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Key concepts: responsive and inclusive decision making

**Target 16.7:** Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

**Indicator 16.7.2:** Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group

**Inclusive decision-making**
Decision-making which provides people with an opportunity to ‘have a say’, that is, to voice their demands, opinions and/or preferences to decision-makers.

**Responsive decision making**
Decision-making in which decision-makers and/or political institutions listen to and act on the stated demands, opinions and/or preferences of people.
Rationale and interpretation

SDG 16.7.2 based on well-established concept of “external political efficacy”

Indicator 16.7.2 is based on two well-established survey questions used by the European Social Survey to measure self-reported levels of ‘external political efficacy’ i.e. people’s feeling that their views can impact on the political processes (OECD How’s Life? 2017: Measuring Well-Being – Chapter on Governance and Well-Being)

Question 1: To measure inclusive participation in decision-making

How much would you say the political system in [country X] allows people like you to have a say in what the government does?

(ESS 2016)

Question 2: To measure responsive decision-making

And how much would you say that the political system in [country] allows people like you to have an influence on politics?

(ESS 2016)
Methodology development

- Developed under the guidance of the *Praia City Group on Governance Statistics* and its dedicated Working Group on SDG indicator 16.7.2
- **Consultations with Expert Group** (consisting of NSOs, international agencies and organizations with expertise in measuring political efficacy (incl. OECD, ESS, Afrobarometer, WVS, etc.) to produce and refine the metadata
- Methodology **draws from well-established practice in national electoral surveys** (since the 1950s) to measure the concept of ‘external political efficacy’, as shown by **global mapping** of relevant survey questions currently in use by NSOs around the world and by reputable regional/global survey outfits
- Proposed items for SDG 16.7.2 already integrated in 1) the core questionnaire of the *European Social Survey* (ESS), a reputable cross-national survey of attitudes and behaviour established in 2001 and conducted biennially across nearly 30 European countries; and 2) in the OECD’s *Adult Skills Survey (PIAAC)* which in its last round (2008-2019) was run in 39 OECD countries and ‘partner’ countries.
- **Extensive statistical analysis** 1) confirmed relevance and validity of perception measures and 2) identified ESS questions as best ‘predictors’ of a regression outcome measure of relevance to target 16.7
- **Piloting in 8 countries** (Cape Verde, Cameroon, Kenya, Korea, Ghana, Mexico, Palestine, Uganda), and inputs received from 7 NSOs (Canada, Colombia, Germany, Norway, Philippines, Sweden and Uganda).
Piloting

Piloting by 8 countries

- 4 completed at time of submitting reclassification proposal
- Used ‘list experiment’ method (i.e. direct and indirect questioning) to estimate any effect of ‘social desirability bias’
- Piloting by WVSA in 15 countries (Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru):
- Now integrated in the core WVS questionnaire for future survey rounds

Pilot results showed positive results:

- Theoretical validity confirmed; clarity of terminology and definitions used
- Appropriateness of the approach and feasibility in diverse contexts
- Self-reported levels of external efficacy independent from a country’s level of democracy or development
- Neither of the two questions affected by social desirability bias: respondents in non-European/non-OECD contexts actually expressed negative opinion more often than European respondents (and very similar non-response rates)

Non-NSO use and piloting

- These 2 questions already used by ESS in nearly 30 European countries and by OECD’s PIACC survey in 39 countries

NSO Pilot countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arab States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asia / Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin America and the Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method of computation

Global reporting on SDG 16.7.2 will require:

• Distributions of answers across all answer options, for each one of the two questions;
• Average % of those who responded positively (3-'some', 4-'a lot' or 5-'a great deal') to the two questions

**1. How much would you say the political system in [country X] allows people like you to have a say in what the government does?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Not at all</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Very little</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Some</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- A lot</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- A great deal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% of those who responded positively**

\[
\frac{(26+34+10)}{100} = 70\%
\]

**2. And how much would you say that the political system in [country] allows people like you to have an influence on politics?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Not at all</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Very little</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Some</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- A lot</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- A great deal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% of those who responded positively**

\[
\frac{(26+14+14)}{100} = 54\%
\]

**Average % of those who responded positively to the 2 questions**: \[
\frac{70\% + 54\%}{2} = 62\%
\]
Disaggregation

**Indicator 16.7.2 requires disaggregation by age, sex, disability and population group**

- **Sex**: Male/Female
- **Age groups**: It is recommended to follow UN standards for the production of age-disaggregated national population statistics, using the following age groups: (1) below 25 years old, (2) 25-34, (3) 35-44, (4) 45-54, (5) 55-64 and (6) 65 years old and above.
- **Disability status**: If possible, NSOs are encouraged to add the [Short Set of Questions on Disability developed by the Washington Group](https://www.washingtongroupinternational.org) to the relevant survey vehicle
- **Nationally relevant population groups**: Groups with a distinct ethnicity, language, religion, indigenous status, nationality or other characteristics

And based on empirical analysis of pilot results, and OECD’s analysis of socio-demographic factors affecting levels of self-reported efficacy across OECD countries:

- **Income level**: By income quintile
- **Education level**: Primary education, Secondary education, Tertiary education
- **Place of residence**: by administrative region e.g. by province, state, district; urban/rural
Conclusions

- **Simple, realistic and cost-effective approach** to measuring people’s perception of the extent to which public decision-making is inclusive and responsive (integrating people’s voice in the measurement is essential to the concept being measured, i.e. people’s feeling that their views can impact on the political processes)

- Will encourage NSOs to produce data on a concept that has high policy relevance at country-level: high levels of external efficacy correlated with 1) government trust and legitimacy, 2) levels of political participation, incl. voting in elections, and 3) people’s overall life satisfaction.

- An important opportunity for NSOs to start producing official statistics on this concept which up until now has only been measured in a systematic and globally comparable way by independent research networks (ESS, WVSA, PIAAC), in a limited number of countries worldwide, and with small-size samples which only allow for limited disaggregation

- Metadata validated through pilot study in diverse contexts in 18 countries (4 NSOs & 15 countries across the world)

- Strengthening synergies with other indicators:
  - SDG 10.2.1 on the promotion of the social, economic and political inclusion of all, which only has one indicator measuring economic exclusion and;
  - SDG 10.3.1 Proportion of the population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed.