Strengthening the capacity of civil society organisations to enhance democratisation, decentralisation and local governance processes
Literature Review
Katy Oswald, Institute of Development Studies

# Contents

## Purpose:

The purpose of this literature review is to provide a summary of the main lessons and recommendations found in literature on capacity development of civil society (understood as non-governmental organisations, civil society organisations, and social movements) with a particular focus on governance.

## Methodology:

I started with a general search of the University of Sussex library database and the British Library of Development Studies (BLDS) database using the following search terms "capacity development" and "civil society"; "capacity development" and "governance"; "capacity development" and "accountability"; "capacity development" and "democracy"; "capacity development" and "decentralisation". I then searched these terms within the websites of: The World Bank's Capacity Development Resource Centre: http://go.worldbank.org/TFIPT5BOR0; UNDP: http://www.undp.org/; the Learning Network on Capacity Development: http://www.lencd.org/; INTRAC: www.intrac.org; and Capacity.org: www.capacity.org.

The searches surfaced a large number of peer reviewed journal articles and grey literature. However, a significant number of these focused on the capacity development of local and national government officials. For example, the 2010 UNDP publication 'Capacity *is* Development' which contains twenty case studies of UNDP supported capacity development initiatives, only two could be classified as focusing on civil society (working with the judiciary system in Timor-Leste, and the Poverty Observatory in Mozambique). There is also a large literature on generic capacity development that can be applied to all sectors, whether it be regarding governance, health, water and sanitation, etc.

I concentrated on literature that discussed generic lessons and good practice on capacity development and literature that focused specifically on the capacity development of *civil society* (understood as non-governmental entities, including local and international NGOs, community organisations, and social movements) in the context of democratisation, decentralisation and local governance. I also selected some articles looking at the capacity of civil society in accountability processes more broadly (for transferrable lessons.) I reviewed over 60 articles and reports.

## Introduction:

The first section of this review covers what is meant by the capacity of civil society organisations to enhance democratisation, decentralisation and local governance processes. It will discuss what the literature means by the term 'capacity' and 'capacity development', then outline what the literature argues are the important capacities necessary for civil society to contribute to democratisation, decentralisation and local governance processes. In the second section, this review covers recommendations from the literature for how donors and international NGOs can support the capacity of civil society organisations to enhance democratisation, decentralisation and local governance processes. It will discuss the how to understand the context; how to ensure ownership and support endogenous processes of capacity development; how to understand and use power relations; how to think beyond formal organisations; and how to think beyond training. In the third and final section, it concludes with some of the debates in the literature on the incentives and disincentives to support capacity within the current development and aid paradigm, and a short summary of the key messages from the literature.

# Section 1: What is the capacity of civil society organisations to enhance democratisation, decentralisation and local governance processes?

## What is meant by 'capacity'?

A very commonly used definition is the one used by the UNDP, which defines capacity as "the ability of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner" (Baser and Morgan 2008: 22). An important point emphasised by much of the literature, is that 'capacity' is systemic. Morgan (2006) explains that "[c]apacity has to do with collective ability, i.e. **that combination of attributes that enables a system to perform, deliver value, establish relationships and to renew itself**…" (7). If we understand that capacity is systemic, then we can see how individual capacities are related to organisational capacities, and how organisational capacities are related to societal capacities. We can also see how strengthening a capacity to act can have systemic impact. For example, when CSOs work in collaboration to change societal attitudes, perhaps through a social media campaign, their combined organisational capacities to use social media effectively can have a systemic change in societal attitudes.

The UNDP differentiates between functional and technical capacities, functional capacities are cross-cutting and are relevant across all sectors. They are the capacity: **to engage stakeholders; to assess a situation and define a vision and mandate; to formulate policies and strategies; to budget, manage and implement; to evaluate** (2008: 12). Technical capacities are areas of expertise and practice in a specific domain or sector, such as democratisation, decentralisation and governance (ddlg) or education, health etc..

## What is meant by 'capacity development'?

In part due to the systemic and often all-encompassing nature of capacity - the UNDP famously proclaimed that capacity *is* development (UNDP 2010). However, perhaps because of this all-encompassing nature, there is a lack of clarity and definition of what *capacity development* is in practice (James 2010, Clark & Oswald 2010, Lipson and Warren 2006, Mugisha 2015, OECD DCD/DAC/GOVNET 2005, UNDP 2008).

James and Wrigley (2007) take a critical and transformative stance, defining it as "fundamentally **a human process of development and change that involves shifts and transformations in relationship and power**" (5). They argue that it goes well beyond learning new skills, it is about shifting power relations and transforming systems.

Capacity development/building/strengthening are often used interchangeably. Mugisha (2015) choses to use capacity strengthening because he "find[s] the notion of capacity building conceptually paternalistic. It assumes two inherently unequal partners: one, a blank slate without even a modicum of ability to take care of his or her own survival; and the other, an expatriate genius that is well endowed with the ability to build his or her partner's capacity from the ground up….**the notion of capacity strengthening recognises that the local individual has a valuable knowledge base and abilities that can still be enhanced through their interaction and engagement with the Western partner**…" (253).

The OECD DAC GOVNET Good Practice paper on capacity argues that capacity development needs to be more than just training. It states that "[c]apacity development involves much more than enhancing the knowledge and skills of individuals. It depends crucially on the quality of the *organisations* in which they work. In turn, the operations of particular organisations are influenced by the *enabling environment* – the structures of power and influence and the institutions – in which they are embedded. **Capacity is not only about skills and procedures. It is also about incentives and governance**" (2006: 3). This relates to the idea that capacity is systemic. The link between individual capacities and organisational capacities is to be found in the idea of the *enabling environment*. For example, an organisation may have skilled staff, but if there is no incentive for staff to use these skills (because they are not valued or acknowledged by the organisation), then those skills will not be used effectively. A good example of this is when staff in junior positions are given responsibility for certain roles (such as gender equality), the staff member may be well trained, but because of their junior position, they lack the influence needed to effectively deploy these skills to the benefit of the organisation. The *enabling environment* (in this case the governance structure of the organisation) is not supportive.

A final point raised by the literature is that we need to be precise about the purpose of capacity development. The OECD DAC GOVNET Good Practice paper reminds us that **"[i]t is important for practitioners to start by asking the question 'capacity for what?'** and focus on the specific capacities needed to accomplish clearly defined goals.

## What capacities does the literature say civil society organisations need to contribute to democratisation, decentralisation and local governance?

As this literature review is interested in the capacity to engage in processes of democratisation, decentralisation and local governance, what the does the literature say are the capacities required to engage in those processes? They involve what Checkland (1993: 316) would call 'soft' problems. A problem is 'soft' if different stakeholders have different interpretations over what the actual problem is (e.g. is a lack of democracy actually the problem? What counts as democratic in this context? How do democratic processes arise in the context? How are they best supported?) These are all questions that will elicit different answers depending on the world view and theory of change the stakeholder has. Ortiz Aragon (2010) argues that the capacities that a particular organisation values are conditioned by individual, organisational and societal worldviews, and their assumptions about the nature of change. So, **we need to be explicit about our worldview and theory of change with relation to processes of democratisation, decentralisation and local governance in order to understand what capacities we believe are needed to contribute to those processes.**

Joshi (2013) argues that there are certain contextual factors that mediate the effectiveness of social accountability activities, and within the domain of civil society, these are: **CSOs technical and organizational capacity; CSOs capacity to build alliances across society; CSOs capacity to build alliances/networks with the state; the authority, legitimacy and credibility of CSOs; the willingness of CSOs to challenge the accountability status quo; the capacity and capability of citizens; and the willingness of citizens** (O'Meally 2013 cited in Joshi 2013: 23).

**The ability to navigate complexity; to understand and engage with power; and the ability to learn and adapt** (Clarke and Oswald 2010) are three capacities frequently mentioned in the literature as being necessary for civil society organisations to have in order to contribute to complex and contested political processes such as democratisation, decentralisation and governance.

Woodhill (2010) and Ortiz Aragon (2010) argue that when trying to influence and navigate complex processes, such as democratisation, a different way of planning is required, one that takes **a systemic approach to problem solving**. LenCD argues that civil society organisations need to have "analytical and adaptive capacities, capacities for strategic planning, management and governance, the capacity for resource mobilisation or the capacity to enhance accountability and increase legitimacy" (2011a: 4).

Pettit (2010) argues that **organisations need to be able to understand power relations and situate themselves within them, in order to be able to strategically engage with those power relations**. 'Drivers of change' and 'power and political economy analysis' are important tools for understanding the context of power relations. The ability of a civil society organisations to undertake this kind of analysis and plan strategically based on it, is an example of a capacity to understand and engage with power.

Another capacity important to democratisation, decentralisation and local governance identified within the literature is **the ability of civil society to undertake advocacy and influence change**. A review of a regional initiative that tried to strengthen the capacity of local NGOs in several Southern African countries to undertake advocacy, argues that the capacity to undertake advocacy is dependent on an organisation's **ability to change social norms; their organisational structure; the alliances they make; and their base of support** (Rose, 2015: 2).

The World Bank Institute argues that there are six learning outcomes essential to all capacity development efforts: **raised awareness; enhanced skills; improved consensus/teamwork; fostered coalitions/networks; formulated policy/strategy; implemented plan/strategy** (Otoo *at al.* 2009).

# Section 2: How can we support the capacity of civil society organisations to enhance democratisation, decentralisation and local governance processes?

## Understanding the context

The context matters for two reasons. Firstly, donors need to understand the context before supporting capacity development, so that they can understand how the context is facilitating/limiting the capacity of civil society to contribute to democratisation processes, this is the *enabling environment* which has been mentioned in previous sections. Secondly, civil society need to understand the context when trying to identify what capacities they require and how they can contribute to democratisation, decentralisation and local governance (Ortiz Aragon 2010).

Clarke and Oswald (2010) link the need to understand the context, with the need to support endogenous capacity development processes, they argue that "[w]e need to understand the culture and the dynamics of the context, to find ways of detecting energies for positive change, and working to connect and facilitate them" (2010: 8. In other words, **a donor needs to have a good understanding of the context in order to identify endogenous initiatives and/or organisations to support**.

Understanding the context can be understood as 'feeling the pulse' of civic and political society in the broad sense. In reference to the political uprising in Eygpt in 2008, Tadros (2013) argues that what was "significant is [that] the actors were not the conventional agents of change; they were not civil society organisations, not social movements and not political parties…They could not be neatly compartmentalised into types of civil society organisations because in most cases, they did not have an organisational structure in the first place" (12). Tadros argues that in order to be able to 'feel the pulse' and understand how informal agents of change are influencing the context, "it is no longer sufficient to analyse the press, there is a need to follow the talk shows and news analysis programmes. Social media too has become a very important medium not only for understanding the agency of mobilised citizens but also state–society interactions. Actors within the government, the Freedom and Justice party and the Muslim Brotherhood more generally have communicated important messages regarding their views on current affairs via their Twitter and Facebook accounts. These messages are crucial on many levels, not least that they often expose disconnects between various discourses for various audiences" (2013: 16). Therefore, **donors, when undertaking context analysis, may need to cast their net wider than more traditional political analysis studies have done in the past**.

Grandvoinnet *et al*. (2015) argue that the driver of **social accountability is the interplay between citizen action, state action, information, civic mobilisation and the citizen-state interface**. This argument recognises that accountability processes are a complex interplay of many elements in a given context and, therefore, recommends that any intervention with accountability as a goal, undertakes a context analysis to understand how these elements are at play in the context at hand.

In a discussion on how to support the capacity to undertake advocacy, Stalker and Sandburg (2011) argue that we cannot separate "the *capacity* to influence and seek change from the *opportunity* to influence" (11). They argue that **the context can mean that even organisations with the capacity to influence, lack the opportunity,** this can be because:

- Cultures within government institutions do not reward responsiveness or promote transparency;
- The state is not fully committed to working in partnership with civil society and may be resistant to working with them;
- There are unequal power relations between civil society organisations and state institutions;
- A lack of room for manoeuvre in policy, particularly in authoritarian states, makes trying to influencing difficult or dangerous;
- Policy makers identify certain groups as 'legitimate' and other as 'illegitimate'.

    (*Ibid.*: 11)

DFID Nigeria argues that 'political will' is critical for whether capacity strengthening initiatives succeed. They argue that "[t]he broader environment (political, social, cultural and institutional) in which capacity building takes place will enable improvements in organizational capacity to be utilized to facilitate the anticipated development outcome" (Pycroft and Butterworth 2005: 2)

## Ensuring ownership and supporting endogenous capacity

The importance of 'ownership' and supporting endogenous processes of capacity development is emphasised by most of the literature (e.g. James 2010). Pearson (2010) calls this 'pushing at a (half) opened door'. Clarke and Oswald (2010) argue that donors and others who support capacity development should"…**focus on identifying what drives organisations and using those drivers to support the development of capacity, rather than adopting a deficit approach which emphasises identifying capacity gaps within an organisation**" (8).

The WBI also recommends a similar approach, arguing that "[c]apacity development efforts should be aimed at a specific goal marked by strong consensus among stakeholders and "owned" by national leaders (or the leaders of whatever administrative entity is responsible for the project.) A local champion should set the goal and assume responsibility for its attainment" (Otoo *et al.* 2009: 10-11)

This is actually quite a difficult approach to take, given the way development projects are often structured. Lopes and Theisohn state that "[w]ith current incentive structures for the development industry heavily stacked in favour of "getting the job done" over sustainability, a gap-filling approach prevails and tends to be donor driven. Everyone stands to benefit, however, when technical cooperation is directed towards fostering organic capacities…**The challenge is to work with agents of change within society and government, while cultivating and protecting existing social capital**" (2003: 9). The danger is that if donors set the agenda, defining capacity needs to meet donor demands, this can lead to local NGOs spending all their time in trainings (James 2010, LenCD 2011a).

However, even if we are not explicitly aware of it, we are always intervening in endogenous processes. Kaplan argues that "development is an innate and natural process found in all living things. It is important for us to understand that as development workers we do not 'bring' or deliver development, but intervene into development processes which already exist" (1999: 9). The skill lies in recognising this, and building on pre-existing processes of capacity development.

## Understanding and using (power) relationships

Relationships, in particular power relationships, matter to the development of civil society's capacity to engage in processes of democratisation, decentralisation and local governance in three ways.

Firstly, unequal power relationships within the development industry can dis-incentivise the strengthening of capacity of local NGOs (this will be discussed in Section 3).

Secondly, Clarke and Oswald (2010) argue that (powerful) relationships can be important drivers of capacity strengthening. Pitpit and Baser (2010) and Margaret (2010) demonstrate that learning and positive change in local government and a social movement happened **through collaborative relationships between like-minded individuals who had a shared goal**. This links to powerful leadership, how that goal is defined and shared is influenced by the leadership within an organisation. Clarke and Oswald (2010) argue that values and leadership are significant drivers of capacity development. "Values, identity, self-esteem and creativity all nurture a vision for the future…make decisions that can be nationally negotiated and agreed on – in ways that seriously respect stakeholders rights" (Lopes and Theisohn 2003: 3-4). Pitpit and Baser (2010) provide an example from local government in which a vision of social change was clearly articulated by the leadership based on clearly defined and shared values. They argue that this gave the leadership legitimacy and emphasised integrity and pride in the work towards that social change, contributing to the capacity of staff to adopt better working practices, such as punctuality. "…**leadership is fundamental for transformation…clarity about their own personal goals and how these fit with collective aspirations, leaders cultivate self-awareness, manage themselves in stressful environments, empathize with other people, and address blocks to individual and team performance in order to get the job done**" (Lopes and Theisohn 2003: 6).

Thirdly, as argued above, **civil society organisations need to be able to understand power relations and situate themselves within them, in order to be able to strategically engage with those power relations**. 'Drivers of change' and 'power and political economy analysis' are important tools for understanding the context of power relations.

## Thinking beyond formal organisations

The literature argues that those interested in supporting capacity of civil society to engage in processes of democratisation, decentralisation, and local governance need to think about informal institutions as well as formal ones. DFID Nigeria argues that **"[i]nformal institutional arrangements tend to be more powerful and pervasive than their formal counter-parts**…*Unless transactions migrate from the informal to the formal institutional arrangements, capacity building focused on formal institutions will have less impact than anticipated"* (Pycroft and Butterworth 2005: 3) This implies that donors capacity development support should not only focus on formalized CSOs but also informal organizations, and non-organised actors.  It also implies that a capacity that formal CSOs themselves require is understanding the importance of informal organisations and non-organised actors and how to work with them.

A challenge in supporting the capacity of informal institutions and organisations, as well as non-organised actors, is identifying who to support and work with and how. **One way in which this can be done is for donors to support networks, forums, discussions (e.g. radio phones –ins), online spaces, or other kinds of 'invited' spaces that provide an opportunity for (non-organised) stakeholders to come together and work on particular issues**. Funds for this can be channelled through a formal organisation who can act as the host of that space, but stakeholders that are not part of formal organisations can participate. This implies a need for a fluid and adaptive approach, as it can be difficult to predict who will participate in such spaces and what the outcome will be. This can be seen as a way of supporting an '*enabling environment*' for coalitions to form and a way of supporting their capacities to work together and advocate for change. As argued above, these spaces need to tap into existing energies and be based on a good understanding of the context and 'feeling the pulse', otherwise they are not likely to take off.

## Thinking beyond training

A lot of the literature highlights the limitations of 'technical assistance' and training (e.g. Clarke and Oswald 2010, James, 2010), arguing for alternative ways to support capacity development such as mutual learning, supporting spaces for dialogue, supporting alliances and networks, and organisational learning (including peer learning, coaching, and action-learning).

The Citizen Development Research Centre, a ten year research network looking at issues of citizenship, participation and accountability, adopted a 'mutual capacity development' approach to support the researchers involved and their institutions. "Such activities have included **South-South visits and exchanges**, student internships, author write-shops, development of research libraries and the bibliographic resources, and workshops with local civil society organisations and government officials" (Brown and Gaventa, 2008: 14)

Tandon and Brown (2013) recommend that donors **support spaces for civil society dialogue with public authorities and private business to enhance mutual appreciation, understanding, and collaboration on shared agendas.**

Thol et al. (2012) argue that **capacity development should be seen as organisational development**, "an ongoing effort to improve an organisation's problem solving and collaborative efforts, ultimately leaving it with new ways of working and the ability to take corrective steps towards renewal and development as and when the need arises" (910). A way to do this is **supporting civil society organisations to undertake 'praxis', a cycle of reflection and action that results in learning** (Margaret 2010). For example, supporting an organisation to critically reflect on their context as a way to learn about power (Pettit 2010). **This requires dedicated time, space and resources to collaboratively learn** (Clarke and Oswald 2010). Most civil society organisations find it difficult to prioritise learning over the day-to-day operational work (Margaret 2010). Learning needs to be valued by the leadership as an activity in its own right (Soal 2010). Tandon and Brown (2013) argue that **donors should invest in long-term capacities for reflection, analysis and learning in civil society, to promote**

**social learning across practitioners, researchers and policy makers, "investing in learning capacity for sources if social innovation is a high priority**" (794).

The capacity to learn is particularly important for organisations trying to address complex problems. Baser and Morgan (2008) identify the ability to adapt and renew as contributing to capacity. "**For organisations to survive and prosper, they need to adapt and learn, sustaining transformational change through a combination of individual and institutional learning** (Lopes and Theisohn 2003: 4). Pearson (2010) and Woodhill (2010) argue that collaborative learning supports the innovation and creativity required to solve complex problems. In order for an organisation to have the capacity to learn and adapt based on that learning, **it needs time and space for the learning to happen and flexibility in its planning and funding mechanisms to make adaptations** (Clarke and Oswald 2010).

# Section 3: Concluding thoughts

A lot of the literature highlights how the context in which civil society organisations work can incentivise and disincentive the development of capacity, particularly in relation to processes such as democratisation, decentralisation and local governance. Many authors argue that **donor support is only part of the solution, and needs to be aimed at facilitating an enabling environment.**

Robinson and Friedman in a review of how civil society has influenced processes of democratisation in Ghana, Uganda and South Africa, found that "[f]oreign aid can facilitate access to the policy process and strengthen capacity where there are opportunities for engagement and strong organisations already in place but it is not the most critical determinant of successful policy engagement. Rather it is **the character of a particular organisation's internal governance in galvanising the citizen's voice and its specific relationship to the state and the political realm that are the most decisive factors in achieving policy influence.** The contribution of civil society organisations to democracy is not limited to their capacity to influence public policy; they also foster voice and participation, which in turn are functions of internal governance practices. Their capacity to offer citizens a say in decisions and to enhance pluralism may be as important as their ability to influence policy and demand accountability from state actors" (2005: iii).

The changing aid system and the state centred approach to funding means that civil society organisations are becoming service providers, thus there is a shrinking space for them to play an advocacy role (James, 2010). "As flexible funding for civil society organisations has become increasingly scarce,…some…are exploring contracts with governments to deliver public services…**Those engaged in service delivery find it difficult to undertake advocacy that might offend government…Community mobilisation for self-help, local capacity building, and independent advocacy to improve governance and accountability are victims of the resource crunch**" (Tandon and Brown 2013: 788).

The public sector management approach (James 2010) puts; "pressure to deliver tangible results in a short time frame which goes against the long-term nature of CD processes" (LenCD 2011a: 4). "[R]ecognizing a longer time frame, [implies] benchmarking for capacity development…needs to be realistic, informed by a sense of history and social influences (Lopes and Theisohn 2003: 3).

**There is a trend for long term partnerships to move towards 'strategic alliances', where INGOs sub-contract local NGOs, which is detrimental to long term capacity development processes and investing in local staff and leadership** (James, 2010, Lipson and Warren 2006, Mugisha 2015). There is a lack of support for Southern capacity development providers (James 2010, Lipson and Warren 2006, LenCD 2011a) and lack of Southern capacity development providers with appropriate competencies (James 2010). Mugisha argues for using reflexivity and reflective practice to foster power relations in INGO and local NGO partnerships "that favour the ideals of local capacity strengthening, and indigenisation of programme leadership" (2015: 248). "Change starts from acknowledging unproductive vested interests and conditions that do not guarantee a level playing field" (Lopes and Theisohn 2003: 5).

There is also a requirement for mutual accountability between the Northern funder and the Southern NGO. "**NGOs that are concerned to help to build capacity,…, should first scrutinise their downward and horizontal accountability.** They need to look at the impacts of their support on the webs of relationships in which their chosen 'partners' function. They need to look at how they learn from their 'partners', not just gathering 'stories and pictures', but in terms of their values, their perceptions, their analyses, concerns and aspirations. They need to check their feedback, and communication mechanisms, because without these there is no mutual accountability" (Eade 2007: 636).

There are also strong disincentives for civil society to play an advocacy role is certain national contexts. "In response to criticism, political society has often maligned, harassed, and intimidated activists…Using the state apparatus to intimidate activists has become common in the face of civil society demands for accountability…**When civil society challenges public authorities or demands accountability, governments are tempted to shrink the space for that criticism**" (Tandon and Brown 2013: 790).

To conclude, there are several issues that the literature highlights as important to consider when supporting the capacity of civil society to work on governance issues, which are summarised in the bullets below. Some of these are picked up in the supporting Practice Paper which includes practical examples:

- Capacity is not only about skills and procedures. It is also about incentives and governance within an organisation. Capacity is systemic.
  - The *enabling environment* links individual capacities to organisational capacities, which may or may not support the ability and opportunity for that individual to utilise their capacities within the organisation.
  - The *enabling environment* links organisational capacities to the wider context, which may or may not support the ability and opportunity for an organisation to utilise its capacity to contribute to governance processes.
- Capacities important for civil society to contribute towards good governance processes are the ability to: to be able to undertake context analysis; navigate complexity; understand and engage with power; learn and adapt; undertake advocacy and influence change; make alliances; and generate a base of support.
- Donors need to understand the context, including the role that informal and non-organised actors are playing in governance issues, in order to identify existing energies and support endogenous capacity.
- Focus on identifying what drives and motivates CSOs and support capacity where there is endogenous energy and ownership.
- Positive leadership and using power relationships to foster positive change are important drivers of the capacity to contribute to good quality governance processes.
- Donors can support the capacity of informal and non-organised actors to contribute to governance processes by supporting networks, forums, discussions (e.g. radio phones –ins), online spaces, or other kinds of 'invited' spaces that provide an opportunity for (non-organised) stakeholders to come together and work on particular issues.
- Supporting capacity development needs to go beyond training. For example, supporting: mutual learning between organisations and stakeholders; spaces for dialogue, debate and discussion between stakeholders; and organisational learning processes that foster a learning culture within the organisation, and the capability for self-reflection and adaptation
- There are some disincentives to supporting the capacity of CSOs to contribute to good governance processes, in particular: short-term sub-contractual arrangements between INGOs and CSOs; and CSOs performing service delivery functions which can potentially make criticising the governments that fund them difficult.

# References:

Affolter, F. and Cabula, H. (2010) 'Strengthening ''Reflective Practice'' Within Angolan Civil Society Organizations', *Voluntas* 21:271–292

Baser, H. and Morgan, P. (2008) *Capacity, Change and Performance: Study Report*, Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)

Brown, D. and Gaventa, J. (2008) 'Constructing Transnational Action Research Networks: Observations and Reflections from the Case of the Citizenship DRC', *IDS Working Paper 302*, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Checkland, P. (1993) *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*, Chichester: Wiley

Clarke, P. and Oswald, K. (2010) 'Introduction: Why reflect collectively on capacities for change?', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Eade, D. (2007) 'Capacity Building: Who Builds Whose Capacity?', *Development in Practice* Vol 17, Nos 4/5, 630-639

Faehndrich, M. and Nhantumbo, I. (2012) ʻAdvancing Accountability through Conselhos Consultivos in Mozambique: PROGOAS Case Study', *IDS Working Paper 420,* Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Grandvoinnet, H., Aslam, G., and Raha, S. (2015) *Opening the black box : the contextual drivers of social accountability*, Washington; The World Bank

James, R. (2010) 'Virtues and Vices in Capacity Development by International NGOs', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

James, R., and Wrigley, R. (2007) *Investigating the mystery of capacity-building*, INTRAC Praxis Paper 18." Oxford: INTRAC

Joshi, A. (2013) *Context Matters: A Causal Chain Approach to Unpacking Social Accountability Interventions*, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Kaplan, A. (1999) *The Developing of Capacity*, Cape Town: Community Development Resource Association (CDRA)

LenCD (2011a) *Perspectives Note Capacity Development and Civil Society Organizations,* Learning Network on Capacity Development

LenCD (2011b) *Perspectives Note: The Enabling Environment for Capacity Development,* Learning Network on Capacity Development

Lipson, B., and Warren, H. (2006) *Taking Stock – A Snapshot of INGO Engagement in Civil Society Capacity Building*, Oxford: INTRAC

Lopes, C. and Theisohn, T. (2003) *Ownership, leadership and transformation. Can we do better for capacity development?* New York: United Nations Development Programme

Margaret, J. (2010) 'Capacity Development Processes within a Social Movement: Päkehä Treaty Workers' Movement', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Mugisha, V. (2015) 'Toward purposeful individual capacity strengthening: alternative considerations for Western NGOs', *Development in Practice* Vol. 25, No. 2, 247–258

OECD DCD/DAC/GOVNET (2005) *The Challenge of capacity development: Working toward good practice*, Paris: OECD DCD/DAC/GOVNET

Ortiz-Aragon, A. (2010) 'A Case for Surfacing Theories of Change for Purposeful Organisational Capacity Development', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Otoo, S., Agapitova, N. and Behrens, J. (2009) *The Capacity Development Results Framework: a strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development,* Washington: World Bank Institute

Pearson, J. (2010) 'Pushing at a Half-open Door', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Pettit, J. (2010) 'Multiple Faces of Power and Learning', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Pitpit, F. and Baser, H. (2010) 'Values as a Driver for Capacity Development: Promoting Justice in Papua New Guinea', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Pycroft, C. and Butterworth, R. (2005) *Where capacity is not the only problem: Moving from generic capacity building to support for issues-based change in Nigeria,* Washington: World Bank Institute

Robinson, M. and Friedman, S. (2005) 'Civil society, democratisation and foreign aid in Africa', *IDS Discussion Paper 383*, , Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Rose, S. (2015) *Measuring advocacy impact: Case study of a capacity building programme,* Oxford: INTRAC

Stalker, C. and Sandburg, D. (2011) *Capacity Building for Advocacy,* Oxford: INTRAC

Soal, S. (2010) 'The More Things Change, the More they Stay the Same?', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Tadros, M. (2013) *Egypt's Unfinished Transition or Unfinished Revolution? Unruly Politics and Capturing the Pulses of the Street*, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Tandon, R. and Brown, D. (2013) 'Civil societies at crossroads: eruptions, initiatives, and evolution in citizen activism', *Development in Practice* 23:5-6, 601-608

Thol, P., Chankiriroth, S., Barbian, D. and Storer, G. (2012) 'Learning for capacity development: a holistic approach to sustained organisational change', *Development in Practice* 22:7, 909-920

UNDP (2008) *Capacity Development: Practice Note,* New York: United Nations Development Programme

UNDP (2010) *Capacity is Development: Stories of Institutions*, New York: United Nations Development Programme

Woodhill, J. (2010) 'Capacities for Institutional Innovation: A Complexity Perspective', *IDS Bulletin* 41.3, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies