

ATTITUDES TO DEMOCRACY IN MALAWI

A Framework for Assessing Public Opinion
and Monitoring USAID's Democracy and Governance Programs

December 31, 1996

Delivered to USAID/Malawi by Michael Bratton, Michigan State University in accordance
with Purchase Order No. PO-612-5-0225

SUMMARY

This report proposes a comprehensive framework, including options and recommendations, for assessing public opinion and monitoring USAID's democracy and governance programs in Malawi.

The report recommends a phased series of civic attitude surveys with results disseminated to multiple audiences. The work would be conducted collaboratively by the Center for Social Research, Chancellor College, and a US university, which would provide short-term technical assistance and advanced degree training to build public opinion research capacity at the University of Malawi.

The total budget for the recommended option is \$595,485 over four years, 1997-2000. Basic and middle options are also presented at \$114,860 and \$366,235 respectively.

PURPOSE

To paraphrase the Statement of Work, this comprehensive framework is intended cover the following items:

- * identification of the information needed to track public opinion on DG issues and programs in Malawi;
- * recommendation of appropriate research methods, probably sample surveys, for collecting such information;
- * assessment of the political, cultural and technical feasibility of applying such methods in the context of Malawi;
- * identification of a local partner institution to conduct the work, together with an assessment of its capacities and needs;
- * a draft research instrument for use in the first survey;
- * a design for sampling prospective survey respondents, taking into account population characteristics, regions, costs, and logistical factors in Malawi;
- * options and recommendations for implementing the comprehensive framework;
- * estimated budgets for each option;
- * an implementation plan for the recommended option, with emphasis on the steps, responsibilities, and timeline for the first survey.

Discussions with the Director and staff of USAID/Malawi confirmed and clarified two objectives. First, the comprehensive framework must serve a dual mandate: on one hand, it must enable USAID/Malawi to monitor progress on intermediate results for its Democracy and Governance Strategic Objective (SO5); on the other hand, it should also open a wider window onto the evolving character of democracy in Malawi. Second, the focus of data collection and analysis is on mass public opinion and on "people-level" impacts of DG programming. In other words, no direct effort will be made to address SO5 intermediate results that are expressed at the level of institutions, for example in terms of "institutional strengthening". Nor would special concern be extended to the attitudes of political elites except to the extent that these elements are represented in the national population as a whole.

Discussions with USAID staff also helped to expand and give substance to the notion of public opinion. Democratization can be understood as a process whereby political power is divided and distributed to a plurality of countervailing centers within state and society. Donor DG programming, including USAID's SO5 program, begins by strengthening key formal institutions in the governmental and non-governmental sectors (correctly so, in my opinion). However, informal forces can also check and balance a dominant political executive; preeminent among these is public opinion. If clearly articulated, it can inform political representatives and policy-makers about popular preferences. By helping to give voice to ordinary citizens, a framework for analysing, reporting, and disseminating public opinion can contribute to democratization in its own right. In other words, assessing attitudes to democracy in Malawi is not just a means to an end (e.g. monitoring donor programs) but can also be a substantive, programmatic end in itself.

NEED

This report is based on consultations over a three-week period ending December 20, 1996 with USAID personnel in Malawi and Washington D.C. and with officials of the Government of Malawi, other donor agencies, and educational and non-governmental organizations in Lilongwe, Zomba and Blantyre. A list of persons consulted is attached at Appendix 1.

Is there a demand for public opinion research in Malawi? Virtually all persons consulted considered it desirable to gather information on the opinions of Malawians about recent political and economic reforms in their country. They agreed that little is presently understood about what Malawians, understand, think and feel regarding their fledgling democracy. Information on these topics would be useful to a range of audiences. Indeed, many respondents thought that the best reason for proceeding with a comprehensive program to track public opinion was to inform Malawians themselves about trends in the national mood.

Which general aspects of public opinion should be assessed? In my view, the investigation should be organized in the first instance to delve into the knowledge, attitudes and practices of eligible Malawian voters, that is, those over 18 years of age. In addition, I would recommend probing into popular perceptions and evaluations of key political and

economic reform policies.

* **Civic Knowledge.** What do people know about the system of government in Malawi and their own rights and obligations as citizens? This cognitive dimension of public opinion can be tapped with questions on respondent knowledge of the functions of key public institutions, the identity of national and local political leaders, and the differences between one-party and multiparty systems. And how do they understand democracy? As a set of political rules or in terms of socio-economic outcomes?

* **Civic Attitudes.** How do people feel about democracy? Have they internalized its values? Because the affective dimension of public opinion is multifaceted, several attitudinal aspects must be explored. Questions can be posed about political tolerance (e.g. of political opinions different from one's own), political trust (at interpersonal and intergroup levels, as well as in public institutions), and political efficacy (i.e. do citizens feel competent to influence decision-making in local and national arenas?).

* **Civic Behavior.** What actions result? In particular, do citizens participate in the democratic process? In addressing behavioral outcomes, attention must be paid not only to voting, but to other aspects of participation like involvement in community affairs or policy debates, attendance at election campaign events, and contacting political representatives between elections. It would be particularly important to know whether behaviors associated with democratic citizenship (as well as civic knowledge and democratic values) were increasing over time.

* **Policy Evaluations.** How do citizens appraise recent political and economic reforms? What sort of positive or negative connotations do they attach to democracy? Do they prefer elected or effective government? How do they think the current government has performed? It would also be important to assess popular opinions about the various dimensions of structural adjustment policy reform such as market pricing, fees for service, privatization and public sector budget austerity. Moreover, whom do citizens hold responsible for personal and public welfare? Themselves or the government?

* **Demographic Characteristics.** Data is also needed on the standard social background characteristics of citizens, not only to confirm that any sample is representative of an intended target population, but to enable analysis of the effects of gender, age, education and other similar factors on respondent knowledge, attitudes and practices. Information on organizational affiliations would also be gathered here. For Malawi, special attention should be directed to ethnic and regional characteristics and to political party identifications.

Fortunately, research on public opinion in Malawi does not have to start from scratch, but can build on valuable contributions already made by the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the Centre for Research, Advice and Education on Rights (CARER). NDI conducted a series of four focus groups through September 1996 and plans to conduct at least two more. These collective interviews provide original qualitative insights into topics like the sources of political information used by citizens (mainly radio), the weak representative performance of Members of Parliament, the persistence of political support for traditional

leaders, and the obstacles to political participation faced by women. In June 1996, CARER published the results of 14 focus groups and a pilot survey (n=300) on citizen knowledge and needs regarding human rights. While the methods employed in the CARER study are rudimentary, the results -- for example that citizens have a unformed notions of their rights under the national constitution -- seem plausible.

Other research projects will be launched in the near future. For example, Dr. Dan Chimwenje, Director of the Malawi Institute of Education plans a needs assessment for civic education among junior secondary students (with EU funding). And Dr Necton Mhura, Head of the Chancellor College Department of Law plans a qualitative exploration of the attitudes to democracy of selected political elites (currently unfunded). Vision 2020 (UNDP) will soon publish findings an Malawian hopes for the future, including a report on good governance by Dr. Anthony Mawaya. And, during 1997, under its existing agreement with USAID/M, NDI will interview MPs on their constituency outreach practices. All of these studies are welcome for the additions they promise to our stock of knowledge. Qualitative and interpretive work will continue to be needed. But the time has arrived to undertake a broadly-based, systematic assessment of public opinion using the best available scientific methodologies.

CIVIC ATTITUDE SURVEYS

I propose that USAID/M commission at least one and preferably two civic attitude surveys that would address the topics identified in the previous section. These surveys would be administered to a national probability sample of eligible voters. In these surveys, attention must be paid to the following methodological issues:

- * **Sampling.** Information that purports to represent the opinions of "the public" should be presented with known levels of representativeness. To be generalizable to the population of voters as a whole, data should be gathered from a randomized national probability sample of persons 18 years and older. The sample should be large enough to obtain standard confidence levels (95%) and confidence intervals (plus or minus 4%, preferably 3%) for the reporting of results. It should also be large enough to enable reliable examination and comparison of subsets of the population, even when the sample is subdivided up to three times or variables are classified into six or seven categories.
- * **Quantification.** Qualitative research methods (like focus groups) can establish the presence of phenomena but cannot measure their extent. Where appropriate, and all other things being equal, USAID/M should prefer quantifiable indicators of the distribution of knowledge, attitudes and practices of citizens. At minimum, data on the voting population as a whole and for selected subgroups should be presentable in percentage form so that orders of magnitude can be revealed.
- * **Analysis.** Sample surveys are a powerful tool for describing the attributes of large populations. Too often, this is all they are used for because analysts stop short at reporting descriptive statistics. Yet much more is possible in the way of inference about the various

"causes" of public attitudes and behavior. For example, survey data can be used to discern whether and to what extent citizens participate in the political process due to their social background (e.g. gender), their attitudinal orientations (e.g. a preexisting interest in politics) or their institutional affiliations (e.g. as registered voters, political party followers, or members of voluntary associations). In short, survey research can not only describe what people think and do, but can begin to explain why they do it. This sort of analysis not only deepens our understanding of a country political context, but potentially has profound implications for DG programming.

* **Impact Measurement.** If carefully designed, survey research can isolate the effects of program impacts on the knowledge, attitudes and behavior of intended beneficiaries. Within a single survey, the attributes of "treatment" and "control" groups can be compared; using two or more surveys across time, analysts can track trends, distinguishing "before" and "after" effects; and more complex designs can incorporate both these dimensions. Careful attention is required, however, to the selection of respondents and the formulation of questionnaire items in order to reliably capture intended project impacts.

FEASIBILITY

Is it possible to conduct civic attitude surveys in Malawi? Three dimensions of feasibility are considered here:

* **Technical Feasibility.** National probability sample surveys pose technical challenges that are difficult to meet in poor countries whose social science research and national statistical capabilities are sometimes limited. At minimum, probability sampling requires a reliable and exhaustive sampling frame such as an up-to-date population census. Moreover, survey administration requires a research institution with a proven track record in instrument design, data collection, data entry, statistical analysis, and report preparation. In the case of democracy surveys, technical feasibility also depends on the availability of principal investigators with advanced training in both political analysis and social science research methods.

Malawi possesses some, but not all, of the requisite technical capacities to conduct civic attitude surveys.

The Centre for Social Research (CSR), Chancellor College, University of Malawi (UNIMA) has considerable experience at administering large-scale surveys, for example the Malawi Social Indicators Survey, 1995. It has a staff of a dozen professionals and adequate support staff and services. The latter include a fleet of 4x4 vehicles, plus a basic computer lab with 4 pentium processors and a USAID-funded network, yet to be installed. E-mail facilities are available, though printing and copying services are meagre and unreliable. CSR draws field supervisors and survey enumerators recruited through UNIMA.

The Centre's expertise lies in the fields of rural sociology, public health, food

security, and environmental and housing economics rather than in democratic governance. Since it has no resident political scientist, and its permanent staff are stretched quite thin, CSR would have to recruit and attach for the duration of the proposed project an appropriately qualified principal investigator from the UNIMA community or beyond. Ideally, this person would be based in Zomba where CSR is located. A draft job posting for this position is attached at Appendix 2.

The National Statistical Office (NSO), Zomba, last conducted a national census of population and housing in 1987. The next decennial census, due in 1997, will only be implemented in 1998, with preliminary results reported no earlier than 1999. Thus, the best available national statistical frame is the 1987 census whose figures, if adjusted for known rates of population growth in various urban and rural areas, could be used for current sampling purposes. It is certainly technically feasible to draw a random sample (with probability proportional to population size) down to the level of each census enumeration area (EA) (of which there are 8373 in the country, each containing some 900 to 1200 persons in rural areas and up to 1600 in parts of urban Blantyre).

Because, pending completion of household mapping for the next census, there is no systematic or reliable sampling frame below the EA level, I recommend the use of quota sampling techniques for identifying individual respondents within randomly selected EAs. A quota sample depends on the availability of data on known distributions of populations within EAs according to gender, age and such indicators of social status as employment (for urban areas) and water supply or roofing materials (for rural areas). As far as I can ascertain, suitable data is available at NSO, including updated estimates for some social indicators for the 1990s.

I therefore conclude that survey research on civic attitudes is technically feasible in Malawi. Two conditions, however, must first be met: first, a qualified Malawian investigator must be identified and recruited; and second, CSR must receive small amounts of short-term, targeted technical assistance. TA requirements are discussed in greater detail below.

* Political Feasibility. Even by African standards, Malawi experienced an unusually high level of political repression under the Ngwazi's regime of one-man rule. And since the founding elections of May 1994, the country's new democratic dispensation has been marred by growing political polarization among regionally-based political parties. Will the legacy of silence inherited from the past, combined with present fears of political intimidation, prevent Malawian citizens from expressing themselves freely?

Since such concerns cannot be completely dispelled, the best approach is to seek to minimize their influence. Prospective survey researchers in Malawi can take several protective steps. First, they should obtain neutral sponsorship. CSR is an appropriate institutional base because, to my knowledge, it is broadly regarded as independent and apolitical; additional political insulation can be provided if a U.S. university serves as

co-sponsor of the project. While the salaries of CSR's permanent staff are paid by the government-funded UNIMA, its operations are entirely self-financed and its research recommendations sometimes question government policy. Second, researchers should adhere throughout to best scientific practices. While they can never prevent survey findings from being selectively seized upon (even deliberately misinterpreted) by political partisans, researchers must always be able to defend results in terms of professional standards. In short, rigorous research methods are a strong defence against charges of political bias. Finally, the timing of survey work is critical. Because of the inordinately high mortality rate among MPs, Malawi seems to be in the throes of a permanent by-election campaign. Every effort should be made to schedule surveys outside peak periods and places of electioneering. Respondents are more likely to offer truthful opinions when they are not feeling intense cross-pressures from competing political parties.

I therefore acknowledge lingering problems of political feasibility, and recognize these problems are unlikely to abate. Nevertheless, I consider that such problems can be managed along lines suggested above, and to an acceptable level that would permit survey work to proceed.

* Cultural Feasibility. Because of Malawi's remote geographical location, its isolation from the rest of the world during the Banda years, and its lagging literacy rates, large parts of the country remain steeped in traditional norms and spiritual beliefs. Against this background, modern liberal democracy may appear to many Malawians as an unfamiliar, even alien, form of government. In this context, customary taboos -- for example against speaking critically about elders and leaders in public -- might inhibit rural Malawians from expressing opinions, especially dissenting ones. Indeed, one wonders whether public opinions on democracy issues have fully formed among the most isolated and illiterate groups like older rural women.

As before, cultural obstacles cannot be removed, only mitigated. I would argue that one of the objectives of the survey research is precisely to determine whether, and to what extent, public opinion on democracy issues has actually formed. A battery of well-designed questionnaire items, administered by carefully trained enumerators, should elicit reliable responses. Moreover, insofar as survey research identifies gaps in public knowledge and democratic values, this information can be fed directly into the design of the civic education programs now being launched by various Malawian NGOs. Finally, while initially skeptical, I have been persuaded by my Malawian interlocutors that yesterday's culture of silence is on the wane. Not only do people now apparently feel free to speak their minds, but may even overenthusiastically assume that democracy implies rights without responsibilities. In other words, Malawians hold strong (if not particularly sophisticated) opinions and these should be accessible to survey researchers.

In sum, Malawi possesses a more challenging cultural environment than other Southern African countries (like South Africa and Zambia) where political attitude surveys have been successfully conducted. In Malawi, then, active measures must be taken to adapt any survey

instrument to local conditions, for example by concretizing abstract concepts and tailoring questions to pertinent local issues of the day (e.g. do you support or oppose the current boycott of parliament by some opposition MPs?). Questionnaires will have to be translated and back-translated into at least three local languages (Chichewa, Chiyao and Chitumbuka). Enumerators will have to be carefully trained, not only in the nuances of meaning embedded in questionnaire items but how to dress and comport themselves in village settings. Thus, considerable investment should be made "up front" in questionnaire design, translation, pretesting, questionnaire revision, and enumerator training and supervision. To assist in these tasks I propose the appointment of a six-person Advisory Group of Malawian experts, whose functions are spelled out in greater detail below.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

A preliminary draft of a questionnaire for use in a first survey in Malawi is attached at Appendix 3. It is based on an instrument developed for use in neighboring Zambia, a country which shares substantial political and cultural similarities with Malawi. I have begun to adapt the instrument to Malawian conditions, insofar as possible during a brief, three-week sojourn here. I have also inserted items that will generate data to directly address USAID/M's indicators for people-level SO5 intermediate results. This draft benefitted greatly from the indicators proposed in David Hirschmann's draft results framework of January 1996 and suggestions for questionnaire items provided by Kathryn English and Venge Nkosi of USAID/Malawi and Bruce Bolnick of HIID, whom I thank. If and when USAID/M approves a first survey, the CSR investigator and the Advisory Group will be asked to contribute to further, major revisions.

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

In my experience, the best arrangement for implementing civic attitude surveys in Africa is a collaborative partnership between local and U.S. university research institutions. For the present proposed activity, each institution would provide a Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI). These two individuals would share responsibility for designing the research, managing the survey, and analysing and reporting results. The two organizations would sign a written agreement about a division of labor, collective responsibility, and providing guarantees of mutual benefit.

A division of labor between collaborating institutions is suggested in a chart showing Activities and Responsibilities at Appendix 4.

In Malawi, the Centre for Social Research would co-sponsor the research activity jointly with a U.S. university. In order to find the right Co-PI, I recommend that CSR constitute a selection committee which would include representation from USAID/M and the collaborating U.S. university. This investigator would then take shared responsibility for the

various activities listed in Appendix 4. For each survey, the Malawian investigator would be engaged for 45 working days.

A U.S. University would jointly sponsor the research activity. This institution would provide a senior political scientist with experience in survey research in Africa to serve as the other Co-PI. This person would be engaged for 21 days for each survey, of which a minimum of 10 days would be spent in-country. The US institution would also provide a Survey Project Manager with experience in similar projects in Africa; this person would be engaged for 45 days per survey, of which at least 30 days would be spent in-country.

These personnel would provide technical assistance to CSR targetted on research and instrument design, survey management, data management and data analysis. The latter two ask are particularly important given the recent vacancy that has occurred in the position of CSR statistician. Technical assistance is also required since the Malawian Co-PI may or may not have experience with survey design and data management.

Training. The recruitment of a Malawian Co-PI with graduate qualifications in political science and training and experience in survey methods will not be easy. The Public Administration Department at Chancellor College is understaffed with reputable political scientists. I therefore strongly urge USAID/M to include long-term graduate training (if only to the Masters level) in its plans for strengthening capacity to conduct public opinion polls on a regular basis in Malawi. Concrete proposals for participant training are included in the action options presented below.

In consultation with USAID/M and the US partner, the Malawian Co-PI would recruit a six-person Advisory Group to continuously guide the project on questions of political, cultural and technical feasibility. Each member of this assembly of experts would have deep and intimate knowledge of Malawian circumstances and an appreciation of the issues at stake in democratization. They should represent a balanced profile of regional backgrounds and political party affiliations within Malawi. To avoid any taint of partisanship, individuals who hold official leadership positions in political parties are probably best excluded. The Advisory Groups should also represent the range of technical expertise pertinent to USAID/M's DG program priorities (e.g. regarding elections, the judiciary, and NGOs). At least two members should have a background in social science research.

Under separate cover, I have provided an illustrative list of qualified persons. USAID/M and CSR will undoubtedly wish to expand and diversify this pool of potential candidates. The Advisory Group is a temporary body, meeting only twice for each survey, once before instrument pretesting and again during write-up of results. It would then be dissolved.

Contracting Mechanisms. I recommend that USAID/Malawi consider a cooperative or grant agreement with the collaborating US university as the mechanism for implementing public opinion surveys in Malawi. Cooperative or grant agreements have several

advantages: they allow flexibility between USAID/M and the grantee in formulating and adjusting goals; they absolve USAID/M or responsibility for managing the relationship with the Malawian institution, which would be handled by the US grantee; and they are ideal mechanisms for capacity building, primarily in the host country, but not excluding strengthening US university capacities to assist USAID Missions in Africa with DG M&E.

As for training fellowships (see Options 2 and 3 below), these could be funded through the existing ATLAS program, which contains funds earmarked for DG training.

OPTIONS

Survey research on civic attitudes in Malawi can be implemented at different levels of effort and cost. Three action options are presented below for consideration by the USAID/M Director and staff.

The options vary according to the time required for implementation, the number of surveys actually conducted, and the amount of technical capacity built within Malawi.

The options are arrayed cumulatively and should not be regarded as mutually exclusive. Indeed, as my recommendation below will attest, I favor starting small and swiftly, only later expanding activities as additional funds are mobilized.

* Option 1

Deliverables: 1 Baseline Survey, 1997
 1 Dissemination Workshop

This basic option takes a bare-bones approach. Through a baseline survey, it allows a snapshot of public opinion at a single moment in time. The "one-shot" nature of this option makes it the least attractive choice because it cannot track changes in public opinion over time or build much research capacity in Malawi. Option 1, however, does have certain virtues:

- * It will generate more detailed and more reliable data than the impressions of public opinion generated by previous studies;
- * It can be implemented relatively quickly; ideally, fieldwork should occur between April and June, 1997, that is, between the end of the rains yet before any local government election campaign gets into full swing;
- * It can provide feedback of survey results, at least to literate populations, through a results workshop and press release.
- * Not being expensive, the basic option may be fundable with resources already authorized

fellows would be required to submit policy-relevant special studies to USAID/M.

* Upgrades the CSR computer laboratory by adding the following state-of-the-art equipment: 2 desktop computers for data processing, two laptop computers for Co-PI fieldwork (one for the US university), one laser printer and one heavy-duty photocopier to help address CSR weaknesses in this area, and relevant software including an Internet search engine (at CSR request). With an upgraded lab, CSR could consolidate its position as a national center of excellence in social science data analysis.

* Launches a broad-based media campaign to disseminate the main survey results to the general public. This campaign will consist of radio discussion programs produced independently for broadcast by the Malawi Broadcasting Corporation. The Advisory Group would be called upon to help negotiate these arrangements. The campaign would also produce 40,000 leaflets, perhaps illustrated with cartoons, to be disseminated through newspaper inserts and through the grassroots development programs of ministries, NGOs and churches.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that USAID/M authorize the implementation of Option 1 as soon as possible, preferably to enable the implementation of the Baseline Survey in the second quarter of 1997.

In the meantime, USAID/M should seek additional funding for the implementation of Option 3, with start-up of long-term participant training at a US university by August 1997.

BUDGETS

The costs of each Option are itemized in Appendix 5.

Note: The Option 3 budget accounts for approximately 4.3 percent of USAID/M's five-year, \$14m. budget for the DG Strategic Objective. This figure falls below the threshold of the 5-10 percent of total program budget that is conventionally allocated to M&E. It also leaves room for USAID/M to commission additional M&E studies, for example to measure the attainment of intermediate results relating to institutional strengthening.

Two further considerations help to place the budget figures in perspective. First, relatively larger M&E investments are required for new program initiatives (like DG in Africa) with which donor agencies have limited experience, simply in order to accumulate the knowledge necessary for informed decision-making. Second, as argued earlier, an investment in public opinion research that gives voice to a previously silent, unheard, or poorly represented citizenry can be regarded as a substantive contribution to democratization. Thus there is a programmatic rationale (that goes beyond an instrumental M&E justification) for helping to articulate and amplify the preferences of Malawian citizens.

TIMELINE

A tentative schedule is attached at Appendix 6.

Note: If USAID/M decides to proceed with civic attitudes research, it should do so without further delay. In order to make quasi-experimental, "before and after" comparisons of program impacts, baseline data should have been collected prior to the implementation of any programs. By happenstance rather than design, certain SO5 activities have been delayed (e.g. by the opposition boycott of the National Assembly) or are only now getting underway (e.g. at the Electoral Commission). Thus it is not too late to embark on the collection of baseline data, as long as this is done soon.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are owed to Andy Sisson, Kathryn English and Tonya Himelfarb for arranging this consultancy and helping develop the proposals contained here. Thanks are also due to Patricia Ziwa and Nancy Masi for administrative support. I appreciate the opportunity to have been involved in this fascinating initiative.

USAID/Malawi

Cynthia Rozell, Director
Thomas Lofgren, Deputy Director
Andrew Sisson, Program Officer
Tonya Himelfarb, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor
Kathryn English, Team Leader, SO5
Kurt Rockeman, Team Leader, SO1
David Himelfarb, Team Leader, SO2
Joan LaRosa, Team Leader, SO3
Shobna Chakravati, Team Leader, SO4
Venge Nkosi, Economist

USAID/Washington

Jennifer Windsor, Deputy Director, Democracy Center, Global Bureau
Melissa Brown, Coordinator for Africa, Democracy Center
Jerry Hyman, Strategies and Information Coordinator, Democracy Center
Gary Hansen, Civil Society Team Leader, Democracy Center
Lynn Carter, Contract Manager, DG Indicators, Management Systems International
Gwen Bevis, Contract Manager, Civil Society Strategies/Civic Education, Management Systems International

Contractors and Grantees

Bruce Bolnick, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (Chief of Party, Harvard Institute for International Development)
Fernando Fernholz, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (Economist, Harvard Institute for International Development)
Consuella Brown, Program Director, National Democratic Institute
Adrian Munga, Program Officer, National Democratic Institute
Kondwani Nwangulube, Focus Group Facilitator, National Democratic Institute
Chris Gomes, Malawi/Zambia Desk Officer, NDI/Washington
Paul McDermott, Project Manager, International Foundation for Election Systems
Laurie Cooper, Senior Program Officer (Africa), IFES/Washington
Charles Ward, World Learning International/Services in Health, Agriculture and Enterprise Development (SHARED)
Bonnie Ricci, Program Officer (Africa), World Learning/Washington
Ruth Kornfield, Research Anthropologist, John Snow International/Support for HIV/AIDS and Family Planning (STAFH)
Janet Robb, Chief of Party, Creative Associates International/GABLE Social Mobilization Campaign

Kondwani Kankondo, Communications Officer, Council for NGOs in Malawi (CONGOMA)
Vera Chirwa, Executive Director, Malawi CARER

Government of Malawi

Justice Dunstan Mwaungulu, Judge, High Court
Justice Anastasia Msosa, Chairperson, Electoral Commission
John Chipeta, Commissioner, Electoral Commission (Chair, Civic Education Committee)
Miriam Maluwa, Assistant Chief Parliamentary Draftsman, Ministry of Justice
Linley Kamtengeni, Controller of Women and Children Affairs, Ministry of Women and Children Affairs, Community Development and Social Welfare
Manuel Mang'anya, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, National Statistical Office
Dan Chimwenje, Director, Malawi Institute of Education, Domasi

University of Malawi

Stanley Khaila, Director, Centre for Social Research, Chancellor College
Wycliffe Chilowa, Assistant Director, Centre for Social Research, Chancellor College
Peter Mvula, Research Fellow, Centre for Social Research, Chancellor College
James Milner, Research Fellow, Centre for Social Research, Chancellor College
Anne-Marie Broeder, Centre for Social Research, Chancellor College
Jan Kees van Donge, Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Administration, Chancellor College
Daro Blessings Chinsinga/Augustin Magolowondo, Teaching Assistants, Department of Public Administration, Chancellor College
Dolly Mullen, Fulbright Scholar, Department of Public Administration, Chancellor College
Necton Mhura, Head, Department of Law, Chancellor College
Wiseman Chirwa, Senior Lecturer, Department of History, Chancellor College
Kings Phiri, Senior Lecturer, Department of History, Chancellor College
Moirra Chimombo, Associate Professor, Department of English, Chancellor College
Samu Samu, Head, Department of Language and Development Communication, Bunda College

Others

Robert Dance, Public Affairs Officer, USIS/M
Karen Levine, Economic Officer, U.S. Embassy
Sirys Chinangwa, Assistant Economic Officer, U.S. Embassy
Malcolm Blackie, Representative, The Rockefeller Foundation
James Kennedy, Director, The British Council
Ted Bousfield, British High Commission
Walter Seate, Deputy High Commissioner, South African High Commission
Hitomi Komatsu, UNDP

Alice Greene, Canadian International Development Agency
Fletcher Kankhwende, Partner, Deloitte and Touche
Frank Mbendera, Vice-Chairman, Malawi Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Francis Antonio, Secretary General, Malawi Congress of Trade Unions
Anthony Mawaya, Team Leader, Malawi Vision 2020

JOB POSTING

Appendix 2

CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

STUDY ON ATTITUDES TO DEMOCRACY IN MALAWI

Applicants are sought for the position of Principal Co-Investigator on a study of Public Attitudes to Democracy in Malawi. This major, donor-funded study is the first systematic, large-scale effort to measure the opinions of the Malawian public about recent political and economic reforms. Data will be collected by means of probability sample survey conducted at numerous sites across the country during 1997.

The study will be undertaken collaboratively by the Centre for Social Research, University of Malawi and a United States-based university. The Co-Principal Investigator would share responsibility with an American counterpart for all aspects of study design, survey management, data analysis, report writing, and dissemination of results.

The successful applicant will have all or most of the following qualifications:

- * A postgraduate degree (Masters or Doctorate) in political science or a closely related discipline (e.g. public policy, public administration, constitutional law, political sociology, contemporary history);
- * Training in social science research methods, including quantitative data analysis. Experience in designing and implementing field surveys or public opinion polls would be an added asset, as would experience at managing large-scale quantitative data sets;
- * Excellent writing skills, together with proven capacity to deliver high quality written reports within a tight deadline;
- * Availability and willingness to work full-time for a period of 45 days, probably between April and June 1997, while based at the Centre for Social Research, Zomba.

Staff of the University of Malawi, both men and women, are especially encouraged to apply. Please submit a letter of application stating the reasons for your interest in the study

topic and including a current curriculum vitae to:

The Director,
Centre for Social Research
University of Malawi
P.O. Box 278
Zomba

DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix 3

A preliminary draft of a questionnaire for possible use as a research instrument is attached. Discussion is invited about topics, items and wordings, including possible alternatives. Except where indicated as open-ended (OE), questions will be precoded. A trained and experienced enumerator should take no more than 35-45 minutes to administer the precoded questionnaire.

Social Background

I would like to start with a few questions about yourself.

- * Male or female?
- * In which year were you born?
- * What was the highest grade/standard/form you completed in school?
- * What Malawian language do you speak most often?
- * Can you read and/or write in English?
- * What is your tribe?
- * What is your main occupation?
- * Roughly how much money do you earn per day/or month/or year?

Associational Life

- * Are you a member of a community organization such as a church, mosque, club, union, cooperative or some similar group?
- * For each organization:
 - Which community organization? (OE)
 - For how many years have you belonged?
 - Do you hold an official leadership position?
- * Within the past five years, how often have you engaged in the following activities in your organization(s):
 - attended a meeting?
 - spoken publicly at a meeting?
 - organized or chaired a meeting?

Undergone some kind of training?

(If yes) What was this training about? (OE)

- * Do people like yourself have a say in deciding the activities of these organizations?
- * How so? (OE)

Civic Knowledge

- * Do you own a radio?
- * (If yes) Is it in working order?
- * (If yes) Do you presently have batteries for this radio?
- * How often do you listen to a news bulletin on the radio?
- * At which time of day you most often listen to news bulletins?
- * How often do you read a newspaper?
- * (If applicable) Which newspapers do you read?
- * Can you tell me the names of the following people?
 - The Member of Parliament for this area?
 - The Vice-President of Malawi?
 - The Minister of Finance?
- * In Malawi, is there a difference between a government and a political party, or are they the same thing?
- * In Malawi, is there a difference between the central government and local government, or are they the same thing?
- * What do you understand by the term "democracy"? (OE)
- * What do you understand by the term "election" (OE)
- * What do you understand by the term "government budget"? (OE)
- * What do you understand by the term "free market"? (OE)
- * As you know, Malawi changed from a one-party state to a multiparty democracy with the elections of 1994. In your opinion, was this change good or bad for the country?
- * In what ways was it good/bad? (OE)

Political Authority

- * In your opinion, should chiefs and village heads play a part in governing Malawi today?
- * (If yes) What should their role be? (OE)

Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statements: (5-point Likert scale)

- * Young people these days do not show enough respect for their elders.
- * Compared with the past, discipline is breaking down in the schools.
- * Women should have the same right as men to vote in elections.
- * Only men should have the right to run for public office (such as MP or councillor)

Rule of Law

Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statements: (5-point Likert scale)

- * Widows should be able to retain most of the property of a deceased husband.
- * Chiefs and village heads (rather than magistrates) should judge family disputes.
- * If citizens witness a crime taking place, they should inflict a punishment on the spot.
- * In Malawi, people charged with a criminal offence are generally able to obtain a fair trial.
- * (If disagree) Why do you disagree?

Political Trust

How much do you trust the following people? (5-point Likert scale)

First, think about people whom you personally know:

- * Your close relatives
- * Your neighbors
- * Traditional leaders
- * Your own tribesmates

Now, think about people whom you may not know personally:

How much do you trust them?

- * Your own tribesmates
- * People from the Southern Region
- * People from the Central Region
- * People from the Northern Region

Finally think about the following groups and organizations:

How much do you trust them?

- * The police
- * Magistrates
- * Government health workers
- * Cabinet Ministers
- * Churches
- * The Malawi Broadcasting Corporation
- * this interview team

Political Accountability

Please say whether you agree or disagree with the following statements: (5-point Likert scale)

- * Bribery is very rare among public officials in Malawi.
- * Most politicians are mainly concerned with enriching themselves.
- * The President's region of the country gets more government services than any other region.
- * Corruption was a worse problem under Kamuzu's government than these days.
- * Corruption among political leaders has little impact on the economic development of the country.

Political Efficacy

- * How interested are you:
 - in local political affairs?
 - in national political affairs?
- * How often do you discuss political affairs with other people?

Please tell me which statement is closest to your own opinion.

- * 1. Government sometimes seems so complicated that I cannot really understand what is going on.
 - 2. The way that government works is generally understandable to people like me.
- * 1. In discussions about politics with friends and neighbors, I can influence the opinions of others.
 - 2. As far as politics are concerned, friends and neighbors do not listen to me.
- * 1. As a community, we are generally able to make our elected representatives listen to our problems.
 - 2. We are usually unable to make our MPs listen to us.
- * 1. No matter how we vote, things will not get better in the future.
 - 2. We can use our power as voters to choose leaders who will help us improve our lives.
- * 1. When it comes to making policies for the country, the government usually consults those who will be affected.
 - 2. Government almost never asks us our opinion of policies that directly affect us.

Political Reform

Please tell me which statement is closest to your own opinion:

- * 1. If people have different views than you do, they should be allowed to express them.
 - 2. It is dangerous and confusing to allow the expression of too many different points of view.
- * 1. Freedom of speech is a basic right that must never again be denied to Malawians.
 - 2. In a poor country like Malawi, there are more basic needs that must be addressed before free speech.
- * 1. In order to move ahead in our country, we must forgive and forget any political crimes committed in the past.
 - 2. All those responsible for political crimes in the past must be brought to justice.
- * 1. All people should be permitted to vote, even if they do not understand all the issues in

an election.

2. Only those who are sufficiently well educated should be allowed the privilege of voting.

- * 1. The best form of government is a government elected by its people.
- 2. The best form of government is a government that gets things done.

- * 1. It would be better for the country if we returned to a system of single-party rule.
- 2. It is more desirable for Malawians to have a choice of political parties and candidates.

- * 1. The system of electing leaders should be extended to local government councils.
- 2. There are already too many elections in Malawi so we should not elect local government councils.

- * 1. Since the introduction of democracy in 1994, conflicts have increased among Malawians of different tribes.
- 2. Since 1994, relations among our country's ethnic groups have remained much the same as they always were.

Economic Performance

- * How satisfied are you:
 - with the general state of the Malawian economy today?
 - with your own living standards today?
- * What is happening to the following aspects of your living standards? (i.e. rising, falling, or staying the same)
 - total household income
 - household food consumption
 - your total savings
 - any overall debt
- * Do you sell any of the commodities you produce?
- * (If yes), what is changing the way you make sales? (more private channels, more public channels, no change)
- * When you look at your living standards today, how satisfied do you feel compared with five years ago?
- * When you look forward at your life's prospects, how satisfied do you expect to be in one year's time?
- * In your opinion, who is responsible for current economic conditions in Malawi?
- * What are some things that the present (UDF) government has done better than the previous (MCP) government? (OE)
- * What are some things that the present (UDF) government has done worse than the previous (MCP) government? (OE)
- * What is your overall assessment of the performance of the present (UDF) government?

Economic Reform

Which statement is closest to your own view?

- * 1. It is better to have goods in the market, even if prices are high.
2. It is better to have low prices, even if there are shortages of goods.
- * 1. It is better to have free schooling for our children, even if the quality of education is low.
2. It is better to raise educational standards, even if we have to pay school fees.
- * 1. Our leaders should provide us with government jobs, even if this is costly to the country.
2. The country cannot afford so many public employees and should lay some of them off.
- * 1. The government should own and operate businesses, even if it cannot run them efficiently.
2. The government should sell its businesses to private individuals who can run them more profitably.
- * 1. People should be responsible for achieving their own success and well-being in life.
2. The government should bear the main responsibility for ensuring the success and well-being of Malawians
- * 1. To develop our country, all citizens, including our leaders, should be willing to make economic sacrifices.
2. If they are unwilling to do so themselves, our leaders should not ask us to make economic sacrifices.

Political Participation

- * Are you a registered voter?
- * (If no) Why not? (OE)
- * Did you vote in the May 1994 general elections?
- * (If no) Why not?
- * In your opinion, were these elections generally fair, or did some candidates have an unfair advantage?
- * (If unfair) In what specific ways were the elections unfair? (OE)

- * Who did you vote for in the presidential election of 1994?
- * Who did you vote for in the parliamentary election of 1994?
- * Did you vote for this MP because of his/her qualities as an individual or because of the political party he/she belongs to?
- * Did you choose this candidate by yourself, or did someone convince you to vote for them?

- * (If convinced) Who convinced you? (OE)
- * Did you receive any education on procedures for registering or voting?
- * (If yes) From which source? (OE) What specifically did you learn? (OE)
- * What additional information would you like about voting? (OE)

- * How often have you engaged in the following activities during the past five years? (Never, only once, sometimes, often)
 - attending a community meeting
 - getting together with others to raise an issue
 - attending an election rally
 - working for a political candidate or party
 - signing a petition
 - writing a letter to a newspaper
 - attending a demonstration
- * During the past five years, how often have you contacted the following persons for help to solve a problem?
 - a chief or village head
 - a local government councillor
 - a Member of Parliament
 - an official of a government ministry
 - a church leader
 - some other influential person
- * Since the last election, how satisfied have you been with the performance of the MP for this area?
- * To your knowledge, how many meetings has your MP held with constituents since the last election?
- * How many such meetings did you attend?
- * Have you heard about the boycott of parliament by certain MP's?
- * (If yes) Do you support or oppose this boycott?
- * Why?
- * Do you identify with any political party?
- * (If yes) Which one?
- * Do you presently hold a paid-up membership card for this party?
- * For how long have you been a member of this party?
- * How often have you attended meetings intended solely for members of this party?
- * Do you intend to vote in the forthcoming local government elections?
- * (If yes) If these elections were held today, which party would you vote for?

ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Appendix 4

ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBILITIES			
	CSR co-PI	USU* co-PI	USU PMan	AID/M**
Revise research instrument	X		X	
Recruit Advisory Group	X			X
Convene Advisory Group	X		X	X
Pretest survey instrument in field	X			X
Draw national probability sample	X	X		X
Recruit survey field teams	X			X
Plan survey logistics	X			X
Train supervisors/enumerators	X	X		X
Oversee data collection	X			X
Direct data entry		X		X
Analyse data		X	X	X
Reconvene Advisory Group	X			X
Write up results	X	X		X
Organize dissemination workshop	X			X

* A US university, to be identified

** AID/Malawi has a consultative role only

Appendix 4

ESTIMATED BUDGETS

Appendix 5

OPTION 1

Deliverables: 1 Baseline Survey, 1997
1 Dissemination Workshop

Personnel

28595

1 CSR Co-Principal Investigator (1 x 45 days @ \$150)*	6750
1 US Co-Principal Investigator (1 x 21 days @ \$330)	6930
1 US Project Manager (1 x 45 days @ \$125)	5625
Fringe Benefits (@25% on U.S. salaries)	3140
4 UNIMA Field Supervisors (4 x 1 month @ \$300)	1200
16 UNIMA Survey Enumerators (16 x 1 month @ \$100)	1600
4 CSR Data Entry Clerks (4 x 1 month @ \$100)	400
4 CSR Drivers (4 x 1 month @ \$100)	400
3 UNIMA Translators (3 x 5 days @ \$50)	750
6 Advisory Group Experts (6 x 2 days @ \$150)	1800

Per Diem

19200

2 Investigators (2US x 10days x \$172, urban)	3440
(2US+CSR x 10 days x \$172, urban)	3440
(2 x 10 days x \$86, rural)	1720
4 Field Supervisors (4 x 10 days x \$60, urban)	2400
(4 x 10 days x \$30, rural)	1200
16 Survey Enumerators (16 x 20 days x \$15)	4800
4 Drivers (4 x 20 days x \$20)	1600
International Transit (2 x 2 days x \$150)	600

Transportation

18175

2 round-trip airfares, US - Lilongwe @ \$4000	8000
Vehicle Hire (5 4x4 vehicles x 2500kms @ \$0.67, including fuel)*	8375
Advisory Group travel allowance (6 x 2 trips x \$150)	1800

Supplies and Services

10600

Printing (1000 questionnaires @ \$1)	1000
Dissemination	
(200 reports @ \$2)	400
CSR Workshop (20 persons)	5000
Computer Time (400 hrs @ \$5)	2000
Communications (international and local)	1000

Insurances		500
Immunizations, medical supplies	200	
Miscellaneous survey supplies	500	
SUBTOTAL (Direct Costs)		
76570		
Indirect Costs		38290
Centre for Social Research (@ 20%)	15315	
US University (@ 30%, assuming off campus rate)	22975	
TOTAL		
\$114860		

* All local costs calculated at rates charged by CSR.

OPTION 3

Deliverables: 1 Baseline Survey, 1997
2 Malawians trained to Masters level in political science/research methods
2 US doctoral dissertations/special studies
CSR computer lab upgraded
1 Impact Survey, AD 2000
2 Dissemination Workshops
Radio/Leaflet Campaign

Baseline Survey (n=800)(see cost from Option 1 budget)	114860
Fellowships	206000
Masters degrees for UNIMA students in US* (2 persons x 2 years @ \$30000, includes airfare, tuition, maintenance, etc.; itemized budget to be provided)	120000
Research Assistantships, US doctoral students (2 persons x 1/4 time x 1 year @ \$8000)(includes tuition waiver)	16000
Doctoral dissertation awards in Malawi, US doctoral students (2 persons x 1 year @ \$35000, includes airfare, maintenance, used vehicle, etc. itemized budget to be provided)	70000
Personnel	48750
Administrative Assistant at US university (1 person x 1/4 time x 3 years x \$40000) Fringe benefits @ 25% Indirect costs @ 30%	
Equipment	21500
2 desktop computers (CSR)	6000
2 laptop computers (CSR/US)	6000
1 laser printer (CSR)	1000
1 heavy-duty photocopier	7000
Software (CSR/US)	1500
Dissemination	13000
3 radio discussion programs	3000
40,000 leaflets (@\$0.25)	10000
Impact Survey, A.D. 2000 (n=1200)(see cost from Option 2 budget)	191375

TOTAL \$595485

Note: No indirect costs on fellowships or equipment.

TENTATIVE TIMELINE

Appendix 6

January 1997	USAID/M authorizes Option 1
February 1997	USAID/M issues Cooperative Agreement to USU*
March 1997	CSR recruits Malawian Co-PI CSR/USU revise research instrument
April-June 1997	USU personnel arrive in Malawi CSR convenes Advisory Group & recruits field teams CSR/USU fieldtest research instrument draw national sample plan survey logistics train field teams implement baseline survey enter data
July-September 1997	CSR/USU analyse data write draft report CSR reconvenes Advisory Group CSR/USU finalize baseline report
August 1997	USAID/M authorizes Option 3 Malawian trainees depart for USU Local government elections?
October 1997	CSR convenes dissemination workshop
January 1998	USU procures equipment CSR commissions radio productions
March 1998	CSR installs equipment CSR launches media campaign
May 1999	Presidential and Parliamentary Elections
August 1999	Malawians return from long-term training
April 2000	USU personnel return to Malawi Impact Survey

June 2000

USU/CSR report on USAID DG Program impacts

* A US university, to be identified