

SDG Indicator 16.7.2

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

IAEG-SDG
March 2019



Summary

- Key concepts: responsive and inclusive decision making
- Rationale and interpretation
- Methodology development
- Piloting
- Method of computation
- Disaggregation
- Conclusions

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 WWSA in 15 countries (Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru):
- Now integrated in the core WWS 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

| |
|--|
| Africa |
| Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda |
| Arab States |
| Palestine |
| Asia / Pacific |
| Korea |
| Latin America and the Caribbean |
| Mexico |

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? (Sample: 100)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1- Not at all | 8 |
| 2- Very little | 22 |
| 3- Some | 26 |
| 4- A lot | 34 |
| 5- A great deal | 10 |
| % of those who responded positively | % who responded 3,4 or 5: (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? (Sample: 100)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1- Not at all | 16 |
| 2- Very little | 30 |
| 3- Some | 26 |
| 4- A lot | 14 |
| 5- A great deal | 14 |
| % of those who responded positively | % who responded 3,4 or 5: (26+14+14)/100 = 54% |

Average % of those who responded positively to the 2 questions: (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](#) 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*⁹