*Three Approaches to Advocacy*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **APPROACH TO ADVOCACY** | **ADVOCACY FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY A SITUATION** | **ADVOCACY WITH THOSE AFFECTED BY A SITUATION** | **ADVOCACY BY THOSE AFFECTED BY A SITUATION** |
| **Advocacy work done by** | Professionals, NGOs, church leaders | A mixture of professionals, NGOs and local community groups | Local community workers |
| **Main objectives for intervention** | Change in law, policy or practice | Increased access to decision-makingChange in law, policy or practiceBuild advocacy capacity of those affected by situation | Increase in awareness of advocacy possibilities and capacity to do advocacy |
| **Characteristics** | Issues often identified by outsidersUsually targeted at official decision-makers | Issues identified by communityShared planning, resources and actionOutside organisers mobilise capacity | Issues identified by communityLearning by involvementMay have significant outside input at start |
| **Advantages** | Quick access to decision-makersGood access to information about wider context | Increase access of poor to decision-makersAdvocacy skills and capacity developed | Empowering – poor see themselves as agents of changeSustainableCan correct power imbalance |
| **Disadvantages** | Could strengthen existing power structuresMay not increase the capacity of local groups to act | NGO often in control and sets agendaSlower due to need for agreement between all parties | Access to fewer resources and informationRisk of revengePolicy change may take longer |

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