Matthias Ploeg PILLARS – Pathways to Inclusive Labour Markets: Guidelines on public participation in the policy-making Part of Deliverable 7.5 January 2023 Technopolis

the hurdles to seat at the policy making table? What give them leverage to access policy making space? To what degree are they involved in policy-making? And what shape these degree of participation?

II-/State of the Art Literature

Sub-Saharan African countries have gone, in their political history, through many developments shaped by internal as well as external factors. Some of them moved at the beginning of the 1990s from single party and autocratic regimes towards multipartite and democratic regimes (Bratton & van de Walle 1997). Came with this political development an expansion of the number of CSOs, with the recognition, though in various contexts, of their role as contributors to addressing important inequalities in society, by articulating and communicating the voice of the people (Gyimah-boadi 1996). Terminology CSOs is, here, used in a generic sense to refer to non-state actors involved in development and governance. “At its most general level, civil society refers to all people, activists, relationships, and formal and informal groups that are not part of the process of government” (Riddell 2007). They bring together people of different categories, promote different interests, coordinate people of various professions (Brouwers 2011). “Their role is to act as alternative gateways for citizens to voice their needs and concerns, promote area-specific ideas, develop recommendations, monitor policy implementation, and check on the government’s performance”³. CSOs, big and small, formal and informal, local, national and international, have become major players in public policy space. Recent decades have seen a rise to prominence of CSOs. This development is called “a seismic shift in the perceived role of civil society” by James (2002), is qualified as a “meteoric career” for civil society by Sogge (2004), and is called “magic bullet”, the “panacea to failed top-down development” by Hearn (2007). “While the changing world order created new spaces for non-governmental organizations and the confidence of bilateral and multilateral donors boosted their numbers, internal dynamics propelled the sector in the same direction of growth and changing roles. Clearly, external factors were decisive for the mushrooming of non-state actors in the developing South; the NGO-sector itself grasped the openings offered by the global dynamics, resulting in an unprecedented expansion in number of NGOs and in claims about the blessings of the efforts of non-state actors” (Brouwers 2011).

A trend of shrinking civic space is identified in countries in sub-Saharan Africa since the early 2000s, though a variation of the magnitude of this trend across countries has been observed. A few governments enacted further reforms and improved their human rights records, but others restrained operation space for CSOs. Governments, scholarship indicates, resort to restrictive measures to curtail CSOs operations. Activists intimidation and arrest, and critic in public of their advocacy work are part of these measures. Policies are enacted that curtail foreign funding for CSOs. And, they also resort to other subtle ways (Smidt 2018). For instance, the operation space for CSOs in some countries in east Africa shrunk more in 2015 than it did in 2000, while CSOs in West Africa have experience over the last 10 years a decline in restrictive policies. And, in some Southern African countries CSOs face restrictive policies since 2005 (Smidt 2018). “Apart from the challenges regarding CSOs, the literature has identified a number of challenges with regard to participation – challenges that for the most part derive from the political and institutional environment in which local governments operate. An important hindrance to citizen participation is the lack of a legal framework, or rather the lack of its application. Although national legislation on citizen participation exists in 27 African countries, it is only consistently applied in three of them: Ghana, South Africa, and Tanzania” (Gutheil 2022). Despite a plethora of CSOs throughout Sub-Saharan Africa, participation in policy-making is still a long way to go before becoming a reality. “Even though CSOs are increasingly called on to fill the gaps left by the state, there is still

³ EVIDENCE-BASED AND INCLUSIVE POLICYMAKING IN THE WESTERN BALKANS What role for think tanks and other policy-orientated CSOs? Think for Europe Network June 2018

resistance to the idea that they should be consulted on matters of policy”⁴. The African Development Bank’s (AfDB’s) and the African Union (AU) have engagement frameworks for CSOs⁵.

Among those theoretical approaches to explaining participation in policy making are theories of participatory governance. Participatory Governance, (Beetham, 1999; Agrawal & Gibson, 1999) advance, is a foundational principle of polycentric governance, advocating for active citizen engagement in policymaking to enhance legitimacy and accountability. These theories have long posited that service provision activities benefit when citizens are afforded the opportunity to contribute (Jakobsen et al., 2019; Malemane & Nel-Sanders, 2021). And, they provide a conceptual framework for accounting for policy participation. Our conceptual framework draws, in an integrative approach, upon such perspectives as the Framework Participatory Governance (Beetham, 1999; Agrawal & Gibson, 1999) and the Institutional Approach (March & Olsen, 1984; North, 1990) to address the factors affecting CSOs agency in policy space.

“Power is a property of relationships such that the beliefs or behaviors of an actor are affected by another actor or system” (Buchanan, 2018). Power, such as defined, has two basic modes in which it operates: a systematic mode and an episodic mode. Is ‘systemic’ power that works through routine, ongoing practices to advantage particular groups without those groups necessarily establishing or maintaining those practices (Clegg, 1989; Foucault, 1977; Hardy, 1994; Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). And, ‘episodic’ power refers to relatively discrete, strategic acts of mobilization initiated by self-interested actors (Clegg 1989). “States shape the legal and policy space within which people express views, assemble, associate, and engage in dialogue with one another and with authorities about issues that affect their lives, from the quality of basic services to better institutions and respect for fundamental freedoms”⁶. The state, as the one that shapes the legal frameworks, wields ‘systemic’ power, and may not, therefore, find itself in ‘systemic’ power dynamics with CSOs. And, exercise of ‘systemic’ power being the preserve of state, CSOs can but resort to ‘episodic’ power. As power, defined as information and/or expertise, may be available to both state and CSOs, the kind of power dynamics in which the state may find itself with CSOs is ‘episodic’ power.

CSOs need an enabling environment, including a legislative and regulatory framework that guarantees the right of association, incentives to facilitate support and ways for CSOs to be involved in public policy-making and implementation (UNDP 1994). There may be country level frameworks provisions for participation in the policy-making, without any supporting measures for the implementation of these laws. Having rules for public participation in the legislative process does not by itself guarantee that people will either use or be able to exercise that right (Buccus 2004). “If the government is unwilling to open up space for civil society debate, it is very difficult for CSOs to push these boundaries” (Mavee & Cloete 2012). Participation in policy-making by CSOs at any scale, whether local, regional or national, requires existence of, and operational, participation venues, no matter the forms they may take. These venues comprise, depending on countries, committees, councils, assemblies, forums, etc. Lack thereof or currently non-operational venues may amount to absence of venues for policy making participation. Therefore, creating and making operational policy-making participation venues such as committees, meetings, councils, forums, assemblies is considered a supporting measure for participation. It creates an opportunity window for upload of whatever interests or concerns that citizens may have.

⁴ The Role of Civil Society in Policy Formulation and Service Provision Report of the UNRISD Geneva 2000 Seminar New York, 31 March 2000

⁵ AMANI AFRICA REPOR No18

⁶ STATE OF CIVIC SPACE REPORT The State of Civic Space in Zimbabwe EXPANDED VERSION December 2024

III-/Research Design

Research hypotheses

To address the question this paper concerned itself with, we formulate three hypotheses. “First, the President of the National Association of Nigerian Traders (NANTS) noted that, due to a dearth of expertise on the technicalities of trade matters, very few non-state actors were engaged in the consultation process during the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) negotiations. The topic of trade is complex and technical, and only few CSOs could support (Manufacturers Association of Nigeria) MAN and NANTS with evidence-based policy analyses and impact studies needed to back advocacy”.⁷ Based on this argument that only knowledgeable in a policy sector CSOs may be invited at the policy-making table, we formulate our first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: When power dynamics are in favor of state actors, CSOs are not likely to participate to policy making.

“One of the most significant attempts to study the role of CSOs in the research-policy nexus is the Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) program at the Overseas Development Institute (ODI). Sutcliffe & Court, the principle authors of the ODI study, concluded that: 1) better outcomes stem from better policy and practice; 2) better policy and practice occur when rigorous, systematic evidence is used; and (3) CSOs that use evidence better will have greater policy influence and greater pro-poor impact.”⁸ This conclusion provides us a basis for formulating our second hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: When power dynamics are in favor of CSOs, they are likely to participate to policy making.

“Critical policy decisions are better formed when they are subjected to the crucible of debate and backed by evidence based research. Civil society organizations play a crucial role in this respect and can, among other functions, mediate between individuals, the private sector, and the government, bring new knowledge to the table, promote transparent and accountable policy processes, and contribute to good governance.”⁹ This assertion gives as a rational for our third hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: When power balance is in favor of neither CSOs nor state actors, CSOs are likely to participate to policy making.

Method

The paper uses desk-based research. It consists in collection and analyzing information in academic and scholarly literature concerned with policy participation by CSOs. Our approach to addressing the research question rests on documentary analysis. We, first, extract and aggregate relevant data, and, then, analyze them (Taylor-Powell & Renner 2003). This approach (i) identifies actors and their roles in the policy arena, (ii) identifies and documents strategies devised by actors, as pathways shaping access to policy making.

⁷ Onyekwena, C., Weylandt, M., Akanonu, P. 2017 The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Improving National Policy A Case Study of Nigeria's Trade Negotiations in the EU-ECOWAS Economic Partnership Agreement Position Paper Prepared for the African Policy Circle

⁸ Understanding the role of civil society research in influencing government policies towards fair tax systems in Africa Tax Justice network Africa NOVEMBER 2021

⁹ Onyekwena, C., Weylandt, M., Akanonu, P. 2017 The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Improving National Policy A Case Study of Nigeria's Trade Negotiations in the EU-ECOWAS Economic Partnership Agreement Position Paper Prepared for the African Policy Circle

Data, source and collection

The selection of the documents for examination was guided by the need to achieve as far as possible comprehensiveness with respect to (i) policy sector and (ii) geographical region. It is about being inclusive of as well various policy sectors as several sub-Saharan African regions, so that the findings reflect various policy sectors across several regions. Policy sectors targeted include: education, poverty alleviation, budgeting and service delivery. Countries covered based on the documents we access to are: Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. The documents we examined are, for education sector Mundy (2011), for budgeting and service delivery processes Ngunjiri (2024), for poverty alleviation Mavee & Cloete (2012) and Abdulai & Quantson (2012), and for various policy sectors Baccus & Hicks (2018).

Variables and measurements

There are two types of variables: a dependent variable and an independent variable. The dependent variable, here, is participation. Participation means to be given a seat and a say in such venues as an assembly, a committee, a council, a forum at policy making phases. Not being given a seat and a say in one such above-mentioned venues amounts to non-participation.

The independent variable is power dynamics. Power dynamics is defined as asymmetry in knowledge between state actors and CSOs in a policy sector and in the policy making process. Knowledge in policy sector means to have information on, and to be familiarity with, the relevant sector, and knowledge in the policy-making process means being familiar with policy making phases. The side of the policy making equation that has knowledge asymmetry in its favor has power over the other side. Therefore, having knowledge in a policy sector and in the policy making process is equated having power dynamics in one's favor.

IV-/Results and Discussion

Results

Scholarships on CSOs participation identified and documented some policy sectors where achievements have been made across countries as far as access to policy making by CSOs is concerned. Participation took place at national, provincial and local levels. CSOs, scholarship indicates, were able to seat at education policy-making table in such countries as Tanzania, Kenya, Burkina Faso and Mali. Also, CSOs were able to access to policy-making in Kenya, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Rwanda as far as budgeting and service delivery processes are concerned. CSOs participated to poverty alleviation policies in Ghana and Tanzania. CSOs, evidence from research paper we examined indicate, were invited at policy-making table at national, provincial and local levels in South Africa.

Education policy

The CSO coalition, the Tanzania Education Network (TEN/ MET), mobilizing a wide range of members around a common policy platform used evidence-based policy advocacy to access to local authority committee. This occurred even though “rules for CSO engagement in sector program design and oversight are neither transparent nor formalized”, and despite government attempts to contain criticism and contention, while favoring complementary service providers.” Expansion of policy space for CSOs in the new sector programs is, in part, ‘created’ by CSOs themselves, through advocacy and research, use of media, and leveraging of international networks and actors. CSO engagement is coordinated, focused on accountability, and independent.”

Evidence from Mali suggests that CSOs participated in education-sector programs in joint annual donor review of education-sector programs, though governments, with no transparent processes, still

select those SCOs eligible to this end. While the state, in its consultation with CSOs, in the design and implementation of sector programs, favors those CSOs that provide services in the sector and have the capacity for technical training, it tends to marginalize teachers' unions. Bargaining individually rather than collectively with the state, CSOs engagement in 2006 in Mali, was a fragmented one. In addition, CSOs, evidence indicate, lacked understanding of the decision-making spaces for civil-society actors within the sector program. Both lack of coordination among CSOs and lack of knowledge of policy-making process might have resulted, CSOs pointed out, in "overall diminishment of CSO participation in the education-policy arena since the design of the sector program in 1999".

The CSOs coalition in Burkina Faso, has "limited capacity for monitoring national educational quality and equity issues, and limited ability to engage a wider public on education issues" (Mundy, 2011). All CSOs have, however, seen an expansion of government-controlled ('invited') policy space, especially at decentralized levels where their engagement is complementary and collaborative. Though CSOs were not invited to take part to the education-sector plan in 2002 formulation, they used, through a national education coalition building, the Cadre de Concertation en Education de Base (CCEB), as an opportunity to give voice on issues of gender, curricular reform, and regional planning. Their efforts increasingly centered around directly providing for expansion of access and creation of curricular alternatives. And, by 2006, it became routine for state to consult with CSO at the national and regional levels.

In Kenya, the "expansion of policy space for the engagement of CSOs, was in part 'created' by their advocacy in the lead up to the 2002 elections. CSOs coalition EYC has, since then, lost much of its capacity and voice for active advocacy and monitoring. And, CSOs have, since 2007, tended to focus on gaining individual leverage inside the Ministry of Education. As CSOs lost their common platform for coordination after the government's abolition of school fees, competition, even among networks, is common, resulting in a decline in overall capacity and effectiveness of the national EYC. Some CSOs were successful in becoming policy partners in the recent education sector-wide approach (SWAp). "CSOs engagement is routine and frequent, but rather than policy interlocutors, they are viewed as implementers being assigned complementary service and contracting roles. And, this engagement is relatively uncoordinated with "limited signs of CSO capacity for popular contention or engagement in watchdog or accountability roles." (Mundy 2011)

Budgeting and service delivery

CSOs, research evidence indicate, are involved in policy-making process in public forums, with those CSOs that built networks being able, using formal public forums for planning and budgeting wherever provided, to make greater impact than those CSOs that work on their own. "Various studies across the different regions confirm that CSOs have made significant contributions to enhancing citizen engagement in public policy processes, including local governance" Ngunjiri (2024). They were, regarding engagement in social accountability processes at a small scale, successfully effective in such social accountability activities as public expenditure tracking (Kenya), citizen score cards (Kenya and Rwanda), participatory and gender responsive budgets (Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, and Zimbabwe).

CSOs at local levels, the study came up with, do not always have appropriate knowledge of policy-making process and understanding of the public expenditure management processes, and the majority of CSOs, it continues, are also unfamiliar with existing legal frameworks that guide public participation and civic engagement. State actors taking advantage of these insufficiencies, indirectly prevent them from participation in policy-making process "by supplying shortly of fora meetings kick off time bulkier and inaccessible documents", as these are full of technicalities not understandable to lay persons.

Poverty alleviation

The Mozambique Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) 2001–2005, version drafted by an inter-sector technical group appointed for the purpose of bringing together representatives from various sectors of the government, underwent several stages in the course of its development. Consultations were held at national and sector levels. After all the government's efforts to include all sections of society in the drafting of the PRSP, an instrument at first centred on state actors, had to some extent opened up to participation by CSOs. Consultations were held with the main purpose to get contributions and to discuss the methodology for the development of integrated provincial plans of action, and at a later stage to gain uniformity in the overall vision, priorities and targets of PRSPs, and achieving institutional co-ordination. The experience of CSOs participation was, however, viewed as little more than a functional necessity, rarely beyond the level of superficial consultations. CSOs participation, critics point out, was exclusive (the governments decided who was invited) and superficial due to a lack of capacity in both the governments and CSOs. Also many Southern CSOs, analysts say, did actively mobilise around the PRSP. As the private sector was better organized and prepared in scheduling meetings with the Ministry of Planning and Finance its contribution prevailed over those of CSOs' whose participation was further undermined by late contributions that could not be included. So, even though the consultation process around the preparation of the final draft of the PRSP was considered satisfactory, some actors were either not included or present.

Began with the formation of multi-stakeholder working teams known as Cross-Sectoral Planning Groups (CSPGs) to discuss the five thematic under the GPRS I, the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (GPRS)II planning processes broadened its consultations to cover several stakeholders including CSOs, NGOs, CBOs and the Private Sector. After consultations at national level, district consultations were held through focus group discussions, seminars, and district and community level workshops. The GPRS II policies were explained and more suggestions for improvement were taken. Print and electronic media were used to publicize, awareness was raised and views were collected from segments of the population. Were also thought of such activities as produce and distribute policy documents in the major local languages, and promote the dissemination of GPRS II and its Annual Progress Reports. CSOs were familiar with the policy document and participated in at least one aspect or stage of the GPRS II-the design and drafting stage, the legislative stage, the implementation, or the review stage-most organizations surveyed reported. Few organizations operating in areas such as education, an area expected to be guided by the objectives of the GPRS II, were unfamiliar with this document. In order to harness efforts and increase impact, most CSOs used networking with others such as the Growth and Poverty Forum (GPF). GPF comprises about 30 CSOs, organized regular meetings among its members as well as between the Forum and policy makers. Its objectives include 'contribute to the policy frameworks and plans in the formulation and implementation of the GPRS II, deepen awareness and understanding of growth and poverty reduction issues among all stake holders in Ghana and serve as liaison between state and civil society in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of growth and poverty reduction policies and programs. 'Most CSOs participated through 'consultation' and 'information sharing', none initiated, or held control over, policy making (Abdulai & Quantson 2012). CSOs belonging to umbrella organizations did so indirectly through their representatives on these coalitions such as Private Enterprise Foundation (PEF), the Ghana Employers Association (GEA) or the Ghana Association of Private and Voluntary Organizations in Development (GAPVOD). Meanwhile, those who served on the Cross-Sectoral Planning Groups (CSPGs) felt strongly that their role in the process was limited to validating draft documents already prepared by the technical groups. Within their own ranks, CSOs presented a fragmented position on critical policy issues during the process.

Various policy sectors

It has been established in South African legislatures, since 1994, mechanisms for public participation in policy-making. These mechanisms exist at national, provincial levels, and local levels. The national and provincial levels mechanisms are: Public hearings, Public access to portfolio committee

meetings, Outreach programmes and information dissemination, and Green/white paper processes. Two main participatory mechanisms operate at the local government level: Integrated development planning (IDP) and the Budget process. Public hearings, the most common mechanism, is where interest groups, stakeholders and individuals are requested to submit written and oral comments. The public is usually given between five days' and three weeks' notice, sending invitations, placing advertisements in newspapers, public places and on radio. To enable direct, formal input by community groups into the refining of legislation, they are generally held in centres other than capital cities. Public access to portfolio committee meetings, although being open to members of the public, records and minutes and other legislative documents are often difficult to access, particularly from committee processes. Outreach programs and information dissemination particularly targeted rural communities. Strategies, here, include using educational workshops and information dissemination through focused media strategies, with some legislatures innovatively making use of community radio stations to reach particular communities. They resort to such strategies as educational workshops and information dissemination through focused media. Green/white paper processes involve publishing in Government Gazettes of a "green paper" which outlines a set of policy intention, and a "white paper" which is an actual policy proposal, and inviting the public to comment each paper. There is no standard approach to Integrated development planning (IDP), municipalities are free to devise their own approach to development planning and to the drawing of community stakeholders into these processes. These local level participatory processes take place at the ward level, where committees chaired by ward councillors, are established as the institution to link communities and local politicians.

The policy-making process is, research evidence suggests, seen as elite driven, functioning largely to the exclusion and demobilisation of the public (Buccus & Hicks 2007). This view is, the scholars also observed, even expressed by those largely middle-class constituencies of the civil-society sector, as they increasingly perceive themselves as being side-lined and marginalised, excluded and disempowered, with language used in those processes being considered as further excluding community-based organisations (CBOs) from decision making. "There is a sense that the civil-society sector is often co-opted into participating in a process with a pre-determined outcome and of being excluded from an 'inner circle' enjoying privileged access to decision makers" (Buccus & Hicks 2018). Power relationships, evidence also indicate, are 'at play in the policy process, both among policy makers themselves, and between policy makers and civil society, resulting in some issues being overlooked, some stakeholders excluded from that critical juncture where decisions are made. There were tensions between CSOs network such as the South African National Civics Organisation (SANCO), the South African NGO Coalition (SANGOCO), CBO network bodies and the CSOs and communities they claim as membership bases, with a perceived level of competition and struggle for dominance between these structures.

Discussion

Policy participation venues are provided in all countries for education sector. These are local authority committee (Tanzania), joint annual donor review (Mali), Cadre de Concertation en Education de Base (CCEB) where it is routine for state to consult with CSO at the national and regional levels (Burkina Faso). Policy participation venues in Ghana are focus group discussions, seminars, and district and community level workshops. The participation venues in various policy sectors in South Africa are: public hearings, public access to portfolio committee meetings, Outreach programmes and information dissemination, and green/white paper processes at national and provincial level. There are at local government level: Integrated Development Planning (IDP) and the Budget process. The participation venues recorded in several countries surveyed, but not in Mozambique. Mozambique lacked institutionalized participation venues. "The G-20, which is the forum for civil society participation, came into existence only in 2003" (Mavee & Cloete 2012). As regards budgeting and service delivery processes, there are formal public forums at a small scale.

Leverages for participation

From the research results achieved emerge some observable trends in policy participation by CSOs. Coalition building by CSOs, be it at national, provincial, local level, appeared, irrespective of policy sector, as a common strategy adopted across countries to put pressure on state to open up policy making to CSOs. There are such CSOs coalitions or networks as, for instance, the South African National Civics Organization (SANCO), the South African NGO Coalition (SANGOCO), Tanzania Education Network (TEN/ MET), the Cadre de Concertation en Education de Base (CCEB) in Burkina, the ElimuYetu Coalition (EYC) in Kenya. Where CSOs bargained individually, or formed competing coalitions, state actors were able, by playing up ones against others, to select those they wish to invite at the policy making table. This is demonstrated in the case of social accountability activities such as public expenditure tracking (Kenya), citizen score cards (Kenya and Rwanda), participatory and gender responsive budgets (Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, and Zimbabwe). “Although a number of CSO coordinating groups have emerged in Mali since the late 1990s, CSOs in Mali as in Kenya tended to bargain with government and donors individually rather than collectively” (Mundy 2011). “CSO networks have been noted to shore up greater impact than those CSOs that work on their own” Ngunjiri (2024). Using policy sector specific knowledge, it also appeared, gave some policy participation leverage to CSOs. This is demonstrated for poverty alleviation policy in Ghana. CSOs used also familiarity with policy making process to access to the policy making table. This came out clearly in the case of participation in education and poverty alleviation policies by CSOs.

It appears, first, that CSOs that formed coalitions were successful in accessing to policy making, and second, that those CSO with policy sector expertise and that are familiar with policy making process were also successful in accessing the policy space. CSOs with knowledge in the policy sector concerned, knowledge of legal frameworks for CSOs engagement and understanding of the policy making process accessed to policy space. In Burkina Faso, for instance, CSOs used the national education coalition to promote expansion of access and creation of curricular alternatives. In Ghana, for instance, the GPF whose paper position was that the parliament lacked the necessary structures and expertise to appreciate the technicalities involved in the thematic areas (GPF Activity Report, 2006), subsequently held a knowledge building workshop for the Parliamentary Committee on Poverty Reduction in November 2005 to discuss the GPRS II. Where CSOs fail to build coalitions through networking, participation to policy making was not effective. By way of illustration, bargaining individually rather than collectively with the state, CSOs engagement in 2006 in Mali, was a fragmented one. In Kenya, CSOs’ common platform was lost after government’s abolition of school fees, resulting in competition among CSOs. CSOs in Mozambique also failed to influence policy, as the coalition was formed after consultations with government on PRSP. These findings echo Cognetti (2014) who points out that “the paradox is that participation itself can become a way of exclusion, especially of the weaker actors, who do not have instruments to represent themselves. These insufficiencies may be referred to as lack of a participatory culture – On the one hand, culture can be defined as “not only values or personality, but rather the great corpus of techniques, knowledge, models of social organisation, ideas and aspirations, specific to a society, which is handed down and learned in each generation and enables a form of social life to take place” (Kotze 1997). In the same vein Beach (1985) argues that people should possess a certain minimum amount of intelligence and knowledge for any participation program to succeed. “For CSOs, a lack of capacity among some organizations to understand complex policy processes and economic arguments meant that they were unable to engage effectively in discussions” (Curran 2005). In budgeting and service delivery, though some CSOs were, at local levels, successfully effective in social accountability activities, many do not always have appropriate knowledge of policy-making process and understanding of the public expenditure management processes. Lack of capacity within the CSOs, especially the small ones, in terms of human resources and also in developing submissions excluded them from the process. In Mali lack of understanding of the decision-making process for CSOs actors within the sector program resulted in “overall diminishment of CSO participation in the education-policy arena since the design of the sector program in 1999” (Mundy 2011). CSOs at local levels do not always have appropriate knowledge of

policy-making process and understanding of the public expenditure management processes, and the majority of CSOs, this argument continues, are also unfamiliar with existing legal frameworks that guide public participation and civic engagement. This point is illustrated by participation to budgeting and service delivery process in Kenya and Rwanda, South Africa, and Zimbabwe.

It may be inferred from the above-mentioned findings that evidence collected support hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3, as CSOs, they assumed, are likely to participate to policy making, when power dynamics are in their favor, and when power balance is not in favor of any side of the policy-making equation.

Degree of participation

Throughout the countries considered and irrespective of policy sector concerned, CSOs engagement with state actors in policy cycle took place as consultation or collaboration, but not co-creation. As a result of this level of engagement, appears various roles assigned to CSOs, with variations in relative capacity, depending on participation leverages by CSO, to switch to another degree. It is remarkable how taken on board in consultations by state actors, as a way of receiving feedback on policy, CSOs, in Ghana, used their knowledge in poverty alleviating as leverage to access the position of policy partner, providing training to parliament. Meanwhile, CSOs, by and large, described their roles as complementary and collaborative, without any real impact on policy. CSOs, in Burkina Faso, considered their roles as complementary and collaborative, where they “provide for expansion of access and creation of curricular alternatives.” In Tanzania, where they used advocacy and research to leverage influence, role of CSOs focused on accountability. In Kenya, where they are seen as partners, they implement policy, and are assigned complementary service and contracting roles. CSOs in Mali experienced less involvement in policy making. In Tanzania and Burkina Faso state expanded routine consultation with CSO at the national and regional levels. In Ghana, “CSOs become increasingly appreciated as valuable partners in the policy process once they got organized through networks such as the GPF, and their front appeared more harmonized” (Abdulai & Quantson 2009). Though state actors engaged with CSOs in Ghana and Mozambique in poverty alleviation policy making, CSOs, evidence indicate, did not impact the policy.

Participation weaknesses

Though CSOs in some policy sectors and across countries were able to seat at the policy making table, CSOs participation, evidence indicate, is confronted to some issues: lack of effectiveness of public consultations, limited accessibility and transparency, insufficient accountability and inclusiveness, and weak public engagement /interest.

Effectiveness of public consultations: this is documented, for instance, in Mozambique and South Africa. There is a sense that the civil-society sector is often co-opted into participating in a process with a pre-determined outcome and of being excluded from an ‘inner circle’ enjoying privileged access to decision makers (Mavee& Cloete 2012).

Accessibility and Transparency: are recorded, among others, non-availability of documents and/or documents being made available short time before meeting. In Mozambique “Most of the important documents that had to be discussed in the consultative meetings were given to these CSOs only on the day of the meeting”, and “all the documents were written in Portuguese and the language was very technical; thus it was difficult to understand what was written in the documents” (Mundy et al.2010). Documents supplied for meetings are in technical language in the case of budgeting (Ngunjiri 2024). “Most processes present pre-determined positions and programs for limited feedback or information sharing only, or create only limited opportunities for communities to raise concerns”, (Mavee& Cloete 2012). Also language barriers are recorded in South Africa.

Accountability and Inclusiveness: in Mozambique most of the CSOs that participated in the process of formulation of the PRSP were from the capital city of Maputo (Mundy et al.2010). “The

government seems to have invited civil society participation in order to lend the process credibility and legitimization rather than with the intention of seeking substantive input” (Mundy et al.2010) State actors favor those INGOs and national-level organizations that provide services in the sector and have the capacity for technical training (Mundy et al.2010).

Public engagement /Interest: “For the sake of convenience, we refer to this vast network of middle-class group as civil society organizations or CSOs who tend to ignore, bypass or fail to connect with a much smaller, more grassroots sector of community-based organizations (CBOs)” We found that children and women’s groups added a gender dimension to the critique, noting that participatory processes at community level tend to be dominated by men” (Mavee& Cloete 2012)

Conclusion

Our paper started with a research question as follows. Power dynamics and agency in the policy space: How coordinated actions by power-conscious citizens shape policy participation in Sub-Saharan Africa? And, to address this question, our paper, while acknowledging the influence of a host of factors on public policies in Sub-Saharan Africa, focused on the relationships between power dynamics and agency of CSOs in the policy making, with a view to highlight the way their interplay may shape access to policy making by citizens. With a view to give insights into the way CSOs shape participation in policy-making, the paper sought to identify actors and their degree of participation, to document strategies devised by actors. It, then, formulated three hypotheses, proceeded to collect and to analyze information. Using a documentary analysis, the paper extracted and aggregated relevant data, and, then, analyzed them. CSOs, the paper came up with, used coalition-building by networking with others to put pressure on state open up participation venues, used familiarity with policy cycle to navigate their way through the policy making process, and resorted to expertise in the policy sector to contribute. Analyzing information, we came up with research evidence consistent with some assumptions, specifically hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3. Irrespective of policy sector concerned and across the countries considered, CSOs engagement with state actors in policy making took place as consultation or collaboration, but not co-creation. Tough CSOs, in Ghana, successfully used their knowledge in poverty alleviating as leverage to access the position of policy partner, providing training to parliament, no CSO reported to have impacted policy as sharing decision-making power. In addition to engagement with CSOs at consultation and collaboration degree, and not co-creation, participation was shot through with such weaknesses as lack of effectiveness of public consultations, limited accessibility and transparency, limited accountability and inclusiveness, and weak public engagement /interest.

References

- Abdulai, A.. & Quantson, R. 2008 The Changing Role of CSOs in Public Policy Making in Ghana *Ghana Social Science Journal*, Volumes 5 & 6, Numbers 1 & 2, 2008/2009, pp. 114-151
- Aberbach, J.D. 2014 Power Consciousness: A Comparative Analysis Published online by Cambridge University Press
- Agrawal, A. & Gibson, C. 1999 Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation *World Development* Volume 27, Issue 4, April 1999, Pages 629-649
- Anderson, A.B. 1975 Policy Experiments: Selected Analytic Issues *Sage Journals*
- Baccus, I. & Hicks, J. 2018 Civil Society and Participatory Policy Making in South Africa: gaps and opportunities *New South African Review* 2

- Banovetz, J.M. 1972. Public Participation in Local Government. *Studies in Comparative Local Government*. 6:54.
- Beetham, D. 1999 *Democracy and Human Rights*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Böcher, M. & Krott, M. 2016 Science Makes the World Go Round. Successful Scientific Knowledge Transfer for the Environment
- Bratton, M. & van de Walle, N. 1997 *Democratic experiments in Africa: regime transitions in comparative perspective* Cambridge University Press
- Brouwers, R. 2011 The Power of Civil Society When ‘civics’ go ‘governance’: on the role and relevance of civic organizations in the policy arena in Sub-Saharan Africa Working Paper Series Synthesis Paper
- Buccus, I. 2004 Civil Society and Participatory Policy Making in South Africa: gaps and opportunities IDASA’s submission on the ATB, June 2003 ii Press statement issued by SANEF
- Buchanan, S., 2018 *Power, Institutions and Organizations* The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism
- Barnes, C. 2006 Agents for Change: Civil Society Roles in Preventing War & Building Peace Agents for Change
- Castells, M. 2007 Communication, Power and Counter-power in the Network Society *International Journal of Communication* Vol. 1
- Clegg, 1989; Radical Revisions: Power, Discipline and Organizations *Sage journals*. Volume 10, Issue 1
- Cognetti, F, 2014 What forms of participation today? Forms, pressures, competence *Provided by Archivio istituzionale della ricerca*-Politecnico di Milano
- Curran, Z. 2005. Civil Society Participation in the PRSP: The Role of Evidence and the Impact on Policy Choices? PPA synthesis study.
- Erven, C. et al. 2023 PILLARS – Pathways to Inclusive Labour Markets: Guidelines on public participation in the policy making Part of Deliverable 7.5
- Crozier, M. & Friedberg, E. 1977 *L'acteur et le système* Editions du Seuil, Paris
- Fetterman, M. 2005 *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice* Edited by David M. Fetterman and Abraham Wandersman
- Foucault, M. 1977 *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (A. Sheridan, Transl.). Random House Vintage Books.
- Gutheil, L.2022 Working with Civil Society in Authoritarian Contexts? The Case of Niger Megatrends Policy Brief 28, 16.10.2024, 11 Seiten doi:10.18449/2024MTA-PB28v02
- Grugel, J. (ed) (1999) *Democracy without borders: transnationalism and conditionality in new democracies*, London: Routledge.
- Gyimah-boadi, E. 1996 Aspirations and Realities in Africa: Democratic Delivery Falls Short Volume 30, Issue 3
- Hardy, C. 1994 Power and Organizational Development: A Framework for Organizational Change *Journal of General Management* Volume 20, Issue 2
- Hearn, J. 2007 African NGOs: The New Compradors? *Development and Change*. 2007; Vol. 38, No. 6. pp. 1095-1110

- Jakobsen et al., 2019 Expanding the field of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) – from responsible research to responsible innovation
- Kelkil, F. T. Civil Society Organizations and Societal Transformation in Africa: The Case of Ethiopia (PhD Thesis)
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. 1978 *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.
- Kinyashi, G. F. 2006 Conditions for genuine participation for the poor: Critical analysis of Village Travel and Transport Project (VTTP) Morogoro, Tanzania Institute of Rural Development Planning Dodoma Tanzania
- Jackson, R. 2021 The purpose of policy space for developed and developing countries in a changing global economic system Research in Globalization
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. 1985 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London
- Lane, J.E. 2014 Institutionalism: “Institution” and “Institutions Matter” *Open Journal of Political Science* Vol.4, No.1, 23-30
- Lawrence, T. & Buchanan, S. 2018 Power, Institutions and Organizations The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism
- Malemane & Nel-Sanders, 2021 Strengthening participatory local governance for improved service delivery: The case of Khayelitsha *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review* | Vol 9, No 1 |
- Mallya, E.T. 2009 Civil Society Organizations, Incompetent Citizens, the State and Popular Participation in Tanzania *Journal of African Elections* Volume 8 No 2
- March, J. & Olsen, J.P. 1984; The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 78, No. 3 (Sep., 1984), pp. 734-749
- Marić, S. & Subotić, S. 2018 Evidence-based and Inclusive Policymaking in the Western Balkans What role for think tanks and other policy-orientated CSOs European Policy Centre (CEP Belgrade)
- Mavee, S. E. A. & Cloete, F. 2012 The role of Civil Society Organizations in the policy-making process in Mozambique Case study of the Poverty Reduction Strategy *Administratio Publica*, Vol 20 No 4
- Mayer, J. 2009 Policy Space: What, For What, and Where *Development Policy Review*, 2009, 27 (4): 373-395
- Moriyole, B. A. Adesopo, A. A 2015 Citizen's Participation in Policy Making at the Local Government in South Western Nigeria *Academic Research International* Vol. 6(2)
- Mundy, K. et al. 2010 Civil society, basic education, and sector-wide aid: insights from Sub-Saharan Africa ISSN: 0961-4524 (Print) 1364-9213 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi>
- Najam, A. 1999 *Citizen Organizations as Policy Entrepreneurs International Perspectives on Voluntary Action* Routledge

- Ngunjiri M. W. et al. 2023 Citezens Participation in Local Governance in Africa A Selection of Case Studies International IDEA Strömsborg SE-103 34 Stockholm SWEDEN +46 8 698 37 00 info@idea.int www.idea.int
- North, 1990 *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* Cambridge University Press
- Ongolo, S., Krott, M. 2025 *Power Dynamics in African Forests The Politics of Global Sustainability* Routledge London
- Onyekwena, C., Weylandt, M. & Akanonu, P. 2017 The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Improving National Policy A Case Study of Nigeria's Trade Negotiations in the EU-ECOWAS Economic Partnership Agreement Position Paper Prepared for the African Policy Circle
- Pollard, A.& Court, J. 2005 How Civil Society Organisations Use Evidence to Influence Policy Processes: A literature review Overseas Development Institute
- Popkewitz, T. S. & Brenman, M. 2005 Restructuring of Social and Political Theory in Education Foucaul and Social Epistemology of School Practices *Educational Theory* /Volume 4/ pp.287-313
- Yogesh, R. & Gergen, J. 2016 With or Without You: Making Governance More Participatory Working Paper. ThinkWell
- Report No. 32538-GLB Engaging Civil Society Organizations in Conflict Affected and Fragile States Three African Country Case Studies June 28, 2005 Social Development Department Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Document of the World Bank
- Riddell, R. C. (2007). *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford University Press
- Rigon, A. 2014 Participation of people living in poverty in policy making Lessons for implementation of post-2015 COFOD Just One World
- Salamon, L.M., Sokolowski, S.W. and List, R. (2003) Global Civil Society: An Overview. Center for Civil Society Studies, Institute for Policy Studies, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.
- Smidt, H. 2018 Shrinking Civic Space in Africa: When Governments Crack Down on Civil Society GIGA Focus Africa Number 4 ISSN 1862-3603
- Schneider, H.1999 Participatory Governance: The Missing Link for Poverty Reduction OECD Development Centre Policy Brief No. 17
- Sogge, D. 2004, *Give and Take. What's the Matter with Foreign Aid?* Global Issues
- Sutcliffe, S. & Court, J. 2006A toolkit for progressive policymakers in developing countries. London: Overseas Development Institute
- Taylor-Powell, H. & Renner, M. 2003 Analyzing Qualitative Data Program Development & Evaluation University of Wisconsin
- The Roles of Civil Society in African Union decision making processes: agenda setters, participants, collaborators and shapers? - Special Research Report Amani Africa media and research service
- The Role of Civil Society in Policy Formulation and Service Provision Report of the UNRISD Geneva 2000 Seminar New York, 31 March 2000
- Understanding The Role Of Civil Society Research In Influencing Government Policies Towards Fair Tax Systems In Africa NOVEMBER 2021

- Van Schoor, J. 2023 What are Power Dynamics? The South African College of Applied Psychology
- Van der Waladt, G. & Du Toit D. F. P. 1999 *Managing for Excellence in the Public Sector* Juta and Company Ltd 474 pages
- Van Wesell, M. 2018 Navigating possibilities of collaboration How representative roles of diverse CSOs take shape A literature review
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).