*Three Approaches to Advocacy*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **APPROACH TO ADVOCACY** | **ADVOCACY FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY A SITUATION** | **ADVOCACY WITH THOSE AFFECTED BY A SITUATION** | **ADVOCACY BY THOSE AFFECTED BY A SITUATION** |
| **Advocacy work done by** | Professionals, NGOs, church leaders | A mixture of professionals, NGOs and local community groups | Local community workers |
| **Main objectives for intervention** | Change in law, policy or practice | Increased access to decision-making  Change in law, policy or practice  Build advocacy capacity of those affected by situation | Increase in awareness of advocacy possibilities and capacity to do advocacy |
| **Characteristics** | Issues often identified by outsiders  Usually targeted at official decision-makers | Issues identified by community  Shared planning, resources and action  Outside organisers mobilise capacity | Issues identified by community  Learning by involvement  May have significant outside input at start |
| **Advantages** | Quick access to decision-makers  Good access to information about wider context | Increase access of poor to decision-makers  Advocacy skills and capacity developed | Empowering – poor see themselves as agents of change  Sustainable  Can correct power imbalance |
| **Disadvantages** | Could strengthen existing power structures  May not increase the capacity of local groups to act | NGO often in control and sets agenda  Slower due to need for agreement between all parties | Access to fewer resources and information  Risk of revenge  Policy change may take longer |

It might be appropriate to use a mixture of these approaches to advocacy at different times throughout the process. Development organizations that support the principles of participation and empowerment should aim to see the poor undertake advocacy themselves and become agents of change in their local area. However, due to risk or lack of skills and knowledge, advocacy for others may be the only option at the start.