Introduction:

Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability

John Gaventa

1 Introduction

Around the world, a growing crisis of legitimacy characterises the relationship between citizens and the institutions that affect their lives. In both North and South, citizens speak of mounting disillusionment with government, based on concerns about corruption, lack of responsiveness to the needs of the poor and the absence of a sense of connection with elected representatives and bureaucrats (Commonwealth Foundation 1999; Narayan *et al.* 2000). Traditional forms of expertise and representation are being questioned (Leach *et al.*, this volume). The rights and responsibilities of corporations and other global actors are being challenged, as global inequalities persist and deepen (Newell, this volume).

In the past, there has been a tendency to respond to the gap that exists between citizens and institutions in one of two ways. On the one hand, attention has been paid to strengthening the processes of *participation* – that is the ways in which poor people exercise voice through new forms of deliberation, consultation and/or mobilisation designed to inform and to influence larger institutions and policies. On the other hand, growing attention has been paid to strengthening the *accountability* and *responsiveness* of these institutions and policies through changes in institutional design and a focus on the enabling structures for good governance. Each perspective has often perceived the other as inadequate, with one warning that consultation without attention to power and politics will lead to 'voice without influence', and the other arguing that reform of political institutions without attention to inclusion will only reinforce the status quo.

Increasingly, however, we are beginning to see the importance of working on both sides of the equation. As participatory approaches are scaled up from projects to policies, they inevitably enter the arenas of governance, and find that participation can only become effective as it engages with issues of institutional change. As concerns about good governance and state responsiveness grow, questions about how citizens engage and make demands on the state also come to the fore. As traditional forms of representation are being re-examined, new more direct and deliberative democratic mechanisms are proposed to enable

citizens to play a more active part in decisions that affect their lives. Similarly, especially in the context of globalisation, questions emerge about how participatory methods are used to hold corporations accountable and how corporations in turn act responsibly, *vis à vis* local communities. In this context, the questions of how citizens, especially the poor, express voice with influence, and how institutional responsiveness and accountability can be ensured, have become paramount.

To be meaningful, arguments for participation and institutional accountability must become grounded in a conception of rights which, in a development context, strengthens the status of citizens from that of beneficiaries of development to its rightful and legitimate claimants (Cornwall 2000). The recently published DFID strategy paper on *Realising Human Rights for Poor People* (2000), for example, argues that rights will become real only as citizens are engaged in the decisions and processes which affect their lives. Underpinning the approach are three principles of a rights perspective: *inclusive rights* for all people, the right to *participation*, and the 'obligations to protect and promote the realisation' of rights by states and other duty bearers: a concept which links to that of *accountability*. Similarly the *UNDP Human Development Report 2000* argues that 'the fulfilment of human rights requires democracy that is inclusive'. For this, elections are not enough. New ways must be found to 'secure economic, social and cultural rights for the most deprived and to ensure participation in decision making' (UNDP 2000: 7–9).

While such arguments are increasingly linked under the label of a new 'rights-based approach to development', discourses on rights have a long history in the field. In 1986, for example, a United Nations Declaration affirmed the 'right to development,' which it defined as:

> ...a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the wellbeing of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting therefrom. (*Declaration on the Right to Development* 2001)[1]

The Declaration thus not only linked the idea of development to the concept of rights, but also names the rights to meaningful participation and social justice as its inherent components. The UN Declarations argue, as do some DFID and UNDP papers, for the responsibility of states to guarantee such rights: '...it is essential for states to foster participation by the poorest people in the decision-making process by the community in which they live, the promotion of human rights and efforts to combat extreme poverty'.[1]

Concepts of rights, especially those linked to the responsibilities of states, also raise questions about the meaning and nature of citizenship. Who is eligible for rights? On what basis are they obtained? Are they linked to the nation-state, or do they extend beyond it? The concept of citizenship has long been a contentious one. In Western thought, citizenship has traditionally been cast in liberal terms, as individual legal equality accompanied by a set of rights and responsibilities bestowed by a state on its citizens. Recent more pluralistic approaches re-conceptualise citizenship to take a less state-centred, and more actor-oriented approach. They argue that citizenship is attained through the agency of citizens themselves, based on their diverse sets of identities. Such an approach also extends rights from the civil or political spheres, to encompass economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to participation itself, at local, national and global levels. Such concepts also go significantly beyond concepts of the nation-state as the sole custodian of citizenship, and place great importance on the role of non-state participants in claiming, monitoring and enforcing rights themselves (Nyamu-Musembi 2002).

However, while declarations on rights and citizenship are increasingly abundant, the gap between the rhetoric and reality remains large. Also, while the principles of the rights-based approach are important, there still is much to be understood about what it means, both conceptually and empirically, as well as much to learn about how to put it into practice. Little is yet known of how rights and citizenship are understood by poor people themselves, how they are realised in practice across different conditions and contexts, and with what impact. Similarly, new understanding is needed of what it means to re-cast

the debates of inclusion, participation and accountability in a rights-based and citizenship-centred mould. Picking up on this agenda, the recently launched Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (*see* Preface) is based on the premise that a critical challenge for the twenty-first century is to construct new concepts and forms of citizenship which will help to make rights real for poor people.

In this *Bulletin*, researchers associated with the Centre share emerging work around themes related to the meanings of rights and citizenship, spaces and places for participation, and new forms of accountability as they are emerging in differing parts of the globe. Part I of the *Bulletin* explores further how these concepts, many of which are prevalently debated in Northern contexts, link to the meanings and expressions of rights and citizenship in a number of Southern countries. As rights of citizenship are voiced, they often enter institutional arenas or spaces for participation, some of which involve (or claim to involve) more deliberative and inclusionary forms of policy making and democratic governance. The nature and dynamics of participation in these spaces are examined, again from a number of contexts, in Part II. Changing understandings of rights and new arenas of participation in turn lead to a reconsideration of traditional relationships of accountability and responsibility amongst actors across differing spheres and levels. The accountability debate, especially as it relates to civil society and the corporate sector, is taken up in Part III.

2 Conceptualising citizenship[2]

During the late 1990s, several parallel shifts in development thought have given rise to the emergence of 'citizenship' as an area of debate. The focus of participatory development, long rooted in concern with participation at the project level (often apart from the state) began to turn towards political participation and increasing poor and marginalised people's influence over the wider decision-making processes which affect their lives (Gaventa and Valderrama 1999; Cornwall 2000). Alongside this shift was the rise of the 'good governance' agenda and its concerns with increasing the responsiveness of governments to citizens' voices (Goetz and Gaventa 2001). The rights-based approach opened

further spaces for a discussion of citizenship. Shaped by parallel moves within both human rights and development thought, participation itself has been re-framed as a fundamental human and citizenship right, and a prerequisite for making other rights claims (Ferguson 1999). Representing a level of convergence, these shifts have opened spaces for the participation and good governance agendas to meet under concepts of 'citizenship participation', 'participatory governance' or 'participatory citizenship'.

The emerging focus on citizenship within development mirrors the increasingly global interest in the subject. Heater (1999: 2–3) argues that the contemporary interest in citizenship can be explained by a number of factors, including increased international migrations, heightened political awareness of ethnic and cultural difference within nation-states, and a fragmentation of nation-states on the basis of this politicised difference. In response, some governments have promoted the notion of citizenship as a civic identity in an attempt to draw citizens together under a new form of commonality (*see* Meekosha and Dowse 1997; Seidman 1999). Others have argued for the need to address the exclusions created by the linkage of citizenship to nation-states (Ellison 1997; Newell 2000; Turner 1999), and argued for recognition of a more multi-layered concept, linking the local to the global (Edwards and Gaventa 2001).

As the discourses of citizenship are increasingly used, however, the danger is that they come to offer to everybody what they would like to understand them to mean. This can range from Tony Blair's proclamations on 'active citizenship', to George W. Bush's inaugural exhortations on the theme, to the claims of multinationals to corporate citizenship, to the claims by dispossessed groups for greater inclusion. Much literature around citizen participation simply uses 'citizenship' to mean the act of any person taking part in public affairs. While increasingly 'participation' is promoted as a right, there is little conceptualisation of what this in turn implies: individual rights, collective rights, rights to participate on the basis of particular identities or interests, rights to difference or dissent? While the mainstreaming of participation in development may have opened up new spaces

and places for citizen participation, little understanding exists of what actually occurs in these spaces, and how they differ one from another. Similarly, with regard to accountability, there is little conceptualisation of who is accountable to whom in what domains of life, or how a person might deal with their multiple and often conflicting individual and group obligations and rights.

Many of these questions have been theoretically explored within the academic literature on citizenship, which often distinguishes between the liberal, communitarian and civic republican traditions (Jones and Gaventa 2002). Liberal theories promote the idea that citizenship is a status which entitles individuals to a specific set of universal rights granted by the state. Central to liberal thought is the notion that individual citizens act 'rationally' to advance their own interests, and that the role of the state is to protect citizens in the exercise of their rights (Oldfield 1990: 2). The actual exercise of rights is seen as the choice of citizens, on the assumption that they have the resources and opportunities to do so (Isin and Wood 1999: 7). While rights to participate have long been central to liberal thought, these are largely seen as rights to political and civic participation, e.g. to vote within a representative democratic system, to form associations (such as parties) and to exercise free speech.

The concept of the 'self-interested', 'independent' citizen, which some liberal thinkers construct, has been critiqued by communitarians, who argue that an individual's sense of identity is produced only *through* relations with others in the community of which she or he is a part. As this implies, communitarian thought centres on the notion of the socially-embedded citizen and on community belonging (Smith 1998: 117). Civic republican thinking, on the other hand, places more emphasis on people's political identities as active citizens, apart from their identities in localised communities. While it also emphasises what binds citizens together in a common identity, this is underpinned by a concern with individual obligations to participate in communal affairs (Oldfield 1990: 145). As this suggests, much civic republican writing promotes deliberative forms of democracy, in contrast to the liberal emphasis on representative political systems (Heater 1999).

More recent work in contemporary citizenship theory attempts to find ways of uniting the liberal emphasis on individual rights, equality and due process of law, with the communitarian focus on belonging and the civic republican focus on processes of deliberation, collective action and responsibility. In doing so, it aims to bridge the gap between citizen and state by recasting citizenship as practised rather than as given. As Lister (1997: 41) argues: 'To be a citizen in the legal and sociological sense means to enjoy the rights of citizenship necessary for agency and social and political participation. To act as a citizen involves fulfilling the potential of that status'. Placing an emphasis on inclusive participation as the very foundation of democratic practice, these approaches suggest a more active notion of citizenship: one which recognises the agency of citizens as *makers and shapers* rather than as *users and choosers* of interventions or services designed by others (Cornwall and Gaventa 2000).

Not only do these arguments broaden the concepts of rights and citizenship as realised through non-state actors, rather than through the state alone, they often also carry with them a more integrated view of the nature of rights themselves. Historically, under the liberal view of citizenship, concern with rights focused primarily on the protection of individual freedoms, especially in reference to civil and political rights. Beginning with the work of T.H. Marshall, a number of writers have extended the concern with civil and political rights, to social and economic rights, which in turn attempt to guarantee the resources and securities necessary for people to participate in civil and political life (Ellison 1997; Turner 1999; Nyamu-Musembi 2002). Increasingly, the demands for social and economic rights are stretched yet further, to conceptualise rights which enable the realisation of other rights, including the right to claim rights, or as Isin and Wood (1999: 4) suggest, the 'right to have rights'.

Extending the notion of citizenship also implies that the right to participation itself should be seen as a fundamental citizenship right, which helps to protect and guarantee all others. As Lister suggests:

> ...the right of participation in decision making in social, economic, cultural and political life should be included in the nexus of basic

human rights... Citizenship as participation can be seen as representing an expression of human agency in the political arena, broadly defined; citizenship as rights enables people to act as agents (Lister 1998: 228).

As we have seen earlier, the UN Declaration on the Right to Development not only calls for the right to participation, but also argues that participation must be '*active, free and meaningful*', thus warning of the dangers of its more manipulated or tokenistic forms.

While the liberal versions of citizenship have always included notions of political participation as a right, extending this to encompass participation in social and economic life *politicises* social rights, through re-casting citizens as their active creators. As Ferguson (1999: 7) asserts, for example, people cannot realise their rights to health if they cannot exercise their democratic rights to participation in decision making around health service provision. Thus, while social rights can be seen as positive freedoms in terms of enabling citizens to realise their political and civil rights, participation as a right can be seen as a positive freedom which enables them to realise their social rights (Ferguson 1999; DFID 2000, Lister 1997).

While extending the meanings and concepts of citizenship and rights is important, at the same time there is a growing recognition that entitling all citizens to the same rights does not necessarily promote equitable outcomes (Cornwall 2000; Ferguson 1999). Paradoxically, rather than addressing inequalities, universalism can work to marginalise the already marginal and exacerbate social exclusion (Ellison 1999: 58–9; Coelho, this volume) while simultaneously masking this under a veneer of formal equality (Lister 1997: 18). As Kabeer, building on Fraser, reminds us, there are at least two broad reasons for this paradox, deriving from differences in resources and in recognition (Fraser 1995; Kabeer 2000).

The first set of reasons for why universal pronouncement may fail has to do with inequities of resources and power, which allow some to claim their rights more forcefully than, and often at the expense of, others. Concepts of citizenship that abstract rights from the political and historical contexts in which citizens find themselves, and that ignore differences in both awareness of rights and the capacities to claim them, will inevitably lead to differential outcomes. Those with the resources, power and knowledge to shape definitions of rights and how they are put into practice are able to turn rights discourses and entitlements to their advantage. On the other hand, the very structure of exclusions means that the most marginalised are often unable to do so (Young 1989: 258) As Ellison argues, imposing a universal set of values under the guise of concern for all produces a 'false uniformity' (1999: 59), which hides the realities of power and difference that 'make some more equal citizens than others' (Cornwall and Gaventa 2000: 53; Taylor 1996; Caragata 1999).

Questions of power and material resources are linked very closely to a second set of issues involving identity and difference, or what Lister refers to as 'a politics of recognition and respect' (2002: 37). Citizens' voices derived from identities that are not recognised, nor indeed respected, are not likely to be heard. How people perceive themselves as citizens, and how (or indeed, whether) they are recognised by others, is likely to have a significant impact on how they act to claim their citizenship rights in the first place (as the story told by Abah and Okwori in this volume illustrates). In turn, perceptions and identities themselves are created by and in interaction with dominant structures of power and discourse. Feminist, race and disability writers and movements have been at the forefront of challenging conceptions of citizenship, which are often based on the reality of the 'white-male-able-bodied citizen', leaving little space for the recognition of differences.

With the increasing recognition that for many the dominant, universal conceptions of citizenship are in practice hollow and meaningless, more pluralistic understandings of citizenship that grow from and give recognition to differing forms of identity have gained new prominence in the contemporary literature. A number of writers have argued usefully that different claims to group identity can be conceptualised as forms of citizenship rights, and that citizenship must be understood within differing cultural, ethnic,

national and gendered contexts (Isin and Wood 1999; Lister 1997; Nyamu-Musembi 2002.) In this formulation, citizenship is an 'ensemble of different forms of belonging' (Isin and Wood 1999: 21). Drawing on Mouffe's (1992) conceptualisation of identity, it can be seen that not only is citizenship differentiated across individuals, but each individual person may experience and express different forms of citizenship (Isin and Wood 1999) in differing spaces and moments.

3 Meanings and expressions of rights and citizenship

To further pursue a pluralistic understanding of rights and citizenship implies an approach that starts with the views of citizens themselves. Understanding citizenship rights in this approach focuses more on asking 'how do people perceive their rights of citizenship?' than on examining how those rights of citizenship are enshrined in law. Though a great deal of conceptual debate exists about the nature of rights and the definitions of citizenship, little empirical work has been done to understand how poor people themselves perceive their rights, how these meanings are acted upon through political or social mobilisation, and how they are bounded by issues of knowledge and representation, as well as by differences in identity.

In the lead article in Part I, Kabeer examines how Western philosophical notions of citizenship compare and contrast with colonial and post-colonial experiences. In so doing, she first reminds us that even in the West, where citizenship is often held to be universally assured, history suggests numerous ways in which major populations have been excluded based on their difference, whether it be class, race, gender or something else. Realisation of citizenship in these contexts came only after centuries of struggles by the excluded to claim and extend their rights, both to new populations and to new arenas, from the political to the economic and social. Just as Western conceptions of citizenship had often been used to disenfranchise populations in their own countries, so too did colonial powers use differences of caste, religion and race within colonial societies to construct categories of personhood which in turn were used to re-enforce divisions. Moreover, Kabeer reminds us, constructs of citizenship emerge from differing material

conditions. While liberal notions of free and equal citizenship in the West were linked to other social and economic changes, such as the Industrial Revolution, colonised populations often achieved national independence organised as religious, ethnic and tribal communities, with very different material histories.

In the following article, Abah and Okwori continue this theme, exploring the impact of ethnic and religious identities on the meanings and expression of citizenship in the Nigerian context. What is today the formal state of Nigeria, was in fact cobbled together by colonial fiat, linking very diverse tribal, religious and cultural groupings under the same somewhat artificial construction of 'Nigerian' citizenship. Whereas the national Constitution under the new democracy in Nigeria proclaims that 'every citizen shall have equality of rights, obligations, and opportunities before the law', in fact such rights are mediated through other forms of identity, which may often be exclusionary and competing. People who 'belong' with one identity, whether based on location, religion, gender or ethnicity, are considered 'foreigners' with another. Constructing new forms of citizenship in such a complex context must overcome not only the legacy of colonial policies of indirect rule, which allied with and re-enforced ethnic and tribal institutions (Mamdani 1996), but also a history of decades of post-independence military dictatorship as well. Abah and Okwori argue that the search for meanings of citizenship in Nigeria must go back to the citizens themselves, and use participatory methods, such as citizen's drama, both to understand local perceptions as well as to create spaces for articulating new, more inclusive meanings.

While an all-embracing notion of the citizen, bestowed with certain absolute rights, is also 'guaranteed' by the Bangladesh Constitution, the article by Mahmud shows that in fact these rights are often mediated by culture of privilege and patronage, and by gender and social status. However, Mahmud argues, in certain instances, collective citizen action can provide the space for 'making rights real' and can foster a more inclusive sense of citizen identity through strengthening the belief that one has the right to have rights as a member of the community. Investigating this claim across four mini case studies of collective action in

the fields of health and education, Mahmud finds that even though such forms of claiming action did open space for some, especially the most disenfranchised women, the process itself did not overcome social differentiation. Rather, she argues, the process of claiming and articulating rights is embedded in, and often strengthened by, inequalities of power and person, making the idea of a truly 'inclusive' citizenship an elusive one.

While Mahmud's work focuses on how concepts of citizenship and the claiming of social rights may be mediated by forms of social power, the article by Leach, Scoones and Thompson examines how issues surrounding knowledge and expertise also serve simultaneously both to exclude citizen voice and to open up new opportunities and arenas for citizen engagement in decision making. Building on current debates surrounding science, society and risk found especially in the North, as well as debates in the South on indigenous knowledge and ethnoscience, they examine the role of citizen participation in science policy processes, locally, nationally and globally. In so doing, they also argue for extending the bundle of political, social, and economic rights to include 'knowledge rights': the right for differing forms of knowledge to co-exist and have influence in decision making. Moreover, they show how the recognition and claiming of knowledge rights can be an important arena for the expression and construction of citizenship, an issue later picked up in the article by Hughes on the case of corporate bioprospecting in indigenous communities in Mexico.

4 Concepts and practices of participation

From the understanding of how rights and citizenship are perceived and articulated, we move to the second theme: understanding the dynamics of citizen participation in various types of deliberative spaces and places. Across the globe, as the concepts of rights are expanded, the traditional boundaries between the state, civil society and the private sector are becoming blurred, requiring a rethinking of the roles and relationships of governments, the corporate sector and citizens. Since the last decade of the twentieth century, many countries have pursued new mechanisms to promote more direct citizen engagement in the processes of governance, ranging from the creation

of new decentralised institutions, to a wide variety of participatory and consultative processes in national and global policy deliberations. Rhetorically at least, there has been increasing emphasis on using such mechanisms to support inclusion of the poorest social groups, those who do not usually have sufficient resources (economic, educational, political) to influence the outcomes of traditional policy processes. Signalling at once the perceived inefficacy of formal representative mechanisms and a growing concern with means of enabling otherwise excluded groups to engage in shaping the institutions that affect their lives, these strategies seek to create and make use of new political spaces.

In Part II, the article by Cornwall traces the changes in the discourse of participation in development, especially the shift from participation of 'beneficiaries' in projects, to the more political and rights-based definitions of participation by citizens who are the 'makers and shapers' of their own development (Cornwall and Gaventa 2000). She then moves on to examine more closely the kinds of 'spaces' in which participation may occur, arguing that they must be understood in the contexts in which they are created. In particular, she argues for distinguishing, amongst other factors, between 'invited spaces' created from above through donor or governmental intervention, and spaces which are chosen, taken and demanded through collective action from below. Whatever their origins, however, no new spaces for participation are neutral, but are shaped by the power relations which both enter and surround them. While attention has been paid to what spaces and mechanisms exist for public participation, more attention, she argues, must be paid to who is creating these spaces and why, who fills them, and how the new spaces carry within them 'tracks and traces' of previous social relationships, resources and knowledge. What prevents long-established patterns of power from being reproduced? Who speaks, for whom, and who is heard?

Building on 20 years of experience of the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) in exploring these issues, Tandon also takes a historical approach, arguing that the exploration of participation must look both at traditional forms

and spaces for participation, as well as those that have been created through more 'modern' institutions, such as interventions of development agencies or statutory bodies, especially those associated with decentralisation. Moreover, Tandon argues that in the Indian context, new forms of citizenship must be created which build on collective meanings and institutions as well as on individual conceptions of rights. Finally, Tandon reminds us that we should not look at the concepts of citizenship, participation and accountability separately, but that they come together in a broadly interlocking 'governance wheel,' in which 'citizenship gives the right to hold others accountable and accountability is the process of engaging in participation.'

While Tandon explores the creation of spaces and places for participation historically, Coelho, Andrade and Montoya examine new social policies found in the 1988 Constitution in Brazil, which have attempted to guarantee the 'liberal citizenship' approach through creating spaces for direct civil society-state interaction in the form of local councils and public hearings. While the processes of participatory budgeting in Brazil have recently received a great deal of attention internationally, less well known outside of the country are these local councils, which serve as spaces for deliberation and debate in the design and monitoring of social services. In the area of health alone, there are more than 5,000 health councils, almost one for each of 5,507 municipalities, providing a large-scale case study of attempts to institutionalise direct forms of citizen participation. Situating the creation of these spaces in the crisis of the welfare state, Coelho *et al.* draw some important lessons from them, including the need to understand the state, civil society and market not as homogeneous groups of actors, but as heterogeneous in their interests, and to point out that the spaces alone do not guarantee voice. Despite their Constitutional guarantee, there is still the question of whether the most marginalised groups are able to articulate their voice in these arenas, and a question of the alliances and institutional arrangements which help them to do so.

Similarly, Subrahmanian explores the implications and challenges of recent moves to enshrine the 'right to education' in the Indian Constitution. Even though such rights may be adopted in law,

her article warns that the ways such rights are framed by human capital discourses, by prior approaches to compulsory education, and by the rise of privatisation will limit the degree to which such rights can be realised through the state alone. For the right to education to become real, more work is needed to reframe the concept and discourse of universal education in a way that allows for diversity and difference, and to construct more meaningful spaces and processes for citizen participation that attempt to address the forms of exclusion which bound the degree to which rights to education can themselves be claimed.

Both the Brazil and India cases provide examples of attempts to institutionalise citizen participation and social rights through constitutional means. While thus attempting to provide 'invited spaces' for participation, both cases suggest that legal means for ensuring rights are not enough. Broader approaches are needed, which recognise the diversity and identities of local actors and the ways in which they can be pre-empted from claiming rights by forces of social and economic exclusion. The case study by Paré, Robles and Cortéz discusses the ways in which the Zapatista movement and other indigenous peasant movements in southern Mexico have attempted to claim their rights to the use and management of natural resources, based on their own cultural understandings as well as their reading of international declarations on the rights of indigenous peoples. Such understandings are very much at odds with other more individualistic views of private property rights driven by global market forces, and enshrined in the existing Mexican Constitution. In such cases, they warn, participation in new spaces for dialogue must go beyond narrow, instrumental concerns, which risk simply re-enforcing existing rules of the game. They argue for a more strategic approach, which embraces a wider perspective of rights and citizenship, and aims to challenge existing social relations and rules of the game over the longer term. Such strategies may also require resistance from below to participation in certain public spaces created from above, and construction of more autonomous spaces, which are based on recognition of the culture and identities of indigenous people.

5 Dimensions of accountability

Changing meanings of rights and citizenship, as well as the opening up of new roles and spaces for citizen participation, raise critical questions about the ways in which civil society, state and market actors hold each other to account. Rather than focusing simply on the role of the state in ensuring rights of citizenship, new models of accountability are emerging which focus on the role of citizens themselves in monitoring the enforcement of rights, and in demanding public scrutiny and transparency. By broadening our definitions of rights beyond the civil and political, further questions also arise about the role of citizens in seeking social and corporate responsibility, and of the role of non-state actors in the regulatory process.

As meanings and discourses of citizenship are broadened, the language of 'corporate citizenship' is invoked by corporations themselves to indicate the social, cultural and economic responsibilities to communities in which they operate and to assert claims to their own rights as well (Zadek 2001). Tracing debates about corporate accountability, Newell critically examines this concept as it is used in relation to poorer communities in both North and South. He argues that power inequities and the lack of meaningful mechanisms for accountability raise questions as to whether the concept of corporate citizenship appropriately describes the balance of rights and duties that major firms enjoy. Then, drawing on a number of examples, he examines ways in which poor communities themselves may be able to demand and construct new relations of accountability with corporations. Similarly, the earlier article by Tandon refers to work in India which promotes concepts of 'multi-stakeholder' accountability, and which uses mechanisms such as public hearings and citizen monitoring to hold both corporations and governments to account in addressing industrial development issues.

The final article by Hughes provides another good example of communities and civil society groups attempting to hold corporations accountable on the issue of 'bioprospecting' by multinational corporations in regions of high biological and ecological diversity in Mexico. At the same time as they make broader demands for accountability and transparency, civil society organisations themselves are also being challenged to examine their own accountability to their membership and constituency. Demonstrating the importance of the issues of control of knowledge in scientific debates (as developed by Leach *et al.*), the case study examines the entangled issues of accountability in the pursuit of cultural, economic, environmental and knowledge rights for indigenous people. Echoing concerns raised by Cornwall, this article also asks questions about representation; about who has the right to speak for whom in rights-based claims.

6 Emerging lessons and themes

Through the exploration of these themes within a rights-based approach, by authors from a range of disciplines and continents, this *Bulletin* hopes to deepen our understanding of the meaning and application of concepts like citizenship, participation and accountability in development. In so doing, we quickly see that the concepts are not generic, easily applicable and portable from one situation to another. Rather, a far more nuanced, multidimensional and multi-tiered approach is needed.

Perhaps most importantly, the articles suggest the need to understand how rights and citizenship are shaped by differing social, political and cultural contexts. Several articles in this volume question the extent to which concepts of citizenship developed in a Western (or Northern) context, can be applied in the same way to post-colonial settings in the South. Similarly, we have seen throughout the volume ways in which more universal conceptions of citizenship and rights are themselves mediated by relations of power, social hierarchy, and often competing identities, which serve simultaneously as a force for the inclusion of certain voices and identities and the exclusion of others. At the same time, case material from both North and South demonstrates the importance of struggles by people across the globe to articulate and claim their own perceptions and practices of citizenship in their everyday lives, and that simply legalistic, and state-based mechanisms for realising rights will not be fulfilled without the agency of non-state actors themselves.

On the other hand, state-based and more universal declarations of rights, including the right to

participation, have also served in certain cases to broaden the spaces through which citizens themselves may exercise their claims. But they do not always do so. A more nuanced view requires 'unbundling' the rights-based framework through exploration of differing kinds of rights and their interaction with one another. While much of the literature on the construction of democratic citizenship focuses on the formal mechanisms for the protection of legal, political and civil rights, these articles have pointed to the importance of a more multidimensional approach through examining how the civil and political intersect with other rights, including social, economic, environmental and 'knowledge' rights. In particular, we have focused on 'participation' and the 'right to have and to claim rights' as an important foundation for other rights. In so doing, difficult questions arise of conflicts amongst rights, and of how these are negotiated.

Negotiation often means entering spaces for participation and expression of citizen voice. Our discussion of policy spaces, however, reminds us that they are rarely neutral. The fact that public spaces for participation exist, whether in rule of law or social practice, does not mean that they will always be used equally by various actors for realising rights of citizenship. Rather, each space is itself socially and politically located, with dynamics of participation varying across differing levels and arenas of citizen engagement, and across differing types of policy spaces. In a contemporary era, characterised *both* by increased globalisation *and* by increased localisation, the spaces for the construction of citizenship are multi-tiered. As we have seen in various articles, perceptions of rights are shaped both by global declarations as well as by local and indigenous practices. At the same time, in looking at claims to participation across a variety of policy spaces, be they environmental, social, economic or political, and be they at local or global levels, we have seen a common set of questions emerging about issues of representation, and about how power and privilege shape the dynamics of who participates. In each space, contestations over whose knowledge and whose voice are legitimate will affect who enters, with what agendas, and with what outcomes.

Despite the emerging and welcome turn to a 'rights-based approach' to development, these articles remind us that rights-based approaches are not automatically pro-poor. They are likely to become so, we argue, only through understanding the perceptions of poor people themselves about their rights, and through creating spaces for citizen engagement that are relevant to and inclusive of poor people. Through linking concepts of rights to constructs of citizenship that emphasise the agency of poor people acting for themselves to claim their rights, and by holding others accountable for them, we can hope to begin to make rights real.

Notes

1. From *Declaration on the Right to Development,* adopted by General Assembly resolution 41/128 of 4 December 1986. Quoted in Human Rights Council of Australia, 2001, p. 26.

2. Parts of this section draw heavily on work by Emma Jones and John Gaventa (2002), 'Concepts of citizenship: a review', *IDS Development Bibliography* No 19, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

References

Caragata, L., 1999, 'The privileged public: who is permitted citizenship?', *Community Development Journal*, Vol 34: 270–86

Commonwealth Foundation and CIVICUS, 1999, *Citizens and Governance*, London: Commonwealth Foundation

Cornwall, A., 2000, *Beneficiary, Consumer, Citizen: Perspectives on Participation for Poverty Reduction*, Stockholm: SIDA

Cornwall, A. and Gaventa, J., 2000, 'From users and choosers to makers and shapers: re-positioning participation in social policy', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol 31 No 4

Cornwall, A. and Gaventa, J., 2001, 'Bridging the gap: citizenship, participation and accountability', *PLA Notes*, Vol 40: 32–35

Department for International Development, 2000, *Realising Human Rights for Poor People: Strategies for Achieving the International Development Targets*, London: DFID

Edwards, M. and Gaventa, J., 2001, *Global Citizen Action*, London: Earthscan and Colorado: Lynn Rienner

Ellison, N., 1997, 'Towards a new social politics: citizenship and reflexivity in late modernity', *Sociology*, Vol 31 No 4: 697–711

Ellison, N., 1999, 'Beyond universalism and particularism: rethinking contemporary welfare theory', *Critical Social Policy*, Vol 19 No 1: 57–83

Ferguson, C., 1999, *Global Social Policy Principles: Human Rights and Social Justice*, London: DFID

Fraser, N., 1995. 'From redistribution to recognition?' *New Left Review*, Vol 212: 68–93

Gaventa, J. and Valderrama, C., 1999, 'Participation, citizenship and local governance – background paper for workshop: strengthening participation in local governance', mimeo, IDS, Brighton, 21–24 June 1999, www.ids.ac.uk/particip (5 March 2002)

Goetz, A-M. and Gaventa, J., 2001, 'From consultation to influence: bringing citizen voice and client focus into service delivery', *IDS Working Paper* No 138, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Heater, D., 1999, *What is Citizenship?*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Human Rights Council of Australia, 2001, *The Rights Way to Development: A Human Rights Approach to Development Assistance*. Maroubra, Australia: Human Rights Council

Isin, E. and Wood, P., 1999, *Citizenship and Identity*, London: Sage

Jones, E. and Gaventa, J., 2002, 'Concepts of citizenship: a review', *IDS Development Bibliography* No. 19, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Kabeer, N., 2000, 'Social exclusion, poverty and discrimination: towards an analytical framework', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol 31 No 4: 83–97

Lister, R., 1997, *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*, New York: New York University Press

Lister, R., 1998, 'Citizen in action: citizenship and community development in Northern Ireland context', *Community Development Journal*, Vol 33 No 3: 226–35

Lister, R., 2002, 'A politics of recognition and respect: involving people with experience in poverty in decision making that affects their lives', *Social Policy and Society*, Vol 1: 37–46

Mamdani, M., 1996, *Citizen and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton HJ: Princeton University Press

Marshall, T.H., 1950, *Citizenship and Social Class*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Meekosha, H. and Dowse, L., 1997, 'Enabling citizenship: gender, disability and citizenship in Australia', *Feminist Review*, Vol 57: 49–72

Mouffe, C., 1992, 'Democratic citizenship and the political community', in C. Mouffe (ed), *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*, London: Verso

Narayan, D., Chambers, R., Shah, M.K. and Petesch, P., 2000, *Voices of the Poor: Crying Out For Change*. Washington, DC: World Bank

Newell, P., 2000, 'Environmental NGOs and globalisation: the governance of TNCs', in R. Cohen and S. Rai (eds), *Global Social Movements*, London: Athlone Press: 117–34

Nyamu-Musembi, C., 2002, 'Toward an actor-oriented perspective on human rights', background paper prepared for the DRC workshop on Meanings and Expressions of Rights and Citizenship, Bangladesh, 30 January–4 February

Oldfield, A., 1990, *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*, London: Routledge

Seidman, G., 1999, 'Gendered citizenship: South Africa's democratic transition and the construction of a gendered state', *Gender and Society*, Vol 13 No 3: 287–307

Smith, A-M., 1998, *Laclau and Mouffe: The Radical Democratic Imaginary*, London: Routledge

Taylor, D., 1996, 'Citizenship and social power' in *Critical Social Policy: A Reader*, London: Sage

Turner, B.S., 1999, *The Sociology of Citizenship*, London: Sage

UNDP, 2000, *Human Development Report 2000*, New York: UNDP

Young, I., 1989, 'Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal universal citizenship', *Ethics*, Vol 99: 250–74

Zadek, S., 2001, *The Civil Corporation: The New Economy of Corporate Citizenship,* London: Earthscan