Africa Integrity Indicators 2021-2022

Terms of Reference / Instructions
<u>Role: Lead Researcher</u>

* All researchers must carefully read these instructions prior to the training *
** During the research, all researchers must formulate their OWN assessment (and not simply cite experts or provide quotes) **

1. The Project

The Africa Integrity Indicators project assesses key social, economic, political and anti-corruption mechanisms at the national level in all 54 African countries. Independent in-country researchers evaluate the legal framework and its practical implementation across various categories, including the rule of law, public service integrity, sustainable economic opportunity, and human development. The research is based on Global Integrity's expert assessment methodology.

Each country assessment consists of a qualitative scorecard with 54 indicators. Each indicator is assigned a numeric equivalent, corresponding to the qualitative commentary provided by the researcher. For more information about the objectives of the data, the methodology and the indicators, please refer to the Africa Integrity Indicators website: https://www.africaintegrityindicators.org/.

2. Responsibilities of the Lead Researcher

As part of its research process, Global Integrity carefully selects experts to research the indicators in order to ensure that the data is as accurate and balanced as possible. Researchers are selected for their knowledge and experience with key social, economic, political and anti-corruption issues and particularly their expertise on their assigned countries. To be selected, researchers need to have been independent of the government of their assigned country for at least the past three years.

Specifically, the researcher's job is to rigorously research all indicators through interviews, desk research and the verification of primary data. Each researcher must develop their own assessment for each indicator, basing their answer on facts and evidence obtained during the research.

The researcher will conduct the field research by following five steps for every indicator:
1) Understanding the indicator and its specific scoring criteria.
2) Researching the indicator based on the criteria through original interviews, desk research, verification of primary data, etc.
3) Drafting a clear and unambiguous (3-4 paragraph-long) assessment/narrative, in accordance with the style guide further below, that relates the precise research findings to the scoring conditions.
4) Documenting all sources used to inform the answer provided according to the format provided.
5) Choosing a score for the indicator.

While the indicators are formulated to limit interpretation, there is a good chance that researchers will have questions at some point. It is the researcher's responsibility to approach her/his project manager any time there are questions on any of the above steps or on any specific indicator during the research process.

3. Deliverables & Timeline

1) **Preparation:** You are expected to familiarize yourself with these instructions and some 15 or 20 indicators (as examples) prior to the training.

2) **Training session:** You will participate in a training session with your project manager, which will be the kick-off date for your research as well. The research training will be approximately 45-60 minutes long.

3) **3 days after the training session (first week):** You will send your project manager your sourcebook with a list of anticipated sources that you plan to consult for EACH indicator. NOTE: The first few days are essential for you to understand the scope of ALL indicators, structure your outreach and plan the next 5 weeks. Good planning is essential in keeping with the deadlines and

delivering a quality product. Your project manager will vet the plan as soon as possible and will make suggestions and observations as needed.

4) **7 days after the training session (first week):** You will send your project manager 10 indicators, fully answered with an unambiguous assessment (narrative), correct and full citation of all sources consulted and a score chosen based on your findings in relation to the scoring conditions. These indicators shall include indicators 2-3 from the Rule of Law subsection, indicators 12-13 from the Accountability subsection, 91 from the Business and Infrastructure subsection, 101 and 102 from the Welfare subsection. For the remaining three, submit any indicators of your choice. Your project manager will vet the ten indicators and notify you of any corrections necessary to meet the minimum criteria. It is essential for you to reach out and plan interviews for other indicators during the first 7 days in order to meet all deadlines.

5) **21 days after the training session (week 2&3):** You will send your project manager 20 additional indicators fully answered with an unambiguous assessment (narrative), correct and full citation of all sources consulted, and a score chosen based on what your findings are in relation to the scoring conditions. You may answer more indicators if you can, but not fewer. Your project manager will NOT vet those indicators, but only take a brief snapshot of your work.

6) **35 days after the training session (week 4&5):** You will send your project manager all remaining indicators fully answered with unambiguous assessments (narrative), correct and full citation of all sources consulted, and a score was chosen based on what your findings are in relation to the scoring conditions.

7) The next step is for your project manager to do a detailed fact-checking and quality-control exercise, reading all of your indicators and flagging any and all questions, necessary corrections, ambiguous statements, incorrectly cited or non-credible sources, or scores that do not match the narrative provided. At this point, researchers are expected to promptly respond to queries on the submitted indicators and also engage in any reasonably related research to make necessary revisions.

8) After some back and forth between you and your project manager on these remaining questions, your draft research will be peer-reviewed. Following the peer review, your project manager will again do detailed quality control and flag any and all questions to you that you still have to address based on the peer review.

9) After the second quality control, the Global Integrity team will undertake a consistency check of all indicators, to ensure that scoring and commentaries are accurate and equitable across all 54 countries covered by the research. Your project manager will be in touch with you for any final questions to address that arise during the review process.

10) One the consistency check is finalized, the data will be made available on the AII website to the public for a two-month window. During this time, data users and interested parties are offered the opportunity to review the freshly completed research and provide corrective information for any substantive inaccuracies identified. To resolve any outstanding issues, the Global Integrity team will contact the researcher.

The research will start in July/August 2021 and last 5 weeks. After the draft research is submitted, the quality control stages will be conducted in the following weeks. Throughout this period (from draft research submission until research finalization) researchers will need to respond to any questions and clarification requests.

Meeting the deliverables AND timelines is essential for this massive data-gathering project to be successful. **You will have up to 35 days (please note these are NOT working days, and therefore weekends are counted within that period) to complete and submit the initial draft for quality control.** As a researcher, you are expected to start working on the assignment immediately and allocate at least 1.5 to 2 hours of concentrated work daily for the following 35 days.

4. Remuneration

The first part of the payment (50%) will be made within 30 days of the end of the first quality control (step 8 under Deliverables & Timeline). At this point, it is expected that all indicators are submitted fully answered within the given deadline as well as all additional questions for clarifications from the project manager have been answered by the researcher. The remaining payment (50%) will be made within 30 days of the end of the consistency check (following your responses to feedback from your project managers and peer reviewers).

5. Research guidelines

Each indicator consists of the following *six* parts: the indicator question, the scoring criteria, instructions, the score, the comment and the sources. Researchers are to familiarize themselves with the first three parts to then work on the comment, sources and score.

1) **Indicators "in practice:** "In practice" indicators ask about the implementation or enforcement of laws. In many cases, they also ask about the extent to which mechanisms exist that are not codified in the law at all. "In practice" indicators must be answered with examples and observations from reality (Are there reports? How many? How detailed? Etc.) and must never be answered with laws or legal provisions.

2) **Scoring conditions:** Each indicator has question-specific scoring conditions. The extent to which the scoring conditions are met for each indicator defines what your assessment must describe. The scoring conditions also define what score can be chosen. Researchers must make sure to address every individual scoring condition point.

3) **Score:** Based on the research, you must also choose the appropriate score. The scoring criteria defines what observations correspond to a particular score choice. "In practice" indicators will be scored with a 0, 25, 50, 75 or 100. The score options 25 and 75 do not have defined scoring conditions. They may be chosen if the evidence points to a score that is not quite a 0, and not quite a 50 – or – not quite a 100, and not quite a 50 either. In either case, the rationale provided must clearly describe why a certain score is a correct answer.

4) **Instructions:** Researchers will find additional guidance and definitions underneath some indicators. Researchers must make sure to read and understand this additional guidance. At various times throughout the research process, you may be sent emails clarifying definitions, please make sure to make annotations on those definitions in your notebook. Researchers must read all indicators carefully and ask Global Integrity project managers any questions *before and during* the fieldwork. Global Integrity project managers are meant to clarify any doubts that may arise in the process to avoid wasting time and resources.

5) **Comments:** You must write your own assessment of the situation in an unambiguous 2-4 paragraph-long comment. Any assessment has to provide country-specific evidence through examples and/or facts that clearly show how the scoring criteria are met (or not). You must be explicit anytime something is non-existent. It is necessary to research and answer all aspects of the scoring conditions to fully comply with Global Integrity quality expectations. It is not necessary to go beyond the scoring conditions. Any assessment must be clear and fully explanatory to any reader that is not familiar with your country. All assessments must be logical and cannot presume prior knowledge (acronyms, context, cross-referencing indicators). For further details on **Comments** and **Sources,** please read the guidelines below.

5-1. "in practice" indicator guidelines

- Scope: Each indicator is asking about a specific "in practice" or real-life observation during the period study. The reporting period is September 2020 to September 2021. There is a small margin of flexibility (few days before or after the study period).
- All research and narratives must clearly identify the data to be describing observations during the study period. Global Integrity will not accept studies or articles (or interviews) that describe data from before this period. The exceptions are incidents or occurrences that have last occurred prior to the period of study. If, for example, state elections last took place in 2017, then these elections must be referred to, however, you must make an explicit mention in the comment that observations relate to a time outside the period of study.
- You are expected to provide an explanation of the general situation in the country, an isolated example is NOT enough to relate and choose a score. Researchers are expected to consider and assess the overall context and note in the narrative if the overall context negates the observations made. You must note outliers if applicable. ("Despite this one defined instance of non-disclosure, most senior officials of the three branches of government file asset disclosures").
- Each and every one of your responses for In Practice indicators must be researched from scratch and **MUST NOT contain ANY copy and paste from prior years**. The answer must be newly written with as much context as needed and new examples, even if the score remains the same.
- **Each "in practice" indicator must have a <u>minimum of 3 sources.</u>** These three sources may consist of any combination of expert interviews, original data observations, or desk research (studies or newspaper articles). They need to follow the format included in the training material.
- **Each "in practice" indicator must have at least one original interview to inform the assessment of the indicator**. Make sure to ask highly specific questions to any interview partner (mirroring the precise scoring criteria) to get factual information from your sources. Researchers must make sure that sources answer based on knowledge and facts and do not provide "just" an opinion. Global Integrity does not need transcripts of the interviews.
- All sources used must be relevant, reliable, credible, unbiased, independent (from each other) and factual. You must exercise professional judgment to determine whether the opinions of an interviewee are factual and accurate. Researchers must corroborate information obtained in interviews with desk research and/or dig deeper until they have sufficient facts to formulate an assessment on their own.
- **Anonymity:** If it is not feasible to publish the name of an interviewee (fear for one's safety, requested anonymity, etc.), tell AII staff the name of the interviewee. In the "Sources" box,

simply state "Anonymous" for the interviewee's name. Provide as many details as possible (e.g. *Anonymous, Member of Parliament, Federal Republic of Somalia, August 10, 2021, Mogadishu, Somalia, Interview by telephone*). Please also add below the following phrase: *Global Integrity knows the names of anonymous sources and has agreed not to disclose them.* AII staff will uphold confidentiality, and the report will be printed without the names.

5-3. Here is what we do not want you to do, aka the "Top mistakes"

- Making blanket statements without factual information. This is not an op-ed.
- Evading or circumventing researching and answering **all** scoring conditions.
- Rewording the scoring criteria without providing specific evidence.
- Cross-referencing content from prior or subsequent indicators: "As described in indicator 25…"
- Cross-referencing sources: "As can be seen in the sources…"
- Assessing results/impact instead of process/mechanisms.
- Writing ambiguous or vague statements.
- Simply quoting sources instead of writing an assessment.
- Starting a comment with a "Yes,…" or "No,…"
- Saying "It was hard to find data…," instead: find out and – if you really can't find the data – you must say "There is no data."
- Using acronyms or abbreviations without defining them for every single indicator.
- Referencing the numeric score in your assessment: "This indicator scores a 25**"**
- Starting your comment with "In practice, .."

Should you have any questions at any given stage in the research, please contact your Global Integrity Project Manager. We look forward to working with you!

6. Who We Are

Global Integrity supports progress toward open and accountable governance in countries and communities around the world. We focus on generating research and data, supporting the work of country-level reformers, and influencing global conversations on open governance. Our work covers a number of themes, with data, learning and citizen engagement at the core of everything we do. To know more about us, visit our website at www.globalintegrity.org.