

ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, PARTICIPATION, AND INCLUSION: A NEW DEVELOPMENT CONSENSUS?

THOMAS CAROTHERS AND SASKIA BRECHENMACHER

Four key principles—accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion—have in recent years become nearly universal features of the policy statements and programs of international development organizations. Yet this apparently widespread new consensus is deceptive: behind the ringing declarations lie fundamental fissures over the value and application of these concepts. Understanding and addressing these divisions is crucial to ensuring that the four principles become fully embedded in international development work.

An Incomplete Bridge

- Accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion represent vital embodiments of the opening to politics that occurred in development work in the 1990s. They bridge three distinct practitioner communities that emerged from this new direction—those focusing on governance, on democracy, and on human rights.
- But consensus remains elusive. Democracy and human rights practitioners generally embrace an explicitly political understanding of the four concepts and fear technocratic or purely instrumentalist approaches. Governance specialists often follow a narrower approach, applying the core principles primarily to the quest for greater public sector effectiveness.
- Aid providers frequently present the four concepts as a unified agenda. Yet in actual programming they may only pursue or prioritize selective parts of the set, engendering tensions among the different principles.

Inconsistencies and Uncertainties

Shallow practice. Aid organizations often treat the four principles as programmatic boxes to be ticked rather than fundamental elements of their work. Although these concepts evoke potentially transformative notions of citizen empowerment, they risk being reduced in practice to limited forms of citizen consultation or technocratic reforms that rely on simplistic theories of developmental change.

Debates about the place of the principles. Many aid practitioners remain skeptical of treating accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion as intrinsic to their conception of development. They worry that broadening the development agenda on normative grounds will dilute the core focus on poverty reduction and growth.

Questions about impact. Evidence for the developmental impact of the four principles is limited and inconclusive to date. Uncertainty about their instrumental value is compounded by the unresolved broader debate over the relationship between governance and economic development.

Resistance on the recipient side. Many developing country governments have rhetorically embraced the value of accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion and joined international initiatives aimed at furthering these principles. However, the political will to translate such commitments into substantive political reform is often lacking. Some governments remain fiercely opposed to incorporating these principles into the international development agenda, viewing them as entry points for illegitimate political meddling.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Thomas Carothers is vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is the founder and director of the Democracy and Rule of Law Program and oversees Carnegie Europe in Brussels.

Saskia Brechenmacher is a first-year MALD candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

CONTACT

Christopher Dockrey
Government Affairs Manager
+1 202 939-2307
cdockrey@ceip.org

Clara Hogan
Media Manager
+1 202 939-2241
chogan@ceip.org

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is a unique global network of policy research centers in Russia, China, Europe, the Middle East, and the United States. Our mission, dating back more than a century, is to advance the cause of peace through analysis and development of fresh policy ideas and direct engagement and collaboration with decisionmakers in government, business, and civil society. Working together, our centers bring the inestimable benefit of multiple national viewpoints to bilateral, regional, and global issues.

© 2014 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. All rights reserved.

The Carnegie Endowment does not take institutional positions on public policy issues; the views represented here are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect the views of Carnegie, its staff, or its trustees.

CarnegieEndowment.org



@CarnegieEndow



facebook.com/
CarnegieEndowment