

# What People Say When They Truly Speak: Results from Ghana's first Deliberative Poll



## REPORT

August 2015

RAN Core Partners



CSIS

CENTRE FOR STRATEGIC &  
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES



USAID  
Higher Education  
Solutions Network

## **Profile of UDS**

The University for Development Studies (UDS) was established in May 1992 by PNDC Law 279 to blend the academic world with that of the community in order to provide constructive and meaningful interaction between the two for the total development of Northern Ghana, in particular, and Ghana as whole.

The UDS began academic work in September 1993 with the first batch of thirty-nine (39) students admitted into the Faculty of Agriculture. The University's principal objective is to address and find solutions to the environmental problems and socio-economic deprivations that have characterized northern Ghana in particular and are also found in some rural areas throughout the rest of the country.

As stated in its vision "*to be a home of world-class pro-poor scholarship*", the University strives to ensure that there are intellectual and pragmatic inputs into the developmental processes of the poor, disadvantaged and the marginalized areas and peoples of the country and beyond.

### **For further information contact:**

University for Development Studies  
P. O. Box TL 1350  
Dungu, Tamale  
Tel: +233 (0) 372 022 078  
[www.uds.edu.gh](http://www.uds.edu.gh)

West Africa Resilience Innovation Lab  
School of Medicine and Health Sciences  
University for Development Studies  
P. O. Box 1883  
Dungu, Tamale.  
Tel: +233 (0) 243 507 505  
+233 (0) 502 253 500  
+233 (0) 201 391 691  
[www.warilab.org](http://www.warilab.org)

# Table of contents

	i		<b>Table of Contents</b>
	iii		<b>Acknowledgements</b>
	iv		<b>Executive Summary</b>
	1		<b>Introduction</b>
	2		<b>Problem and Justification</b>
	2		<b>Participant Sample</b>
	3		<b>Opinion Changes</b>
	6		<b>Efficacy and Expectations</b>
	7		<b>Top Ten Proposals</b>
	8		<b>Knowledge Changes</b>
	8		<b>Event Evaluation</b>
	9		<b>Small Group Discussions</b>
	15		<b>Conclusion</b>
	16		<b>Appendix</b>
	20		<b>Photo Gallery</b>

## **About the RAN**

The ResilientAfrica Network (RAN) is a five-year USAID funded program that brings together a network of 20 African universities in 16 countries united in pursuit of the vision of building resilient African communities through innovative solutions. Launched in November 2012, the RAN is one of seven university-led USAID partnerships established through the Higher Education Solutions Network (HESN), now under the umbrella of USAID's newly created Global Development Lab. The core partners in the Network are: Makerere University (the lead institution), Stanford University, Tulane University, and the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

The RAN program is designed to be implemented through an operational level network of four University-based Resilience Innovation Labs (RILabs) located in four regions in sub-Saharan Africa. The RILabs aim to have direct impact in their target vulnerable communities, strengthening these communities' capacity to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses in a way that leaves them better off and less vulnerable to future crises—that is, more resilient.

At the same time, RAN serves additional strategic objectives that will contribute to the literature on the emerging field of resilience programming and deepen understanding of the potential opportunities that a “*resilience approach*” offers for new and more-effective engagement for policymakers, development practitioners, and communities.

### ***Objectives of the RAN***

With an overall mission to strengthen resilience in vulnerable African communities, RAN's core objectives include:

1. Design and apply a data-driven, evidence-based framework to better understand and measure resilience in target communities;
2. Develop, test, and bring to scale innovative technologies and interventions that strengthen the resilience of vulnerable individuals, households, and/or communities; and
3. Enhance and share resilience-related knowledge globally by engaging students, faculty, staff, and development experts to collaborate on working toward strengthening resilience.

# Acknowledgements

This report has been made possible thanks to the generous contribution of our community partners - a random sample of Tamale residents - who graciously committed their time, energy and resources to the successful conduct of Ghana's first Deliberative Poll (DP). They are hereby duly acknowledged for their voices, herein recorded, that will emblazon their memory across the resilience world.

Lab Director, Dennis Chirawurah, led the entire WARILab team to put together the processes leading up to D-Day (the DP event). Dr. Ayaga Bawah, Assistant Professor at Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University served as DP Survey Consultant.

The DP Advisory Group led by Prof. Gordana Kranjac Berisaveljevic, vetted and approved the briefing materials. Prof. Jim Fishkin, Director of Stanford University's Center for Deliberative Democracy (CDD), provided technical guidance. Having developed and tested his DP concept for many years, his support was indispensable to the successful conduct of Ghana's DP. Other members of CDD are Alice Siu and Kathleen Giles.

We single out for special mention, the Minister for Northern region, Hon. Limuna Mohammed Muniru, who demonstrated his personal commitment to the DP work and inaugurated the DP Advisory Group.

In his role as Chief and also Presiding Member of the Tamale Metropolitan Assembly, Hon. Alhaj A. A. Mohammed provided a solid bridge to the metro's political authorities and the communities.

Kudos to the university faculty and students who contributed in diverse ways towards the successful conduct of the DP.

The university authorities, particularly the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, are hereby cordially acknowledged for providing an overall conducive environment for the Lab to thrive.

We also acknowledge the Lab's partners and collaborators from both the public and private sector who, in one way or the other, contributed to Ghana's first DP.

We are immeasurably thankful to the Ghana Statistical Service for providing the Enumeration Area (EA) Maps that made it easy to randomly sample dwelling units and households for the DP exercise.

Other WARILab team members include Michelle Dassah, the Lab Administrator, Kamal-Deen Djabaku, the M & E Officer, Moses Akadima, the Innovations Officer, and Niagia Santuah, the Programme Coordinator.

Our Network Plus Universities, the University of Education, Winneba in Ghana; Cheikh Anta Diop University of Dakar in Senegal and the University of Bamako in Mali are acknowledged for their support for the Lab's activities.

Harriet Adong and other members of RANSec made useful comments for finalizing this report.

## **Suggested Citation:**

ResilientAfrica Network (2015). What People Say When They Truly Speak: Results from Ghana's First Deliberative Poll. West Africa Resilience Innovation Lab. University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.

# Executive Summary

The West Africa RILab hosted by the University for Development Studies conducted a Deliberative Poll (DP) in Tamale in January 2015. The Center for Deliberative Democracy (CDD) at Stanford University provided advice and support. The poll involved a random, representative sample of the Tamale Metropolitan Area, to assess the representative opinions of the population, both before and after it has had a good chance to really think about issues affecting them and to discuss them in-depth.

Tamale is reputed to be the fastest growing city in West Africa, and this comes at a cost. The influx of people and their needs have outstripped the government's capacity to provide sufficient water supply, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure, among others. Tackling these issues means consulting the people about what needs to be done. However, most citizens, most of the time, in most countries around the world, do not expend much effort considering public policy questions in-depth. Is there a method of public consultation that truly enables the people to make informed choices?

Deliberative Polling (DP) is an innovative citizens consultative process that assesses the representative opinions of a population, both before and after it has had a good chance to thoroughly discuss problems confronting them and their communities, and identifying appropriate solutions. The method offers clear advantages over other methods of public consultation because it provides the opportunity for the people to reflect on issues before making decisions from a range of options. Ghana's first Deliberative Poll was conducted in Tamale on January 10-11, 2015. A random, representative sample of the Tamale Metropolitan Area was convened for a face-to-face deliberation on Water, Hygiene, and Sanitation; and Livelihood and Food Security. The aim was to point the local government in the direction of leading the search for sustainable solutions.

In all, 243 persons were recruited through random selection of households and random selection of participants within the households and interviewed. The average age of the sample was 33.7 years and 48% male; 27.9% had never been to school, and 3.9% were first-degree holders. Only 2 persons selected declined to take the initial survey, whereas 208 persons completed the two days of deliberations, which means 35 respondents completed the baseline survey but did not attend the deliberations. This 85% response rate represents a very high level by world standards for surveys. Given the low literacy rate, a fifteen-minute video version of briefing materials was produced and shown at the beginning of each day of deliberation.

## Results

Policy proposals were rated before and after deliberation on the same 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is *“extremely unimportant”* and 10 is *“extremely important”*. Of the 39 policy proposals in the Tamale Deliberative Poll, 28 (71.8%) showed statistically significant changes after deliberation. Notably, the proposals were all rated highly before and after deliberation. Yet some of the proposals posed some hard choices. When the tradeoff between food security and health was explored, participants emphasized the use clean water for watering vegetables over the need to promote food security.

Deliberators were therefore willing to have a law banning the use of wastewater for vegetable farming. Deliberators also strongly supported the proposal to *“provide water tanks for rain water harvesting in residential facilities and in all educational institutions”*.

The topmost proposals show the public putting the highest priority on practical measures to control disease. *“Promote public education for effective cholera control”* shot up from 9.45 to 9.71. *“Implement a systematic plan to control mosquitoes”* also went up significantly from 9.09 to 9.52, and *“intensify the hand washing campaign in schools”* rose from 9.25 to 9.51. Having realized that both disposal of waste and lack of energy were problems, participants favoured *“a public-private partnership to convert waste to energy”* because the strategy effectively makes one problem part of the solution to the other. Nine out of ten participants said the Deliberative Polling event was an extremely valuable use of their time, whereas nearly all of them agreed that they learned a lot about other people from the small group discussions. Participants' confidence that the government would take their views seriously also significantly increased.

In terms of practical solutions, participants strongly supported the proposal to *“promote a low cost treatment of waste water for farming through the use of charcoal and stones”*. They equally supported the *“use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all houses”* because *“sometimes we don't have water to drink, not to talk of using it for flushing toilets”*. There was also strong support for food fairs to encourage the consumption of local nutritious foods.

## **Conclusion**

The Tamale DP shows a representative sample of the population that became more informed after deliberation, and they identified specific policy solutions that can help address Tamale's urgent problems. The outcome of the DP also validates the theory that deliberative democracy can be applied in a development context even if the population has low levels of literacy. The sample was representative, the participants changed their views in many statistically significant ways, and they did so for identifiable reasons. The increases observed in the Tamale DP were not only strongly significant but they were also substantively large. Some of the voices of the people can be developed into policy briefs to address the most pertinent issues concerning residents of Tamale and people from around the world who organize their livelihoods under similar circumstances.

## Introduction

The West Africa Resilience Innovation Lab (WA RILab), working in close collaboration with the Center for Deliberative Democracy (CDD) at Stanford University, conducted Ghana's first Deliberative Poll (DP) in January 2015. A random, representative sample of the Tamale Metropolitan Area was convened for a two-day deliberation in Tamale. The participants in Tamale deliberated face-to-face on January 10-11, 2015.



Map of Ghana

Deliberative Polling assesses the representative opinions of a population, both before and after it has had a good chance to really think about an issue and discuss it in-depth. The idea is to gather a good sample and engage it in transparently good conditions for considering the pros and cons of competing policy options. Most citizens, most of the time, in most countries around the world, do not spend much effort considering public policy questions in depth. The premise of Deliberative Polling is that when policy options are important for a community, then public consultations about them should be representative of the population and thoughtfully based on the best information available. Therefore, there is a strong case for engaging a good random sample through transparent and good conditions for considering the issues and arguments for and against various policy options.

The DP method offers certain advantages over other methods of public consultation. Self-selected town meetings are unlikely to be representative because they only involve those who feel strongly enough to attend. Focus groups cannot be used to represent opinion because they are too small to be statistically meaningful. Rather, they are useful for uncovering the way the public frames an issue as a step in facilitating more systematic research. Conventional polls, while potentially



Rapidly urbanizing Tamale

representative when done well, offer the public's impression of sound bites and headlines. They do not reflect what the public would think if it were actually engaged in thinking about the issues.

Deliberative Polling is a method that offers representative and informed opinion. It offers a road map to the policies the public would accept, on reflection, and for what reasons. It can also offer a guide to those the public would have reservations about, and for what reasons.

## Problem and Justification

Tamale, the administrative and commercial capital of northern Ghana, is the country's third most-populated city with a population of 461,072 in 2010. The 26% increase in population over the last decade outstripped the government's capacity to provide sufficient water resources, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure. Investments made by the government in recent years have been ineffective in improving the situation. As a result, Tamale residents suffer from a range of problems including disease and food insecurity exacerbated by the effects of climate change. The Tamale Deliberative Poll was focused on two main categories of issues: Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH); and Livelihood and Food Security. The purpose of the Deliberative Poll was to provide direction for the local government, as well as donor agencies, on how to address the most pressing needs faced by people in the metropolis.

In many countries, the policy process does not adequately involve the communities. Governments often use subjective assessments of situations to craft policies towards mitigation of risk and vulnerability. The challenge then is how to consult the communities and seek their opinion in an adequately representative and unbiased way. Deliberative Polling provides a method by which a representative sample of the community can be consulted in-depth on key issues. It provides representative and informed opinion data, both quantitative and qualitative, about the views of the public once they have really considered the issues.

## Participant Sample

A scientific random sample of the Tamale Metropolitan Area was gathered for two days of deliberation. The samples were recruited through random selection of households and random selection of participants within the households. In total, 243 persons were interviewed and only 2 persons selected declined to take the initial survey.

Thirty five respondents completed the baseline survey but did not attend the deliberations. A total of 208 persons completed the actual two days of deliberations. Tables A and B in the Appendix show that there were very few significant differences between the participants and non-participants in either demographics or attitudes. The response rate was 85%, a very high level by world standards for surveys and even more remarkable for two days of deliberation. The sample was 48% male with an average age of 33.7 years. In terms of education,



Interviewers in Tamale

27.9% of the participants had never been to school whereas 3.9% were first degree holders. The project offers a good test case for the challenges of whether deliberative democracy can be applied in a development context with populations that have low literacy levels. The results summarized below suggest a positive answer.

An extensive advisory group of stakeholders, NGOs, academic experts and government officials developed and vetted the briefing discussion materials around Water, Sanitation and Hygiene, Livelihood and Food Security (see Appendix Table C for list). Their work built on previous focus groups and key informant interviews. The two days of discussion were divided as follows: Livelihood and Food Security on day one, then Water, Sanitation and Hygiene on day two. Given the low literacy rate of the population, a fifteen-minute video version of the briefings was produced and shown at the beginning of each day of deliberation.



Deliberators during a plenary session

## Opinion Changes

In all, 39 policy proposals were deliberated upon in the Tamale Deliberative Poll. All of the policy proposals were rated before and after deliberation on the same 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “extremely unimportant” and 10 is “extremely important”. Out of the 39 policy proposals, 28 (71.8%) showed statistically significant changes after deliberation.

The proposals were all rated highly before and after deliberation, and all of them stayed on the “important” side of the scale. This is not surprising since they all focused on basic sanitation, health and food security issues for a population facing severe challenges in these areas.

Yet some of the proposals posed some hard choices. The briefings made clear that public latrines and the areas for vegetable farming were currently very much in the same places. On the map (see Figure 1 below) they appeared to be in nearly identical locations. Given the scarcity of water, and the fragility of food security, it is not surprising that a great number of people survive by raising food in gardens using waste water. Hence a focus on food security would have its cost in the spread of diseases, especially cholera. But a focus on health would require sacrifices in food security. This tradeoff was explored in question 40:

*“Some people think that vegetable farms should produce as much as possible, even if they have to use the waste water from toilets (at point 0). Other people think that vegetables should only be produced with clean water, even if that means fewer vegetables are produced (at point 10).”*


Before deliberation, the support was already strongly on the clean water side of the trade-off (at a mean of 9.04 on the ten point scale). After deliberation it moved even further to 9.53 on the scale, a gain of nearly half a point and a very significant change ( $p=.004$ ). Participants were significantly more willing to emphasize clean water to avoid disease even at the cost of food security.

This trade-off is also reflected in the policy option: “Ban the use of untreated waste water for gardening” an option that increased from 8.53 on the ten point scale to 9.09, an increase of more than half a point and a strongly significant change ( $p=.004$ ). This option shows the willingness to require a ban on the practice so it is not merely a prescription but a proposal for a legal requirement.

While deliberators were willing to ban waste water for vegetable farming they were very interested in supporting other



An interviewer conducts the pre-DP survey with a participant



Map showing Toilet Facilities in Tamale Metropolis

solutions for water that could support farming. For the proposal: *“Promote a low cost treatment of waste water for farming through the use of charcoal and stones”* the results showed an increase from 7.77 to 8.36 ( $p=.003$ ). And to conserve water, *“promote the use of drip irrigation”* an increase from 8.44 to 9.01 ( $p=.003$ ).

They were also interested in other sources of clean drinking water: *“Provide water tanks for rain water harvesting in all educational institutions”* increased from 8.85 to 9.35 ( $p=.000$ ). The same question for residential facilities increased from 8.80 to 9.20 ( $p=.006$ ).

Some empirical premises shed light on the reasoning: *“Providing water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems would ensure availability of more good quality water”* increased from 8.55 to 9.04 ( $p=.007$ ). And, *“Treating waste water for farming would allow people to use good quality water for drinking”* increased from 7.75 to 8.81, an increase of more than a full point 1.06 ( $p=.000$ ).

It is important to realize that since these proposals are all on the *important* side of the scale, we are effectively using the range from 5 to 10. In this context a half point shift is a large one (a tenth of the whole effective range) and a shift of a full point is really large (20% of the effective range of the scale). So the increases are not only strongly significant, they are also large substantively.

All of the changes are shown in Table 1. Table 2 shows the top ten priorities after deliberation. Here the top three proposals show the public putting the highest priority on practical measures to control disease: *“Promote public education for effective cholera control”* went up significantly from 9.45 to 9.71 ( $p=.001$ ); and, *“Implement a systematic plan to control mosquitoes”* went up significantly from 9.09 to 9.52 ( $p=.001$ ); and *“Intensify the hand washing campaign in schools”* went up significantly from 9.25 to 9.51 ( $p=.008$ ).

Other significant changes supported food security with training for backyard poultry farms, backyard vegetable gardens and appropriate storage facilities for farming. There was also strong support for food fairs to encourage consumption of local foods and training for better nutrition and promotion of fonio and other neglected local nutritious crops.



Fonio grain

**Table 1: Opinion Changes**  
**Tamale Deliberative Poll—Pre- and Post-Deliberation**

Note: All questions are on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant and 10 is extremely important.

Question	T1	T2	T2-T1	Sig.
1. Promote training for households and community groups to set up <b>backyard poultry farms</b>	8.11	8.93	0.82	0.000***
2. Promote training for households and community groups to set up <b>backyard vegetable gardens</b>	7.14	8.34	1.20	0.000***
3. Promote access to information on credit opportunities for livelihood activities	7.57	8.26	0.69	0.002***
4. Promote the setting up of village savings and loans associations	7.80	7.99	0.19	0.392
5. Provide water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems in all educational institutions	8.85	9.35	0.50	0.000***
6. Promote access to credit for urban farmers through the Common Fund	7.89	8.46	0.57	0.005***

**Table 1: Opinion Changes (cont.)****Tamale Deliberative Poll – Pre- and Post-Deliberation**

Note: All questions are on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant and 10 is extremely important.

Question	T1	T2	T2-T1	Sig.
7. Provide timely weather forecasting information for farming	8.55	8.79	0.24	0.114
8. Provide timely extension services for farming	8.82	9.04	0.22	0.094
9. Provide appropriate storage facilities for farm produce	8.71	9.20	0.49	0.000***
10. Provide technology training for food storage	8.64	9.25	0.61	0.000***
11. Promote maximum use of local foods	8.82	9.33	0.51	0.000***
12. Train people to prepare nutritious foods using local food items (millet, groundnuts)	8.61	9.10	0.49	0.000***
13. Promote the cultivation of fonio and other neglected nutritious local crops	8.05	9.02	0.97	0.000***
14. Promote food fairs to encourage the consumption of local foods	8.08	8.65	0.57	0.001***
15. Promote the setting up of a mobile phone platform for providing information to farmers	7.71	7.65	-0.06	0.750
16. Set up sewage treatment plants for managing solid and liquid waste	8.69	9.19	0.50	0.001***
17. Encourage a Public-Private-Partnership to convert waste to energy	8.55	9.15	0.60	0.000***
18. Ban the use of plastic carrier bags in the city	6.79	7.64	0.85	0.001***
19. Promote the use of carrier bags made of biodegradable materials	8.14	8.97	0.83	0.000***
20. Encourage media houses to allocate weekly airtime for water, hygiene and sanitation information	8.90	9.16	0.26	0.042**
21. Promote the segregation of household waste by providing waste bins	8.46	8.65	0.19	0.328
22. Promote the sorting of waste by all institutions	8.58	8.86	0.28	0.091
23. Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all houses	9.27	9.48	0.21	0.052**
24. Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all institutions	9.24	9.44	0.20	0.059
24b. Ban the setting up of vegetable farms within 100m of toilet facilities	8.62	8.80	0.18	0.358
25. Ban the use of untreated waste water for vegetable farming	8.53	9.09	0.56	0.004***
26. Intensify the behavior change communication campaign to improve hygiene and sanitation	8.86	9.18	0.32	0.017**
27. Intensify the hand washing campaign in schools	9.26	9.51	0.25	0.008***
28. Build the capacity of local institutions such as the School of Hygiene to promote good hygiene and sanitation practices	8.97	9.35	0.38	0.001***
29. Promote a low cost treatment of waste water for farming through the use of charcoal and stones	7.77	8.36	0.59	0.003***
30. Promote the use of drip irrigation	8.44	9.01	0.57	0.001***
31. Encourage communities to use organic materials in agriculture such as composting	8.79	9.39	0.60	0.000***
32. Promote the setting up of irrigation facilities adapted for urban settings such as using boreholes, wells and dugouts	8.58	8.88	0.30	0.069
33. Provide water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems in residential facilities	8.80	9.20	0.40	0.006***
34. Ensure regular desilting of gutters	9.24	9.51	0.27	0.005***
35. Construct and maintain gutters	9.23	9.32	0.09	0.378
36. Provide more opportunities for the most vulnerable to buy insecticide treated bed nets at a low price	8.89	9.11	0.22	0.097
37. Implement a systematic plan to control mosquitoes	9.09	9.52	0.43	0.001***
38. Provide the most vulnerable with treated bed nets at a low price	8.85	9.14	0.29	0.109
39. Promote public education for effective cholera control	9.46	9.71	0.25	0.001***
40. Some people think that vegetable farms should produce as much as possible, even if they have to use the waste water from the toilets (at point 0). Other people think that vegetables should only be produced with clean water, even if that means that many fewer vegetables are produced (at point 10).	9.04	9.53	0.49	0.004***
41. How strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements? 0 is strongly disagree, 10 is strongly agree and 5 is exactly in the middle.				
41a. Providing water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems would ensure availability of more good quality water	8.55	9.04	0.49	0.007***

**Table 1: Opinion Changes (cont.)**

**Tamale Deliberative Poll – Pre- and Post-Deliberation**

Note: All questions are on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant and 10 is extremely important.

Question	T1	T2	T2-T1	Sig.
41b. Treating waste water for farming would allow people to use good quality water for drinking	7.75	8.81	1.06	0.000***
41c. Sewage treatment plants would prevent fecal and solid waste ending up in the wrong places.	8.61	9.00	0.39	0.009***
41d. Teaching people how to prepare nutritious meals would solve food contamination.	8.11	8.92	0.81	0.000***
41e. The media promotions on sanitation and hygiene will not change people's behavior.	4.22	4.41	0.19	0.573
41f. Getting more access to loans and credit will improve our daily lives.	7.17	7.63	0.46	0.047**
47. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is not at all serious, 10 is completely serious, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how serious or not serious do you think the government will take into account your views and suggestions provided in this event?	6.90	7.93	1.03	0.000***
48. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is not at all confident, 10 is completely confident, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how confident are you the government will use the results from this event?	6.59	7.92	1.33	0.000***
49. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is not at all confident, 10 is completely confident, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how confident are you the community will use the results from this event?	7.38	8.42	1.04	0.000***
50. And, how strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements? 0 is strongly disagree, 10 is strongly agree, and 5 is exactly in the middle.				
50a. "Most people do not know much about public affairs, decision making is best left to experts, community leaders and government officials."	7.70	7.94	0.24	0.410
50b. "I have opinions about my community that are worth listening to."	8.30	8.76	0.46	0.023**

### Efficacy and Expectations

Participants were asked before and after deliberation whether or not they thought anyone would make use of these results. Would the government take it seriously? Would it use the results? Would the community use the results? On all counts there were very significant increases in the expectation that they would. When asked, "How serious or not serious do you think the government will take into account your views and suggestions provided in this event?" participants' views on government seriousness increased significantly from 6.90 to 7.93 more than a full point on the scale,  $p=.000$ . And, regarding how confident participants were that the government would use the results from the Deliberative Poll, participants' confidence increased significantly from 6.59 to 7.92 (an even larger gain with  $p=.000$ ). Lastly their confidence that the community would use the results increased significantly from 7.38 to 8.42, again an increase of more than a full point with  $p=.000$ . Regarding their own opinions on whether "I have opinions about my community worth listening to" there was a significant increase from 8.30 to 8.76 ( $p=.023$ ).

These increases in external efficacy (whether the government or community will pay attention or respond to their opinions) and in internal efficacy (whether their opinions are worth listening to) are impressive results of the dialogue. They can be found in Table 1 questions 47-50. The deliberations seem to have had a considerable effect on their sense of efficacy.

## Top Ten Proposals

There are two ways of looking at the quantitative results of the Deliberative Poll. First, one can look at how opinions change when people deliberate and really think about the issues. As noted earlier, the overwhelming majority of the policy proposals, 28 out of 39, changed significantly with deliberation. Second, one can look at the highest rated proposals at the end of the day, whether they changed or not. Before deliberation one might rate a proposal highly but one is unlikely to have thought about all the arguments for and against it in any depth. After a weekend of deliberation, a respondent has really considered the competing arguments. Hence if the proposal is still rated highly, it reflects a kind of considered judgment. It is an opinion that has been tested against the arguments on the other side. It is thus worth looking at the top proposals regardless of how much they changed.

Table 2 shows the top ten proposals after deliberation. All the policy options were rated on the same 0 to 10 scale, so it is easy to see which ones were the top choices after all the deliberations were concluded.

Eight of the top ten proposals reflect the high priority participants put on fighting disease, via better sanitation, hygiene and efforts to combat malaria. We saw earlier that when faced with the difficult choice between disease and food security, they opted for fighting disease, as with the support for banning untreated waste water for vegetable farming even if it might endanger food security. The top proposals included: promoting education for effective cholera control, implementing a systematic plan to control mosquitoes, intensifying the hand washing campaign in schools, ensuring the regular desilting of gutters (which eliminates pools of water that can serve as breeding grounds for mosquitoes), promoting the use of environmentally friendly toilets, building the capacity of local institutions to promote good hygiene and sanitation practices, and providing rain water harvesting system for the schools.

**Table 2: Top Ten Proposals After Deliberation  
Tamale Deliberative Poll— Pre- and Post-Deliberation**

**Note: All questions are on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant and 10 is extremely important.**

Question	Pre	Post	Post-Pre	Sig.
39. Promote public education for effective cholera control	9.46	9.71	0.25	0.001***
37. Implement a systematic plan to control mosquitoes	9.09	9.52	0.43	0.001***
27. Intensify the hand washing campaign in schools	9.26	9.51	0.25	0.008***
34. Ensure regular desilting of gutters	9.24	9.51	0.27	0.005***
23. Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all houses	9.27	9.48	0.21	0.052**
24. Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all institutions	9.24	9.48	0.20	0.059
31. Encourage communities to use organic materials in agriculture such as composting	8.79	9.39	0.60	0.000***
28. Build the capacity of local institutions such as the School of Hygiene to promote good hygiene and sanitation practices	8.97	9.35	0.38	0.001***
5. Provide water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems in all educational institutions	8.85	9.35	0.50	0.000***
11. Promote maximum use of local foods	8.82	9.33	0.51	0.000***

## Knowledge Changes

Table 3 reports the results of the knowledge questions. The percentages indicate the percentage of correct answers on multiple choice questions. All five of the knowledge questions showed significant increases, as did the index for knowledge (constructed from the five questions which asked for participants' knowledge of facts pre- and post-deliberation). The index increased significantly from 25.1% to 37.5% an increase of more than 12 points ( $p=.000$ ). Some of the gains were large. For example, on which disease is the biggest killer in Ghana, 31% answered malaria correctly before deliberation and this increased to 46.5% after deliberation ( $p=.000$ ). Before deliberation, only 21.6% knew that the percentage of Tamale with access to potable water daily was about 21.6%. After deliberation, the percentage correctly answering this question rose significantly to 37.6%, an increase of 16 points ( $p=.000$ ). The deliberations show a representative microcosm that became more informed. The knowledge index will be used in later analyses of opinion change.

**Table 3: Tamale Knowledge Changes— Pre- and Post-Deliberation**

**Note:** The table shows gains in knowledge after deliberation. The index in the last row shows the overall gains for the five questions.

Question (% correct)	T1	T2	T2-T1	Sig.
Q42. Which of the following is true about Tamale? ANSWER: E. Tamale has a higher percentage of people who are not working than any other city in Ghana.	24.1	33.5	9.4	0.018**
Q43. Which of the following diseases is the biggest killer in Ghana? ANSWER: C. Malaria	31.0	46.5	15.5	0.000***
Q44. How much more densely populated is Tamale compared to the Region? ANSWER: D. about twelve times	8.6	24.5	15.9	0.000***
Q45. Which percentage of Tamale has access to potable water daily? ANSWER: B. about 40%	21.6	37.6	16.0	0.000***
Q46. Which of the following statements is TRUE? ANSWER: C. About 20% of the population use open drains, private toilets with fee, and/or open defecation.	40.0	45.3	5.3	0.205
<b>Index</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>0.000***</b>

## Event Evaluation

Table 4 summarizes participants' feelings about the event overall. Almost all participants (99.5%) reported that the Deliberative Poll event was a valuable use of their time, with 88% saying that it was extremely valuable. Further, all participants felt the briefing materials and the event as a whole were valuable; with 83% of participants indicating that the briefing materials were extremely valuable and 90% of participants indicating the event as a whole was extremely valuable. The participants also provided extremely positive feedback about the moderators who, according to the survey questions, were unbiased when leading discussions and effectively facilitated discussions for everyone to contribute his or her diverse views on the topic. All participants agreed that the group moderator provided everyone an opportunity to participate in the discussion, with 95% strongly agreeing. In addition, 90% of participants disagreed that the moderator tried to influence the group with his or her views, with 82% strongly disagreeing. In terms of participants' views of fellow participants, nearly all participants (99%) agreed that they learned a lot about people very different from them and 93% agreed with this statement strongly. These are among the strongest evaluations we have seen in Deliberative Polls around the world. Furthermore, they show the high level with which the model was implemented at least from the standpoint of the participants.

**Table 4: Tamale Post Deliberation – Event Evaluations**

Question	% Valuable	% Extremely Valuable
On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is "a waste of time", 10 is "extremely valuable" and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues?		
The small group discussions	99.5	87.7
The briefing materials	100.0	83.0
The plenary session	99.5	76.3
Event as a whole	100.0	90.1
And how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?	<b>% Agree</b>	<b>% Strongly Agree</b>
My group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion	100.0	95.3
The members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions	96.2	78.8
My group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered	80.8	68.3
The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions	97.2	84.4
I learned a lot about people very different from me - about what they and their lives are like	98.6	92.5
	<b>% Disagree</b>	<b>% Strongly Disagree</b>
My group moderator sometimes tried to influence the group with his or her own views	90.1	82.0

## Small Group Discussions

The 208 deliberators were randomly assigned to 15 small groups led by trained moderators. These small groups deliberated in-depth on the issues posed and formulated questions for the plenary sessions with competing experts. The moderators were trained to facilitate the discussion but not to offer any hint of their own positions on the issues. The process alternated these small group discussions with plenary sessions in which competing experts responded to questions agreed on in the small groups. All the small group discussions were audio-taped and transcribed. Excerpts from the small group discussions shed light on the reasoning of participants in responding to the pros and cons of the various proposals. This qualitative data adds to the quantitative results discussed earlier and shown in Table 1. Table 5 shows excerpts from the small groups on a number of the policy proposals which increased significantly. These are summarized in what follows.

*"Promote training for households and community groups to set up backyard poultry farms"* increased from 8.11 to 8.93, a very significant increase at the .000 level (question 1 in Table 1). Participants saw the value of the poultry farms and expressed a need for the training. *"We don't have the technical know-how about it (poultry farming), the diseases and the food the birds eat."* And, *"when one raises poultry you can get meat and eggs which are essential components of food. One can also save money because you do not need to go to the market and buy meat again."* There are also other uses: *"[Even] their droppings however is very useful because lately our soils have lost all their fertility so if the droppings are carted to the fields they can be used to improve soil fertility."*

There was an even more significant increase in how respondents viewed the importance of *"training for households and community groups to set up backyard vegetable gardens"* (question 2 in Table 1, an increase from 7.14 to 8.34 significant at .000). A prime argument seems to have been that backyard vegetable gardens will be safer for raising vegetables. Participants noted that if people are raising their own food *"they will always make sure the crops are clean for consumption so they will be healthy."* It was also noted that, *"if you buy vegetables from the market you may not know if the vegetables have been watered and or washed with untreated wastewater or sprayed with harmful chemicals."* In addition *"you can sell some of the vegetables to give you income."*

The proposal: *“Encourage a public-private partnership to convert waste to energy”* increased significantly from 8.55 to 9.15 at the .000 level (question 17). Participants realized that both disposal of waste and lack of energy were problems. The waste-to-energy strategy could make one problem part of the solution to the other. *“If they can do it so that it can be turned into fire for cooking or electricity, it would have been nice because if you observe, there are lots of toilets in Tamale.”* Liquid waste disposal is a problem: *“You can see a toilet with filled holes and they claim there is no lorry to convey it. And even if it is conveyed the place to go and dump it is a problem.”* Other participants noted that recycling might provide jobs and the process might provide income for the city’s residents.

Next, the proposal to *“provide water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting in all educational institutions”* increased significantly from 8.85 to 9.35 at the .000 level (question 5). In the small groups, comments focused on how such water tanks would keep children in school and save money; *“most of the children during break would ask permission to go and find water to drink and they usually don't come back.”* Also, sometimes the students have to use their chop money to buy water for their daily use. There were also concerns expressed about *“the maintenance of those facilities and how good and hygienic the water will be.”* *But even, then the water “can be used for handwashing and for the cleaning of the urinaries and toilets.”*

The proposal: *“Promote food fairs to encourage the consumption of local foods”* rose from 8.05 to 8.65 a significant increase at the .001 level (question 14 in Table 1). Participants reasoned, *“it is from our local foods that we get a lot of nutrition, the koose, the vegetables and all.”* There were favorable comments on the annual Farmers Day that focused on *“Eat What You Grow”* and the suggestion that *“the Assembly should get experts in nutrition so they can go round and educate people on the nutritional value of the crops we cultivate.”*

Another proposal: *“Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all houses”* rose from 9.27 to 9.48 a significant increase at the .05 level (question 23 in Table 1). The participants supported the idea that *“all houses should have toilets because you can pick up diseases from the public toilets.”* But this is hard with limited resources. One person noted: *“Sometimes we don't have water to drink, not to talk of using it to flush toilets.”* This may be a factor in favor of the environmentally-friendly toilets, which are better in terms of water usage.

Lastly, the proposal: *“Promote a low cost treatment of waste water for farming through the use of charcoal and stones”* rose from 7.77 to 8.36, a significant increase at the .003 level (question 29). While there was some skepticism expressed as to whether this would happen, the participants were well aware of the benefits: *“if they do it and we use the treated water to water the vegetables it will prevent us from contracting diseases.”* While the water will not be good enough for drinking it will likely be more healthy for farming: *“so we should drink the pipe water and treat the waste water and use it for farming.”* There are however practical issues *“if you do it with charcoal and harvest the top cleaned water what will you do with the down dirty water? Are you going to pour it away or you will have another means of treating it again.”*

**Table 5: Excerpts from the Small Group Discussions**

**SET UP BACKYARD POULTRY FARMS AND VEGETABLE FARMS**

*Problem Summary: Rapid urbanization means less land for farming as agricultural lands have been converted into residential facilities. There is the need to make use of available land for diversified livelihoods, food security and improved sanitation. Achieving this will involve training and credit facilities for households and community groups to support livelihood activities.*

## Backyard Poultry farms

*"This is a good idea because I don't have land to grow maize and other food crops but I can get a small piece of land to set up a place to rear goats and sheep among others. The issue here is the capital to invest. This is where this concept comes in handy so that the men and other people who don't have jobs can take advantage of the intervention and engage themselves [in meaningful businesses]."*

*"If that is done the importation of poultry into Tamale will reduce. This will also support you to cater for your children and other dependents. You can buy maize from it and a whole lot. After the raining season there is no work to do. So, if we do well to engage ourselves in the rearing of poultry it will help us. If we sell our farm produce to pay school fees and reserve some for the consumption of the family, the poultry can supplement the proceeds from our farms till such a period when we will be engaged in the farms again."*

*"It will be a laudable idea if the assembly can help train people from our household about the poultry farming. I think it will enable us to get, some sort of jobs in our homes, even though we do it already but we don't have the technical know-how about them, the diseases, and the kind of food the birds eat. So if they do it, it will reduce the importation of poultry into the country some kind of meat that is not good for our consumption. and I think it will create some kind of jobs for us, because they will need personnel to do certain things during the education. So it will help us a lot. I have also seen that the backyard poultry farm is very important. This is because each of us here will like to chew meat when eating and also to have eggs on our food. When one raises poultry, you can get meat and eggs, which are essential components of food. One can also save money because you do not need to go to the market and buy meat again. You can also get money from the sale of the birds. This will also bring you a lot of friends because if they visit you and you give them some of the birds or their eggs, the fellow will never forget of you"*

*"Their droppings are very useful because lately our soils have lost all their fertility so if the droppings are carted they can be used to help improve soil fertility"*

## Backyard Vegetable farms

*"It is important because when they teach people how to do backyard farming it will help them to get good food to eat. They will take very good care of the plants since they are the people to eat. They will always make sure the crops are clean for consumption so they will be healthy"*

*"I agree that they should encourage backyard vegetables farms. If you buy vegetables from the market you may not know if the vegetables have been watered and or washed with untreated wastewater or sprayed with harmful chemicals. But when you grow these in your own backyard garden, you will take good care of them such that you always have good and fresh vegetables to enjoy"*

*"When you cultivate your tomatoes and other vegetables you cannot eat all at the household level so at least you can sell some to give you income"*

*"It is a laudable idea. During the Acheampong regime (in the 1970s) there was a programme called "Operation Feed Yourself". People farmed by their houses to feed themselves"*

*"If they promote the backyard farming at least for home consumption it is better than going out to buy from sources that you don't know what kind of water has been used. Some people use untreated wastewater and others apply chemicals to their vegetables which is not good for our health. This is good because parents will be able to save money"*

## SET UP RAINWATER HARVESTING SYSTEMS IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

*Problem Summary: Tamale has a very low water table, which makes the area unsuitable for borehole drilling to supplement its scarce water resources. Educational institutions are particularly disadvantaged because frequent water shortages affect school enrolment, attendance, completion and achievement.*

*"It would help because most of the children during break would ask that they want to drink water and they usually do not return [to school]. So if the storage facilities are done then it would help keep the children in school and also enhance teaching and learning".*

*"The provision of the tanks in the schools will be very important. Sometimes we the students have to use our chop money to buy water for our daily use".*

*"I think that will have been a laudable idea and I believe it is already in the system. For example, around my house there is a school there and I have seen it there. But my problem is the maintenance of those facilities and how good and hygienic the water will be. If the water is treated it can be used for hand washing and for the cleaning of the urinaries and toilets".*

## PROMOTE MAXIMUM CONSUMPTION OF LOCAL FOODS

*Problem Summary: Climate change has adversely affected food crop production and this has exacerbated food insecurity in the Tamale Metropolitan area. Drought resistant local crops that provide good nutrition have also been neglected whilst habits are forming around the consumption of imported foods of questionable nutritive value. Thus the need to promote the cultivation of fonio and other neglected nutritious local crops; provide facilities and technology training for food storage; train people to prepare nutritious foods using local food items (millet, groundnuts); and organize periodic food bazzars/fairs to encourage the production and consumption of local foods*

*"As we speak, everybody wants to be healthy and it is from our local foods that we get a lot of nutrition, the koose, the vegetables and all".*

*"Our local foods are more nutritious than the foreign foods".*

*"I think it is good. When you look at the annual FARMERS' DAY this year (2014), the theme for the celebration was **Eat What You Grow**. For instance, rice, maize, beans, etc are all what we farm but government still spends money to buy food outside the country and the money they use would have been used to farm those foods and even take good care of them. So it is time for us to also start using what we have".*

*"The Assembly should get experts in diet so that they can go round and educate people on the nutritional value of the foods we cultivate. This education will make us patronize the local foods. Food experts should educate us on how nutritious local rice and dawadawa is rather than allowing us to eat the fried rice which has nothing important for our health".*

## ENCOURAGE A PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP TO CONVERT WASTE TO ENERGY

*Problem Summary: Waste goes waste whereas it is a rich resource. Private companies can support the government to turn waste into energy in innovative ways that solve many problems at the same time. This will involve providing waste bins to households and institutions to encourage the sorting of waste.*

*"I have agreed to public-private partnerships in waste management to generate energy because the government can't do it alone. So if the Assembly encourages private companies to go into waste management, it will create jobs for the unemployed".*

*"It is good to propose such things, because in Tamale here most of us are farmers, we work only in the raining season, so this recycling can give most of us employment, and the refuse containers in our areas, we can assign it to youths in our area, so that if someone comes to deposit refuse he will pay money. For example in Accra they do that. It will reduce poverty in our country".*

*"I think it is a good idea for the Assembly to collaborate with the private companies to turn waste into energy. It will reduce load shedding in the country because as it provides light it will also provide income to the Assembly as well".*

*"If they can do it so that it can be turned into fire for cooking or electricity it would have been nice because if you observe there are lots of toilets in Tamale. You can see a toilet with filled holes and they claim there is no lorry to convey it. And even if is conveyed the place to go and dump it is a problem because wherever they are going to pour it away is somebody else's place. When it rains it will be carried in to water and humans will drink it again".*

*"It is true that partnership is good because the government cannot do everything for us so it needs support from these individuals and organisations".*

## PROMOTE THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY-FRIENDLY TOILETS

*Problem Summary: Liquid waste disposal is a problem for rapidly urbanizing communities. Provision of environmentally-friendly toilets with biogas potential will serve the purposes of both residential facilities and especially educational institutions.*

*"It is good to have good toilets but I don't think we can build them. Sometimes we don't have water to drink not to talk of using it for flushing toilets".*

*"I think as for the toilets if the Assembly could help us with education and if possible they give us money to build toilets that would have been nice. Because if you have diarrhea and you feel the urge to defecate, where are you going to pass it? There are certain places you will see toilet structures but no one uses it or see a toilet and when you go there it is only wood that has filled it. So if the Assembly could have helped with education and not necessarily giving out money to build toilets.*

*"All houses should have toilets because you can pick up diseases from the public toilets. People should be made to know that toilet is a necessary component in building a house. I agree that it is good for every house to have a toilet but there are certain houses that genuinely do not have resources to build such toilets".*

## **TREATMENT OF WASTE WATER FOR FARMING THROUGH THE USE OF CHARCOAL AND STONES**

*Problem Summary: Farming is still widely practiced and largely the mainstay of residents of the city of Tamale. Tamale for instance lacks clean drinking water, which means water for agricultural purposes, is hard to come by. Often, people who farm vegetables rely on untreated wastewater, which has health implications for consumers. There is the need to promote the multiple uses of water, which includes using traditional and low cost means of treating wastewater and using it for farming.*

*"If they come out with this proposal (of treating waste water for farming) it's good, but my problem is, they will say it without doing it. But if they do it and we use the treated water to water the vegetables it will prevent us from contracting diseases".*

*"I have agreed to that because, they use stones, charcoal and sea-sand to treat waste water. So it's a process they follow to treat the water, the water will pass through the stones and charcoal before it comes out all the dirt in the water comes out and the water will be clean. So we should drink the pipe water and treat the waste water for farming".*

*"Like I said the other time, treating the water for farming will be good, instead of banning it".*

## Conclusion

The premise of this deliberative consultation is that the people who must live with the policies should have a voice. That voice should be representative of the whole population and it should take place under conditions where people can think about the issues in depth, and have experts and policy makers, who represent different points of view, answer their questions. People can offer their views in secret ballots or confidential questionnaires so the process can collect their sincere opinions shielded from social pressures to agree with everyone else.

By all social science standards, these goals were met. The sample was representative, the participants changed their views in many statistically significant ways, they did so for identifiable reasons, they became demonstrably more informed, they increased their sense of efficacy as citizens, and they identified specific policy solutions that can help address Tamale's urgent problems.

A select group of expert stakeholders, most of them having been part of the Tamale DP process from the start, has subjected these findings to further analysis. They examined the proposals that received the strongest support and assessed them based on their level of practical implementation, using criteria including cost, impact potential, implications for use of indigenous knowledge, gender sensitivity, and cross cutting ability to address diverse challenges facing rapidly urbanizing cities. This process has also been supplemented by qualitative analysis based on the transcripts of the small group discussions and the plenary sessions during the deliberations.

The voice of the people makes a strong case for intensifying behavior change communication activities which could have great impact potential at minimal cost. The working group, in consultation with the DP Advisory Group (see Appendix Table C), plans to produce policy briefs to yield specific strategies of implementation in response to this systematic public consultation.

## Appendix

### Appendix Table A.

#### Tamale Representativeness – Demographics

Note: Based on the demographic data available, the table shows the representatives of the participants that attended the Deliberative Polling event and those who completed an interview but did not attend the event or non-participants.

	Participants (%) (n=208)	Non-Participants (%) (n=35)	Sig.
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	47.6	38.2	0.312
<b>Age</b>	33.7	31.2	0.337
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Married	60.6	60.0	0.949
Single	35.1	34.3	0.926
Divorced	1.9	0.0	0.410
Widowed	2.4	2.9	0.874
<b>Education</b>			0.148
Never been to school	27.9	23.5	
Been to primary school	10.1	5.9	
Junior High School Leaver	14.4	11.8	
Senior High School Leaver	19.7	23.5	
Middle School Leaver	3.4	0.0	
Training College/Polytechnic graduate	18.8	17.7	
First degree Holder	3.9	14.7	
Second degree and above	0.5	0.0	
Other	1.4	2.9	
<b>Occupation</b>			
Farmer	10.1	0.0	0.050*
Employee in private business	8.2	5.7	0.618
Trade (business owner)	33.2	40.0	0.433
Trained teacher	7.2	8.6	0.777
Public servant	5.8	17.1	0.017**
Other	35.1	25.7	0.279
<b>No. of children</b>	2.4	1.7	0.126

## Appendix Table B. Attitudinal Representativeness

Note: The table shows the attitudinal representatives of the participants that attended the Deliberative Polling event and those who completed an interview but did not attend the event or non-participants.

Question	Participants (n=208)	Non-Participants (n=35)	Sig.
1. Promote training for households and community groups to set up <b>backyard poultry farms</b>	8.12	7.55	0.188
2. Promote training for households and community groups to set up <b>backyard vegetable gardens</b>	7.15	7.21	0.917
3. Promote access to information on credit opportunities for livelihood activities	7.58	7.59	0.987
4. Promote the setting up of village savings and loans associations	7.81	7.15	0.483
5. Provide water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems in all educational institutions	8.86	8.74	0.733
6. Promote access to credit for urban farmers through the Common Fund	7.90	7.91	0.987
7. Provide timely weather forecasting information for farming	8.56	8.03	0.153
8. Provide timely extension services for farming	8.84	8.41	0.184
9. Provide appropriate storage facilities for farming	8.72	8.82	0.754
10. Provide technology training for food storage	8.65	8.65	0.995
11. Promote maximum use of local foods	8.84	9.00	0.631
12. Train people to prepare nutritious foods using local food items (millet, groundnuts)	8.63	8.12	0.130
13. Promote the cultivation of fonio and other neglected nutritious local crops	8.06	8.06	0.998
14. Promote food fairs to encourage the consumption of local foods	8.11	7.29	0.045**
15. Promote the setting up of a mobile phone platform for providing information to farmers	7.72	6.59	0.010***
16. Set up sewage treatment plants for managing solid and liquid waste	8.70	9.09	0.261
17. Encourage a Public-Private-Partnership to convert waste to energy	8.52	8.52	0.992
18. Ban the use of plastic carrier bags in the city	6.78	6.35	0.476
19. Promote the use of carrier bags made of biodegradable materials	8.13	8.88	0.094
20. Encourage media houses to allocate weekly airtime for water, hygiene and sanitation information	8.90	8.94	0.890
21. Promote the segregation of household waste by providing waste bins	8.46	8.32	0.727
22. Promote the sorting of waste by all institutions	8.57	7.98	0.084

## Appendix Table B. (cont.) Attitudinal Representativeness

Note: The table shows the attitudinal representatives of the participants that attended the Deliberative Polling event and those who completed an interview but did not attend the event or non-participants.

Question	Participants (n=208)	Non-Participants (n=35)	Sig.
23. Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all houses	9.27	8.59	0.011***
24. Promote the use of environmentally-friendly toilets in all institutions	9.24	8.74	.047*
24b. Ban the setting up of vegetable farms within 100m of toilet facilities	8.61	7.94	0.163
25. Ban the use of untreated waste water for gardening	8.50	7.79	0.148
26. Intensify the behaviour change communication campaign to improve hygiene and sanitation	8.86	9.00	0.636
27. Intensify the hand washing campaign in schools	9.26	9.50	0.286
28. Build the capacity of local institutions such as the School of Hygiene to promote good hygiene and sanitation practices	8.96	9.00	0.893
29. Promote a low cost treatment of waste water for farming through the use of charcoal and stones	7.79	7.28	0.281
30. Promote the use of drip irrigation	8.44	8.75	0.422
31. Encourage communities to use organic materials in agriculture such as composting	8.78	8.65	0.680
32. Promote the setting up of irrigation facilities adapted for urban settings such as using boreholes, wells and dugouts	8.57	8.82	0.465
33. Provide water tanks for setting up rain water harvesting systems in residential facilities	8.80	8.47	0.371
34. Ensure regular desilting of gutters	9.23	9.41	0.427
35. Construct and maintain gutters	9.21	9.32	0.637
36. Provide more opportunities for the most vulnerable to buy insect treated bed nets at a low price	8.88	8.76	0.730
37. Implement a systematic plan to control mosquitoes	9.08	9.26	0.547
38. Provide the most vulnerable with treated bed nets at a low price	8.83	8.74	0.815
39. Promote public education for effective cholera control	9.46	9.50	0.814
40. Some people think that vegetable farms should produce as much as possible, even if they have to use the waste water from the toilets (at point 0). Other people think that vegetables should only be produced with clean water, even if that means that many fewer vegetables are produced (at point 10).	9.06	9.50	0.260

**Appendix Table C.**  
**Members of the DP Advisory Group**

NAME	ORGANISATION	DESIGNATION	EMAIL
Mr. Richard Kamboota	Institute of Local Government Studies	Director	rkamboota@yahoo.com
Prof. Seidu Alhassan	Institute of Continuous Education & Interdisciplinary Research	Director	zodaseidu@yahoo.com
Hon. Alhaji. A.A. Mohammed	Tamale Metropolitan Assembly UDS, Tamale	Presiding Member	Paamohammed2002@yahoo.com
Hajia. Alima Sagito Saeed	Savannah Integrated Rural Development Aid	Executive Director	alima.sagito@sirdaghana.org
Mr. Raymond Wekem Avitim	SEND Ghana	Director in charge of the Livelihood Security Programme	raymong@sendwestafrica.org
Prof. Jim Fishkin	CDD, Stanford University	Director	jfishkin@stanford.edu
Dr. Joseph Amikuzuno	Department of Climate Change and Food Security, UDS	Head of Department	amikj26@yahoo.com
Dr. George A. Agulijam	Africa Center for Enterprise Development (ACED)	Advisor	agulijam99@hotmail.com
Prof. Gordanna Kranjac-Berisavljevic	University for Development Studies	Director, International Relations	novagordanak@gmail.com
Mr. Dennis Chirawurah	West Africa RILab, SMHS, UDS	Lab Director	afeyire@gmail.com
Dr. Emmanuel Abeere-Inga	Savannah Accelerated Development Authority	Director	abeereinga@hotmail.com

<sup>i</sup> Deliberative Polling® is a registered trademark of James S. Fishkin. The trademark is for quality control and benefits the Stanford Center for Deliberative Democracy.

# Photo Gallery

## DP Stakeholders Forum June 2014



# Photo Gallery

## Main DP Event - Screening of video documentary Jan 2015



# Photo Gallery

DP video documentary pictures  
Sep - Dec 2014





Production of this report is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of ResilientAfrica Network and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.