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FOREWORD

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are playing a fundamental role in expanding and developing democracy. The political, economic and social reforms that are taking place throughout the world have highlighted the need to support civil society so that it can participate effectively in decision-making processes and in the implementation and monitoring of public policies and programmes.

As in many other countries, CSOs in Mozambique have been playing an increasingly crucial role in its governance and development processes. Initially recognised for their contribution to the provision of humanitarian assistance, civil society organisations have increasingly taken on the role of development promoters, participating actively in research and advocacy actions that monitor and influence public and community development policies. Their role has gradually been recognised by the government and other development actors, as shown by a variety of policy documents such as the country’s development vision, Agenda 2025, the Absolute Poverty Reduction Action Plan (PARPA II), as well as by the establishment of participatory mechanisms such as the Development Observatories and District Consultative Councils.

Nevertheless, the CSOs’ commitment and desire to participate in the country’s governance and development process is very often hampered by their limited ability to contribute effectively and sustainably at all levels. Knowledge of the state of civil society is also limited and there have been few opportunities for CSO members to come together to discuss and reflect on the challenges they face.

The Foundation for Community Development (FDC) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) share the conviction that something must be done about factors that impede the effectiveness and efficiency of CSOs in order to achieve an endogenous and coherent development process in Mozambique. For this reason in February 2007 FDC and UNDP in partnership with CIVICUS embarked on a very ambitious journey to “take the pulse” of Mozambican civil society. They were joined in this effort by hundreds of national and community-based civil society organisations, members of the Group of 20 (G20) platform, social and religious organisations and other international partners including the Aga Khan Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation and the European Union.

The aim of this ambitious venture was to evaluate the main dimensions of civil society. These dimensions are 1) its organisational Structure, covering its free and voluntary involvement, participation and contribution to society; 2) the socio-economic and political Environment in which it exists and the space for its intervention; 3) the Values that support its actions and, 4) the Impact of its intervention at all levels.

The Civil Society Index (CSI) is a tool developed by CIVICUS for the participatory evaluation of needs and action planning that has been applied in over 50 countries in order to establish a knowledge base and impetus for initiatives that strengthen civil society.

The process in Mozambique was extremely participatory and involved a wide variety of grassroots actors, women’s and youth organisations, informal organisations, political parties, representatives of the private sector, academic institutions and the government, among others. This proactive involvement of a variety of stakeholders in
the CSI ensured a sense of ownership in the country and a shared commitment to lay the foundations for a successful resolution of civil society’s weaknesses.

This publication marks the beginning of a long process during which civil society will consolidate and rethink its strategies and operation. This report is thus a tool for CSOs, government, the private sector and development partners. It can be used to build an agenda together and to set targets for strengthening Mozambican civil society in the future.

_Graça Machel, Chair of the FDC Board of Directors, with
Ndolamb Ngokwey, UNDP Resident Representative/United Nations Resident Coordinator_
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section presents the main results of the CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI) research project in Mozambique, conducted between March and December 2007. The project was implemented by the Community Development Foundation (FDC) in collaboration with CIVICUS (World Alliance for Citizen Participation) and with financial support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Aga Khan Foundation and the European Union.

The CSI project is an integrated research effort involving multiple sources, quantitative and qualitative methods, and broad participation by actors and stakeholders with the purpose of evaluating the state of civil society throughout the world.

As prescribed in the CIVICUS CSI methodology, the FDC established a National Index Team (NIT) and a National Advisory Group (NAG). The entire process was implemented by the team of national researchers, monitored and supported by the CIVICUS team, and advised by NAG.

The National Index Team met, organised and analysed information from a variety of sources, both secondary and primary. At different stages of the research the data and results were subject to ample discussion and critical analysis, especially at the meetings of the NAG, where the final scores for the 80 indicators that make up the Civil Society Index were validated.

Consultations and data collection covered the whole country and involved two original primary surveys. One was a Community Sample Survey (INC07) based on a statistically representative sample of 4015 people. The other was a national survey of 477 civil society organisations (INOSC07) based on a sample taken from the database of INE (2006), which conducted a census of almost 5000 non-profit organisations in 2003.

The CSI is an international comparative project that, to date, has involved some 60 countries using the same CIVICUS methodology. The CSI was conceived with two main objectives: 1) to provide current and useful knowledge about civil society and 2) to increase stakeholder commitment to strengthening and expanding civil society.

This summary describes the main results of the Civil Society Index project for Mozambique, including a brief historical overview, the main debate on the civil society concept in the specific case of Mozambique, the results of the analyses of the four dimensions of the CSI Diamond (Structure, Environment, Values and Impact) and, finally, the strengths and weaknesses of the current of Mozambican civil society.

The data and analysis summarised here are the result of considerable discussion and debate by the NAG and other stakeholders in a three-day national workshop held in Maputo from 4th to 6th of December 2007.
The Mozambican Civil Society Index (CSI) in 2007

The fundamental question that the CSI project in Mozambique seeks to answer is this: What is the state and condition of Mozambican civil society?

The CSI project concluded that, overall, Mozambican civil society is weak in its main dimensions. This conclusion draws from the corresponding scores of the 80 indicators, aggregated into 27 sub-dimensions, and finally into the four dimensions (Structure of civil society; the external Environment in which civil society exists and operates; the Values practiced and promoted in the civil society arena; and the Impact of the activities undertaken by civil society actors), as illustrated in Figure 1.1.1a below.

This assessment of Mozambican civil society as weak, albeit with signs of transition to a moderate level, indicates a delicate situation. However, this optimism is by no means a cause for satisfaction and confidence in the future progress of civil society in Mozambique. Before thinking about the future, it is important to study in more detail the more fragile aspects that contribute to the weaknesses of the Mozambican civil society today. It is also important to know which indicators are making a positive contribution to the relative strength of Mozambican civil society in some sub-dimensions.

Finding a realistic and substantiated response to the main weaknesses in Mozambican civil society is not easy. However, it is a challenge that should be addressed in order to discover where future efforts should focus, and which actions should be prioritised.

It was difficult to get clear picture of the state of civil society in Mozambique, in part due to the limited data available. In addition, the fact that the dimensions of the Mozambican Civil Society Diamond have similar scores makes it hard to identify the prime factors in not only the weaknesses and disadvantages, but also in the strengths.

Nevertheless, the empirical data collected by the CSI project provides the first complete database on Mozambican civil society. It is now possible to evaluate the main characteristics of its current condition and future perspectives, but with an emphasis on its current state.
The Civil Society Concept

The operational definition of civil society used in this research is the definition proposed by CIVICUS, namely, the ‘arena outside of the family, the state and the market, where people associate to advance common interests.’ This definition is contentious and is not commonly understood or accepted by the ordinary citizen, or even by many educated people and specialists in certain academic subjects.

The main difference between an operational definition for research purposes, such as the CIVICUS definition, and the commonly held perspective is related to the role of certain actors in society at a given historical moment or location. Given the history of the majority political parties in Mozambique, especially Frelimo and Renamo, and in particular, their hegemonic political role in Mozambican society today, many people argued that these parties should be excluded from research on Mozambican civil society. This was especially true in the provinces, where participants in the regional Stakeholder Consultations (RSC) were of the view that the inclusion of Frelimo and Renamo in the analysis of civil society would hinder and distort the research. In their opinion, the presence of representatives of the dominant political parties in debates on civil society would inhibit people, intimidate them or make it difficult to find solutions for the development of civil society. This is not a surprising finding given that friction and fierce political disputes between the dominant political forces in Mozambique persist. This situation is unhealthy and harmful to the development of civil society because there is a tendency to manipulate members of CSOs to take sides in these disputes.

Historical Background of Mozambican Society

The pre- and post-independence history of Mozambique has produced a context in which civil society’s capacity and ability to exercise its rights and duties in defence of citizens is contested. There is little pre-colonial literature on associational life in African societies in the territory that became Mozambique, although there were state forms that directly or indirectly “forced” the creation of non-profit associations. Literature on associational life during the colonial period sees it in a context of opposition to the Portuguese colonial regime and influenced by the international context of, for example, Pan-Africanism negritude, and revolutionary socialism.

Post-independence literature tried to address associative practice not just in the context of defending group interests, but also as a way of tackling disasters caused by nature and those caused by people. Literature that analyses the impact of associations, argues that there was a controversial impact, positive and negative, depending on the authors’ indicators and approaches.

Before the mid 80s there is little Mozambican post-independence literature on associations because the single party system that existed in Mozambique made it difficult to establish boundaries, confounded the state with the party and society in general, and prohibited any form of association outside the formal vehicles of the Mozambican State. According to Yussuf Adam and Humberto Coimbra (1997) Frelimo and the state saw themselves as the only legitimate representatives of the people, and the few agencies that existed had to submit to their control (Adam and
Coimbra 1997: 83; Newitt 1997: 467). As such, before 1984, there were few associations in Mozambique. References to non-governmental organisations include the Mozambique Red Cross, the General Cooperative Union, Doctors Without Borders and associations linked to the Frelimo party (for example, the Mozambican Women Organisation, OMM). The number of NGOs started to rise following the introduction of the freedom of association.

In 2003, the National Institute of Statistics (INE) conducted a census of 4853 non-profit institutions in Mozambique. Over 70% of these associations operated in just five provinces, while less than 30% were active in the remaining six provinces. Most units were concentrated in Nampula province (19.5%), followed by Gaza (14.6%), Inhambane (14%), Maputo city (12.9%) and Maputo province (9.5%). In the remaining provinces the number was less than or equal to 6.1% (INE 2006: 43).

The State of Mozambican Civil Society

STRUCTURE

The analysis of the structure of civil society leads to the conclusion that this dimension is weak in the various subdimensions: breadth, depth and diversity of citizen participation. Part of the weakness in the structure of civil society is organisational and part is the limit on financial as well as human resources available to CSOs. However, another aspect of the weakness perhaps even more relevant, is that the civil society’s structural and contextual nature is determined by the institutional environment that influences the citizen’s exercise of power. As other studies have pointed out, Mozambicans participate in the exercise of their citizenship rights, but in reality, their power to influence policies is limited. There is widespread manipulation and ad hoc, informal consultation, without real commitment or responsibility being an inherent part of the partnership, hindering influence on policy (Francisco and Matter 2004).

The assessment of the results of the structure dimension by both the NAG and the participants in the national workshop identified the indicators requiring the most attention. In particular, the NAG feels that recognising the weaknesses is an important step towards awareness of the constraints and difficulties facing CSOs.

Data collected in this report dispels some misconceptions on the CSO situation, namely, their geographical spread in the country, and the most common kind of organisations in civil society. Contrary to the prevailing notion, most CSOs are located in districts and local communities, not in the main urban centres. This means that most CSOs are not visible in broad media circles or in influential networks with access to sources of funds, the best technologies and the mass media. This situation presents challenges and opportunities to three kinds of entities.

Firstly, CSOs with national coverage and, in particular, foundations that have most capacity, can use the results of this study to work to improve the structure of civil society by expanding networks and forms of collaboration with grass roots CSOs at the district and community levels.

Secondly, international agencies and donors interested in supporting the development of Mozambican civil society must seek ways of expanding their support beyond the
small percentage of organisations that have benefited so far. According to data provided by the INE survey, in 2003 the income of CSOs was around US$300 million. Of this amount, at least 70% was from overseas support, while 25% was support from the private sector and family/individual donations. Consequently, foreign funding entities face the challenge of finding ways to access a broader range of CSOs in Mozambique in order to help build a strong Mozambican civil society. The question of how to ensure this happens is not the focus of this analysis, but could be the object of subsequent reflection.

Finally, the other entity that cannot be ignored when considering strengthening Mozambican civil society is the state. In this case, the support that CSOs could receive from government is not so much financial but rather operational and facilitating actions and initiatives by civil society members.

ENVIRONMENT

The analysis of political, social, economic, cultural and legal factors as well as the attitudes and behaviour of public and private entities towards civil society, leads to the conclusion that the environment dimension score is close to the other three but slightly better.

The general environment in which Mozambican civil society operates has improved substantially over the last two decades, but needs to improve even more. The NAG concluded, and the national workshop that discussed the results emphasized, that the general environment is not openly hostile but also is not comfortably sympathetic and favourable.

In general, civil society does not participate actively in political life. The findings conclude that political competition is aggressive and non-democratic.

As regards the rule of law, the NAG and the national workshop concluded that laws are largely not observed, and that there is widespread ignorance of the main laws, widespread corruption, an inefficient bureaucracy and poor decentralization. All these constrain the exercise of individual freedoms.

As regards the legal environment for CSOs registration, there is excessive and inefficient bureaucracy. Advocacy activities are allowed by law, but in practice, there are problems that vary between regions of the country.

What exists is what can be referred to as administrative cooperation with little space for dissent. It is felt that there is a democracy with an indicator space and that political participation is more expensive in the North than in the South.

There is no evidence of violent or explicit intolerance, but attitudes towards certain groups are intolerant. People are especially intolerant of homosexuals and of persons living with HIV.

It must be recognised that public and private institutions are still very underdeveloped, rudimentary, narrowly focused around bipolarised political power and lacking mechanisms for the effective representation of the citizenship.

Political reforms are still very centralised and the absence of a broad critical mass reduces the range of choice and the effective impact of the citizen on the political
power, which continues to act more in accordance with its dependence on international entities than in terms of effective partnership with civil society.

Among other factors, the absence of a culture of efficiency, a decentralised public administration, transparent and participatory budget execution, and strong and effective private institutions all limit the effectiveness of action by social actors.

This study shows that the relationship between civil society and the state is problematic as it lacks mechanisms for mutual accountability, transparency and effective monitoring. Interaction between civil society and the state is superficial and informal. Indeed, Mozambican society generally resorts to informal ways of circumventing state regulations because public institutions are often unable to provide required basic services.

Civil society receives virtually no public funding. Most of what it does receive is due to pressure by donors and the state’s international partners. Moreover, there are no clear and transparent rules about the modalities of state support for CSOs. Linkages are established in an *ad hoc* and informal manner without clear, explicit and transparent criteria. This situation needs to be tackled in order to establish practices of effective partnership between dynamic national actors in Mozambican society.

The private sector, too, does not consider CSOs as partners or social actors of importance. Overall, private sector agents display relative indifference to the positive role of civil society in social life. Moreover, in the RSC consultations it became clear that most stakeholders are also indifferent towards the corporate sector. Nevertheless, as data in the text show, after external (foreign donor) support, the second most relevant group for financial and material support for CSOs is the private sector (25% compared to 3% from the government). In the long term, as the national private sector grows there is potential for it to be an alternative to the external sources of funding.

Although there is dialogue between civil society and donors, the latter have little confidence in the capacity of CSOs. Few organisations receive support from donors who seem not to want to invest their money in the many weakly-managed CSOs.

**VALUES**

The score of 1.1 obtained in the study suggests that Mozambican civil society neither practices nor promotes positive values effectively. The main weaknesses identified among the eight sub-dimensions are in transparency, gender equity and diversity.

The national workshop tried to identify the causes of weak democracy in Mozambican CSOs and noted the following: 1) manipulation by political parties, especially in pre-election periods, 2) poor coordination among social actors; 3) widespread poverty; 4) a lack of regular assemblies or other deliberative meetings.

The reasons for weak transparency include the following: 1) the lack of the culture of accountability; 2) weak communication; and 3) weak command of knowledge of statutes and legislation in general. The poor transparency within CSOs is particularly concerning, given that the notion of transparency is strongly associated with society’s norms and values. The organisational development of CSOs based on ‘real’ transparency criteria could help establish solid and dynamic values.
Expressions of weak tolerance in Mozambican society or even some expressions of violence appear to be due to lack of trust between public authorities and the leadership of organisations with citizens or the members of these CSOs. There are also conflicts of interest and of personalities.

Despite extensive declarations of commitment to fighting poverty, doubts persist as to whether CSO leaderships are really creating the institutional foundations for poverty reduction. This is despite the fact that citizens are carrying out a wide variety of poverty reduction actions. Indeed, this sub-dimension received the highest score, the only one of all the sub-dimensions to receive a score of 2.0 (moderate high). There are, however, no clear prospects for the long-term sustainability of poverty reduction efforts. This is supported by citizens’ growing concern and distress about the lack of jobs and productive activities as well as opportunities in the creation and expansion of wealth. It seems that, in practice, CSOs are more committed to providing services, sometimes as an extension of, or complement to social and non-productive public administration services. However, productive private sector and civil society should be trying to develop conditions for viable and sustainable production.

So far, CSO involvement in strategies to fight absolute poverty has been mainly as observers to be sounded out and as circumstantial allies of the government or donors, as in the case of the campaign on debt relief. However, it is not realistic to conclude from this participation that CSOs are real partners of the government and international donors. As Francisco and Matter (2007) argue, partnership in the real sense only exists between the government and the donors or other international actors.

Both the NAG and the national workshop argued that all the eight sub-dimensions that make up the Values dimension needed priority attention by Mozambican CSOs.

Nevertheless, a reading and analysis of the data and the qualitative information leads us to conclude that any improvement in CSO structure and in the environment needs to be accompanied by real progress in embedding the values of a truly participatory democratic, transparent, tolerant, and non-violent civil society; as well as in implementation of efficient and effective actions to reduce poverty and promote environmental sustainability and gender, ethnic, cultural and social equity.

**IMPACT**

As was emphasised at the beginning of this section, the weak structure, limited environment and poor practice of positive values by Mozambican civil society inevitably result in limited impact on governance and on fundamental developmental challenges in Mozambique in general.

The main obstacles to more efficient and effective action by CSOs are observed in poor state and corporate accountability, weak empowerment of the citizen and the weak advocacy and lobby capacity of CSOs. Further, public confidence in CSOs is weak. As a result, CSOs having an extremely limited role in promoting social capital at the grassroots level and in the Mozambican population in general.

Despite the similar scores of the four dimensions, it should be emphasised that the impact dimension has the lowest score. This is not surprising as the impact of civil society depends on the state of the other dimensions.
In past decades, civil society in Mozambique has undergone various phases to arrive where it is today. As regards the success of its efforts to influence and its real impact, secondary sources disagree on the emphasis and qualification of its success. Some analysts, like Negrão (2003) for example, argue that CSOs have substantial influence on public policies, as representatives of society have been called to participate in events such as the election of the chairperson of the National Election Commission, or in fora such as the Poverty Observatory, or in campaigns of national interest (for example, the fight for debt relief).

Other authors, however, argue that CSO participation or involvement is insufficient, as it is sometimes a mere convenience to legitimise circumstantial policies without resulting to real empowerment of civil society. According to this argument, the space granted to civil society must give way to forms of effective partnership, the real empowerment of society and the transfer of state accountability from donors to society through a proactive, efficient, effective and competent Parliament (Francisco & Matter 2007; Hodges & Tibana 2005; Macamo 2006; Mosse 2007).

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on our analysis we conclude that Mozambican civil society is overall weak in its four dimensions: structure, environment, values and impact. A closer look reveals that 15% of the 80 indicators had a score of zero, 59% were between 0 and 1.5, and 26% had a score equal to or over 1.5. In other words, about 74% of the indicators scored below average, while only 26% had a classification equal to or above average.

It must be emphasised that the scores should be considered as indicative of the state of the arenas considered rather than hard and fast numbers. It was not always easy to assign a score. The NIT is conscious of the high degree of subjectivity of many scores in the indicators. However, numerical scores are useful for the process of precise, rigorous and clear evaluation and for preparing future plans to improve the state of Mozambican civil society.

![Figure 1.1.1b: Distribution of Scores for the 80 CSI Indicators, Mozambique 2007](image)
Main strengths of the Mozambican Civil Society, 2007

According to Annex 4, which contains the detailed scores for the 80 indicators, 21 areas have a score equal to or above the average of 1.5.

In the Structure Dimension, five areas are the strongest for the Mozambican civil society: charitable giving and volunteering, geographical distribution of CSOs, effectiveness of the management/governance bodies of CSO federations or networks, and communication among CSOs.

In the Environment dimension, the level of political competition, the right to information, press freedom, tolerance, public awareness and dialogue with donors, all received a score of 2.0. The Values dimension had an above-average classification in four areas: tolerance within civil society, non-violence in civil society, actions against poverty, and equity in diversity within civil society.

For the Impact dimension, the indicators with above-average scores were those related to social policies, lobbying for better state services and meeting societal needs.

Other indicators also have a satisfactory level, with a score near the average (1.5). These can be found in the matrix in Annex 4.

Main Weaknesses of the Mozambican Civil Society, 2007

The scores presented in Annex 4 also show the weak areas. Of the 21 Structure indicators, five received a score of zero. These mainly dealt with CSO membership; CSOs membership in federations or networks; the level of support infrastructure for civil society; and international linkages of CSOs. In the Environment dimension, two of the twenty-six indicators had a score of zero: 2.1.4) corruption in the public sector and 2.6.3) state support in the form of resources for civil society. Two of the 17 indicators for the Values dimension had a zero score: 3.5.2) Effective gender equity practices in civil society; 3.8.3) actions to promote diversity in civil society. Two of the 16 indicators for the Impact dimension had a zero score: 4.2.2) CSO capacity to hold corporations accountable and 4.5.3) Effective response to the immediate needs of marginalised groups.

Obviously, some scores might not be readily understood without a thorough reading of the explanation for the scores.

In order to use the CSI evaluation to produce guidelines and future actions, 250 participants attended a national workshop on 4 to 6 December 2007. In addition, in January and February the NIT had some smaller technical meetings to analyse the results of the study and identify the main recommendations.

General recommendations

The CSI study’s general recommendations arising from discussions during the national workshop can be summarised in five main points:
1. The representatives of Mozambican civil society present in the workshop recognised the need to establish a code of conduct to enable civil society to promote democracy and transparency in its actions.

2. They recommended consolidation of the existing spaces and mechanisms for coordinating and financing CSO interventions at all levels of society;

3. They recommended building CSO technical and knowledge capacity to improve their use of policies and laws and the spaces already provided by the state, the private sector and the international community, and to improve their actions with communities;

4. They recommended improving CSO knowledge, promoting continuous research that could influence and better inform their actions, based on evidence;

5. They recommended that a periodic Civil Society Index study be carried out.

**Specific Recommendations for Each Dimension**

Given time limitations, the workshop participants agreed that concrete recommendations should be prepared later by NIT and other interested parties. Consequently, the NIT and the workshop facilitators met to draft relevant and more specific recommendations. The following set of recommendations makes it possible to contribute to improving the participation and involvement of civil society in the country’s social and economic change processes.

**Recommendations on the Structure Dimension**

The structure of civil society measured the citizen’s involvement in the country’s social and political affairs, and also how CSOs are organised. As the final score was 1.1, a relatively poor structure, the following is recommended:

- Civil society organisations should encourage and challenge citizens to exercise their citizenship rights by getting involved in social and political affairs, such as supporting poor and/or vulnerable communities, exercising their constitutional and human rights and also fulfilling their civic duties;

- Organisations that are large in terms of financial and human capacity as well as geographical coverage should seek ways of providing funds, resources and assistance to smaller ones. This could be done in two complementary ways: i) establishing a coordination mechanism for building capacity in specific areas that improve their social and political interventions ii) using the same mechanism to coordinate the decentralisation of funds, human resources and knowledge among the organisations.

**Recommendations on the Environment Dimension**

The environment dimension measured the political, social, economic, cultural and legal environment in which civil society and its members act and function, as well as attitudes and behaviour. The score for this dimension was 1.2 showing that civil
society exists in a relatively disabling environment. The following are thus recommended:

- Improve civil society’s ability to influence compliance with the major international agreements and national laws that protect the citizen’s human and civic rights and which guarantee the establishment and maintenance of a favourable environment for exercising citizenship. The challenge for civil society is to find a balance between the influence of development-oriented organisations and those working on rights issues. For example, in other African countries it has been seen that organisations working on social development and service delivery have more influence and support than organisations working on the promotion of human rights and democracy;

- Given other successful efforts by civil society (e.g. Law on Foundations, Family Law, among others), society has the power and capacity to propose legislation on the legalisation of non-profit organisations in Mozambique. Not only is the process extremely bureaucratic (lengthy and expensive) but it also classifies all non-profit organisations in the same way, thereby compromising the diversity of civil society organisations;

- Gradually reduce dependence on international organisations for funds and capacity building. Recognising that international organisations that donate funds to civil society tend to change their programme priorities to the detriment of the priorities of the communities with which national civil society works, there is an urgent need to i) challenge the conditional allocation of funds to civil society, ii) diversify sources of funding, making maximum use of the growing business class in Mozambique;

- Given not only the diversification of funds but also the creation of greater corporate accountability for the positive and negative effects of their actions in the areas where they are located, it is recommended that civil society should get actively involved in: i) demanding corporate social responsibility and challenging state policies on tax exemptions, and the allocation of spaces for large corporations; ii) making use of the Patronage Law to encourage responsible philanthropy by the private sector.

**Recommendations on the Values Dimension**

The Values dimension measured the values practiced and promoted by Mozambican civil society and received a score of 1.1. Once again this is a weak score and justifies the following recommendations:

- The establishment of a code of ethics and quality standards for the actions and intervention of civil society organisations. The lack of transparency and democracy on the part of some leaderships and organisations in society nullifies their efforts to gain legitimacy among their constituents, the state and their funding partners;

- In order to promote democracy in Mozambique civil society must challenge the current make-up of the state. Although change may come only gradually, it is important that deputies and members of the government are appointed in a
democratic manner, where citizens have power to choose their representatives in Parliament.

**Recommendations on the Impact Dimension**

The Impact dimension measured the influence of civil society in political and private sector decision-making and its effect on the society. This dimension received the lowest score, reflecting weak action and also the weakness of its structure, environment and values. Consequently, in order to change this situation the following are recommended:

- Civil society in general must make its presence felt in processes that identify issues requiring change or the formulation of social, human rights and financial policies;
- Specifically, civil society should use the spaces provided by itself and by the state not just to question but also to propose improvements in the state’s implementation of policies and its delivery of social services;
- Propose effective ways of making access to state social, legal and economic services more efficient and effective. For example, make the voting card the identification document for all services, given the speed with which it is produced;
- The conscious and knowledgeable involvement of civil society organisations in designing, implementing and evaluating the general state budget at all levels. Civil society recognises that the main way to hold the state accountable is through the state’s financial execution.
- In order to improve its impact civil society should: i) Clarify its role as an agent of change that at no time substitutes the state; ii) improve its standard of service delivery to communities while always respecting the human rights of the people with whom it works.
INTRODUCTION

This document presents the results of the Civil Society Index (CSI) research project in Mozambique conducted between March and December 2007. The project was implemented by the Foundation for Community Development (FDC) in close collaboration with CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation.

The CSI is an action-oriented, participatory research project that evaluates the state of civil society in the world with over 50 countries already participating. The project links evaluation and reflection with planning by civil society stakeholders with an aim to strengthen civil society.

As in other countries, the CSI project in Mozambique was implemented by a CSO, the FDC. FDC created the National Index Team (NIT), a National Advisory group (NAG) and implemented all stages of the research up to the completion of this report. The implementation process was supported by the CIVICUS CSI team.

The NIT met to organise and analyse information from multiple sources, both secondary and primary. All the information was shared and discussed with the NAG. It was also the NAG that finally validated and decided on the scores awarded to the 80 indicators that make up the CSI in Mozambique.

At different stages of the research, the data and results were subject to widespread discussion and critical analysis. Consultations and data collection took place throughout the country, and included two primary surveys: a Community Sample Survey (INC07) with a sample of 4,015 households and a Regional stakeholder consultation (INOSC07) with a sample of 477 CSOs.

As an international comparative project, the fundamental aspects of the methodology are the same and common to all countries. The index was conceived with two main objectives: to provide up-to-date and useful knowledge about civil society and to use the results to increase the commitment of stakeholders to strengthening and expanding civil society.

The first objective involves a degree of tension between international comparability and the specific characteristics of each country. In each country every research team tries to overcome this tension by adapting the methodology when necessary so that the indicators capture the specific reality of the country. In the case of Mozambique the NIT identified some special characteristics that were not captured by the 74 indicators in the basic methodology. For this reason, in the case of Mozambique the CSI has 80 indicators instead of the 74 initially proposed by CIVICUS.

Structure of the Report

This document has four main sections:

Section I “The Civil Society Index Project”, provides an overview of the background to the CSI, the conceptual framework and the research methodology.

Section II “Civil Society in Mozambique” describes the historical background and the current state of Mozambican civil society, highlighting perceptions of the civil society concept, both current perception among Mozambicans and the operational definition suggested by CIVICUS.
Section III, “Analysis of Mozambican Civil Society” is divided into four sections, each corresponding to a dimension of the CSI Diamond: Structure, Environment, Values and Impact. This chapter contains most of the secondary and primary research results covering the 80 indicators that make up the CSI.

Section IV “Strengths and Weaknesses of Mozambican Civil Society” summarises the conclusions, ideas and arguments arising from the analysis, in particular those of the NAG that throughout the process validated the final CSI scores of the CSI indicators. These were subsequently analysed and discussed in a national workshop from 4 to 6 December 2007, after which the NIT made some final inputs.
CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX

Figure 1.1.2: Dimensions and Sub-Dimensions of the Civil Society Index

1. Structure
   1.1. Breadth of citizen participation
   1.2. Depth of citizen participation
   1.3. Diversity of CS participants
   1.4. Level of Organisation
   1.5. Inter-relations
   1.6. Resources

2. Environment
   2.1. Political Context
   2.2. Basic Freedoms and Rights
   2.3. Socio-economic context
   2.4. Socio-cultural context
   2.5. Legal environment
   2.6. State-civil society relations
   2.7. Private sector-civil society relations
   2.8. Donor-civil society relations

3. Values
   3.1. Democracy
   3.2. Transparency
   3.3. Tolerance
   3.4. Non-violence
   3.5. Gender equity
   3.6. Poverty eradication
   3.7. Environmental Sustainability
   3.8. Equity in Diversity

4. Impact
   4.1. Influencing Public Policy
   4.2. Holding state and private corporations accountable
   4.3. Responding to social interests
   4.4. Empowering citizens
   4.5. Meeting social needs
1. CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX PROJECT

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The idea of the CSI dates back to the early 90s when CIVICUS tried to collect information on the rise of civil society throughout the world and created a knowledge bank for issues related to civil society. In 1997 CIVICUS published the *New Civic Atlas* containing a compilation of civil society profiles from 60 countries (CIVICUS, 1997). In order to provide comparable and updated information, CIVICUS started to consider the preparation of a framework for a more rigorous comparative analysis that would enable lessons to be drawn from a variety of countries. It prepared more detailed evaluation tools, which resulted in the Civil Society Index (CSI) (Heinrich/Naidoo 2001; Holloway 2001). In 1999 Helmut Anheier, then director of the Centre for Civil Society in the London School of Economics, played an important role in the creation of the CSI concept (Anheier 2004). When the pilot phase covering 14 countries ended (2000-2002), the focus of the project’s methodology was revised and refined. Over the period 2003-2006 the project expanded to 54 countries (see Table 1.1.1).

| 1. Germany | 19. Georgia* |
| 2. Argentina | 20. Ghana* |
| 3. Armenia | 21. Greece* |
| 5. Bolivia | 23. Netherlands |
| 7. Burkina Faso | 25. Hong Kong (VR China) |
| 8. Chile* | 26. Indonesia |
| 9. China | 27. Italy |
| 11. Croatia | 29. Jamaica |
| 12. Cyprus | 30. Lebanon |
| 13. Czech Republic | 31. Macedonia |
| 14. East Timor | 32. Mauritius |
| 15. Ecuador | 33. Mongolia |
| 16.Egypt | 34. Montenegro* |
| 17. Fiji | 35. Nepal |
| 18. Gambia | 36. Nigeria |

(*) Countries that did the abbreviated version of the CIVICUS Index, comprising a literature review and secondary documentation

The CSI research project is completely in line with the FDC mission. Therefore, when an opportunity arose, the FDC made the CSI one of its priorities for 2007 and committed itself to implementing the project. FDC’s decision to proceed with the CSI was immediately supported by its international partners, who saw in the project an unprecedented opportunity for a timely diagnosis of the current state of Mozambican civil society.
1.2 PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

1.2.1 Main Reason for CSI implementation in Mozambique

The CSI project in Mozambique sought to answer this question: What is the state and condition of Mozambican civil society?

To answer this question a systematic, comprehensive and sufficiently operational methodology had to be found that fit local Mozambican conditions for conducting and implementing research.

In recent years, individual researchers and collective public and private entities have, in one way or another, carried out studies on specific aspects of Mozambican civil society. However, there had never been an attempt to apply a multi-dimensional, systematically integrated methodology with a wide range of research techniques and data sources. CIVICUS CSI provides an operational and participatory research model for evaluating the state of Mozambican civil society through an analytical and methodological model built around four basic dimensions of the civil society. These

Box 1.1.1: Foundation for Community Development
Hope in the fight for social justice

In the early nineties Mozambique was emerging from a long civil war that had been tearing the country apart since 1976. In addition to the gigantic tasks of rebuilding basic social infrastructure there was an urgent need to improve the difficult living conditions of thousands of Mozambicans.

A group of citizens decided to take action and help reduce the poverty and suffering of a major part of the country's population. They started to conceive an ambitious project based on the creation of a foundation - an institution with its own assets and thus an independent one. Once the model had been chosen, the initial capital of the foundation had to be established from zero. The founding members felt that these resources should first of all come from within, based on their own resources. In addition, there was also the legal requirement of first creating an association in order to be able to establish a foundation. The Community Development Association came into being in 1990 with the aim of generating the necessary human, financial and material resources. A sign of hope in a country with deep wounds.

Four years later, in 1994 conditions had finally been created for the establishment of the Foundation for Community Development (FDC). From the mission inherited from the association, the fight against poverty, came the conviction that it is not fate; poverty is merely the result of a complex mechanism of marginalisation and exploitation of the underprivileged, limited scientific and technical knowledge, and limited knowledge of appropriate technologies. It is essentially the result of a system where the poorest groups in society, those without any education and who are outside the formal institutions of society and the economy, have difficulty gaining access to resources. The FDC has fervently committed itself to fighting these structural, and also psychological, obstacles as the root cause of poverty.

The FDC was the main executing agency of the research project on the Civil Society Index in Mozambique. The FDC is a civil, non-partisan organisation with the aim of bringing together forces from all sectors of society to achieve an ideal of development, democracy and social justice. The FDC’s commitment to carrying out the CSI research project is a way of embodying its programme strategy, namely, by learning more and strengthening organised forms of civil society and community leadership.
are the structure of civil society; the external environment in which civil society exists and functions; the values practiced and promoted by civil society; and the impact of the activities pursued by civil society actors.

Based on scattered research and common knowledge, many people have some idea of the current state of Mozambican society, its relevance, its actions, its capacity to negotiate with other actors in society, and the effectiveness of its intervention. In general, each person’s ideas about the state of Mozambican civil society are heavily dependent on his or her expectations about the role that it can, should or could play in the development of society. People with low expectations about the role of civil society organisations in the development of society tend to be complacent in their assessment of Mozambican civil society. On the other hand, people with great expectations and hopes about the role civil society can or should play in the daily life of society, express feelings of greater or lesser frustration at the current state of Mozambican society.

However, one way of compensating for the indifference and complacency of some or trying to respond better to the more demanding and rigorous expectations of others, is to gather as much realistic, updated, reliable and precise information as possible. Once the real state and condition of civil society is known, it is much easier to search for realistic and justified responses to the main obstacles and weaknesses faced by organisations and activists in Mozambican civil society. This is not an easy task, but it is one worth undertaking so that efforts can be more focused and the result of actions more satisfactory.

In this context, the empirical data produced by the CSI project through a systematic, comprehensive and participatory methodology, provide the first holistic database on Mozambican civil society. Irrespective of the limitations of some of the information gathered, the fact that the model used is transparent and observable makes it possible to identify inconsistencies between the available data and concrete reality.

1.2.2. The Civil Society Concept

The operational definition of civil society used in this research is the definition proposed by CIVICUS, namely, the ‘arena outside of the family, the state and the market, where people associate to advance common interests’ (Heinrich 2004). This definition is contentious and is not commonly understood or accepted by the ordinary citizen, or even by many educated people and specialists in certain academic subjects.

The main contention with the operational definition offered by CIVICUS relates to the role of certain actors (especially political parties) in the daily life of Mozambican society. Given the background of the majority political parties Frelimo and Renamo, and especially their hegemonic political role in Mozambican society today, many people argue that these parties should be excluded from research on Mozambican civil society.
In the provinces in particular, participants in meetings and debates in RSC consultations were resistant to the inclusion of Frelimo and Renamo in the analysis of civil society, arguing that this would hinder and distort the research. In their opinion, the presence of representatives of the dominant political parties in debates on civil society would inhibit people, intimidate them, or make it difficult to find solutions for the development of civil society. This hesitation occurs given that friction and fierce political disputes between the two dominant political forces in Mozambique persist. This situation is unhealthy and harmful to the development of civil society, as there is a tendency to manipulate members of CSOs to take sides in a politically bipolar country.

This particular feature of Mozambican civil society warrants consideration in future. The CSI project NIT noted the concerns of members of society and sought to manage difficult situations as they arose, while still adhering to the systematic methodology of the research.

It should be noted that, unlike many other concepts of society, the CIVICUS proposal has two distinctive and interesting aspects that provide for a comprehensive and impartial analysis of civil society. Firstly, it projects the focus of the analysis beyond formal and institutionalised civil society and includes more informal groups and social movements. Secondly, whereas civil society is usually understood as a domain
where positive actions and values reign, the CSI takes into account the negative manifestations of civil society. As such, the operational concept of CIVICUS includes not only associations providing social services or environmental organisations, but also groups such as *xitique* (Group of people coming together to form a merry-go-round credit scheme), community savings schemes and fanatical groups with a tendency toward violence.

The CSI thus evaluates both actions that support values such as democracy and tolerance, and also the emergence and frequency of manifestations of intolerant or violent groups within civil society (see Box 1.1.3 for other definitions of civil society from various sources).

### Box 1.1.3 Definitions of Civil Society from various sources

- **Wikipedia definition of civil society**: There is an infinite variety of definitions of civil society. The practical definition by the Centre for Civil Society of the London School of Economics is very illustrative: Civil society refers to the arena of voluntary collective actions around interests, purposes and values. In theory, its institutional forms are different from those of the state, family and market although in practice the borders between state, civil society, family and market are frequently complex, indistinct and negotiated. Civil society commonly embraces a wide variety of spaces, actors and institutional forms, with varying degrees of formality, autonomy and power. Civil societies are frequently populated by organisations such as charitable institutions, non-governmental development organisations, community groups, women’s organisations, religious organisations, professional associations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, commercial associations, coalitions and activist groups (http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociedade_civil).

- **Negro on relations between NGOs from the North and Mozambican civil society**: When Hegel, in the early XIX century, referred to civil society as an institution lying between the family and the political relations of the state, he permitted an ambiguous reading of the nature and role of this institution. Is Civil Society an institution of intermediation and thus with a role to play, or is it an intermediate Institution that covers the set of socio-economic relations and forces of production as understood by Marx? (José Negro, 2003, http://www.lid.org.mz).

- **National Institute of Statistics definition of Non-Profit Institutions**: They are legal or social entities created with the objective of producing goods and services whose status does not allow them to be a source of income, profit or other financial gain for the units that establish, control or finance them (SCN93 4.54) (INE, 2006: 15). Although it is felt that the SCN93 definition of institutional units is largely appropriate for non-profit institutions, the Manual on Non-Profit Institutions in the National Accounts System provides a functional definition of non-profit institutions as entities that share the following five characteristics: organisations, non-market and non-distributive of profits, institutionally separated from government, self management and non obligatory (INE, 2006: 16).

- **Ernest Gellner’s definition of civil society**: “Civil society is a set of institutions and associations that are sufficiently strong to avoid tyranny, but that are nevertheless permeable, allowing the free entry and exit of individuals, instead of being imposed by birth or maintained by some dreadful ritual. You can enter the socialist party without ever having massacred a lamb...” (Conditions of Liberty, 1995, Ernest Gellner, in http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociedade_civil).

- **PUC-Rio - The concept of Civil Society**: Civil society has been seen as "(...) a non-state, anti-state, post-state and even supra-state sphere" (Gómez, 2003:11). If this varied range of meanings were not enough, in recent years the understanding of civil society has become complicated in a homeronian manner, given the intensification of globalisation processes - see, in this case, theories on the existence of an international or global civil society (http://www2.dbl.puc-rio.br).


### 1.2.3 Analytical Operation and Methodology

#### 1.2.3.1 From CSI Concept to Indicators

In practice, the Civil Society Index concept is manifested in a methodology that seeks to measure four basic dimensions through structured analysis:

1. The structure of civil society;
2. The external environment in which civil society exists and functions;
3. The values practiced and promoted in the civil society arena; and
4. The impact of the activities pursued by civil society actors.

These four dimensions are represented graphically by the Civil Society Diamond (see Figure 1.1.4). Each dimension is structured into sub-dimensions and a total of 80 indicators (Anheier, 2004). Each individual indicator is scored on a scale of 0 to 3 and these scores are then aggregated into scores for sub-dimensions and dimensions. In qualitative terms, the scoring represents 0 - 1 (weak), 1 - 2 (moderate) and 2 - 3 (high, strong).

The 80 indicators constitute the heart of the CSI and provide the data presented in this report. A comprehensive methodology built around the 80 indicators involved the systematic collection of secondary and primary data, the analysis of quantitative and qualitative information, meetings of the NAG, discussion groups, a national workshop, and finally the preparation of this report. The structure of the CSI itself, with its four dimensions, also provided a model for structuring the main chapters in this report.

As the CSI diamond makes it possible to capture the essential dimensions of the state of civil society, it provides a good starting point for interpreting and discussing the state of society at any given moment. Technically, the diamond cannot be reduced to a single value (score) as this would conceal more than it would reveal the multi-dimensional aspects of civil society. Moreover, the Diamond also illustrates civil society at a certain point in time and so has no dynamic perspective. Nevertheless, when applied in an interactive manner it can be used to illustrate developments over time, and to compare the state of civil societies in different countries (Anheier, 2004).

1.2.3.2 Implementation of the Project

This section describes the methods used to collect, classify and analyse the various data sources used in the project.

1.2.3.2.1 Organisation of the research process

The research project was implemented by FDC through a National Index Team (NIT) with close support from National Advisory Group (NAG) comprising 12 people from various sectors of civil society. Figure 1.1.5 illustrates the main actors in the project, including the technical and advisory teams and also the main funding agencies.
1.2.3.2.2 Actors in the Research Process

The actors and sequencing in the methodological approach to implementation of the CSI were the following:

1. The FDC identified the National Index Team (NIT) comprising: 1) programme director responsible for the management of the project, 2) a project coordinator responsible for the coordination of the project, 3) a civil society expert responsible for preparing the national report, 4) a participatory researcher who led and facilitated the various research activities.

2. The NIT conducted a preliminary analysis of interested parties and identified the National Advisory Group (NAG) of 12 members representing the various segments of civil society stakeholders.

3. The NIT reviewed available secondary data and prepared an overview report that was shared with NAG and CIVICUS for comments and reviews.

4. NAG met to revise the overview report and to discuss and adapt the concept and definition of “civil society” given the Mozambican context. NAG also met to analyse the main actors and power relations within society in general and also within civil society, to help place civil society in the broad context of civil society actors and power relations.

5. The primary research instruments were applied. Regional stakeholder consultations were held with selected parties in different parts of the country. The participants replied to different individual questionnaires and then participated in a one-day discussion group. There were also community sample surveys that measured trends and values of community members, their activities in civil society and their attitudes on and engagement in community-level CSOs.
6. The different data were presented to the civil society expert who prepared the preliminary report.

7. The NAG met to discuss and validate the scores assigned to the CSI indicators on the basis of the data presented in the preliminary national report and in accordance with the scoring instructions. However, in some instances where agreement on the scores was not possible, a mid point score was assigned even though the scoring methodology did not provide for such. The scores were aggregated in sub-dimensions and dimensions.

8. A national workshop was held from 4 to 6 December 2007. Over 200 civil society actors and external stakeholders from government, the media, academic institutions and the business sector and representatives from all 11 administrative provinces in Mozambique attended. The workshop reviewed and validated the CSI research, analysed the main strengths and weaknesses of civil society, and identified priorities and potential activities to strengthen Mozambican civil society.

9. The final score and the results of the national workshop are included in this final national report.

1.2.3.2.3 Methodology and Main Stages of the Project

The CSI 2007 in Mozambique was based on a combination of sources: 1) secondary research (literature review and collection of data already available); 2) two national surveys (one for citizens and one for CSOs), and 3) critical analysis, validation and scores for the sub-dimensions and dimensions that make up the Civil Society Diamond.

Figure 1.1.6 illustrates the specific steps in the compilation of data, starting with the research methods for primary and secondary data summarised in indicator scores (from 0 to 3), that are then aggregated into the sub-dimension and dimension scores that eventually form the Civil Society Diamond.

---

**Figure 1.1.6: Civil Society Index Project in Mozambique, 2007**

- **Data Sources**
  - Secondary Data
  - Media Review
  - Reg Consultation of Stakeholders
  - Fact Finding Studies
  - Community Sample Research

- **The CSI Diamond**
  - Collection
  - Dimension Score
    - Mean
  - Subdimension Scores
    - Mean
  - Indicator Score
    - Allocation of scores by the NAG

---
1.2.3.2.4. Data Collection

In addition to secondary data the calculation of the CSI was based on two primary sources in the form of two national surveys. One survey was given to a sample of citizens chosen from households and the other was given to a sample of civil society organisations. Annex 1 provides details of the samples for these surveys.

It was not possible to apply all the data collection methods recommended by CIVICUS. However, the national team did manage to conduct two nationally representative surveys, one with a sample of 4050 respondents and the other covering 475 CSOs. The specific methods used are described below in the order they were implemented:

- **ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY SOURCES**: NIT began by reviewing the numerous existing literature, summarising them in a preliminarily reflection that enabled it to identify additional updated information requirements.

- **MAPPING CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS**: There were three NAG meetings to identify the main actors in the civil society space and their relative degree of influence and power. In July 2007 the NAG discussed the preliminary report of the CSI based on secondary information.

- **SURVEY OF STAKEHOLDERS**: Representatives of the various kinds of CSOs throughout the country were interviewed using a questionnaire sent in advance to 500 CSOs. The CSOs were selected randomly out of a pool of almost 5000 CSOs created by INE in 2003 during its national census of non-profit institutions. During October 2007, 475 completed questionnaires were received.

- **CONSULTATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS**: In order to validate the research findings and identify the strong and weak points of civil society, the CSOs that replied to the questionnaire were invited to group discussions (focus groups). The team managed to organise one-day meetings attended by 20-50 participants.

- **COMMUNITY SAMPLE SURVEY**: In October 2007 the team conducted a national survey of 4050 citizens (See Annex 2).

- **FACT FINDING STUDIES**: As part of the project there were Fact Finding Studies to determine civil society’s policy impact in a number of selected fields and to gauge the extent of corporate social responsibility in Mozambique. However, due to time constraints and the unavailability of researchers, this task did not receive due attention. In order to compensate for this limitation the team tried to dedicate more time to existing studies by other researchers.

- **NATIONAL WORKSHOP**: In the final phase of the project, the final scores validated by the NAG were subjected to a global assessment in a three-day workshop in Maputo from 4 to 6 December 2007. Two hundred participants from Mozambique’s 11 administrative provinces attended the workshop.

1.2.3.3 Compilation, Data Analysis and Final Scores

The data gathered from the various sources mentioned above were organised and subsequently analysed using the SPSS.
The NIT then prepared the preliminary report based on the data and structured around the CSI indicators, sub-dimensions and dimensions. This preliminary report was used as the basis for discussions on the scores suggested to the NAG by NIT. In this exercise each indicator received a score on a scale of 0-3, where zero represented the weakest score and three the strongest score.

The design of the scoring exercise was based on the “citizen-jury” model (Jefferson Centre, 2002), where citizens deliberate together and take a decision on a public matter based on facts presented by lawyers and technical experts. The NAG’s role was to deliberate, confirm or come up with a consensual score for each indicator based on the data presented by the NIT.

Finally, the scores of the sub-dimensions and dimensions were aggregated as the arithmetic average of the respective indicator scores. The score was obtained through weighting and discussion of criteria, qualitative and quantitative data, and comparison with the scale of categories in the basic matrix provided by CIVICUS (see CIVICUS Toolkit, 2004). Finally, the definitive score presented in this report is the outcome of the systematic application of the CSI methodology, producing scores for the four dimensions (structure, environment, values and impact) of the Mozambican Civil Society Diamond in 2007. However, as already indicated, on some occasions, the NAG was unable to agree on the score. In such a case, it was decided to allot a midpoint score even though the CSI methodology does not provide for this. This accounts for the 12 or so indicators that have midpoint scores in this report.

1.2.4 Limitations of the Research

A research of such scale conducted in a very short time, and which has to overcome and adapt to various and unexpected situations will inevitably have limitations.

Although the team responsible for the research knows that no research can be perfect, it is aware that in this particular study with more time and resources would have yielded better data and avoided some inaccuracies and imprecision that will be identified in the text. Therefore ours is not a pretension that the study and the data have no limitation. Rather, the NIT invites the reader and other researchers to assess the results analytically and critically. Wherever the results are not robust and do not inspire confidence, ideally we encourage other analysts and researchers to try and study the subject in greater depth and, to the extent possible, analyse the same data or new data that may be gathered in the meantime, presenting complementary, new or different descriptions and explanations. The results that eventually prevail will be those that pass scrutiny and demonstrate that they are consistent with the reality they seek to reflect.
2. CIVIL SOCIETY IN MOZAMBIQUE

2.1. HISTORICAL APPROACH TO MOZAMBICAN SOCIETY

The pre- and post-independence history of Mozambique has produced a context in which civil society’s capacity and ability to exercise its rights and duties in defence of citizens is contested. There is little pre-colonial literature on associational life in African societies in the territory that became Mozambique, although there were state forms that directly or indirectly “forced” the creation of non-profit associations. Literature on associational life during the colonial period sees it in a context of opposition to the Portuguese colonial regime and influenced by the international context of, for example, Pan-Africanism negritude, and revolutionary socialism.

Post-independence literature sought to approach the associative practice not just in the context of defending group interests, but also as a way of tackling disasters caused by nature and those caused by people. The literature that analyses the impact of associations maintains there was a controversial impact, positive and negative, depending on the authors’ indicators and approaches.

Table 2.1.1: Mozambique Statistical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (1000 Km²)</th>
<th>399.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1000 inhab., Census 2007</td>
<td>20,530.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population, % of total, 2006</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy at Birth, INE</td>
<td>47.1 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1000)</td>
<td>107.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiteracy, % 15 years old and over</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment, IFTRAB, 2004/05</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation, INE, Dec. 05/04</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate (2005, MT/US$)</td>
<td>22,936.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index and international position, 2005</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (Dollars PPC), 2005</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 2005</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Poverty Index, 2005</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini Index 2002-03</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net public development assistance disbursed, USD per capita</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Parliament</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Languages most spoken daily, DHS 2003

| Emakhuwa            | 26.1%       |
| Xichangana          | 13.3%       |
| Portuguese          | 8.8%        |
| Elomwe              | 7.6%        |

Main Religions, DHS 2003

| Catholic            | 25.2%       |
| Siazi/Zione         | 21.7%       |
| Muslim              | 17.7%       |
| Without religion    | 17.8%       |
| Protestant/Evangelical | 8.8%      |

Before the mid-80s there is little Mozambican post-independence literature on associational life because the one party system that existed in Mozambique made it difficult to establish borders, confounded the State with the party and society in general, and prohibited any form of association outside the formal vehicles of the Mozambican State. According to Yussuf Adam and Humberto Coimbra (1997) Frelimo, and the state saw themselves as the only legitimate representatives of the people and the few agencies that existed had to submit to their control (Adam and Coimbra 1997: 83; Newitt 1997: 467).

Even “democratic mass organisations” (DMOs) were subject to strict controls that excluded diversity. Social control of women was exercised by the Mozambican Women’s Organisation (OMM); for youth there was OJM, for waworkers the OTM, for teachers the ONP, and for journalists the ONJ.

However, as in colonial times, during the first decade of independence, there were also actions to free society from the strict state and single party control. In addition to the extreme example involving the armed opposition launched by RENAMO, there were also peaceful examples associated, for example, with the Christian Council of Mozambique (CCM), Caritas Mozambique, and the National Union of Peasants (UNAC) (Negrão, 2003).

Before 1984, there were few associations in Mozambique. References to Non-Governmental Organisations include the Mozambique Red Cross, the General Cooperative Union, Doctors Without Borders and associations linked to the Frelimo party. The number of NGOs started to rise after the introduction of the freedom of association.

In 2003 the INE conducted a census of 4853 Non-Profit Institutions in Mozambique. Over 70% of these associations worked in just five provinces, while less than 30% were active in the remaining six provinces. Most units were concentrated in Nampula province (19.5%), followed by Gaza (14.6%), Inhambane (14%), Maputo city (12.9%) and Maputo province (9.5%). In the remaining provinces the number was less than or equal to 6.1% (INE, 2006:43).
Most associations are young (INE, 2006: 45), which is understandable given the changed paradigm in the political system that permitted the introduction of a new constitution in 1990. The new constitutional framework led to the law on freedom of association and thus the expansion of civil organisations.

In recent decades, the evolution of the role of civil Society can be seen in the way its various component groups get involved, participate and contribute to a variety of events, processes and even situations of national crisis or crisis within their communities. These civil society groups have evolved from simple service delivery, which is the government’s responsibility, to be active participants in research and advocacy actions that put pressure on the state and international institutions. These actions focus on the need to improve public policies and community development in Mozambique.

In order to give some idea of the distribution of CSO involvement and their purpose, Figure 2.1.3 compares the situation as seen during the 2003 INE census of non-profit institutions with the recent situation recorded by the CSO survey under the CSI project.

The methodology of the CSI project tried to take into account not only the categories proposed by CIVICUS but also those of INE, as well as other categories missing from the INE classification because of its focus on formal organisations (i.e., organisations that were registered or had a recognised address).

The CSI survey tried to capture informal organisations, including those that were not registered or did not have a formal address, such as savings groups and other community forms. For this reason, figure 2.1.3 contains a category called “community organisations” which, by definition, were not contemplated in the INE census. As the INE CINSFLU2003 (2006) only captured the formal organisations, the CSI project also tried to cover socially relevant but functionally informal community organisations.

The NIT is convinced that this research has still not been able to capture correctly the complex network of informal organisations that are socially relevant and important in the dynamics of civil society. The roughly 10% of such CSOs that were identified certainly under-represent the real situation. Nevertheless, it was a first step towards identifying socially relevant organisations.
2.2. MAPPING MOZAMBIAN CIVIL SOCIETY

Mozambican civil society has been diversifying and expanding in many ways. Before INE National Accounts System, which guides the compilation of economic data in Mozambique, little relevant information on the civil society sector was available. However, with the publication of its report on the first census of Non-Profit Institutions (2006), INE made an important contribution to filling the gap in representative statistical data on civil society. This INE census of non-profit institutions (CINSFLU) also provided the first representative mapping of Mozambican civil society, at least of the most formal part. It permitted the collection of information on voluntary customs involving not just typically charitable forms or community service, but also a whole range of activities, including organisations that serve society and government as well as households.

Although CINSFLU 2004/5 was published in 2006, it has received minimum attention from CSOs. The CSI project team countered this attitude by using the CINSFLU 2004/5 as the main secondary data source. In truth, from the methodological point of view, the fact that INE had already made an effort to capture relevant dimensions of civil society provided an important starting point. For the purposes of the CSI research the INE mapping of different categories of non-profit institutions was compared and made compatible with the CIVICUS categories. The latter, although more detailed, needed structuring of the kind done by INE.

As shown in Annex 3, the INE (2006) categories with 12 groups and 29 subgroups were compared and made compatible with the 20 categories proposed by CIVICUS. Table 2.1.2 presents the list of uniform categories used in the project’s primary research, both the citizen and the CSO surveys.

One critical note of caution is mentioned explicitly for consideration in future research. There are signs that Mozambican civil society has more complex dynamics than can be captured by categories adapted to formal institutions.

This means that right from the start it must be admitted that the concepts and categories have certain limitations when it comes to capturing relations that are
socially relevant but cannot be immediately formalized. For example, there are many community mutual assistance groups that, for reasons of definition, were not captured by the INE research, and therefore probably went unnoticed by the CSI project researcher. As Mozambican society is highly informal, many institutions of an eminently informal but socially relevant nature were missed by research that focused on formal institutions. For example, mutual assistance groups such as Kurhimela Xitoco-Thothotho, Tsimi-Ntimo, Xitique, Kurhimela, Kuthekela, Matsoni-Holimihana and Mukhumi/Oteka (see Table 13 in Francisco and Paulo 2006: 84) are socially relevant forms of civil society organisations that someday should be taken into account. It is true that such groups do not meet formality requirements, but formality will have to consider ways of becoming more socially relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups by arena of action</th>
<th>Subgroups of categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Culture and Recreation</td>
<td>1.1 Culture and Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Other recreation and social clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Education and Research</td>
<td>2.1 Primary and secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Other education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Health</td>
<td>3.1 Hospitals and Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Support centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Mental Health and Crisis Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Other health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social Services</td>
<td>4.1 Social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Emergency and Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Income support and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Environment</td>
<td>5.1 Environmental groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Animal Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Development and Housing</td>
<td>6.1 Economic, social and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Employment and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Law, Advocacy and Politics</td>
<td>7.1 Civic and advocacy organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Law and legal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Political organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Consumer defense bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 Civic Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Philanthropic intermediaries and Promotion of volunteering</td>
<td>8.1 Grant-making foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2 Other philanthropic intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3 Charitable organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4 Volunteer work organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 International Cooperation</td>
<td>9.1 International Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Religion</td>
<td>10.1 Religious congregations and associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Commercial and Professional Associations, Unions</td>
<td>11.1 Commercial Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2 Professional Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3 Unions and Workers’ organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Community Organisations</td>
<td>12.1 Agricultural mutual assistance organisations (Kurhimela, Kurhumela, Komoza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.2 Savings groups (Male, Yakuthanhana, Nsongo-nsango, Kupheza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3 Xhitique, Fainne, Atimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4 Xitongia, ganho-ganho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1.2: Categories of Civil Society organisations by Group and Sub-Group, Mozambique CSI 2007
3. ANALYSIS OF CIVIL SOCIETY

This chapter contains the statistical and qualitative information gathered during the project. The analysis is structured according to the individual indicators, sub-dimensions and dimensions of the Civil Society Index (CSI). For this reason, the chapter is organised along the four dimensions of the CSI Diamond: Structure, Environment, Values and Impact.

At the beginning of each section a chart summarises the scores for the sub-dimensions classified on a scale of zero (0) to three (3). The four dimensions comprise 27 sub-dimensions and a total of 80 indicators. The results for each indicator are examined in detail in the following sections, and the scores of the individual indicators are summarised in specific tables.
Figure 3.1: Sub-dimensions and Indicators of CSO Structure
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3.1. **STRUCTURE**

The analysis of the structure of society covers aspects such as the size, strength and vitality of civil society in terms of its human, organisational and financial resources. The aggregate score for the Structure dimension is 1.1, showing that Mozambican civil society has a limited structure. Figure 3.1.1 shows the scores for the six sub-dimensions: 1) breadth of citizen participation; 2) depth of citizen participation; 3) diversity of civil society participants; 4) level of organisation; 5) inter-relations, and 6) resources.

![Figure 3.1.1: Score of the CSI Structure Sub-Dimensions Mozambique 2007](image)

3.1.1 **Breadth of citizen participation**

This sub-dimension measures the breadth of the Mozambican citizen’s participation in civil society in various forms. Table 3.1.1 summarises the scores of the respective indicators that give an average score of 1.2. This score suggests that the breadth of the Mozambican citizen’s participation is low or limited in all aspects, with the exception of charitable giving and volunteering, which received moderate scores. Volunteering will be revisited in more detail later (section 1.1.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Non partisan political action</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Charitable giving</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>CSO Membership</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5</td>
<td>Collective community action</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.1 Non-partisan political action. After 1990, under the second Constitution of the Republic of Mozambique, the country had a favourable constitutional framework for free association, both partisan and non-partisan. This new constitutional framework was very different from the previous frameworks of colonial domination by the Portuguese administration and of the first decade of independence, which was dominated by a single party and featured restrictions on individual liberties.

A study by CEP (2003) notes that the degree of influence of institutions is inversely proportional to the level of power they wield. This explains why the neighbourhood or village secretary and the traditional chief are the local entities most sought-after by citizens when they need to resolve any problem in their daily lives. The weak impact of some powerful institutions and civil society organisations can be related to their ignorance of the fact that their work does not meet the basic and immediate needs of citizens, or because they are not adequately rooted within the population.

Resorting to non-partisan forms of struggle, such as strikes, demonstrations and petitions is still virtually unknown in Mozambique. Almost 44% of the population has never participated in a strike or a demonstration and 25% would participate in such actions if they had the opportunity to do so. Afrobarometer 2005 shows that 87% of the population has never contacted a government official, a representative of the Assembly of the Republic, or the representative of any public entity. The same Afrobarometer 2005 shows that about 54% of the citizens surveyed go to religious leaders for help in resolving their problems, while 24% regularly contact community leaders.

The community survey carried out by this project shows that a minority of citizens (28% of respondents) has taken part in some kind of non-partisan political action, such as participation in a public demonstration, writing a letter to the newspaper or signing a petition.

1.1.2 Charitable giving. Secondary literature has little information on charitable giving. According to the INC07, in the 12 months prior to the survey about 43% of respondents provided some kind of voluntary support to the community over and above the support given to members of their households. Most of the stated support was in the form of food (87%), or also in money (57%) and clothing (55%).

1.1.3 CSO membership. The INE census of non-profit organisations (CINSFLU, 2006) showed that in 2003 about 140 thousand people were members of a CSO. This is less than 1% of the total Mozambican population. The 5000 CSOs surveyed by INE in 2003 have virtually the same number of workers as the public sector. About 75% said they were volunteers while 20-25% were earning a salary, consultants or civil servants. In other words, at least 30,000 CSO workers can be considered to have a regular salary. After the state, no other entity employs as many people as CSOs.

As the CINSFLU2006 only covered formal organisations with at least a physical address and evidence of a regular organisational structure, it must be recognised that this perspective excludes a group of socially relevant but functionally informal community organisations. It is well known that only a small proportion of citizens participate in formally established CSOs. Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of the dynamics of civil society, it is important to recognise that the logic behind the work of
socially relevant CSOs in everyday life in Mozambican society is not based on formal and legal criteria.

1.1.4 Volunteering. There are few secondary sources on volunteer work. The CINSFLU2006 census is probably the only exception, providing data on the number of volunteers in non-profit institutions. Of a total of 138,607 recorded CSO members in 2003-04 a little over 39,000 (28%) were regular and about 64,000 (46%) were occasional volunteers.

The CSI project sought to obtain information on volunteering in the population in general through the Community Sample Survey and the Regional Stakeholder Consultations and survey. The INC07 found that a little over one-third (39%) of the people regularly participated in voluntary work at least once a year.

The results of INC07 also show that 27% of respondents were part of, or involved in, some kind of organisation in the general sense, including companies, associations, government bodies and other organisations. In INC07 the proportion of people involved in CSOs falls a little over 20%, but the assertion of regular participation in voluntary work is close to 40%. These findings contradict the CINSFLU2006, whose figures suggested that only a very small percentage of people belong to at least one CSO, especially as a volunteer.

However, as there was no time to study this matter in further detail, we do not have any firm conclusions. The different results could be due to different perceptions of volunteering on the part of both surveys, as well to the respondents themselves. Two social phenomena can influence commonly held perceptions. One possible reason is the informality that characterises much of the involvement in multiple community activities, sometimes quite regular but rarely understood as being part of associative movements or civil society organisations. The other reason could be that under-employment is often disguised or confused with volunteering. Is it really volunteering? If people receive a symbolic payment (in reality a meagre salary), where does under-employment end and volunteering begin? These kinds of questions left some of the CSI NAG members questioning whether there really is a lot of volunteering in Mozambique, as suggested by the INC07 survey.
The subject could not be studied in detail in this project and therefore warrants further reflection and analysis in the future. However, despite the discrepancies and doubts about CSO classification criteria, and the difficulty in capturing the dynamics of volunteering in Mozambican civil society that formal surveys rarely record adequately, the NAG decided to give credence to the substantial proportion of respondents in the INC07 who said that they participated in volunteering actions, assigning a score of 2.0.

1.1.5 Collective community action. Afrobarometer 2005 states that about 40% of people regularly participate in community meetings. The INC07 also recorded over 40%. In accordance with the basic scoring system, evidence of participation below 50% led to the conclusion that only a minority participated in collective community action last year.

In general, considering both the statistical data and also perceptions and empirical sensitivity in qualitative assessments, it can be concluded that the breadth of citizen participation in non-partisan, community action is weak. This assessment was reaffirmed by participants in the national workshop, who held that citizen participation in collective actions is generally weak. Citizens and civil society never come together at critical moments to defend their own interests, against, for example, rising prices, ill treatment of other citizens, and damage and harm caused by the negligence of institutions. Participants agreed that civil society is sometimes compromised by the Government. Some reasons suggested to explain this state of affairs are fear of acting to affirm citizenship, lack of civil society capacity, and knowledge that some of the main civil society leaders are also members of the Government.

3.1.2 Depth of citizen participation

This sub-dimension analyses the depth of citizen participation in Mozambican civil society, as measured by dedication to volunteering and frequency of affiliation in more than one CSO. The average score for this sub-dimension is 1.3. Table 3.1.2 details the score for the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Charitable giving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>CSO Membership</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1 Charitable giving. The INC07 data on the level of charitable giving needs more detailed analysis, as there are some discrepancies, with improbable amounts being identified. With insufficient time to study the matter in more detail in this phase, the possible result proposed is based on the median instead of the simple average of the amounts declared for the previous year. This produces a figure of 100 Meticais. Placing this amount represents about 1-1.5% of the current per capita income in Mozambique (8,750.00 Mt = US$ 350x25MT).
1.2.2 Volunteering. The dedication to voluntary work revealed by the INC07 suggests a relatively high level, but the data recorded need to be checked and re-analysed to clarify their plausibility. Nevertheless, despite doubts about the data the NAG considered it advisable to assign a score of 2.5 in recognition of the substantial weight and importance of unpaid and voluntary work in Mozambican society.

1.2.3 CSO membership. According to the INC07, less than 20% of the people interviewed belong to more than one CSO. This is equivalent to a minority participation and therefore received a zero (0) score. The NAG, and subsequently the national workshop, validated this score and expressed concern about the need to find effective ways of expanding CSO membership that are more responsive to the aspirations and interests of citizens. In practice, this means not only improving CSOs organisationally, but also considering their mission, vision and practical action.

3.1.3 Diversity of civil society participants
This sub-dimension examines diversity and the representation of citizens in civil society. Both the CINSFLU2006 data and the primary data gathered for CSI provide relevant information on diversity. CSI found that important social groups are absent from CSO membership. This resulted in an average score of 1.3, based on the indicators presented in Table 3.1.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>CSO membership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>CSO leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Distribution of CSOs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.1 Diversity in CSO membership. The CIVICUS methodology identifies six relevant groups that are representative of the diversity of social groups in civil society, and the NIT added a further four categories: (1) women, (2) rural population, (3) ethnic/linguistic minorities, (4) religious minorities, (5) poor people, (6) high class/elite, (7) youth, (8) people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWA), (9) the elderly and (10) the disabled. According to the INC07, elite and religious minorities groups have the most equitable participation, whereas the poor, the elderly, and the disabled were considered absent or excluded. Women, the rural population, ethnic minorities, youth and PLWA are considered a little under-represented or excluded from CSOs.

---

1 Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data in this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.
1.3.2. CSO leadership. Except for the elite group, other social groups have identical representation in CSO leadership. To some extent, this differs from perceptions about the previous indicator on the representation of significant social groups in CSO membership. Results of the INC07 suggest that women are a little under-represented in both CSOs and in leadership positions in society in general, which is contrary to the image provided by other sources on the political participation of women. Similar to CINSFLU2006, the INC07 also reveals under-representation of females compared to males. In the first case, the CINSFLU2006 showed that in 2003 CSOs had 63% men compared to 37% women. INC07 has an even larger imbalance, with 74% men compared to only 26% women. Thus, some public opinion surveys indicate that women are relatively well represented in CSOs, including in leadership positions, while other surveys are less conclusive. This suggests that the issue of representation in its various forms warrants more reflection, especially with regard to the quality and practical effectiveness of the representation of social groups in CSO bodies.

1.3.3. Distribution of CSOs. The indicator on the geographical distribution of CSOs has a curious result when compared with factual data such as the CINSFLU2006. As shown in figure 3.1.3, the INC07 shows that most people (45%) believe that CSOs are concentrated mainly in large cities or are mainly limited to urban areas (20%). However, this perception is contradicted by facts provided by the CINSFLU2006 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.4. This census, which had the benefit of a statistically representative coverage of the whole country, challenges two widespread but incorrect perceptions: the type of CSO that predominates in Mozambique and the concentration of CSOs in urban centres.

Regarding the first incorrect perception, it is generally believed that NGOs dominate civil society. Yet of the roughly 5000 non-profit institutions surveyed by INE (2006), the vast majority are associations (92%), either religious (53%) or political, advocacy and legal associations (25%) and only 2% are associations of an educational nature. NGOs account for less than 10%; only 3% are national NGOs and 4% international NGOs, while foundations represent only 0.4% of CSOs. Consequently, considering the CSO classification used by INE, it was concluded that there is weak diversity of civil society organisations: about 75% belong to two types.
of organisations: religious and political. There are few organisations for women or minority groups. However, there is, for example, the Mozambican Women’s Organisation (OMM), spread throughout the country and strongly associated with the party in power, Frelimo. However, the fact that OMM is strongly linked to one party limits its ability to engage a wide range of women who are not interested in direct party activities.

3.1.4 Level of Organisation.

This sub-dimension analyses the coverage of umbrella bodies, their effectiveness and the organisational self-regulation, support infrastructure and linkages of CSOs in Mozambique. How well-organised is civil society? What kind of infrastructure exists for CSOs?

The average score validated by the NAG is 0.6, suggesting that the organisational development of Mozambican civil society is weak. Table 3.1.4 details the scores of the respective indicators.

| Table 3.1.4: Indicators of the level of organisation |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| **Ref. #** | **Indicators** | **Score** |
| 1.4.1 | Existence of CSO umbrella bodies | 0 |
| 1.4.2 | Effectiveness of CSO umbrella bodies | 2 |
| 1.4.3 | Self-regulation | 1 |
| 1.4.4 | Support infrastructure | 0 |
| 1.4.5 | International linkages | 0 |

1.4.1 Existence of CSO umbrella bodies. Figure 3.1.4 shows that no more than 10% of the organisations have nation-wide coverage or are present in various provinces. The ISCO07 corroborated this result for umbrella organisations, networks and broad federation coverage. Many respondents felt that only a small minority (22%) belongs to networks or federations and broad umbrella organisations.

1.4.2 Effectiveness of CSO umbrella bodies. Despite the weak national coverage of organisational networks, INC07 respondents felt that they play an effective or reasonably effective role in pursuing the goals and targets of CSOs. Roughly 43% of respondents felt that the role of networks and federations was somewhat effective compared to 18% who felt they were not very effective.

In meetings with stakeholders and in some secondary sources, the issue of the institutional potential of networks was discussed. The opinions of the main actors differ. On the one hand, some analysts feel that certain networks and coalitions have achieved positive objectives; the case of the Land Campaign, the Debt Group’s mobilisation for debt forgiveness for Mozambique, and participation in the Poverty Observatory and in the commission to elect the president of the NEC are examples (Negrão 2003).
Other analysts are more sceptical and critical about the success of such networks. Hodges and Tibana (2005), and Francisco and Matter (2007), for example, argue that the success and performance of civil society networks must be evaluated with caution and in close association with the role played by donors and international agencies. These analysts argue this importance insight of the knowledge that the space conquered by civil society is more the result of imposition by international donors, to whom the Government is accountable, than of initiatives and affirmation by the CSOs themselves (Hodges and Tibana, 2005).

1.4.3 Self-regulation. This indicator evaluates CSO’s generation of self-regulation mechanisms and their effectiveness in detecting and overcoming eventual irregularities. In the INC07, about 38% of respondents felt that there are preliminary efforts to generate self-regulation mechanisms, while 29% said that the few mechanisms that exist have “extremely limited” impact. Other sources, notably the stakeholders present at the consultations, felt that ad hoc methods, informality and urgency in interventions undermine internal organisation and the potential for CSO impact on society.
1.4.4 Support infrastructure. Support infrastructure (resource centres, organisational capacity, information data banks and technical assistance programmes) is considered very limited throughout the country. The INOSC07 survey shows that 58% of respondents were of the view that support infrastructure is very limited, while 20% identified a complete absence of infrastructure. Only 5% felt that there was a well-developed organisational infrastructure.

![Figure 3.1.7: System of support infrastructure for CSOs](image)

1.4.5 International linkages. CSOs participation in international networks was considered moderate by (35%) and significant (23%), compared to 32% of respondents who considered it limited and 10% non-existent or insignificant.

3.1.5 Inter-relations among CSOs
This sub-dimension analyses communication and horizontal relations between civil society actors. Its score is 1.5, corresponding to an average of satisfactory inter-relations. Table 3.1.5 summarises the scores for the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1.5: Indicators for evaluating inter-relations within civil society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref. #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.1 Communication. Although forms of communications are now expanding, e.g. the introduction of cell phones and an expansion of the television network, a substantial number of respondents feel that the level of communication is limited (32%) or even insignificant (10%).
In its consideration of these data, the NAG felt that there is a broad and effective communication effort that can convey ideas within and among CSOs, but the ordinary citizen does not sense this effort.

1.5.2 Cooperation. Cooperation and inter-sectoral networks and coalitions are collective action options that are being increasingly utilised by organisations in society. In the case of Mozambique, according to INC07, over 50% of respondents said that they participate in few (41%) or no (12%) international civil society events. A substantial percentage (43%) said they had some participation in international events.

Nevertheless, other sources indicate the existence of some networks and coalitions, such as, LINK (a coalition of non-governmental organisations), the Christian Council, UNAC (the cooperative union), the Debt Group (a coalition as a form of group pressure on the Government to reduce its external debt), the extinct Land Campaign, the Poverty Observatory (a forum for civil society elements who want to monitor implementation of PARPA II), as well as other groups like the Children’s Network, MONASO.

The national coverage of some of these networks is unknown, but the NAG found that many are concentrated in urban areas. Thus in practice, inter-regional cooperation, in the sense of broad involvement of local and district CSOs, is relatively weak.

3.1.6 Resources

This sub-dimension analyses the level of resources that civil society can count on in practice. The average classification is 0.7, indicating a low installed resource capacity. Table 3.1.6 lists the indicators and their respective scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3</td>
<td>Technological and Infrastructural Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.6.1 Financial resources. About 50% of respondents felt that the financial resources of CSO were adequate, while the remaining 50% thought they were inadequate. Since a value judgment on the meaning of inadequate or adequate is required here, it is better to clarify this important issue by using more objective data. For example, CINSFLU2006, gathered data that enabled it to prepare a statement of revenue and expenditure for non-profit institutions that provided an objective idea of their resource situation.

2 Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data in this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.
According to INE, about 70% of CSO resources come from overseas, with strong involvement by international NGOs or linkages with international donors. Private companies and families contribute 25% and the government/state only 3% (Figure 3.1.8). Over 52% of financial transfers are concentrated in Maputo city.

Another important imbalance in the distribution of financial resources is that 1% of CSOs have 42% of the financial revenue. This means that the Gini index, a measure of distribution, is 0.940. A score so close to the maximum value of 1 indicates inequality in the distribution of resources (Figure 3.1.9a).

1.6.2 Human resources. The CINBSFLU (2006: 56-57) also provides information on the distribution of human resources in CSOs. As in the case of financial resources, CSO human resources are heavily unbalanced. Only 1% of the units surveyed employ about one-third of all CSOs human resources in Mozambique. The Gini coefficient for human resources reaches 0.739, and the area of concentration between the Lorenz Curve and the equality line is 45 degrees (Figure 3.1.9b).

The INC07 does not have sufficient information to estimate the Gini coefficient for 2007, but the situation is unlikely to have changed much over the last three years.

The relationship between human resources and volunteering was noted above from another perspective. Consider here the relationship between volunteering and the heavy concentration of human resources. If these are assumed to be predominantly paid resources, then the vast majority of CSOs resort to precarious forms of work and collaboration involving under-employment or volunteering. This is not intended to suggest that volunteering is itself precarious, but rather that more stable, and likely more efficient, resources are the best-remunerated and are distributed very unequally.

---

1.6.3 Technological and infrastructural resources. The INOSC07 shows that a large percentage of respondents feel that organisational equipment and infrastructure is “more or less adequate” (60%) and “adequate” (38%). This is surprising, especially when compared with knowledge about the basic resources lacking to them, including electricity, access to modern means (Internet and computer) and other resources (TV, transport, etc.).

There are few references to technological resources in the secondary literature. One exception is the work by Fumo (unpublished) who argues that there are very few well-established organisations in Mozambique, meaning that they have reached a good level of operation, with clearly defined and visible objectives, with a structure, with a system and with clearly allocated resources.

CSOs are usually headed by high-level public figures, enabling them to attract assistance, develop into formal organisations and obtain financial and technical support. However, most organisations lack the technical and organisational support and resources even to become legally established in order to benefit from the advantages of being formalised. Some of these organisations have had considerable impact within civil society, but their work has received little attention is largely not visible. Finally, various CSOs are merely fighting to survive. They cannot state clearly what it is they advocate, nor how they operate or even who their members are. They are usually represented by one individual; many have no fixed office and have inadequate human and financial resources.

Taking into account the critical assessment of the information gathered, the NAG gave a score of 1 to this indicator, instead of the maximum score that might be inferred from INOSC07.

3.1.7 Conclusions on Structure

The analysis and evaluation of the structure of civil society leads to the conclusion that this dimension is weak at the various levels examined: breadth, depth and diversity of citizens. Virtually all the sub-dimensions show a very weak CSI structure.

Part of the weakness of civil society structure is organisational and part is a lack of financial and human resources. Moreover, the civil society’s structural and contextual
nature is determined by the institutional environment that influences the citizen’s exercise of power. As argued in other studies, Mozambicans are frequently called to exercising their citizenship rights, but in practice their power to influence policies, decisions or even economic and political power is limited. In terms of participation in the exercise of power, the citizen usually remains at an *ad hoc* level, exchanging information without mutual commitment, and with very little effective partnership to give the citizen effective responsibility and power (Francisco and Matter 2004).

The assessment of these results by both the NAG and the national workshop is that the indicators make it possible to identify areas where attention must be focused in future. In particular, the NAG feels that recognition of the weaknesses identified is an important step towards awareness of the constraints and difficulties faced by CSOs.

The data gathered in this report also make it possible to dispel some incorrect perceptions of the state of CSOs, namely, their geographical distribution throughout the country and the kind of organisations that predominate. Contrary to the prevailing idea, the vast majority of CSOs are located in districts and local communities, not in the main urban centres.

This means that most CSOs are not visible in mainstream media circles, or in influential networks with the ability to access sources of funding, the best technologies, or the mass media. This is a challenge for two kinds of entities. Firstly, CSOs with national coverage, and in particular the most capable foundations, can use the results of this study to take action to improve the structure of civil society, expanding networks and forms of collaboration with grassroots CSOs, at both district and community levels. Secondly, international agencies and donors interested in supporting the development of Mozambican civil society must seek ways of expanding their support beyond the minority of organisations that have benefited from their support so far.

According to data provided by the INE survey, in 2003 the revenue for formal CSOs was around 300 million American dollars. Financial transfers from overseas accounted for about 70% of this amount, while 25% were transfers from the private sector and individuals/families. Foreign funding agencies thus face the challenge of finding ways to access a broader range of CSOs in Mozambique, in order to contribute to the development of a strong Mozambican civil society. Future reflection on how to best achieve this will be important. For example, given that the private sector has been the second most important source of financial support for CSOs, perhaps there is justification for greater discussion between the foreign source of financial support and the national private sector.

Finally, the state, and in particular the government cannot be ignored in the discussion of ways to strengthen Mozambican civil society. In this case, the support that CSOs could receive from government is not, perhaps, financial but rather functional, as a facilitator for actions and initiatives by members of civil society.
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3.2. ENVIRONMENT

The scores for the environment dimension represent an analysis of the political, social, economic, cultural and legal environment, and also the attitudes and behaviour of public and private sector actors towards Mozambican civil society. The results show that the environment dimension received the highest score of the four dimensions, though the margin is slight.

Figure 3.2.1 shows that the average score in the evaluation of the environment dimension is 1.2. The most visible obstacles to a satisfactory situation are the relations between civil society and both the state and the private sector.

3.2.1 Political Context

This sub-dimension examines the political situation in Mozambique and its impact on Mozambican civil society. The score is 1.0, a classification on the border between weak and moderate. Table 3.2.1 summarises the score of each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.1: Indicators for the Evaluation of the Political Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref. #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1 Political rights. Since 1990 the constitution of the Republic of Mozambique has provided a favourable legal and institutional framework for fundamental political
changes, including the introduction of a multi-party system, and rights of freedom of expression and association. This represents some empowerment of citizens and more opportunity for intervention in decision-making and for demanding accountability of leaders.

At the moment citizens have the right to elect the President of the Republic and 33 municipality mayors through universal suffrage. There are, however, signs of apprehension about the current state of the political environment and civil society. Francisco and Matter call attention to the fact that the citizen has direct voting power over less than 5% of bodies (President of the Republic and Municipality Mayors), while the remaining 95% of opportunities for exercising the vote are delegated to the parties and to presidents who appoint the members of the executive and other administrative bodies.

In the 2007 Freedom in the World Report http://www.freedomhouse.org, Mozambique was considered a partially free country with a score of 3 out of 7 (where 1 is free and 7 is not free) for human rights and 4 for civil liberties. It is felt that citizens enjoy moderate political rights and partial opportunities for political participation. However, the report calls attention to corruption levels, violence and human rights abuses (http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/ccr/country-7236-8.pdf).

2.1.2 Political competition. This indicator seeks to assess the quality of political competition in terms of the existence of a democratic system, diversity across the ideological spectrum, the institutionalisation and public credibility of parties, and the level of patronage practices.

In principle, the current legal system in Mozambique permits the creation of a multi-party system. In the third general multi-party elections in December 2004, 25 parties competed for parliamentary seats and there were eight presidential candidates (Hanlon and Nuvunga, 2004). However, the role of the political parties is rarely felt outside the election period. In practice, a two-party system dominates with the Frelimo party in power and the Renamo party the main opposition party.

With the exception of some municipalities, Mozambique has never experienced alternating parties. However, perhaps an even greater concern is the challenge of growing and widespread abstention. Abstention is becoming the big challenge and test for political parties, irrespective of who is in power or in opposition. Over the years, abstention worsened. In 2004 it reached around 70% or even higher in some parts of the country. The recent electoral registration process was also marked by the spectre of absenteeism, to the extent that it forced the majority political parties to agree on delaying the first provincial elections.

As regards political patronage, various sources, both academic and journalistic, speak of evidence of favouritism associated with party affiliation, especially the party in power (CEP 2001, 2003, Afrobarometer, 2003, 2005).

2.1.3 Rule of law. Over the years, various research sources have revealed little confidence in the rule of law. In 2001, a national public opinion survey called attention to ignorance about some state bodies or institutions, such as the Supreme
Court and trade unions. It also spoke of lack of confidence in the political system because citizens’ rights are still not properly respected (CEP 2001).

In various other studies, the police appear as the entity that citizens trust the least. This was the case in the 2001 CEP study. At the time, people most trusted the President of the Republic, the National Election Commission and religious organisations (CEP, 2001). More recently, the 2005 UTRESP study on governance and corruption also pointed to a lack of trust in police and justice bodies. As regards “observance of the law”, the results of the 2006 Governance Index (World Bank, 2007) show that Mozambique’s performance is around 34%, compared with 67% in Botswana for example (Figure 3.2.2).

![Figure 3.2.2: Governance Index, Mozambique and Botswana, 2006](http://info.worldbank.org)

2.1.4 Corruption. Studies show that the public perception of corruption is very high and could even threaten the survival of the foundations of a democratic society (USAID, 2005, UTRESP, 2005). The World Bank (2007) Governance Index table above shows that whereas control over corruption in Mozambique is estimated to be 35%, in Botswana it is 78%. Various other international sources, from Transparency International to the recent Mo Ibrahim Index, show Mozambique with indicators below 50% for the rule of law, transparency and corruption.

It is true that various other countries are much worse than Mozambique. Nevertheless, the worst examples should not be a source of complacency and comfort with poor quality, and the distance between Mozambican standards and those of other better-classified African countries should a reason for concern and reflection.

2.1.5 Effectiveness of the State. This indicator covers the workings of the state bureaucracy. It received a score of 1.0 indicating that the capacity of the state bureaucracy is very limited. The score is based on national and international sources.

According to Afrobaromter (2003), only 24% of the Mozambican population believes that its elected representatives are concerned about resolving the people’s problems or hearing their opinions (26%). However, 58% of Mozambicans believe in the state’s capacity to resolve the general problems of the people. Mozambicans express different levels of satisfaction with the government’s performance for
different areas. There is positive performance in education (66%), improvements in the health system (58%) and in conflict resolution (52%). There is relative satisfaction with efforts to fight AIDS (45%).

However, Mozambicans are more critical of economic performance. Less than a quarter of the people interviewed believe that the government has made an effort to create jobs (23%), control prices (22%) or reduce social inequality (20%). It should be recalled that as Figure 2.2.3 showed, the effectiveness of the government of Mozambique is classified as 44% compared to 74% for the effectiveness of the government of Botswana.

2.1.6 Decentralisation. The decentralisation challenge has two dimensions: one related to the citizen’s decision-making power, and the other related to access to public resources. In both cases, the degree of decentralisation is weak and embryonic. There is much talk about decentralisation and citizen participation. However, in practice, mechanisms for effective access are weak. This observation is clearly illustrated by the two charts in Figure 3.2.3.

The first chart shows the proportion of direct citizen power compared to the delegated power of political parties. Direct power is understood as the group of state bodies and legislative power where the citizen has the power of direct vote. For example, Mozambicans vote directly for the President of the Republic, and for the Mayors of one-third of the districts of Mozambique (33 municipality mayors).

In most cases, however, citizens delegate their political power to representatives of the political parties as deputies, or to other collective and individual entities that are responsible for appointing government leaders and public administration executors.

Regarding citizens’ access to public funds, the second chart shows that the sub-national percentage of public budget expenditure is very small. Less than 35% of the 2007 state budget was allocated to decentralised responsibilities in provinces, districts and local authorities. The government recently started to allocate a percentage to districts, the so-called “7 million Meticais”. However, this is only about 1% of the
general budget, apart from the fact that its decentralisation comes from the provincial not the central budget.

### 3.2.2 Basic Rights and Freedoms

This sub-dimension examines to what extent civil rights are guaranteed by law and in practice. The indicator has a score of 1.7 that should be interpreted to mean that, although basic rights and freedoms are guaranteed by law, there are isolated or occasional violations of civil liberties. Table 3.2.2 summarises the scores for the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.2: Indicators for evaluating Basic Rights and Freedoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ref. #</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### 2.2.1 Civil liberties. The constitution of the Republic of Mozambique establishes the right to and freedom of association for all citizens as long as they do not have a military or para-military purpose and do not promote violence, racism or xenophobia. The possibility of holding authorities accountable, as well as other rights regarding equality of opportunity, are also suggested in the constitution, even though their practical application is much more limited.

#### 2.2.2 Information rights. In principle, the law guarantees the right to information. However, socioeconomic conditions prevent citizens from having access to sources like radio, newspapers, and television. This is due mainly to their inability to purchase sources of information and to illiteracy and the inability to speak the official Mozambican language (Afrobarometer, 2005).

Afrobarometer 2003 states that 79% of the people interviewed in its survey had access to information through the radio, while only 26% had access to information through television and another 24% at least occasionally had access through newspapers (Afrobarometer, 2003).

#### 3.2.2.3 Press freedom. As regards press freedom and the media Law 18/91, Article 48 of the constitution and Article 50 of the statutes of the Higher Council on the Media establish the right to the independence of the media in the exercise of the right to information, press freedom, broadcasting rights and the right of reply.

According to some sources, compared to international standards such as the European Court of Human Rights, protection is limited and limiting (Mozambique Global Integrity Country Report, 2006). Nevertheless, given the relatively high degree of
press freedom, this indicator received a score of 2.0, based on the assumption that violations of press freedom are more isolated, rather than systematic or frequent.

3.2.3 Socio-economic Context

This sub-dimension analyses the socio-economic situation. Table 3.2.3 shows that it received a score of 1.0, meaning that socio-economic conditions substantially limit the effective functioning of civil society.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the socio-economic context, CIVICUS proposes observation of the presence or absence of eight conditions that can have a major impact on the functioning of civil society, namely: 1) widespread poverty; 2) recent civil wars; 3) ethnic or religious conflicts; 4) serious economic crisis; 5) serious social crisis; 6) severe socio-economic inequality; 7) widespread adult illiteracy and 8) lack of information technology and communication infrastructure. The score for this indicator thus takes into account the number of conditions observed and their severity. Some relevant information on this topic is summarised below.

**Widespread poverty** (over 40% of the population living on less than $2 a day): This condition applies to Mozambique, which is still classified among the dozen poorest countries in the world, in 168th place out of 177 countries (UNDP 2006), and which is the least developed country in southern Africa. The most recent study on absolute poverty showed that poverty levels had fallen from 67% in 1997 to 53% in 2003, but about 74% of Mozambicans continue to live on less than two dollars a day.

**Civil war** (armed conflicts in the last five years): This condition does not apply to Mozambique, as the civil war ended in 1992.

**Serious ethnic and/or religious conflicts**: This condition does not apply to Mozambique.

**Serious economic crisis** (for example, external debt higher than GDP): This condition applies in part. The external debt represents $US 65 for every Mozambican and 45% of Mozambique’s GDP. Under these circumstances, the condition would not apply. However, there is strong concern about evidence showing a tendency for the foreign debt to increase cyclically, and that it is being controlled more through debt forgiveness than through growing economic independence. Moreover, with rising migration to urban areas unaccompanied by a proportional growth in jobs, social and economic tension is increasing in urban centres like Maputo city. At this level, serious economic crisis appears to be latent, but with a likelihood of becoming worse.

**Serious social crisis** (in the last two years): Despite relative social stability, high levels of poverty, rising malnutrition and food insecurity in some parts of the country,
the impact of various epidemics such as HIV/AIDS, when taken together can be considered evidence of serious social crisis.

**Serious socio-economic inequality** (Gini coefficient > 0.4): In the last study on poverty by INE in 2003, the estimate of the Gini coefficient was over 0.4. UNDP recently estimated the Gini coefficient to be 0.573.

**Widespread illiteracy** (over 40 percent): The estimate of INE and UNDP is an illiteracy rate of 52.8%.

**Lack of Information Technology Infrastructure** (i.e. less than five Internet services for 10,000 inhabitants): This condition applies to Mozambique, which in 2007 had fewer than two hundred thousand people with access to the Internet, corresponding to less than one user per 100 inhabitants. (http://www.internetworldstats.com).

### 3.2.4 Socio-cultural Context

This sub-dimension examines to what extent socio-economic norms are favourable or not for civil society. A score of 2.0 is given, expressing a moderately favourable context for the development of civil society. Table 3.2.4 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>Public spiritedness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.4.1 Trust.** The level of public trust in Mozambique is low. The CEP survey (2003) showed that trust rises as people get to know each other better. In the initial contact between two people who do not know each other, about 75% admitted to believing little or nothing of what the unknown person said. Women trust less than men and urban people less than rural people. After getting to know a person better the level of trust rises to 51.4 percent.

The CSI 2007 found that about 58% of respondents said that “every precaution is little” with regard to trusting people, whereas 40% felt that in general people should be trusted.

**2.4.2 Tolerance.** Despite Mozambique’s difficult history, evidence from everyday life suggests a substantial sense of tolerance of relations with immigrants and foreigners, especially minority races, and an acceptance of cultural diversity. There are, however, episodes of intolerance towards some minority groups such as homosexuals or delinquents. In some areas, such as Maputo City, examples of violent reactions to people who kill and steal are rising. However, this seems to be more a reaction to the lack of action by the public protection authorities than intolerance, *per se*. 
Nevertheless, Table 3.2.5 shows some problem situations. Prejudice against homosexuals is particularly strong, followed by prejudice against people with AIDS. In the light of this situation, a score of 2.0 is proposed for tolerance in Mozambique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.5: Indicator of Perceptions of Tolerance, 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would not like to have as neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of a different race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of a different religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant workers/foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People infected with AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3 Public spiritedness. The available data indicate a perception that justice bodies have the duty to make people obey the law. Of those interviewed, 85% believe that they can be punished if they commit serious crimes, 78% believe that citizens who do not pay their taxes should be punished and 66% said they could be punished if they obtained municipal services without paying for them (Afrobarometer 2003).

The INC07 also found “moderate” levels of public spiritedness. This is demonstrated by the replies presented in Table 3.2.6 although, based on daily experience there is the perception that declarations of honesty are not always consistent with a person’s real feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.6: Levels of Public Dishonesty in Various Kinds of Conduct, 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considered justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiming government benefits when I don't have the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding paying for public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying about taxes if I had the chance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People express their concern about theft in the street, attacks of varying severity and other undesired public occurrences. The marked absence of trust in the effectiveness of the security and justice authorities justifies a more detailed investigation of this subject.

3.2.5 Legal Environment

This sub-dimension examines to what extent the legal environment can be considered enabling or disabling for civil society in Mozambique. It received a score of 1.0, meaning a legal environment on the border between weak and moderate. Table 3.2.7 summarises the scores of the indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.7: Indicators for Evaluating the Legal Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref. #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.1 **CSO registration.** According to the INE terminology for Non-Profit Institutions, most CSOs in Mozambique are formally classified as associations. This is related to the legal framework. Following a variety of initiatives, legal opportunities for the formal establishment of CSOs have grown in recent years. In its CINSFLU2006, the INE identified five institutional forms in addition to associations, namely foundations, national NGOs, foreign NGOs and cooperatives.

Although the CSI study took the INE categories as a point of reference, it is felt that this classification missed some more or less informal organisational forms that have an important function in the daily life of Mozambican society. The survey tried to capture information on community forms of organisation that are not visible because neither researchers nor respondents consider them to be sufficiently organised.

The INOSC07 gathered from respondents the perception that registration is not very useful and is not simple. Indeed, knowledge about the real fabric of Mozambican society implies that a profound analysis of the effectiveness of the current registration system is to be recommended. It is possible that the current system is adequate for certain purposes, such as INE’s national accounts system. But can that system capture the informal but regular, prevailing and effective dynamics that exist in society?

It should be noted that, according to the literature, some analysts believe that factors behind the creation of CSOs, whether in the form of associations or more specifically NGOs, are linked to a number of internal and external factors that favour the emergence of NGOs (Kanji et al., s.d). Internally, these factors include religious groups or movements that take on social action and development tasks, the search for alternative employment by professionals and the desire of parties and politicians to attract resources and channel them to their electoral bases. Externally, the most direct factor is more support for NGOs by development agencies.

With this perspective this indicator was scored 1.0, with the recommendation that a more detailed and profound investigation of the whole system for categorizing CSOs and their respective forms of legal recognition be conducted.

2.5.2 **Advocacy and lobbying activities.** In principle the legal environment is favourable to the involvement of CSOs in advocacy and lobbying activities. The INE census found that 25% of Non-Profit Institutions (NPI) operate in the field of law, advocacy and policies and that this is the second largest group after religious associations.

However, participants in the consultations with stakeholders said that a degree of freedom for advocacy could be seen in the country’s capital city that is lacking in the province. The limitation is neither legal nor formal, but consists of constraints and forms of social and psychological intimidation that produce feelings of inhibition, fear of reprisals and emotional unease.

The explanation for this is related to strong political competition between the country’s two biggest parties, Frelimo and Renamo, part of which dates back to historical disputes and the armed conflict, and also to current forms of ideological and political intolerance.
Consequently, the research found that more than legal and administrative impediments, there are limitations of a social nature, a lack of clear, comprehensive and sufficiently transparent norms. For this reason a score of 1.0 was given.

2.5.3 Tax laws favourable to CSOs. On the whole there are no explicit CSO-favourable tax laws. However, as they are non-profit entities, CSOs are in principle exempt from paying value-added tax (VAT) and other fiscal charges. However, the subject needs further study because there are already paradoxical situations indicating that in practice the tax system is not as benevolent as might appear. During the major floods in 2000, there were cases of international organisations providing aid being faced with fiscal charges that led them to suspend their support. Moreover, as tax evasion is a widespread phenomenon it is difficult to distinguish incentives from constraints in the tax system. For this reason a score of 1 was given.

2.5.4 Fiscal benefits for philanthropy. There are no known fiscal benefits for philanthropic actions, although the whole mechanism of grants through non-budget channels should often benefit from exemptions. In reality, the available evidence has produced a variety of different reactions. Some analysts feel that certain exemptions provided to productive foreign companies are not justified, whereas other entities that should benefit from such support are penalized.

This happens with religious charitable entities that report no fiscal benefits for their activities. During consultations with stakeholders, participants mentioned that very few CSOs benefit from tax exemption.

Given the confusion surrounding this subject but also the major tax evasion that still exists, a score of 1 was given, meaning that in practice fiscal benefits are available for at least a limited number of purposes or types of organisation.

3.2.6 State-Civil Society Relations

This sub-dimension describes the kind of relations that exist between civil society and the state. It received a score of 0.7 implying a level of cooperation and dialogue on the border between weak and moderate. Table 3.2.8 summarises the scores for the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3</td>
<td>Cooperation/Support</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.1 Autonomy. This indicator evaluates civil society’s autonomy in relation to the state in terms of how well the development of civil society is facilitated. It is well known that in the past, the development process of civil society was not always facilitated. A convenient state tutelage over civil society can be observed. The parties with seats in Parliament use or marginalise CSOs as is convenient. This has been
visible in the election process where the space for CSOs has been the subject of highly political and partisan controversy. In the INOSC07 the most common reply by respondents was that sometimes there is improper state interference, by means of its institutions, in the activities of civil society.

2.6.2 Dialogue. Most respondents feel that dialogue is moderate. However, dialogue is not always an opportunity for empowering civil society. According to some studies, CSO capacity and action in some key areas for stability and the mobilization of resources by the state, have aroused the government’s interest because this gives it legitimacy in the eyes of its donors. However, the resources do not always revert to the direct benefit of society (Negrão 2003; Hodges and Tibana 2005; Francisco & Matter 2007).

Francisco and Matter (2007) discuss specifically the issue of forms of participation, of dialogue reduced to consultations that do not always produce results. Sometimes they function as manipulation, on other occasions as psychological therapy, and on others as a mere process of consultation and information, without concrete results.

2.6.3 Cooperation and support. This indicator analyses the level of support in the form of state resources for CSOs, as funds and other services or programmes that benefit them. The indicator received a score of 0, reflecting limited support in terms of both the amount and the type of resources budgeted annually by the government for CSOs, and also the coverage and diversity of organisations that really benefit.

3.2.7 Relations Between Civil Society and the Private Sector

This sub-dimension describes the kind of relations that exist between civil society and the private sector. It received a score of 0.8 meaning that relations are indifferent, on the whole. Table 3.2.9 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.

| Table 3.2.9: Indicators for Evaluating Relations with the Private Sector |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Ref. # | Indicators | Score |
| 2.7.1 | Private Sector Attitude | 1 |
| 2.7.2 | Corporate Social Responsibility | 0.5 |
| 2.7.3 | Corporate Philanthropy | 0 |

2.7.1 Private sector attitude. Little has been written on this subject, but the opinion of the businesspersons invited to comment on CSOs is that they could play a more active role in improving the quality of life in communities, but that on the whole they have major limitations in terms of operation and action. Most respondents to the INOSC07 (35%) felt that the private sector’s attitude to civil society one of indifference. Many participants in the regional meetings with interest groups feel that this attitude is reciprocated, meaning that civil society also does not seek to understand and explore possible partnerships with the private sector.
This situation confirms some studies that raise the issue of the difficulty of finding a platform for an alliance or useful partnership between civil society, the government and the private sector so they can be more effective, for example, in activities to fight poverty (Francisco 2005; Fumo, unpublished; Francisco and Matter 2007). Based on this information this indicator received a score of 1.0.

2.7.2 Corporate social responsibility. This indicator addresses the notions and positions of the main private sector companies on their social responsibility. Corporate social responsibility (CSR), which can be defined in its broadest sense as the commitment of companies to take the social and environmental consequences of their activities into account, has grown over the last decade. This is due to increased corporate awareness throughout the world of the importance of operating in an ethical manner both socially and environmentally.

A survey of information was made with the intention of providing input for this indicator and the following one. How well developed are notions of corporate social responsibility in the country? How narrow or broad is the range of CSOs that receive support from the private sector?

The survey was based on secondary information sources that included reports from 2005 and 2006 on eight of Mozambique’s ten biggest companies, in addition to studies and articles relating to corporate social responsibility in Mozambique. The companies were selected using the 2006 edition of the annual report by KPMG on the largest 100 companies in Mozambique.

Specific literature on CSR in Mozambique is rare and unpublished. It suggests, however, that the business environment can only be understood in the light of the country’s history (Mondlane 2007; Fumo 2003). The legacy of colonialism, the post-independence centrally-planned economy in 1975, the market economy from the late 80s, and current legislation have influenced how the business sector functions in Mozambique today. These also influence the social investment tendencies of companies; international/foreign companies, followed by public companies and, to a lesser extent, by national private companies, make most social investment.

The importance given to CSR and the involvement of the business sector has evolved in recent years. This concept was virtually unknown to many companies 6-7 years ago, and most felt they had fulfilled their responsibilities by paying their taxes (Afrisurvey Preliminary Report 2001). In recent years, however, there has been a growing interest in and publicity for social investment actions by companies. For example: a) social investments by companies in Mozambique receive much publicity in the media, b) there have been seminars on the subject promoted by CSOs and private companies, c) a monthly electronic newspaper was recently established on this subject d) in its efforts to reward the biggest companies in Mozambique the consultancy company Ernst & Young has included a prize for the best performance in social investment, and e) specific training programmes, albeit embryonic, are being organised by companies.

Annual reports of 8 of the 10 biggest companies in 2006 contain information about their social investments and link them to the concept of social responsibility.

Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data on this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.
Sometimes the information is included in the annual report and in other cases in specific reports on sustainability. Some companies, mainly the international ones, have a more comprehensive concept of social responsibility, ranging from ethical issues to aspects linked to the domestic public, their partners and suppliers, clients, communities affected by their work, government and society and even environmental aspects. They all compile a separate report on this subject. The reports of the remaining companies interpret social responsibility as their social investment.

Corporate willingness toward social responsibility in Mozambique has grown over time. For companies today, involvement in social development activities is seen as a status symbol. Nevertheless, CSR is undertaken by a small fraction of companies, mainly foreign and large companies. Their interventions have both a philanthropic and patronage perspective. The limited information, an absence of clear mechanisms to facilitate and promote CSR, and limited social pressure are some of the factors that contribute to this situation.

In 1994, pressured by various actors including CSOs, the government of Mozambique passed the Patronage Law permitting tax reductions for companies that donate money to social and cultural development activities. However, the law has never been used extensively for these purposes due to unclear regulations and mechanisms for its application. Consequently, only an insignificant number of companies are currently taking advantage of this law.

Based on this information from the INOSCO7 the indicator received a score of 0.5 reflecting a weak environment and weak corporate social responsibility awareness.

2.7.3 Corporate philanthropy. Until recently, the subject of corporate philanthropy was virtually unknown in the deliberations and concerns of for-profit enterprises. But nowadays more companies want to have a pro-active social attitude in their daily operations.

The limited literature available shows that activities linked to social investment are mainly in the fields of education, health, water and sanitation, food, housing and information technology, and most are concentrated in the areas where these companies operate. Assistance in these fields comprises mainly the supply of infrastructure and assistance when natural disasters occur. Actions that “emancipate” communities are still embryonic.

Most social investments support and/or complement the government’s efforts and are provided directly. In INOSOC07 respondents felt that corporate philanthropy in Mozambique is still insignificant. Involvement with civil society organisations is still minimal. The private sector is still not the main source of funding for CSOs. Nevertheless, a number of partnerships between some companies (usually large ones) and civil society are emerging. Given the fact that a number of CSOs, albeit only a few, receive funds from the private sector, this indicator received a score of 1.0.

3.2.8 Civil Society Relations with Donors

This sub-dimension did not exist in the model initially proposed by CIVICUS. However, the NIT felt it was necessary to recognise and measure the nature of the relationships between civil society and donors. A description of the kind of relations
that exist between civil society and donors is provided, and an average score of 1.3 was given. This means that relations are generally weak, probably because most donor support focuses on the state. Table 3.2.10 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
<td>Aid/External Dependence of CS.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
<td>Dialogue with Donors</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>Cooperation/Donor Support for CS</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.1 Aid/external dependence. This indicator evaluates civil society’s autonomy and dependence on foreign aid. The INE census shows that in 2003 overseas transfers from foreign countries comprised over 70% of all revenue of non-profit institutions. However, as already mentioned in the discussion of the results of the INE census, the revenue is heavily concentrated in a small number of organisations. This means that a minority of CSOs are heavily dependent on external funds, while the vast majority have no access at all to these funds. In this context the score given by the NAG was 0.5, emphasising that there is heavy dependence on foreign resources by those who benefit directly from this aid, but that the aid is insignificant for the majority of CSOs.

2.8.2 Civil Society dialogue with donors. Direct dialogue between civil society and donors is still limited. It should be noted that in this case, the term “donor” is used because the evidence indicates that there is virtually no effective partnership relationship between CSOs and organisations overseas. The relationship is one of an external grant giver and beneficiary who receives in the form of resources or assistance. Recognising the positive dialogue environment, the NAG felt it was reasonable to assign a score of 2.0, i.e., moderately high.

2.8.3 Cooperation between donors and Civil Society. There is an effective partnership relationship between the government and its international partners, but the relationship is virtually non-existent with civil society for the reasons explained by authors such as Francisco and Matter (2007). Donors find it more convenient to focus their support on the state, and also CSOs have no mechanism for relations and effective cooperation. The external cooperation of civil society is still limited. Nevertheless, there seems to be a mutual desire to improve forms of direct collaboration, so a score of 1.5 is proposed for this indicator.

3.2.9 Conclusion on the Environment

The analysis of political, social, economic, cultural and legal factors and the attitudes and behaviour of public and private entities towards civil society lead to the

---

5 Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data on this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.

6 Ditto!
conclusion that the environment dimension score is close to the other three dimensions but is slightly better. The general environment in which Mozambican civil society operates has improved considerably over the last decade, but it still needs to improve much more. The NAG concluded and the national workshop emphasised, that, although the overall environment is not openly hostile, it is also not comfortably sympathetic and favourable.

Overall, civil society does not participate actively in political life. Political competition is aggressive and anti-democratic. The NAG and the national workshop concluded that there is a widespread disregard for the law, considerable ignorance of the main laws, widespread corruption, an inefficient or ineffective bureaucracy, poor decentralisation, and a variety of constraints on the exercise of individual liberties. The legal environment for civil society is unfavourable, notably because the bureaucracy involved in CSO registration is excessive. Advocacy activities are formally permitted, but in practice, there are problems that vary according to region.

There is no evidence of explicit intolerance but there is little tolerance for certain groups. People have a particularly intolerant attitude towards socialising with people who are homosexuals or who are HIV-positive.

However, it must be recognised that public and private institutions are still very underdeveloped, are sharply focussed around polarized political power, and are without mechanisms for the effective representation of citizenship. The political reform process is still much centralised, and the absence of a broad critical mass reduces the citizen’s range of choices and ability to effectively exercise political power. Mozambique continues to act more in accordance with its dependence on international entities than in effective partnership with its own civil society.

Among other factors, the absence of a culture of efficiency, of a decentralised public administration, of transparent and participatory budget execution, and of strong and effective private institutions all restrict effective action by social actors.

This study shows that the relationship between civil society and the state is fragile, lacking in mechanisms for mutual accountability and transparent and effective monitoring. The interaction between civil society and the state is superficial and informal. Indeed, Mozambican society resorts to informality, both as a way of getting around state regulations as well as because public institutions are frequently unable to provide the necessary basic services.

Civil society receives virtually no public funding, and most of what it receives is due to pressure by donors and the state’s international partners. Even then, there are no clear and transparent rules about the modalities of state support for CSOs. Relations are ad hoc informal, and without the clarity of explicit and transparent criteria. The absence of clear, simple and effective mechanisms of operation between civil society organisations, public administration and the government convert the relationship into an informal one, without binding mutual commitments and accountability.

This situation needs be faced and reconsidered in order to establish effective partnership practices between the dynamic national actors in Mozambican civil society, i.e., between CSOs, public sector bodies and the government.

The results of the CSI project suggest that the private sector’s attitude towards civil society is predominantly one of indifference. However, a fair number of participants in the Regional stakeholder consultations with interest groups argued that the
indifference is reciprocated, in that civil society organisations themselves usually do not exploit the potential of partnerships with the private sector.

Corporate social responsibility has evolved over the last decade. This is due to the growing awareness of companies throughout the world of the importance of operating responsibly from an ethical, social and environmental point of view. The good will and actions of corporate social responsibility (CSR) have grown over time in Mozambique. However, for many of the companies currently involved in social development actions, it has become a status symbol. For the time being, CSR is exercised by a tiny fraction of companies, mostly foreign and large ones. In practice these interventions still have a philanthropic and patronage perspective involving a post-profit instrumental approach, because they concentrate more on handing over material support to communities (building schools, houses, etc) than fulfilling their corporate social responsibility (environmental awareness, involvement in social development issues beyond infrastructures).

Until recently, corporate philanthropy was an unknown idea in for-profit companies. Today, more companies appear intent on a proactive social stance. Social investments mainly support or complement those of the government and are done directly. Respondents in this study feel that corporative philanthropy in Mozambique is still insignificant and that its involvement with civil society organisations is still insignificant. The private sector is still not a main source of funds for CSOs, although domestically it is the main sector, much more important than the public sector. Nevertheless, a number of partnerships are emerging between some large companies and larger civil society organisations working in the social sector.

Finally, the study recognises that there is reasonable dialogue between civil society, donors and international organisations. However, there is a body of evidence that shows donors lack confidence in the capacity of most civil society organisations. The weak organisational and leadership capacity of most CSOs discredits them in the eyes of donors who decide that it is more useful to concentrate their support on public and government entities. In many aspects, the relationship between CSOs and donors is still not very effective and this is not due only to the weakness of CSOs. As donors have virtually total control over the resources (financial and technical), in practice this gives them enormous power. The promised grants and assistance often do not take place with the expected and promised effectiveness and efficiency. This also contributes to a discrediting of CSOs in the eyes of the members and communities with whom they have taken on commitments.
VALUES

Figure 3.3 Sub-Dimensions and Indicators of CSI Values

1. Structure
2. Environment
   - 3.1. Democracy
     - 3.1.1. Democratic practices within CSOs
     - 3.1.2. CS actions to promote democracy
   - 3.2. Transparency
     - 3.2.1. Corruption within civil society
     - 3.2.2. Financial transparency of CSOs
     - 3.2.3. CS actions to promote transparency
   - 3.3. Tolerance
     - 3.3.1. Tolerance within CS arena
     - 3.3.2. CS actions to promote tolerance
3. Values
   - 3.4. Non-violence
     - 3.4.1. Non-violence within the CS arena
     - 3.4.2. CS actions to promote non-violence and peace
   - 3.5. Gender equity
     - 3.5.1. Gender equity within the CS arena
     - 3.5.2. Gender equitable practices within CSOs
     - 3.5.3. CS actions to promote gender equity
   - 3.6. Poverty eradication
     - 3.6.1. CS actions to eradicate poverty
   - 3.7. Environmental Sustainability
     - 3.7.1. CS actions to sustain the environment
   - 3.8. Equity in Diversity
     - 3.8.1. Equity in diversity within CS
     - 3.8.2. Actions for diversity within CS
     - 3.8.3. CS actions for diversity
3.3 VALUES

The aggregate score for the values dimension shows that civil society in Mozambique has invested very little in promoting and practicing positive values, other than the eradication of poverty, which received a score of 2.0. The sub-dimensions of tolerance and non-violence also have an average score.

However, the transparency, gender equity and equity in diversity indicators have a score of less than 1.0. The democracy and environmental sustainability indicators are also low, with a score of 1.0 each.

![Figure 3.3.1: Scores of Sub-dimensions of the Values Dimension in the Civil Society Index, Mozambique 2007](image)

3.3.1 Democracy

This sub-dimension examines how Mozambican civil society actors practice and promote democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Democratic practices within CSOs</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>CS actions to promote democracy</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1 Democratic practices within CSOs. CIVICUS suggests that the degree of democracy within CSOs can be assessed by considering how their leaders are selected and how much influence members have in the decision-making process. Regarding methods for selecting leaders, INOS07 data shows that 72% of organisations select their leaders through elections among members, while 21% of leaders are appointed and 6% are chosen by self-selection. On the other hand, about 63% of the organisations consulted are of the opinion that the influence of ordinary members in decision-making is substantial, while 28% classified it as moderate.

This evidence of some internal democracy needs to be qualified better. INOSC07 has other indications of fragile internal democracy. For example, over 80% of the CSOs surveyed revealed that they have no collective code of conduct or other forms of self-regulation.

3.1.2 Civil Society actions to promote democracy. When asked about examples of campaigns, actions or programmes dedicated to promoting democracy the previous
year, most of the CSOs surveyed (38%) said they could not recall any concrete example; 34% could recall one or two examples, 23% various examples and only 4% many examples.

To some extent this perception contradicts the reply of the CSOs studied when they were asked how they evaluate the current role of civil society in promoting democracy in Mozambican society. About 39% answered that it has a significant role, 27% a moderate role, 25% limited and 10% an insignificant role.

As it was impossible to study this subject in more detail in the stakeholder survey, doubts remain about the participation issue. Past studies show that levels of participation and actions for democracy are blurred. It depends very much on assumptions, individual expectations and points of reference (Francisco & Matter 2007; Oya 2005; Afrobarometer 2003; 2005).

### 3.3.2 Transparency

This sub-dimension examines to what extent Mozambican civil society actors practice and promote transparency. It obtained a score of 0.7. Table 3.3.2 summarises the score for each indicator.

| Table 3.3.2: Indicators for Evaluating Transparency |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ref. # | Indicators | Score |
| 3.2.1 | Corruption within civil society | 1.0 |
| 3.2.2 | Financial transparency of CSOs | 0.5 |
| 3.2.3 | CS actions to promote transparency | 0.5 |

#### 3.2.1 Corruption within Civil Society.

It is not easy to evaluate the degree of corruption in civil society in general, as wide varieties of organisations are covered by the definition of civil society used here. However, most of the CSOs surveyed feel
that corruption is very frequent within civil society organisations (33%), or frequent (27%), while 27% thought it was occasional and 13% very rare.

Various participants in the NAG emphasized the feeling that corruption has become a culture. Indeed, one of the dominant themes in the press, especially the independent press, has been to denounce what an editorial in the Semanário Magazine called “the culture of stealing everything!” (29.08.2007, p.7).

### 3.2.2 Financial transparency of CSOs

This indicator was used to assess the percentage of CSOs that publish their financial situation. A third of the organisations stated that they make their accounts publicly available. This means that at least two-thirds make no effort to comply with public financial transparency practices.

### 3.2.3 Civil Society actions to promote state and corporate transparency

The INOSC07 provided revealing data on CSO perceptions of civil society’s efforts to promote transparency in the public sector, namely the government. Roughly 50% of respondents could not recall any example of a public campaign, action or programme organised the previous year by civil society and dedicated to promoting transparency in government.

Opinions were divided about the current role of civil society in promoting transparency with 22% reporting that it is insignificant, and 25% reporting that it is significant; 32% stated that it is limited compared to 22% who felt it was moderate. In general, the prevailing opinion (about one-third) is that campaigns on transparency are insignificant.

---

7 Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data on this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.

8 Ibid
Examples of transparency are even more absent in the case of private companies. Over 70% of respondents could not recall any example of campaigns or programmes aimed at corporate transparency, and the majority (36%) considers that the role of civil society in promoting corporate transparency is insignificant.

### 3.3.3 Tolerance

This sub-dimension examines the degree of tolerance practiced by Mozambican civil society actors and organisations and the extent to which they are engaged in promoting tolerance. Table 3.3.3 summarises the score for each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Tolerance within the CS arena</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>CS actions to promote tolerance</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1 Tolerance within Civil Society. Forty-seven percent of respondents feel that the role of intolerant forces (racist, discriminatory or other) is insignificant. However, the proportion of people who feel there are many examples of intolerance (21%), or various types (21%), or one or two examples (21%) cannot be ignored. Most respondents (34%) feel that intolerant forces are completely isolated and strongly denounced within civil society, or that they are marginalised actors in civil society (19%). But a significant number of people think that these forces are dominant (26%) or are important actors (21%).

![Figure 3.3.6: Existence of Intolerant Forces in Civil Society, Mozambique 2007](image)

![Figure 3.3.7: Role of Intolerant Forces in Civil Society, Mozambique 2007](image)

3.3.2 CS actions to promote tolerance. As regards actions to promote tolerance, 63% of respondents were unable to recall any example of campaigns, actions or concrete programmes the previous year. However, in the assessment of the current role of civil society in promoting tolerance within society, respondents acknowledged more action than the previous question suggests. Nevertheless, the multiple cross references of the
two questions clearly suggests a perception that CSO action has a weak role in the promotion of tolerance.

### 3.3.4 Non-Violence

This sub-dimension describes the practice and actions of Mozambican civil society actors to promote non-violence. Table 3.3.4 summarises the score of the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Non-violence within CS</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Actions by CS to promote non-violence and peace</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4.1 Non-Violence within Civil Society

How widespread is the use of violence, including damage to property and personal violence, within civil society? Most CSOs that replied to the survey stated that the use of violence by certain groups is extremely rare (49%), while 27% of respondents felt that violence is used in isolated cases, and 18% felt that some isolated groups regularly use violence.

#### 3.4.2 CS Actions to promote non-violence and peace

There is every indication that violence as a way of resolving problems is no longer common in Mozambique. This is a good sign in a country that, up to a decade and a half ago, was smarting from 16 years of a tragic experience of armed violence by parties or civil society citizens (supported by military forces from neighbouring countries) as a way of imposing a different ideology or policies to Mozambican society.

The CSOs surveyed were divided over concrete examples of recent civil society campaigns, actions or programmes dedicated to promoting non-violence and/or peaceful solutions. A third of respondents said they could recall one or two examples, 29% could not recall any and 27% stated that they could recall various examples. As
regards the current role of civil society in promoting non-violence and/or the search for solutions to conflicts within society, about 46% of the CSOs surveyed said that it is important, 20% moderate, 19% limited and 15% insignificant.

Based on this information, it can be concluded that a number of civil society activities can be identified in this area. However, it seems that these activities are not sufficiently visible or do not have a sufficiently broad support base.

### 3.3.5 Gender Equity

This sub-dimension describes the practice and level of activity to promote gender equity in Mozambican society and received a score of 0.7. Table 3.3.5 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>Gender equity within CSOs</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>Gender equity practices within CSOs</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3</td>
<td>CS actions to promote gender equity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1 Gender equity. One of the CIVICUS reference criteria for evaluating gender equity in CSOs is the proportion of women on CSO paid staff. Figure 3.3.9 shows that the gender imbalance in CSOs is substantial. The INE census of non-profit organisations (2006:61) found that human resources in CSOs are mainly men (63%), but the proportion is very different for different kinds of human resources. Men are much more common among paid workers (76%) and the clergy (77%) and relatively less so among volunteers. These statistics are corroborated by the perceptions of respondents in the INOSC07. Suffice it to say that only a quarter of respondents were women, compared to almost 75% men.

![Figure 3.3.9: Equity Practice in OSC's, Mozambique ISC2007](image)
3.5.2 Gender equity practices within Civil Society. According to INOSC07, over 65% of the organisations have no written policy on equality of opportunity and/or equity in salary or work between men and women. Consequently, only one-third of the organisations seem to have an internal gender equity policy on work opportunities. The figure below shows that there have been no denunciations of sexist practices in civil society.

![Figure 3.3.10: Frequency of Denunciation of Sexist Practices in Civil Society, Mozambique 2007](image)

3.5.3 CS Actions to promote gender equity. About 26% of respondents could not recall any example of public campaigns, actions or programmes by civil society to promote gender equity during the previous year. Over 50% of the CSOs evaluate the current role of civil society in promoting gender equity in society positively.

3.3.6 Poverty Eradication

This sub-dimension describes the engagement of Mozambican actors and CSOs in promoting poverty reduction, and received a score of 2.0, a moderate level. Table 3.3.6 presents the score of the only indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>CS actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.1 CS Actions eradicate of poverty. Interest in reducing poverty in the broad sense of better living conditions, advocacy and improved well-being is one of the main factors in the actions of Mozambican CSOs. Almost 60% of IOSC07 respondents could recall one, two or various examples of civil society public campaigns, actions or programmes dedicated to eradicating poverty during the previous year. However, it should be noted that just 18% of respondents felt that civil society took “significant”
action toward reducing poverty, while a slightly higher percentage (22%) felt there was no example of visible action.

This relative dissatisfaction can perhaps be explained by the widespread destitution in Mozambican society. The ordinary citizen has a clear idea of the hierarchy of his/her main problems. The main problems are economic, such as unemployment, poverty, hunger, low wages and limited access to water (see Figure 3.3.11).

Although CSOs have tried to and strive to continue to address people’s daily needs, the fact that people think that not enough is being done comes as no surprise. Given this assessment of the indicator under analysis, a score of 1.0 was given, not for lack of motivation for fighting poverty, but rather because of the limited effectiveness.

### 3.3.7 Environmental Sustainability

This sub-dimension analyses the activities of Mozambican civil society actors in the field of environmental sustainability. It received a score of 1.0, meaning that only some activities are carried out by CSOs. Table 3.3.7 presents the score for the only indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7.1</td>
<td>CS actions to sustain the environment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.1 CS actions to sustain the environment There are various organisations and activists in Mozambique promoting environmental conservation and sustainability. In some instances, these organisations express publicly their concern about the management of natural resources, as happened recently with the controversy over the uncontrolled felling of forests.
The opinion of INC07 respondents on environmental action by CSOs is, on the whole, positive with over 70% saying that they could recall “one or two examples” (42%) and “various examples” (30%) of actions dedicated to protecting the environment. Equally, the assessment of the current “important” role of civil society in protecting the environment was also strong (42%) compared to 15% who said it was insignificant.

Given this assessment of the environmental indicator, as in the case of the indicator on poverty eradication, the decision to give a score of 1.0 is related to relatively limited effectiveness rather than to a lack of motivation or action.

### 3.3.8 Equity in Diversity

The NIT thought it would be useful to add a new sub-dimension not foreseen in the initial CIVICUS model to describe the promotion of equity in the diverse Mozambican society, similar to the kind of equity considered and decided between men and women. In this case, the issue of equity in diversity includes aspects of ethnic, regional, and racial issues and cultural or moral preferences. The average score was 0.8. Table 3.3.2 summarises the score of the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>Equity in diversity (ethnic, regional, racial, religious)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>CSO equity in diversity practices</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>SC actions to promote equity in diversity</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.8.1 Equity in diversity in CS. The term diversity can refer to many situations, such as fairness toward and inclusion of minority ethnic, racial, homosexual or religious groups. In daily life, there are various manifestations and references distinguishing the “Other”, some more inoffensive than others, but all expressing specific attitudes towards the difference. For example, the term “xingondo” refers to the “stranger/outsider”, the “other one”. As Mia Couto says in his comments in the book by Daniel da Costa (2003) entitled “Xingongo”, Mozambique is a nation that is the result of successive cultural mixes and exchange dynamics such that the “xingondo” of today is incorporated and becomes something that tomorrow will become part of our “mozambicanicity.” Whether or not Mozambique is “a country where we are all xingondos” (Couto, 2003) only time will tell. For the time being, the perception that emerges from both the civil society surveys and the debates during this research is that minorities are absent or very marginalised in the CS arena.

#### 3.8.2 CS equity in diversity practices. Based on the available sources and debates, the research team estimates that only a minority of CSOs have any kind of clear and explicit policy on the subject of equity in diversity.

---

9 Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data on this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.
3.8.3 CS Actions to promote diversity. The research team feels that a small number of actions of a cultural and social nature are directed towards promoting equity in diversity within society, a subject that should receive more attention in future analyses and reflections.

3.3.9 Conclusion on Values

Overall, the score of 1.1 obtained in this study suggests that Mozambican civil society neither practices nor promotes positive values effectively. The biggest weaknesses identified among the eight sub-dimensions lie in the issues of transparency, gender equity and equity in diversity. In the national workshop the following were identified as causes of weak democracy: 1) manipulation by political parties, especially in pre-election periods, 2) weak coordination among social actors; 3) widespread poverty; 4) absence of regular assembly meetings or other deliberative meetings. The following reasons for weak transparency were highlighted: 1) lack of a culture of accountability; 2) poor communication; 3) limited knowledge of statutes and legislation in general. The low level of transparency seen in CSOs is particularly important, as the notion of transparency is strongly associated with the norms and values in society. Organisational development of CSOs based on transparency criteria could contribute to the establishment of solid and dynamic values. In general, there is no systematic and comprehensive work to promote values that resist corruption and the absence of responsibility and accountability. Moreover, the expressions of an intolerant and violent society seem to be due to lack of trust between public authorities or the leadership of organisations and citizens or the associative mass. There are also conflicts of interest.

Despite many declarations of their commitment to fighting poverty, doubts reign on whether CSOs and other actors in society are really creating the institutional foundations for sustainable poverty reduction. Up to now, CSOs involvement in strategies to fight poverty has been mainly as observers, opinion givers and circumstantial allies, as in the case of the debt relief campaign. Nevertheless, it is not realistic to conclude from this participation that CSOs are real partners of the government and its allies and international donors. As Francisco and Matter (2007) argue, partnership in the real sense only exists between the government and donors or other international actors.

Both the NAG and the national workshop felt that the eight sub-dimensions that make up the Values dimension need priority attention by Mozambican CSOs. There is a strong feeling that citizens are carrying out multiple poverty reduction actions. In fact, this sub-dimension has the best score; it is the only sub-dimension with a score of 2.0, that is, moderately high. There is no clear idea about the prospects for the long-term sustainability of poverty reduction efforts as this was not studied in depth by this project. However, data and information collected lead us to conclude that any improvement in the structure and environment in which CSOs exist needs to be accompanied by progress in addressing the values of participatory democracy, transparency, tolerance, non-violence, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, equity in gender, and in ethical, cultural and social diversity.
Figure 3.4: Sub-dimensions and Indicators of Impact in CSI

1. Structure
2. Environment
3. Values

- 4.1. Influencing Public Policy
  - 4.1.1. Impact on human rights
  - 4.1.2. Impact on social policies
  - 4.1.3. Impact on financial policies
- 4.2. Holding state and private corporations accountable
  - 4.2.1. Holding state accountable
  - 4.2.2. Holding private corporations accountable
- 4.3. Responding to social interests
  - 4.3.1 Responsibility
  - 4.3.2 Public Trust
- 4.4. Empowering citizens
  - 4.4.1. Informing/educating citizens
  - 4.4.2. Building capacity for collective action
  - 4.4.3. Empowering marginalised groups
  - 4.4.4. Empowering women
  - 4.4.5. Building social capital
  - 4.4.6. Supporting livelihoods
- 4.5. Meeting societal needs
  - 4.5.1 Lobbying for state service provision
  - 4.5.2 Meeting pressing societal needs directly
  - 4.5.3 Meeting needs of marginalised groups
3.4. IMPACT

This section describes and analyses the effectiveness of civil society in its influence and impact on a variety of areas. The score obtained in the Impact dimension is 1.0. This corresponds to the border between weak and moderate in the function of citizen’s control over the state (accountability) and private companies.

Figure 3.4.1 details the scores of the 5 sub-dimensions and the 16 indicators of the Impact dimension. Because of the weak structure, limited environment and limited values, Mozambican civil society inevitably has a limited contribution to and impact on governance and, in general, the fundamental issues of the development of Mozambique.

| Figure 3.4.1: Sub-dimensions for Impact Dimension In the Civil Society Index, Mozambique 2007 |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| 4.1 Influencing public policies               | 1.2      |
| 4.2 State and Corporate Accountability        | 0.5      |
| 4.3 Responding to social interests             | 1.0      |
| 4.4 Empowering citizens                        | 0.8      |
| 4.5 Meeting societal needs                     | 1.3      |

3.4.1 Influencing Public Policies

This sub-dimension describes the level of activity and success achieved by civil society in terms of its influence on public policies. It received a score of 1.2, meaning limited influence.

The assessment of evidence on the involvement and effectiveness of civil society in the proposed areas was based on responses to the surveys and on case studies identified in secondary literature that provide evidence of the impact of certain civil society initiatives or interventions. Table 3.4.1 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.
Civil society influence over the main public policies has been a source of growing concern, at least in some CSOs and among some independent analysts. INOSC07 shows that dynamism and the perception of the successful effectiveness of CSOs depend on the arenas of action.

4.1.1 Civil Society impact on influencing human rights arena. Most of the respondents interviewed for the INOSC07 feel that civil society has been moderately successful in the field of human rights (41%), or not very active (26%). About 23% think that there is a lot of active influence and only 10% consider it to be inactive.

As regards civil society’s influence in the human rights field, the graph shows that 38% think there has been little success, 34% feel it has been satisfactory, 16% high and 12% no impact.

4.1.2 Civil Society impact on public social policies. Roughly two-thirds of the people interviewed during the INOSC07 feel that civil society has been slightly or moderately active in the social policy field, while 21% think it has been very active and 11% inactive. As regards civil society’s influence in the social policy field, the perception of most respondents oscillates between “slight success” (37%) and “satisfactory success” (38%). Both “very successful” and “no success” received an equal percentage, 12% each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4.1: Indicators for evaluating influence on public policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ref. #</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 3.4.2: Perception of CS Activism and Success in Influencing the Human Rights Arena, Mozambique 2007

- Not active at all: 9.3%
- Active to a limited extent: 26.2%
- Quite active: 40.3%
- Very active: 23.2%

- No impact at all: 12.2%
- Limited impact: 37.8%
- Moderate: 34.4%
- Significant: 15.6%
4.1.3 Civil Society impact on public financial policies. The financial policy field produces the biggest dissatisfaction with regard to both CSO activism and the degree of successful influence over decisions on public financial policies. Roughly 38% of the people interviewed feel that civil society has not been very active, 27% feel it has been moderately active and only 8% acknowledge strong activism, compared to 27% who think that CSOs are inactive. Most respondents rate civil society influence in the field of financial policies as weak, followed by “no success” (31%), 18% “moderate impact” and less than 10% “significant impact”.

Figure 3.4.3: Perception of CS Activism and Success in Influencing the Social Policy Arena, 2007

Figure 3.4.4: Perception of CS Activism and Success in Influencing the Financial Policy Arena, 2007
3.4.2 Holding State and Private Corporations Accountable

This sub-dimension analyses civil society’s activity and success in holding the state and private corporations accountable. It received a score of 0.5, indicating limited capacity to achieve these objectives. Table 3.4.2 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Holding the State Accountable</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Holding Private Corporations Accountable</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 Holding the state accountable. Control over public expenditure recorded no (24%) or little (36%) activism by civil society. There are isolated voices, of both CSOs and analysts or some independent media, but judging by the perceptions of most of the CSOs who responded to INOSC07, actions were unsuccessful (34%) or had limited success (47%). NAG stressed that the state treats CSOs as an extension of itself or as an auxiliary, leading to a dependency that does not aid effective monitoring or the holding of members of the public administration and the government accountable.

4.2.2 Holding private corporations accountable. Perceptions on the accountability of private corporations are identical to the previous case. Corporate accountability has seen no (25%) or little (44%) activism by civil society. There has been some action, but CSO perception of the weak success of civil society influence is well illustrated in the following chart, where 32% of respondents feel there has been no success, 50% limited impact, 12% satisfactory and only 6% good impact. In this case, CSOs awareness about monitoring and holding private companies accountable is even weaker than in relation to the state. There is a fear of holding private companies accountable because of possible reprisals. The request for accountable behaviour on
the part of private companies often does not strengthen discipline, support for the company’s productivity or improvements in the quality of its products. There is no balance between what is demanded of companies so that they contribute to the economy and the support they receive in order to increase their production. One example of this is widespread theft at all levels (electric cables, copper, company materials etc.). CSOs show little interest in this kind of issue, related to the quality, morals and functioning of society in general.

3.4.3 Responding to Social Concerns

This sub-dimension analyses the responsiveness of civil society to social concerns. It received a score of 1.0, indicating capacity well below average, and for this reason a satisfactory response to the emerging demand in society. Table 3.4.3 summarises the scores of the respective indicators.

| Table 3.4.3: Indicators for evaluating responsiveness to social concerns |
|---|---|---|
| Ref. # | Indicators | Score |
| 4.3.1 | Responsiveness | 1.0 |
| 4.3.2 | Public Trust | 1.0 |

4.3.1 Responsiveness. This indicator measures the effectiveness of civil society actors’ response to social problems that the population feels are a priority. Past surveys, such as one by Luis de Brito, et al. (2005) shows that the population has a well-established sense of priorities.

Unemployment, poverty, hunger and wages have much higher priority than the issues that receive the attention of public discourse, such as corruption, AIDS and infrastructure. How is this sense of priority reflected in the CSO respondents’ perceptions of their responsiveness? Roughly 57% of respondents said they could not recall examples of civil society lobbying the government in order to obtain public services for the population.
In cases where there was action, 62% of respondents said that lobbying the government had been “unsuccessful” (7%) or had some success (55%), compared to 25% “successful” and 13% “extremely successful”.

4.3.2 Public trust. Public trust in institutions and political leaders is falling, as is expressed, for example, in the electoral vote, which has fallen from election to election between 1994 and 2004.

The recent electoral registration process did not show any improvement in the ordinary citizen’s enthusiasm and confidence in electoral bodies. The dominance of informality in society can be seen as an expression of the state’s difficulty in involving the ordinary citizen in formal mechanisms through services and forms of useful engagement.
The UTRESP study on governance and corruption also gathered concrete evidence about the specific entities in which people have little confidence; they included the justice system and the police.

Some NAG members expressed their concern over examples of rigidity, growing confusion between the state and the party in power, comments on forms of intimidation and the use of psychological pressure for election registration or, in the districts, for certain party actions.

### 3.4.4 Empowering Citizens

This sub-dimension analyses civil society’s capacity to strengthen the capabilities of citizens. It received a score of 0.8, indicating weak empowerment capacity. Table 3.4.4 summarises the score for the respective indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>Informing and Educating Citizens</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2</td>
<td>Building Capacity for Collective Action</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.3</td>
<td>Empowering Marginalised Groups</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.4</td>
<td>Empowering Women</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.5</td>
<td>Building Social Capital</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.6</td>
<td>Supporting Livelihoods</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.1 Informing and educating citizens.** The people interviewed during the INOSC07 see CSOs as active (43%) in promoting citizen information and education and acknowledge satisfactory (39%) or even good success (23%). NAG members however, maintained that a more critical analysis of information and education for the citizen was needed. They argued that educational activities are limited, with a weak impact and weak quality criteria. Substantive and useful information on citizenship for the citizen barely exists. There is a greater but sporadic effort during election campaigns, but this effort is influenced by the specific interests of politicians rather than a genuine concern to respond to the population’s concerns. Based on these critical considerations the NAG decided to give a score of 0.5. This means that the consequences of civil society activities in this field are either not felt or only minimally so.

**4.4.2 Building capacity for collective action.** The INOSC07 respondents also felt that civil society activism to develop the capacity of local communities was satisfactory (38%), good (26%) and limited (31%). Perceptions of the success of this action are also positive (42%), although responses indicating weak success or no success totalled 35%.

As in the case of the previous indicator, despite receiving a higher score (1.0) the NAG felt that CSO activism to build the capacity of local communities might appear positive, but in practice it has had little effect and minimal impact. As an example, it

---

10 Please note that the CSI methodology does not provide for midpoint scores. However, given the contestable nature of the data on this indicator, NAG decided to use a midpoint score.
emphasised the fact that CSOs have been unable to take political advantage of election registration to conduct campaigns, or even to lobby, so that the voting card can serve for something other than just voting during elections. Such an expensive effort as the distribution of voting cards was never done for the Identity Card which, in practical terms and in terms of citizenship, can be much more useful for the citizen. Unfortunately, the CSOs did not know how to take advantage of this opportunity to try to create a capacity building instrument for collective actions that benefit the citizen.

4.4.3 Empowering marginalised groups. The majority (57%) of respondents said they could recall a least one specific example of civil society providing services to the population in general. However, this is not the case for specific marginal groups, especially minorities, who continue to be barely visible in CSO priorities. Although the respondents recognised satisfactory success in the services provided, the NAG gave a score of 0.0 for this indicator because of the weak empowerment of marginal and underprivileged groups in Mozambican society.

4.4.4 Empowering Women. This indicator seeks to measure how civil society has been able to empower women in terms of autonomy and capacity to materialize and control their choices. Respondents feel that women are increasingly active in formal and, more especially, informal ways. However, as the above data reveal, there is a major gender imbalance in access to CSOs. In some meetings examples were given of innumerable cases where, instead of protection, widowhood has placed women in a very precarious situation caused by their late husband’s family.

Mechanisms whereby civil society can monitor and influence observance of the innumerable resolutions and programmes aimed at empowering women are minimal. Women continue to have fewer job opportunities.

4.4.5 Building social capital. This indicator observes how civil society helps improve mutual trust. There is still little qualitative or statistical data. The NAG gave a score of 1.0. It corresponds to the CIVICUS scoring criteria that civil society does not make an effective contribution to building the social capital of Mozambican society.
4.4.6 Supporting livelihoods. This indicator measures the dynamism of civil society in creating and supporting the creation of employment and income generation opportunities, especially for young people and women. Based on the INE census and evidence gathered during the research, it was found that the CSOs have little capacity to promote income generation activities. Indeed, most CSOs concentrate on non-productive services, imitating state bodies or responding to the priorities of donors and international organisations that are mainly directed at the social assistance sector and non-productive services. For this reason, NAG decided on a score of 1.0 which, according to the classification matrix, corresponds to a situation where civil society activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernable impact.

3.4.5 Meeting Societal Needs

This sub-dimension examines civil society activity and success in meeting the urgent needs of the population. It received a score of 1.3, corresponding to weak response capacity. Table 3.4.5 summarises the respective indicator scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>Lobbying for state service provision</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2</td>
<td>Meeting pressing societal needs directly</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3</td>
<td>Meeting needs of marginalised groups</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Lobbying for state service provision. There is still a strong, centralised state culture in Mozambique that, directly or indirectly, impedes people’s participation and active initiatives to resolve emerging social needs. The option of liberal policies to promote a market economy has been used as a subterfuge and justification for the state to shed many of the social functions that it should carry out, maintain or even reinforce. Privatisation options for public services are also used as an excuse for the state not getting involved.

Various NAG members emphasised that, in practice, the privatization of state services only results in transferring the state’s monopoly power to one or another private entity. Nevertheless, the NAG also recognised the state’s effort to find effective ways of guaranteeing stability, both political and financial. In this case, the government’s efforts to achieve budget stability and creating good articulation with international partners, was explicitly recognised by the NAG. Precisely because of this positive effort, the NAG decided to increase the initial classification from 1.0 to 2.0.

4.5.2 Meeting pressing societal needs directly. The evidence available in this report shows that the most urgent needs of Mozambicans gravitate around the lack of sources of income and their standard of living. However, as already noted, the NAG emphasized yet again that the fact that most CSOs do not deal with employment promotion makes their relevance questionable. Moreover, the NAG felt that it was essential that CSOs play a more active role and make every effort to make public administration improve its performance and service for the citizen. Once again, the example mentioned above of CSOs lobbying parties with parliamentary seats about a
voting card that could be used for many different purposes not just the electoral act and would thus be more useful for the citizen was also mentioned here.

However, the NAG also recognised that on some occasions in the past CSOs were able to have an impact on the international community, in particular with regard to debt forgiveness. According to some analysts, their monitoring of how the resources saved were being used seems to have been less effective (Hodges and Tibana; Administrative Court 2005, 2006, 2007). For these contradictory reasons the NAG has given a score of 2.0. In other words, civil society exists but its impact is limited, occasional or sporadic.

4.5.3 Response to the needs of marginalised groups. This indicator tries to evaluate whether, when compared to the state, CSOs are more or less effective in providing services to marginalised groups. At a glance, it seems unreasonable to compare the effectiveness of CSOs with that of the state, as CSOs have many fewer resources than the state, especially given that the state can mobilize resources from society and also from overseas. Indeed, one could even say that civil society entrusts resources to the state (direct and indirect taxes) so that the state can provide assistance to marginal and more vulnerable groups. However, effectiveness does not depend only on available resources. The option for criteria of excellence, discipline and commitment are indicators of effectiveness depend not just on material and financial resources. And in this respect the available evidence suggests that CSOs are less effective than the state, thereby justifying a score of zero.

3.4.6 Conclusion on Impact

As emphasised at the beginning of this section, the weaknesses in Structure, Environment and Values dimensions inevitably mean that Mozambican civil society has a limited impact on governance and in general on fundamental issues for the development of Mozambique. The main obstacles to more efficient and effective action by CSOs can be seen in the sub-dimensions on holding the state and corporations accountable, weak empowerment of the citizen and weak CSO advocacy and lobbying capacity. Public confidence in CSOs is weak. As such, CSOs have an extremely limited role in promoting the growth of social capital at grassroots, community and district levels. In practice, CSOs contribute little to promoting the social capital of the Mozambican population.

Despite the similarity in the scores of the four dimensions, the Impact dimension has the lowest score. It would be strange and suspect if this were not the case. Directly or indirectly, the impact of civil society depends on the state of the other dimensions. In past decades civil society in Mozambique passed through various phases. Some analysts, such as Negrao (2003), argue that CSO influence on public policies has been substantial, as representatives of civil society have been called to participate in events such as the election of the Chair of the National Election Commission, or in Poverty Observatory, or in national campaigns (the debt campaign, for example). However, other authors argue that CSO participation and involvement is insufficient, at times merely a convenience to legitimise circumstantial policies; it does not involve the real empowerment of civil society. According to this latter argument, the space provided to civil society needs to give way to effective partnerships, to the real empowerment
of society, transferring state accountability to donors to state accountability to society through a pro-active, efficient, effective and competent Parliament. (Francisco & Matte 2007; Hodges & Tibana 2005; Macamo 2006; Mosse, 2007).
4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our analysis, the CSI Project 2007 in Mozambique concluded that overall, the four dimensions of Mozambican civil society, Structure, Environment, Values and Impact, are weak. A summary of major strengths and weaknesses of Mozambican civil society is given below.

4.1. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF MOZAMBIAN CIVIL SOCIETY

4.1.1 Main Strengths of the Mozambican Civil Society, 2007

Annex 4 shows that at least 21 indicators have a score equal to or above the average of 1.5. In the Structure dimension of the CSI five indicators are the strongest: charitable giving and volunteering, geographical distribution of CSOs, effectiveness of management bodies of CSO federations or networks and communication among CSOs. In the civil society Environment dimension, the level of political competition, the right to information, press freedom, tolerance, public awareness and dialogue with donors received scores of 2.0. The Values dimension had an above-average score in four areas: tolerance within civil society, non-violence in civil society, actions against poverty and equity in diversity within civil society. As regards Impact, the indicators with above-average scores were those for social policies, lobbying for better state services and meeting societal needs. Other indicators also have a score around 1.5.

4.1.2 Main Weaknesses of the Mozambican Civil Society, 2007

Annex 4 also contains the scores for frail and even very weak areas. Of the 21 indicators for Structure, 5 received a score of zero: 1.1.3) Percentage of people belonging to CSOs; 1.2.3) percentage of people belonging to more than one CSO; 1.4.1) Percentage of CSOs in federations or networks; 1.4.4) Level of support infrastructure for civil society; 1.4.5) Proportion of CSOs with international linkages.

In the Environment dimension, two of the 26 indicators had a score of zero: 2.1.4) corruption in the public sector and 2.6.3) state support in the form of resources for civil society. Two of the 17 indicators for the Values dimension had a zero score: 3.5.2) Effective gender equity practices in civil society; 3.8.3) actions to promote diversity in civil society. Two of the 16 indicators for the Impact dimension had a zero score: 4.2.2) CSO capacity to hold corporations accountable and 4.5.3) Effective response to the immediate needs of marginalised groups.

Obviously, some scores might not be readily understood without a thorough reading of the explanation for the scores. Some appear counter-intuitive and others simply surprising. The explanations will have to be read and the methodology’s criteria matrix taken into account. As regards the other areas with scores above zero but below the average, Annex 4 contains numerical details and an explanation. In order to use the CSI evaluation to produce guidelines and future actions, a national workshop attended by almost 250 participants was held. In addition, the NIT had some smaller technical meetings to analyse the results of the study and to identify the main recommendations. These recommendations are outlined in the next section.
4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The CSO study’s general recommendations arising from group discussions during the national workshop can be summarised in five main points.

4.2.1 General Recommendations

The representatives of Mozambican civil society present in the workshop recognised the need to:

1) Establish a code of conduct for civil society that enables it to promote democracy and transparency in its actions;

2) Consolidate existing spaces and mechanisms for coordinating and financing the interventions of CSOs at all levels of society;

3) Build CSO technical and knowledge capacity to improve the use of policies and laws and the spaces already provided by the state, the private sector and the international community, and to improve their actions with communities;

4) Improve CSO knowledge, promoting continuous research that could influence and better inform their actions, based on evidence; and

5) Have periodic Civil Society Index study.

4.2.2 Specific Recommendations for Each Dimension

Given time limitations, the national workshop participants agreed that concrete recommendations should be prepared later by NIT and other interested parties. Consequently, the CSI Coordination Team and the workshop facilitators met to draft relevant and more specific recommendations. The recommendations were organised by study dimension in order to visualise how to improve the index score of each one. The set of recommendations makes it possible to contribute to improving the participation and involvement of civil society in the country’s social and economic change processes.

4.2.2.1 Recommendations on the Structure Dimension

The structure of civil society measured the citizen’s involvement in the country’s social and political affairs, and also how CSOs are organised. As the final score was 1.1, a relatively weak structure, the following is recommended:

- Civil society organisations should encourage citizens to exercise their citizenship more by getting involved in social and political affairs, such as supporting poor and/or vulnerable communities, exercising their constitutional and human rights and also fulfilling their civic duties;

- Organisations that are large in terms of financial and human capacity as well as geographical coverage should seek ways of providing funds, resources and assistance to less able ones. This could be done in two complementary ways: i) establishing a coordination mechanism for building capacity in specific areas that improves their social and political interventions: ii) using the same mechanism to coordinate the decentralisation of funds, human resources and knowledge among the organisations.
• Established CSO fora and networks should try to implement their mission of coordinating actions, actively and effectively sharing information relevant to interventions and also space for peer review within civil society;

• Civil Society Organisations should become increasingly political (in the sense that they get involved in promoting the citizen’s political participation) and at the same time less “partisan” (they should avoid being exposed to political manipulation by political parties);

• Organisations that manage big grants should demystify and simplify the rules for grantees that acquire and manage their funds. The system and regulations for grants for small organisations should be improved using the experience of micro-credit grants;

• There is an urgent need for organisations with large programmes and large geographical spread to specialise in specific subjects in order to maximise the use of human and financial resources, but in particular to guarantee that interventions are efficient and effective.

4.2.2.2 Recommendations on the Environment Dimension

The environment dimension measured the political, social, economic, cultural and legal environment in which civil society and its members act and function, as well as attitudes and behaviours present in society. The score for this dimension was 1.2, showing that civil society exists in a relatively weak environment but with the prospect of becoming moderate. The following is thus recommended:

• Improve civil society’s ability to influence compliance with the major international agreements and national laws that protect the citizen’s human and civic rights, and which guarantee the establishment and maintenance of a favourable environment for exercising citizenship. The challenge for civil society is to find a balance between the influence of development-oriented organisations and of those working on rights issues. For example, in other African countries it has been seen that organisations working on social development and service delivery have more influence and support than organisations working on the promotion of human rights and democracy;

• Given other successful efforts by civil society (e.g. Law on Foundations, Family Law, among others) society has the power and capacity to propose legislation on the legalization of non-profit organisations in Mozambique. Not only is the process extremely bureaucratic (lengthy and expensive) but it also classifies all non-profit organisations in the same way, thereby compromising the diversity of civil society organisations;

• Gradually reduce dependence on international organisations for funds and capacity-building. Recognising that international organisations that donate funds to civil society tend to change their programme priorities to the detriment of the priorities of the communities with which national civil society works, there is an urgent need to i) challenge the conditional allocation of funds to civil society, ii) increasingly diversify sources of funding, making maximum use of the growing business class in Mozambique;

• Given not only the diversification of funds but also the creation of greater corporate accountability for the positive and negative effects of their actions in the
areas where they are located, it is recommended that civil society become actively involved in i) demanding corporate social responsibility and challenging state policies on tax exemptions and the allocation of spaces for large corporations; ii) making use of the Patronage Law to encourage responsible philanthropy by the private sector.

4.2.2.3 Recommendations on the Values Dimension

The Values dimension measured the values practised and promoted by Mozambican civil society received a score of 1.1. Once again this score shows a weak situation and justifies the following recommendations:

- The establishment of a code of ethics and quality standards for the actions and intervention of civil society organisations. The lack of transparency and democracy on the part of some leaderships and organisations in society nullifies their efforts to gain legitimacy among their constituents, the state and their funding partners;

- In order to promote democracy in Mozambique, civil society must challenge the current makeup of the State. Although change may come only gradually, it is important that deputies and members of the government be appointed in a democratic manner, where the citizen has the power to choose the individual that can best represent him/her in Parliament.

4.2.2.4 Recommendations on the Impact Dimension

The Impact dimension measured the influence of civil society in political and private sector decision-making and its effect on the communities with whom it intends to work. According to the evaluation this CSI dimension received the lowest score, reflecting weak action and also the weakness of its structure, environment and values. Consequently, in order to change this situation the following is proposed:

- Civil society in general must make its presence felt in processes that identify issues requiring change or the formulation of social, human rights and financial policies;

- Specifically, civil society should use the spaces provided by itself and by the state not just to question but also to propose improvements in the state’s implementation of policies and its delivery of services;

- Propose effective ways of making access to state social, legal and economic services more efficient and effective. For example, make the voting card the identification document for all services, given the speed with which it is produced;

- The conscious and knowledgeable involvement of civil society organisations in designing, implementing and evaluating the general state budget at all levels. Civil society recognises that the main way to hold the state accountable is through the state’s financial execution.

- In order to improve its impact civil society should i) clarify its role as an agent of change that at no time substitutes the state; ii) improve the standard of its service delivery to communities while always respecting the human rights of the people with whom it works.
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**ANNEX 1**

**Annex 1: Research Chronogram**

**Implementation Methodology**

1. Training the National Index Team
   - March 2007

2. 1st Meeting of NAG
   - April 2007

3. 2nd Meeting of NAG. Discussion on secondary data and panorama of primary research
   - June 2007

4. Primary Research, Regional Consultations and Community Survey
   - July / September 2007

5. Data Analysis
   - August November 2007

6. 3rd Meeting of NAG/CIVICUS Results
   - November 2007

7. National Workshop
   - December 2007

- Country Report
- Recommendations/Action plan
### Annex 2: Sample for National Surveys: Community and CSOs

Survey of Civil Society Organisations (CSO), September 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Non-Profit Institutions Base</th>
<th>Proportion of Base (%)</th>
<th>Sample of Non-Profit Institutions</th>
<th>Sample of Informal CSOs (mutual assistance networks)</th>
<th>Sample of CSO respondents</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Difference from target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niassa</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDelegado</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampula</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambézia</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tete</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manica</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofala</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhambane</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map. Prov</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map. Cidade</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moçambique</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>-94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Sample Research on CSI in Mozambique, 2007

Table on Allocation, Distribution and Implementation of Household Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Census 97 Households In the sample</th>
<th>Persons eligible</th>
<th>Household (HH), HH weight in Enumeration Areas chosen</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niassa</td>
<td>189,925</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDelegado</td>
<td>336,497</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampula</td>
<td>794,431</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambézia</td>
<td>726,268</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tete</td>
<td>268,010</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manica</td>
<td>202,203</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofala</td>
<td>275,792</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhambane</td>
<td>259,444</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>228,297</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map. Prov</td>
<td>174,887</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map. Cidade</td>
<td>178,802</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moçambique</td>
<td>3,834,586</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probability Sample
Three stage sample
Stratified Sample
Confidence Interval
Precision 95%
Design Effect 0.000-0.040
Domains: National, National Urban, National Rural, Provincial 0.800-1.900
### Annex 3: Categorisation of CSOs by group and Sub-Group

Comparison of the International Classification of Groups and Sub-groups of Non-Profit Institutions (ICNPO) and the CIVICUS Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INE Census Categories</th>
<th>CIVICUS Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Culture and recreation</strong></td>
<td>15 Culture and Arts CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Culture and arts</td>
<td>16 Social, recreation, sporting club CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Other recreation and social clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Education and Research</strong></td>
<td>5 Education services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Primary and secondary education</td>
<td>6 Non-Profit media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Higher Education</td>
<td>7 CSO active in education and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Other education</td>
<td>8 Education services CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Research</td>
<td>9 CSO activities in education and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Hospitals and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>20. Social Movements (landless, peace movements etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Support Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mental Health and crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Other health services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Services Socials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Emergency and Relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Environment</td>
<td>14. Environmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Animal protection</td>
<td>3. Advocacy CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Development and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Economic, Social and Community Development</td>
<td>11. Community organisations / associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Housing</td>
<td>9. Associations of marginalized groups (e.g. homeless, landless, migrants and refugees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Employment and training</td>
<td>12. Economic interest CSO (cooperatives, savings associations, mutual assistance associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Law, Advocacy and Politics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Civic and advocacy organisations</td>
<td>3. Advocacy CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Law and legal services</td>
<td>10. Political parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Political organisations</td>
<td>17 Philanthropic foundations and fund raising organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Philanthropic and volunteering promotion intermediaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Grant making foundations</td>
<td>19 CS networks and federations and support organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Other philanthropic intermediaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 International Co-operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious congregations and associations</td>
<td>1. Faith based organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Commercial and professional associations, unions</strong></td>
<td>10. Professional and corporate organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Commercial associations</td>
<td>2. Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Professional Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Workers’ Unions</td>
<td>7. Women’s Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Youth and Student Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Ethnic, traditional and indigenous organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE, 2008; CIVICUS Toolkit-2004
## Annex 4: Score Matrix for CSI Indicators

Estimate of the Mozambican Civil Society Index (MCSI 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Breadth of citizen participation</td>
<td>1.2. Political Connect</td>
<td>1.3. Democracy</td>
<td>1.4. Impacting Public Policy</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Non-governmental action (%)</td>
<td>1.2.1. Political rights</td>
<td>3.1.1. Democracy practiced within CSI</td>
<td>4.1.1. Impact on human rights</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. Dialogue giving (%)</td>
<td>1.2.2. Political socialization</td>
<td>3.1.2. CSI actions to promote democracy</td>
<td>4.1.2. Impact on society policy</td>
<td>0.9.</td>
<td>0.9.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3. CSR membership (%)</td>
<td>1.2.3. Rule of law/ Respect for the law</td>
<td>3.2.1. Corruption</td>
<td>4.1.3. Impact on financial policies</td>
<td>0.7.</td>
<td>0.7.</td>
<td>0.7.</td>
<td>0.7.</td>
<td>0.7.</td>
<td>0.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4. Volunteering (%)</td>
<td>1.2.4. Corruption</td>
<td>3.2.2. Financial transparency of CSIs</td>
<td>4.2.1. Holding state accountable</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5. Collective community action (%)</td>
<td>1.2.5. Role effectiveness</td>
<td>3.2.3. CSI actions to promote transparency</td>
<td>4.2.2. Holding private corporations accountable</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Depth of citizen participation</td>
<td>1.2.6. Decentralization</td>
<td>3.3.1. Tolerance within CSI values</td>
<td>4.3.1. Resilience</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1. Membership in NGOs (%)</td>
<td>1.2.7. Basic freedoms and rights</td>
<td>3.3.2. CSI actions to promote tolerance</td>
<td>4.3.2. Public Trust</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Volunteering (No. hours)</td>
<td>1.2.8. Civil liberties</td>
<td>3.4.1. Violence within CSI</td>
<td>4.4.1. Empowering citizens</td>
<td>0.8.</td>
<td>0.8.</td>
<td>0.8.</td>
<td>0.8.</td>
<td>0.8.</td>
<td>0.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3. CSI membership (%)</td>
<td>1.2.9. Information rights</td>
<td>3.4.2. CSI actions to promote non-violence and peace</td>
<td>4.4.2. Building capacity for collective action</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Diversity of CSI participants</td>
<td>1.2.10. Press freedom</td>
<td>3.5.1. Gender equity within CSI</td>
<td>4.4.3. Empowering marginalized groups</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1. CSI membership diversity</td>
<td>1.3.1. Freedom of association and belief</td>
<td>3.5.2. Gender equitable practices within CSI</td>
<td>4.4.4. Empowering women</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
<td>0.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2. CSI leadership</td>
<td>1.3.2. Gender equitable practices within ISI</td>
<td>4.4.5. Building social capital</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3. Distribution of CSIs</td>
<td>1.3.3. CSI actions to promote gender equity</td>
<td>4.4.6. Supporting fundamental</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Level of Organization</td>
<td>1.3.4. Small group of organizations</td>
<td>3.6.1. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>4.5.1. Meeting societal needs</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1. Membership of CSI and formal bodies</td>
<td>1.3.5. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>3.7. Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>4.5.2. Meeting pressing societal needs directly</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2. Effectiveness of CSI leadership bodies</td>
<td>1.3.6. CSI actions to sustain the environment</td>
<td>3.8. Equity in diversity</td>
<td>4.5.3. Meeting needs of marginalized groups</td>
<td>0.0.</td>
<td>0.0.</td>
<td>0.0.</td>
<td>0.0.</td>
<td>0.0.</td>
<td>0.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3. Separation by CSI</td>
<td>1.3.7. CSI actions for diversity within CSI</td>
<td>3.8.1. Equity or diversity within CSI</td>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4. Support of infrastructures for CSI</td>
<td>1.3.8. CSI actions for diversity</td>
<td>3.8.2. CSI actions for diversity</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Inter-relations among CSIs</td>
<td>1.4.1. Small group of organizations</td>
<td>3.8.3. CSI actions for diversity</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td>0.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1. Communications among CSIs</td>
<td>1.4.2. CSI actions to promote non-violence and peace</td>
<td>4.6.1. CSI actions to promote non-violence and peace</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2. Coordination among CSIs</td>
<td>1.4.3. CSI actions to promote gender equity</td>
<td>4.6.2. CSI actions to promote gender equity</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td>1.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Resources</td>
<td>1.4.4. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>3.6.1. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1. Financial resources</td>
<td>1.4.5. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>3.6.2. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2. Human resources</td>
<td>1.4.6. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>3.6.3. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3. Technological and infrastructure resources</td>
<td>1.4.7. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>3.6.4. CSI actions to eradicate poverty</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td>2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-dimensions: 6  
Indicadores: 21  
20  
17  
5  
27  
80
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