Annex 1: On Nigeria Theories of Change and Measures

The ultimate goal of On Nigeria’s efforts is to reduce corruption by building accountability, transparency, and good governance. On Nigeria hypothesizes that corruption can be reduced by (1) reducing incidences of citizens’ everyday experiences and exposure to corruption in two key sectors, (2) using the government’s anticorruption campaign as a springboard for a national movement, and (3) helping citizens see progress in the fight against corruption. Systems-focused criminal justice reform, strengthening of media and journalism, expanding the number of anticorruption champions, and shifting of social norms complement the sectoral accountability portfolios.

On Nigeria’s theory of change posits that IF civil society organizations (CSOs), journalists, and other actors have the capacity and work together to expose corruption and demand action (“voice”), AND IF actors such as schools, distribution companies (DISCOs), and government officials in the targeted sectors and the judiciary at state and federal levels have capacity and incentives to create and enforce appropriate anticorruption measures (“teeth”), THEN successful anticorruption initiatives will take place, reducing corruption and improving service delivery in targeted sectors and geographic locations. By experiencing tangible improvements in anticorruption actions, and education and electricity services as a result of the government’s and citizens’ efforts, Nigerians’ expectations about corruption will change. They will be less likely to tolerate corruption related to electricity and education services, and demand both the services they are entitled to and greater anticorruption efforts. IF stakeholders’ capacity, influence, and demand for accountability and transparency are increased and sustained, THEN gains will be institutionalized.

Each module has its own theory of change and, together, they roll up to the strategy-level theory of change, which also includes cross-cutting activities that seek to influence social norms around corruption and complement the “voice” demands and “teeth” actions within the modules. The following pages present the theories of change graphically and identify the interim outcomes, long-term outcomes, and impacts. Each theory of change is followed by a graphic outlining the measures On Nigeria is using to assess progress. Note that not all outcomes have a measure.

---

1 Outcomes are the nearer term and intermediate changes in attitudes and actions of target audiences (e.g., individuals, communities, organizations, and policies) that stem directly from the strategy’s activities. Interim outcomes are results expected to be achievable within 3 years of the strategy initiation, and are categorized by the strategy’s four approaches: “voice,” “teeth,” capacity, and collaboration. Long-term outcomes are results in On Nigeria’s targeted areas, and reflect systems performance, service delivery, and citizens’ expectations; long-term outcomes are dependent on interim outcomes, but are also affected by assumptions underlying the theory of change and On Nigeria’s context. Some long-term outcomes should be visible in 3 years.

Impacts are the longer term aspirational changes in the population and systems where the strategy operates. These changes represent the overall significance and value of the strategy. For the On Nigeria sectoral modules, impact relates to the spread of results beyond the initial geographical areas of focus to broader, national-level changes in reducing corruption and increasing trust in government.
Exhibit A-1: Strategy-level theory of change

STRATEGY LEVEL INTERIM OUTCOMES: Corruption is confronted.

See modules for interim outcomes related to UBEC, HGSF, ELEC, Criminal Justice, and Media and Journalism.

CAPACITY BUILDING

CSOs can communicate and monitor progress of their work on issues of accountability, transparency, and governance.

COLLABORATION

Anticorruption actors collaborate on issues of accountability, transparency, and governance.

“VOICE”

- CSOs, media, women’s groups, youth, and social influencers raise public awareness, advocate, monitor, and amplify candidates’ commitments to transparency, accountability, and anticorruption before and after the 2019 elections.
- CSOs and media expose corruption and win, and engage citizens via social and other media, including at the local level.
- Faith-based leaders educate and mobilize their communities to create new champions for anticorruption efforts.
- Entertainment actors create and disseminate educational content on corruption issues and foster dialogue with audiences.

“TEETH”

- Anticorruption government actors implement the National Action Plan for Combatting Corruption.
- Candidates running in the 2019 election address anticorruption, transparency, and accountability in their campaign platforms.

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES: Corruption is reduced in specific sectors and geographies.

Government and other actors enforce anticorruption rules and implement processes uniformly.

- Governments and private-sector actors implement transparency and accountability practices as standard procedure to ensure the flow of goods and services.
  Outcomes: HGSF 15, UBEC 16, ELEC 15
- Candidates elected in the 2019 election enact commitments to anticorruption, transparency, and accountability.
  Outcomes: STRAT 1

Citizens receive improved goods, services, and benefits.

- Citizens in targeted states receive UBEC and HGSF goods and services, and transparently priced electricity.
  Outcomes: HGSF 16, UBEC 17, ELEC 16
- Governments and monitoring committees adopt state-level versions of the ACJA and monitor ACJA compliance.
  Outcomes: CJ 18 and 19
- Anticorruption government actors implement and enforce policies and laws to address corruption (e.g., name looters, recover assets, protect whistleblowers, and conduct legislative oversight of corruption).
  Outcomes: STRAT 1, CJ 17
- Citizens have greater awareness of anticorruption issues and wins from media and other sources they consider reliable.
  Outcomes: STRAT K, MJ 8 and 9

Citizens in targeted areas demand services they should be receiving and have decreased tolerance for corruption.

Outcomes: HGSF 14 and 17 UBEC 15 and 18 ELEC 16 and 17

- Experience of improved systems and greater access to services changes citizens’ expectations about corruption.
- Spread strategies, including journalism and media, amplify anticorruption successes and change all actors’ commitment to action across Nigeria.

IMPACT: Gains are spread and institutionalized.

Citizens across Nigeria have decreased tolerance for corruption and demand services they should receive. (HGSF 18, UBEC 19, ELEC 22)
Citizens across Nigeria engage in anticorruption efforts and refrain from participating in corruption. (STRAT M)
Citizens across Nigeria demand that elected officials, government actors, and private companies implement transparency and accountability practices as standard procedure to ensure the flow of goods and services. (STRAT L)
Federal government, additional states, and additional private-sector actors adopt and institutionalize systems for transparency, accountability, and corruption reduction. (HGSF 19, UBEC 20, ELEC 17, MJ 11)
Federal government and additional states conduct corruption trials in accordance with ACJA standards. (CJ 20)
Federal government, states, and judiciaries prosecute, recover stolen assets, implement anti-theft systems, and transparently redeploy assets for social good. (STRAT N)
Citizens across Nigeria receive improved goods and services previously hindered by corruption. (HGSF 20, UBEC 21, ELEC 20)
Citizens across Nigeria have increased trust in the government’s ability to combat corruption. (STRAT I)

- This stronger governance and civic participation norms nationwide, anticorruption efforts are sustained.

GOAL: CORRUPTION ACROSS NIGERIA IS REDUCED
Exhibit A-2: Theory of change to disrupt corruption in the UBEC program

**INTERIM OUTCOMES**

1. CSOs, SBMCs, and journalists/media are aware of entitlements, government funds, and processes related to UBEC and SUBEBs.
2. CSOs, SBMCs, and journalists/media know how to monitor, investigate, and advocate for action on OCDS and transparent flow of funds.
3. UBEC and targeted SUBEBs know how to use the OCDS.
4. Bilateral/multilateral agencies and other key actors (including the Foundation) leverage relationships to encourage UBEC and SUBEBs to “pick up” funds.
5. Oversight and coordination agencies (Bureau for Public Sector Reform, Bureau for Public Procurement), state governors, and CSOs work in concert to ensure that UBEC and SUBEBs use OCDS.
6. Cross-Cutting: Journalists/media and CSOs share information about and collaborate on government anticorruption promises, activities, and wins in education.
7. More CSOs and SBMCs demand/advocate for transparency and accountability related to UBEC and SUBEBs.
8. CSOs and journalists/media monitor the flow of UBEC and SUBEB funding.
9. CSOs and journalists/media use information from OCDS and other sources to educate parents and school personnel about education funds and policies.
10. CSOs, SBMCs, school personnel, and journalists/media monitor the delivery of promised UBEC-supported education resources and demand UBEC education resources for their schools.
11. UBEC monitors and ensures appropriate use of funds by SUBEBs.
12. Targeted SUBEBs pilot, adopt, and roll out the OCDS.
13. UBEC, targeted SUBEBs, and vendors provide accurate information about procurement and appropriation processes to the public, CSOs, media, and relevant government agencies.
14. UBEC sanctions SUBEBs and vendors for inappropriate use of funds.

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

15. Citizens in targeted states demand UBEC resources for their children’s schools.
16. Actors along the supply chain for UBEC resources ensure regular, reliable, and transparent flow and use of allocated funds to schools in targeted states.
17. UBEC-supported goods and services that have been hindered by corruption are delivered to schools in targeted states.
18. Citizens in targeted states have decreased tolerance for corruption related to UBEC resources.

20. Actors along the supply chain for UBEC resources across Nigeria ensure regular, reliable, and transparent flow and use of allocated funds to schools.
21. UBEC-supported goods and services that have been hindered by corruption are delivered to schools across Nigeria.
22. Citizens across Nigeria have decreased tolerance for corruption related to UBEC resources.
Exhibit A-3: Measures for the disruption of corruption in the UBEC program

Captured through landscape and grantee data.

6 **Cross-Cutting: Journalists/media and CSOs** share information about and collaborate on government anticorruption promises, activities, and wins in education.
   - **Measure:** Number of media mentions of CSOs referencing anticorruption efforts
   - **Measure:** Evidence of collaboration between journalists/media and CSOs

10 **CSOs, SBMCs, school personnel, and journalists/media** monitor the delivery of promised UBEC-supported education resources and demand UBEC education resources for their schools.
   - **Measure:** Evidence showing “voice” actors are demanding UBEC services
   - **Measure:** Evidence showing “voice” actors are monitoring UBEC services and government accountability promises

11 **UBEC** monitors and ensures appropriate use of funds by SUBEBs.
   - **Measure:** Evidence that UBEC has changed the way they supervise SUBEBs

12 **Targeted SUBEBs** pilot, adopt, and roll out the OCDS.
   - **Measure:** Evidence of effective OCDS implementation

13 **UBEC, targeted SUBEBs, and vendors** provide accurate information about procurement and appropriation processes to the public, CSOs, media, and relevant government agencies.
   - **Measure:** Number of UBEC, SUBEBs, and vendors providing clear, up-to-date information on procurement and appropriation processes

14 **UBEC** sanctions SUBEBs and vendors for inappropriate use of funds.
   - **Measure:** Proportion of SUBEBs sanctioned for inappropriate use of counterpart funds
   - **Measure:** Number of vendors sanctioned for inappropriate use of counterpart funds
   - **Measure:** Degree to which federal government indicates that CSOs (including grantees) influenced their ability or willingness to combat corruption

15 **Citizens in targeted states** demand UBEC resources for their children’s schools.
   - **Measure:** Proportion of citizens demanding UBEC resources for their children/schools

16 **Actors along the supply chain for UBEC resources** ensure regular, reliable, and transparent flow and use of allocated funds to schools in targeted states.
   - **Measure:** Evidence that UBEC, SUBEBs, local governments, vendors, and schools ensure the flow and use of allocated funds through supply chains to schools

17 **UBEC-supported goods and services** that have been hindered by corruption are delivered to schools in targeted states.
   - **Measure:** Proportion of goods and services allocated to schools by UBEC and SUBEBs actually received by schools
   - **Measure:** Evidence that UBEC goods and services are flowing more effectively and meeting UBEC contract specifications

18 **Citizens in targeted states** have decreased tolerance for corruption related to UBEC resources.
   - **Measure:** Proportion of citizens indicating they lack tolerance for corruption in education sector related to UBEC resources

Captured through long-term outcome indicators, with data from nationwide sample.

Exhibit A-4: Theory of change to disrupt corruption in the HGSF program

1. **CSOs, SBMCs, and journalists/media** are aware of entitlements, government funds, and processes related to the HGSF.
2. **CSOs, SBMCs, and journalists/media** know how to monitor, investigate, and advocate for transparent procurement and implementation of HGSF services.
3. State governments know how to reduce the risk of corruption in feeding programs.

4. **Bilateral/multilateral agencies and other key actors (including the MacArthur Foundation)** leverage relationships to encourage states to enroll in the HGSF.
5. **State governments and CSOs** coordinate in monitoring HGSF implementation.
6. **Cross-Cutting: Journalists/media and CSOs** share information about the government’s HGSF anticorruption promises, activities, and wins.

7. More CSOs and SBMCs demand/advocate for transparency and accountability related to the HGSF.
8. **CSOs and journalists/media** monitor the flow of HGSF funds and services.
9. **CSOs and journalists/media** educate SBMCs and school personnel about HGSF policies and parents/schools’ rights.
10. **CSOs, SBMCs, school personnel, and journalists/media** monitor the delivery of government-promised feeding programs at schools and demand the HGSF services their children should be receiving.

11. **Federal and state government(s)** implement corruption-reduction practices in the HGSF program by establishing and operationalizing designated structures, inclusive implementation committees (e.g., TAC), and inclusive monitoring/reporting frameworks.
12. **Federal government** sanctions states that do not comply with HGSF guidelines.
13. **Federal and state governments** sanction suppliers violating HGSF contractual obligations.

14. **Citizens in targeted states** demand HGSF program services their children should be receiving.
15. **Actors along the supply chain** implement corruption-reduction practices, and use HGSF program funds according to guidelines and contractual obligations in targeted states.
16. **Schoolchildren** receive HGSF benefits that have been hindered by corruption.
17. **Citizens in targeted states** have decreased tolerance for corruption related to HGSF services.

18. **Citizens across Nigeria** demand the HGSF services their children should be receiving.
19. **Actors along the supply chain** implement corruption-reduction practices, and use HGSF program funds according to guidelines and contractual obligations across Nigeria.
20. **Schoolchildren across Nigeria** receive HGSF benefits that have been hindered by corruption.
21. **Citizens across Nigeria** have decreased tolerance for corruption related to HGSF services.
Exhibit A-5: Measures for the disruption of corruption in the HGSF program

**INTERIM OUTCOMES**

6. **Cross-Cutting:** Journalists/media and CSOs share information about the government's HGSF anticorruption promises, activities, and wins.
   **Measure:** Number of media mentions of CSOs referencing anticorruption efforts
   **Measure:** Evidence of collaboration between journalists/media and CSOs

10. CSOs, SBMCs, school personnel, and journalists/media monitor the delivery of government-promised feeding programs at schools and demand the HGSF services their children should be receiving.
    **Measure:** Evidence showing “voice” actors are demanding HGSF services
    **Measure:** Evidence showing “voice” actors are monitoring HGSF services and government accountability promises

11. Federal and state government(s) implement corruption-reduction practices in the HGSF program by establishing and operationalizing designated structures, inclusive implementation committees (e.g., TAC), and inclusive monitoring/reporting frameworks.
    **Measure:** Evidence of existence and functioning capacity of HGSF technical advisory committee and inclusive implementation committees

12. Federal government sanctions states that do not comply with HGSF guidelines.
    **Measure:** Proportion of states not complying with HGSF guidelines that are sanctioned by federal government

13. Federal and state governments sanction suppliers violating HGSF contractual obligations.
    **Measure:** Proportion of state governments that appropriately sanction suppliers when suppliers violate HGSF contractual obligations
    **Measure:** Degree to which federal and state governments indicate that CSOs (including grantees) influenced their ability or willingness to combat corruption

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

14. Citizens in targeted states demand HGSF program services their children should be receiving.
    **Measure:** Proportion of citizens demanding HGSF resources for their children/schools

15. Actors along the supply chain implement corruption-reduction practices, and use HGSF program funds according to guidelines and contractual obligations in targeted states.
    **Measure:** Evidence that federal and state officials, local governments, vendors, cooks, and schools are implementing corruption-reduction practices

16. Schoolchildren receive HGSF benefits that have been hindered by corruption.
    **Measure:** Proportion of HGSF meals that are: (1) delivered and (2) meet HGSF contract standards
    **Measure:** Evidence that HGSF goods and services are flowing more effectively and meeting HGSF contract specifications

17. Citizens in targeted states have decreased tolerance for corruption related to HGSF services.
    **Measure:** Proportion of citizens indicating they lack tolerance for corruption in education sector related to HGSF

Captured through landscape and grantee data.

Captured through long-term outcome indicators with data from nationwide sample.
Exhibit A-6: Theory of change to disrupt corruption in electricity distribution

INTERIM OUTCOMES
Do “voice” and “teeth” actors have the capacity and knowledge they need?

1. **CSOs and journalists/media** are aware of entitlements, government policies, and processes related to electricity distribution.
2. **CSOs and customers** know their rights and how to access redress mechanisms related to electricity distribution.
3. **DISCO management** knows how to implement and monitor anticorruption actions with their staff.

4. **Bilateral/multilateral agencies and other key actors (including the MacArthur Foundation)** leverage relationships to encourage government and DISCO responsiveness.
5. **Targeted DISCOs, customers, and consumer advocacy organizations** engage in constructive dialogue, resolve complaints, and hold each other accountable to regulations.
6. **Cross-Cutting: Journalists/media and CSOs** share information about government and business anticorruption promises, activities, and wins.

INTERIM OUTCOMES
Are “voice” actors engaging in advocacy and monitoring?

7. **CSOs, and related organizations** advocate with NERC, CPC, and DISCOs for consumer protections, transparency, and accountability related to electricity distribution.
8. **CSOs and journalists/media** monitor DISCOs’ performance.
9. **CSOs and journalists/media** use information from NERC and others to generate awareness, and educate customers about their rights and redress mechanisms.
10. **CSOs and customers** advocate for and demand electricity services they should be receiving, and use redress mechanisms.

INTERIM OUTCOMES
Are actors collaborating to leverage success and build pressure for change?

11. **Federal government agencies** provide accurate, complete, and actionable information about metering, tariffs, and DISCOs’ performance (for all DISCOs).
12. **Federal government** develops and promulgates policies and regulations for the electricity sector to increase transparency and accountability for customers (e.g., billing, metering).
13. **Targeted DISCOs** continue or improve practices that increase transparency and accountability for their services to customers.
14. **NERC and the Consumer Protection Council (CPC)** use their authority to push for improved DISCO accountability and compliance.

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES
Are service improvements institutionalized and social norms shifted in targeted DISCO catchment areas?

15. **Targeted DISCOs** implement transparency and accountability practices as standard procedures.
16. **Targeted DISCO customers** demand and access transparently priced (e.g., metered) electricity.
17. **Targeted DISCO customers** have decreased tolerance for corruption (bribes and connecting illegally) when they see that DISCOs are combating corruption.
18. **Citizens in targeted DISCO catchment areas** have increased trust in the DISCOs’ ability to combat corruption.

INTERIM OUTCOMES
Are “teeth” actors operating transparently and holding others accountable?

19. **DISCOs across Nigeria** implement transparency and accountability practices as standard procedures.
20. **DISCO customers across Nigeria** receive transparently priced electricity services.
21. **DISCO customers across Nigeria** have decreased tolerance for corruption (bribes and illegal connections) when they see that DISCOs are combating corruption.
22. **Citizens across Nigeria** have increased trust in the DISCOs’ ability to combat corruption.

IMPACTS
Are service improvements institutionalized and social norms shifted nationwide?

Note: Outcomes 7 and 15 have been revised since the August 2018 Theory of Change to properly account for CPC’s role.
Exhibit A-7: Measures for the disruption of corruption in electricity distribution

1. **CSOs and customers** know their rights and how to access redress mechanisms related to electricity distribution.
   **Measure:** Proportion of DISCO customers who know their rights

2. **Cross-Cutting:** Journalists/media and CSOs share information about government and business anticorruption promises, activities, and wins.
   **Measure:** Number of media mentions of CSOs referencing anticorruption efforts
   **Measure:** Evidence of collaboration between journalists/media and CSOs

3. **CSOs and customers** advocate for and demand electricity services they should be receiving and use redress mechanisms.
   **Measure:** Evidence showing “voice” actors are demanding electricity services by using redress mechanisms
   **Measure:** Evidence showing “voice” actors are monitoring electricity services

4. **Federal government agencies** provide accurate, complete, and actionable information about metering, tariffs, and DISCOs’ performance (for all DISCOs).
   **Measure:** Evidence that federal government agencies provide accurate, complete, and actionable information about metering, tariffs, and DISCOs’ performance

5. **Federal government** develops and promulgates policies and regulations for the electricity sector to increase transparency and accountability for customers (e.g., billing, metering).
   **Measure:** Evidence that federal government agencies are developing policies and regulations for the electricity sector to increase transparency and accountability

6. **Targeted DISCOs** continue or improve practices that increase transparency and accountability for their services to customers.
   **Measure:** Proportion of customer and CSO complaints to DISCOs resolved

7. **NERC** and the **Consumer Protection Council (CPC)** use their authority to push for improved DISCO accountability and compliance.
   **Measure:** Proportion of NERC non-complying DISCOs sanctioned by NERC annually
   **Measure:** Degree to which NERC and DISCOs indicate that CSOs (including grantees) influenced their ability or willingness to combat corruption
   **Measure:** Evidence that CPC is using its authority to compel DISCOs to respond to customer complaints

8. **Targeted DISCOs** implement transparency and accountability practices as standard procedures.
   **Measure:** Proportion of targeted DISCOs implementing transparency and accountability practices as standard procedure

9. **Targeted DISCO customers** demand and access transparently priced (e.g., metered) electricity.
   **Measure:** Proportion of Nigerians in target DISCO areas indicating they: (1) are DISCO customers; (2) have a prepaid meter, and (3) feel electricity prices are transparent
   **Measure:** Proportion of customers seeking redress who were satisfied with DISCO’s response

10. **Targeted DISCO customers** have decreased tolerance for corruption (bribes and connecting illegally) when they see that DISCOs are combating corruption.
    **Measure:** Proportion of customers in target DISCO areas indicating they lack tolerance for corruption in electricity sector

11. **Citizens in targeted DISCO catchment areas** have increased trust in DISCOs’ ability to combat corruption.
    **Measure:** Proportion of citizens in target DISCO areas stating they trust DISCOs’ ability to combat corruption

12. **INTERIM OUTCOMES**

13. **LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

Captured through long-term outcome indicators with data from nationwide sample.
Exhibit A- 8: Theory of change to strengthen the criminal justice system in its fight against corruption

1. CSOs and journalists/media know the content of the ACJA and other proposed anticorruption policies.
2. Targeted legal practitioners and judges know core elements of the ACJA, generally and as related to corruption.
3. Legal institutions, judicial institutions, and CSOs develop tools and modules on the ACJA to be incorporated into core training for stakeholders, and mandate/use them in core training curricula and continuing legal education.
4. State assemblies have information and support they need to consider adopting the ACJA.
5. Federal government has information and support it needs to consider anticorruption legislation (complementary to the ACJA).

6. Criminal justice and anticorruption agencies demonstrate improved coordination.
7. CSOs participate in the federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee.
8. Cross-Cutting: Journalists/media and CSOs share information about government anticorruption promises, activities, and wins related to criminal justice.
9. CSOs advocate for the functioning of the federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee.
10. CSOs advocate for the strengthening of general federal anticorruption policies (complementary to the ACJA).
11. CSOs and journalists/media monitor compliance with the ACJA in anticorruption cases at state and federal levels.
12. CSOs use information about the ACJA to advocate for holding accountable those involved in corruption at state and federal levels.
13. CSOs develop model laws and/or policies that incorporate the essential, unifying, and progressive elements of the ACJA (including establishment of monitoring committees) for states not yet adopting a local version.

14. The Federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee monitors and supports compliance with the ACJA.
15. Federal government considers criminal justice-related anticorruption laws and policies (complementary to the ACJA).
16. State assemblies consider ACJA adoption with essential, unifying, and progressive elements.

17. Federal government and the judiciary implement criminal justice-related anticorruption policies and practices.
18. State and federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committees monitor and support states’ implementation and compliance with their versions of the ACJA.

19. State and federal judiciaries and prosecutors conduct more trials, including corruption cases, according to ACJA standards.

IMPACTS
Are anticorruption cases fully enforced in accordance with institutionalized legal standards?
Exhibit A-9: Measures for strengthening the criminal justice system in its fight against corruption

1. **Legal institutions, judicial institutions, and CSOs** develop tools and modules on the ACJA to be incorporated into core training for stakeholders, and mandate/use them in core training curricula and continuing legal education.
   **Measure:** Evidence of the integration of training tools/modules into legal training core (mandatory) curricula

2. **State and federal judiciaries and prosecutors** conduct more trials, including corruption cases, according to ACJA standards.
   **Measure:** Proportion of cases, including anticorruption cases, adhering to ACJA standards

3. **CSOs and journalists/media** share information about government anticorruption promises, activities, and wins related to criminal justice.
   **Measure:** Evidence of collaboration between journalists/media and CSOs

4. **Federal government considers criminal justice-related anticorruption laws and policies** (complementary to the ACJA).
   **Measure:** Number and type of federal criminal justice-related anticorruption laws and policies considered

5. **State assemblies consider ACJA adoption with essential, unifying, and progressive elements.**
   **Measure:** Status of consideration/adoption by state (levels: in consideration in state assembly, passed into law, implemented) AND degree of inclusion essential, unifying, and progressive elements

6. **CSOs participate in the federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee.**
   **Measure:** CSO representation on committee (Yes/No)

7. **Cross-Cutting: Journalists/media and CSOs** share information about government anticorruption promises, activities, and wins related to criminal justice.
   **Measure:** Number of media mentions of CSOs referencing anticorruption efforts
   **Measure:** Evidence of collaboration between journalists/media and CSOs

8. **CSOs and journalists/media** monitor compliance with the ACJA in anticorruption cases at state and federal levels.
   **Measure:** Evidence that CSOs are monitoring ACJA compliance, adoption, and/or enforcement

9. **Federal government and the judiciary** implement criminal justice-related anticorruption policies and practices.
   **Measure:** Evidence of federal government implementing criminal justice-related anticorruption laws, policies, and practices (levels: in consideration in state assembly, passed into law, implemented)

10. **State and federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committees** monitor and support states’ implementation and compliance with their versions of the ACJA.
    **Measure:** Proportion of states with committees monitoring results and recommending action on key ACJA procedures

11. **State and federal judiciaries and prosecutors** conduct more trials, including corruption cases, according to ACJA standards.
    **Measure:** Proportion of cases, including anticorruption cases, adhering to ACJA standards

**INTERIM OUTCOMES**

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**
Exhibit A-10: Theory of change to strengthen the field of media and journalism in the fight against corruption

1. **Independent media outlets** have increased capacity to support data-driven investigative reporting.

2. **Journalists** have increased capacity (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) to conduct data-driven investigative reporting.

3. **Citizens (including youth)** have increased capacity to effectively use social media to expose corruption, amplify reporting, and demand government action or investigative journalism.

4. **Cross-Cutting: Journalists, citizens, and CSOs** share information about government and business anticorruption promises, activities, and wins.

5. **Independent media houses and more journalists** conduct more and higher-quality investigative reporting driven by data to expose corruption, monitor anticorruption promises, and reveal wins (solutions).

6. **CSOs** amplify investigative reporting to expose corruption, demand government action, and show successes.

7. **More citizens** use social media to engage with (create, comment on, and share) corruption and accountability issues.

8. **Government officials and private-sector actors** take action in response to media coverage related to corruption issues.

9. **Citizens across Nigeria** have increased awareness of anticorruption wins.

10. **Citizens across Nigeria** are aware of which media houses are independent, and perceive them as sources of reliable information about corruption and anticorruption actions.

11. **Independent media outlets** invest in skills building for their reporters and editors, and provide more funding for investigative reporting on corruption and anticorruption.

12. **Independent media outlets** invest in and conduct high-quality investigative reporting as a standard of practice.
Exhibit A-11: Measures for strengthening the field of media and journalism in the fight against corruption

Captured through landscape and grantees data.

**Cross-Cutting: Journalists, citizens, and CSOs** share information about government and business anticorruption promises, activities, and wins.

- **Measure**: Number of media mentions of CSOs referencing anticorruption efforts
- **Measure**: Evidence of collaboration between journalists/media and CSOs

**Independent media houses and more journalists** conduct more and higher-quality investigative reporting driven by data to expose corruption, monitor anticorruption promises, and reveal wins (solutions).

- **Measure**: Proportion of corruption-related reporting meeting the high-quality standard
- **Measure**: Volume of corruption- and anticorruption-related reporting (number of articles; number of keyword mentions)
- **Measure**: Extent of anticorruption reporting by journalists trained by CSOs or media institutions

**CSOs** amplify investigative reporting to expose corruption, demand government action, and show successes.

- **Measure**: Extent to which CSOs amplify investigative reporting by using media reports for advocacy, accountability, and further spreading of the investigative reporting

**More citizens** use social media to engage with (create, comment on, and share) corruption and accountability issues.

- **Measure**: Proportion of citizens using social media to engage (create, comment on, and share) on corruption, governance, and accountability issues

**Government officials and private-sector actors** take action in response to media coverage related to corruption issues.

- **Measure**: Evidence of government officials and private-sector actors taking action in response to media coverage related to corruption issues

**Long-Term Outcomes**

**Citizens** across Nigeria have increased awareness of anticorruption wins.

- **Measure**: Proportion of citizens who are aware of positive outcomes of anticorruption actions
- **Measure**: Proportion of citizens who believe more people are being held accountable for their actions (in or outside of courts)

**Citizens** across Nigeria are aware of which media houses are independent, and perceive them as sources of reliable information about corruption and anticorruption actions.

- **Measure**: Proportion of citizens stating they view media as reliable source of information on corruption and anticorruption actions
- **Measure**: Proportion of citizens who indicate reporting quality on corruption has improved

**Independent media outlets** invest in skills building for their reporters and editors, and provide more funding for investigative reporting on corruption and anticorruption.

- **Measure**: Evidence that media outlets are undertaking significant efforts to improve investigative reporting quality and quantity
## Annex 2: On Nigeria Grantees by Module

### Exhibit A-12: On Nigeria UBEC Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Democratic Development Research and Training (CEDDERT)</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>14-May-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Life Project</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected Development Initiative</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>13-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Initiatives</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>14-May-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Awareness for Nigeria Women</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Resolve</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Private Development Centre</td>
<td>Capacity Building Teeth Voice</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>14-May-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Centre for Human Rights and Civic Education</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>3-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP LearNigeria Initiative</td>
<td>Voice Teeth Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>3-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Basic Education Commission</td>
<td>Teeth Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>31-Jan-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit A- 13: On Nigeria HGSF Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Health, Incorporated</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actionaid International Foundation Nigeria</td>
<td>Teeth</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>6-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Women’s Health and Information</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>3-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Gender for Development</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Muslim Women Associations in Nigeria</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>3-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Child Concerns</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>3-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College London, Partnership for Child Development</td>
<td>Teeth</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>13-Sep-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian Popular Theatre Alliance</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Consortium of Nigeria</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>15-Aug-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Exhibit A- 14: On Nigeria Electricity Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Nigerian Electricity Distributors</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>14-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brekete Family</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>20-Feb-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Protection Council (CPC)</td>
<td>Teeth</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>20-Feb-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nextier Capital Limited                      | Capacity Building  
Voice  
Collaboration | $400,000         | 31-Jan-2017        |
| Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission   | Teeth  
Capacity Building  
Collaboration | $600,000         | 12-Sep-2017        |
| Stakeholder Democracy Network                | Voice  
Capacity Building  
Collaboration | $350,000         | 14-May-2016        |

**Exhibit A- 15: On Nigeria Criminal Justice Grantees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Centre for Socio-Legal Studies (2)           | Teeth  
Capacity Building  
Collaboration | $1,700,000         | 7-Dec-2015        |
| CLEEN Foundation (3)                         | Teeth  
Capacity Building  
Collaboration  
Voice | $1,350,000         | 31-Oct-2015       |
| International Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) | Teeth  
Capacity Building | $400,000         | 13-May-2017        |
| Legal Defense and Assistance Project LEDAP (2) | Capacity Building  
Teeth | $1,023,000         | 14-Feb-2016       |
| Nigerian Bar Association                     | Teeth  
Capacity Building | $1,800,000         | 19-Jun-2017        |
| Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies | Teeth  
Capacity Building  
Collaboration  
Voice | $1,200,000         | 18-Jun-2017       |
| Partners West Africa – Nigeria               | Teeth  
Collaboration | $500,000         | 13-May-2017        |
| TrustAfrica                                   | Teeth  
Capacity Building  
Collaboration | $2,000,000         | 9-Jun-2015        |
### Exhibit A-16: On Nigeria Media and Journalism Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayero University, Kano</td>
<td>Capacity Building Voice Collaboration</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Broadcasting Corporation</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>24-Sep-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Newspaper Journalism Foundation</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Trust Foundation</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Investigative Journalism Network</td>
<td>Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>23-Jun-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Center for Journalists</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$44,388</td>
<td>1-Nov-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Centre for Investigative Reporting</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Times Centre for Investigative Journalism</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Impact Organization for Community Development</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>29-Jan-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reboot</td>
<td>Capacity Building Voice Collaboration</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahara Reporters</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Communications Limited</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
<td>24-Sep-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Eye Social Foundation</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Department of Journalism</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>6-Aug-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Funding (in USD)</td>
<td>Grant approval date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadata Communication Nig Ltd</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>24-Sep-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wole Soyinka Centre for Investigative Journalism</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit A-17: On Nigeria Cross-Cutting Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Funding (in USD)</th>
<th>Grant approval date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Lab</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>24-Jul-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Centre for Leadership, Strategy and Development</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>21-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Centre for Media and Information Literacy</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>13-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Fadeyi Foundation</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1-Nov-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Habibiyyah Islamic Society</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University, School of International Service</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$499,750</td>
<td>24-May-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arewa Research and Development Project</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>21-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayero University, Kano</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Insights (US) Inc.</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>25-Oct-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BudgIT</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>14-May-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BudgIT Foundation</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12-Nov-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Information Technology and Development</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>12-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Funding (in USD)</td>
<td>Grant approval date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Democracy and Development (Nigeria) (2)</td>
<td>Collaboration Voice Teeth</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>18-Jul-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Transparency Advocacy</td>
<td>Voice Collaboration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>13-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham House</td>
<td>Capacity Building Voice Teeth</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>12-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Legislative Advocacy Centre</td>
<td>Voice Collaboration</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>19-Jun-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>Capacity Building Collaboration</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>14-May-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Access International</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fans Connect Online Limited</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>21-Oct-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griot Studios</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>1-Nov-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government</td>
<td>Capacity Building Teeth</td>
<td>$377,400</td>
<td>31-Jan-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDA Resource Centre (2)</td>
<td>Voice Collaboration</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>21-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Definition Film Studio, Limited</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Capacity Building Voice</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>11-Feb-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Research and Exchanges Board</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>$49,800</td>
<td>4-Oct-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Terra Leadership Foundation</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Image Limited</td>
<td>Voice Capacity Building</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>21-Oct-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>13-Feb-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government Partnership Secretariat</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>9-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Funding (in USD)</td>
<td>Grant approval date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace of Priests Assembly</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>31-Oct-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Legal Advocacy Centre</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$1,070,000</td>
<td>12-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proteus Fund Inc.</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>13-Oct-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SceneOne Productions, Limited</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>12-Dec-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shehu Musa Yar’Adua Foundation (2)</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$2,004,000</td>
<td>19-Jun-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development Integrated Centre</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>21-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Rights and Accountability Project</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>14-May-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Citizens Online Democracy (2)</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$26,950</td>
<td>24-Jul-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>21-Sep-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Rights Advancement and Protection Alternative</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$1,562,000</td>
<td>21-Sep-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Initiative for Advocacy, Growth, and Advancement</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>13-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Detailed Evaluation and Learning Framework

The data presented in this report fall under the On Nigeria evaluation and learning framework. This framework uses a mixed-methods design and employs complexity-aware evaluation approaches, which are appropriate given the theory of change whose causal relationships are dynamic, non-linear, and not always known at the outset. The framework includes a range of measures to track interim and long-term outcomes and impacts. Primary source data include a national telephone survey, qualitative interviews and focus groups, media monitoring (including a quality assessment of investigative journalism), and feedback workshops with grantees. Secondary source data include document review, grantee data, and global corruption indices. Exhibit A-18 presents the sampling technique, unit(s), and size by method for primary sources data and document review.

Exhibit A-18: Sample design and target sample size for primary source data and document review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
<th>Unit(s)</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Telephone Survey</td>
<td>Stratified random</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>8,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Monitoring</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Media outlets (print, online, television, and radio; grantee and non-grantee)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assessment of Investigative Reporting</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>All 2016 corruption-related stories arising from media monitoring</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Interviews and Focus Groups</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Grantees, non-grantee CSOs, government, DISCOs, media, school and parent groups, donors, experts</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Workshops</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Grantees</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Review</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Grantee and non-grantee corruption- and anticorruption-related documents relevant to the On Nigeria strategy and context</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>(January 2015–August 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Data</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Grantee Annual Reports (counted and reviewed during document review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Grantee Monitoring Data: CLEEN surveys, Girl Child Concern and another grantee baseline, SDN survey</td>
<td>28 grantee annual reports (2016–2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most data sources in this report consist of a single cross-section, having been collected at one point; thus, they represent a “snapshot” in time. The telephone survey and qualitative questionnaires both asked respondents to make comparisons to prior years to obtain additional baseline insights. The media monitoring data are tracked over time and currently cover 2 years. Exhibit A-19 indicates the timing of data collection (for primary sources) or the period the data cover (for secondary sources), by each method.

Exhibit A-19: Period data collection methods cover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Telephone Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Investigative Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Interviews and Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption Indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subsections below describe the methods, sampling, and tools for each data source. A strength of the mixed-methods approach is the ability to triangulate findings across a rich variety of data sources. This improves validity by ensuring findings are grounded in multiple perspectives, and providing opportunities to explore the complexity and nuance of findings. To bring together the diverse data, the evaluation and learning partner first analyzed each data source separately. The team then synthesized findings over a 2-day data triangulation and interpretation session for each module, the strategy, and feedback to tell the main story of On Nigeria to date. The evaluation and learning partner presented and discussed these findings during participatory workshops with the On Nigeria Program Team and grantees to validate findings through feedback and additional input, as well as co-create conclusions and considerations.
National Telephone Survey 2018

**Design and Sample:** The national telephone survey used a 35-item questionnaire administered via phone to a representative sample of Nigerian citizens to measure population-level changes in citizens’ (1) actions—seeking redress, demanding accountability, and engagement with social media; (2) perceptions of the extent of corruption; (3) attitudes and social norms surrounding corruption; (4) levels of trust in the government to tackle corruption; and (5) experiences with service delivery and media consumption in On Nigeria target sectors. The survey will be repeated in future years using similar methods and sampling to enable comparison of a national cross-section over time.

EnCompass subcontracted NOIPolls (NOI) to administer the survey, with NOI’s database of 70 million phone-owning Nigerians serving as the sampling frame. NOI-assigned geographic quotas ensured that each state and senatorial district were proportionately represented in the sample. From this frame, data collectors attempted 15,803 contacts and completed 8,043 telephone interviews, reflecting a 50.4 percent response rate. NOI and EnCompass constructed sampling and post-stratification weights for all data presented in this report, with post-stratification weights based on the 2006 Nigerian census. The sampling weight accounts for the probability of selecting a respondent in each senatorial district, population coverage corrections, and non-response corrections, with the final weight for each respondent calculated as the product of the sampling weight and the post-stratification weight:

$$W(\text{respondent}) = \left( \frac{N_{1i}}{EA_i} \cdot \frac{N_i}{N_{1i}} \cdot \frac{EA_i}{AA_i} \right) \times PSW_j$$

Where:

- $N_i =$ Nigerian population age 18 and older (projected from 2006 census to 2017)
- $N_{1i} =$ NOIPolls number database age 18 and older in 2017 (sampling frame)
- $EA_i =$ expected sample in each senatorial district
- $AA_i =$ achieved sample in each senatorial district
- $PSW_j =$ post-stratification weight that adjusts for state and gender representation in final sample

In the final sample of 8,043 individuals, 42 percent were female, 70 percent were between 26 and 45 years of age, 53 percent had a post-secondary education, 69 percent lived in urban areas, and 50 percent had a monthly income of 60,000 Naira or less. Forty-eight (48) percent of interviews were conducted in English. Of these 8,043 respondents, 93 percent received their electricity from a DISCO, 30 percent had at least one child in a government primary or junior secondary school (thus, in a school eligible for UBEC funds), and 22 percent had at least one child in government primary or junior secondary schools and lived in a state with an operative HGSF program.
**Tool and Methods:** EnCompass developed the survey tool with input from a team of experienced Nigerian evaluators, corruption measurement experts, and NOI. Where appropriate, the team used validated survey instruments from Afrobarometer, the Global Corruption Barometer, and Corruption Victimization Surveys to inform question construction. In lieu of a baseline, one question asked respondents to compare the current prevalence of corruption (at both the national and state levels) to the prevalence 12 months prior, reflecting the direction of current trends.

NOI translated the finalized tool from English into four other languages (Hausa, Igbo, Pidgin English, and Yoruba). EnCompass consultants fluent in the respective languages and with experience collecting data on corruption issues, but who had not previously been exposed to the English version of the questionnaire, back translated the language versions into English. EnCompass and this team then worked with NOI to reconcile differences and make final edits to translated versions. Two members of the EnCompass team attended enumerator training where further, slight modifications were made to the questionnaire for clarity based on feedback from enumerators—each fluent in the language they would administer the tool in. NOI piloted the tool in all five languages with 543 respondents in July 2018 and analyzed the data with EnCompass; pilot data analysis looked for outliers in response by language to identify any potential questions where translations might be inaccurate, and concluded there were no outliers that had not shown similar cross-language variance in other surveys, such as Afrobarometer. EnCompass and NOI used qualitative feedback from enumerators, collected through daily pilot debriefs, to make final adjustments to phrasing. Pilot data were not included in the data presented in this report.

NOI conducted full data collection from August 27 to September 28, 2018, with an average length of survey administration of 15.65 minutes. EnCompass conducted weekly data checks to ensure quality.

**Analysis:** Data analysis used descriptive and inferential statistics to produce population-level estimates, expressed as a point estimate within a range reflecting the 95-percent confidence interval. Most data were disaggregated by On Nigeria target state, DISCO catchment area, and sex, as appropriate and as feasible given sample sizes. A few questions—primarily those related to media and journalism and corruption more broadly—were further disaggregated by age, education, income, and geopolitical zone. All disaggregations presented in this report are statistically significant. Analysis was conducted in the Stata 14 software.

**Limitations:** The national telephone survey has the following limitations:

- Telephone administration excludes individuals without phones. If the demographics or responses of phone-owning Nigerians differ from those without phones, data would be biased toward the responses of those with phones. As described in the next point, comparison with household surveys administered face-to-face showed similar results for common items, but this cannot be inferred to mean that there would be no differences on other items between Nigerians with and without phones.
- Key strategy-level “anchor” questions that align to Afrobarometer produced responses within each respective tool’s margin of error, indicating good crossinstrument reliability of these
questions. However, this reliability cannot be assumed for other items, and it is not known whether phone or face-to-face survey administration would produce more accurate results.

- The sample size of 8,043 was not sufficient to allow for statistically significant subnational disaggregation of questions related to the education programs (UBEC Intervention Fund and HGSF), which have restriction criteria limiting the number of eligible respondents.
Qualitative Interviews 2018

Design and Sample: The qualitative interviews and focus groups asked respondents to reflect on the things as they stood at the time of the interview (representing a cross-section), combined with retrospective questions about changes in the “last 3 years” to understand changes that occurred since 2016.

The total qualitative sample in 2018 included 169 interviews and focus group discussions (see Exhibit A-20). Respondents were sampled purposively to represent key On Nigeria stakeholders, beneficiaries, and all grants funded and active as of November 2017 for each module (see Exhibit A-21).

Exhibit A-20: 2018 Qualitative sample: 169 interviews and focus groups (266 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantees and Sub-Grantees</td>
<td>59 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Donors and Experts</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Grantee CSOs and Parent Groups</td>
<td>23 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Officials</td>
<td>22 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Businesses (including DISCOs)</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, LGEA, and SBMC Officials</td>
<td>31 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Organizations and Journalists</td>
<td>12 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit A-21: Interviews conducted by state

Analysis: The evaluation and learning partner conducted qualitative analysis in the online qualitative analysis software, Dedoose, using deductive and inductive coding to organize data, followed by thematic analysis. All transcripts were deductively coded to the On Nigeria measures, context, and assumption questions, while parallel inductive coding ensured the most common themes articulated by respondents surfaced.

Content and Methods: Qualitative interviews and focus groups captured (1) strength and momentum related to collaboration and anticorruption actions; (2) behavior change of key actors; and (3) perceptions of the most significant changes in systems and structures designed to reduce corruption. All qualitative interviews employed appreciative inquiry, an asset-based approach that surfaces strengths and the most significant changes respondents identify, as well as a vision for the future and steps needed to make that reality.

Limitations: On Nigeria stakeholders may have a bias due to a vested interest in the project’s success or protecting their own reputations. Effective probing during interviews and corroborating across respondents and data sources strengthen data validity and help mitigate this potential bias. Data from questions about changes in the last 3 years could be limited by respondents’ recall bias; nevertheless, they provide an indication of respondents’ perceptions regarding trends since On Nigeria’s inception and help mitigate the larger challenge of being unable to compare the current state to a baseline. Recall bias is mitigated by careful probing, contrasting questions about 3 years ago with questions about the past year, and triangulation with other data sources, particularly...
document review and media monitoring. Some stakeholder groups were difficult to reach, which led to under-sampling of federal and state government representatives, especially those representing the Criminal Justice module. Efforts will be made to rectify this issue for 2019 data collection.
Media Monitoring 2016 and 2018

**Design and Sample:** Media monitoring tracks reporting by conventional print, radio, television, and online media outlets over time, using a set of pre-identified keywords corresponding to On Nigeria’s work in the modules and at the strategy level. This report presents data gathered retrospectively based on digital media archives for 2016 and 2018; ongoing media monitoring will continue throughout On Nigeria’s period of activity. Parallel, retrospective 2017 data will be gathered prior to the next report. To ensure comparability of data over time, the 2016 and 2018 methods align.

EnCompass subcontracted Playspread LLC, based in Lagos, to conduct the media monitoring. The media monitoring sample targets 24 media sources in 2016 and 26 sources from 2018 on, which EnCompass selected purposively in conjunction with Nigerian media experts at Playspread and the On Nigeria team (see Exhibit A-22). The sample covers the most widely read and broadcast media sources in Nigeria and media outlets that are On Nigeria grantees, and ensures regional representation of Nigeria’s main media markets. Although purposively drawn, the selection of media sources is designed to capture a broad swath of Nigerian journalism and be of sufficient size to reflect national trends in corruption reporting.

**Exhibit A-22: News sources sampled for 2016 and 2018 media monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIT Network</td>
<td>Raypower Network</td>
<td>This day</td>
<td>Daily Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxy Network (Lagos and Ibadan)</td>
<td>Brila FM (Abuja, Kaduna, Lagos, and Onitsha) (sports and news)</td>
<td>The Sun (sensational)</td>
<td>*The Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels Network (Abuja, Edo, Kano, Lagos)</td>
<td>Rhythm FM (Edo State, FRCN)</td>
<td>Vanguard (Edo State)</td>
<td>*International Centre for Investigative Reporting (ICIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels Network (Abuja, Edo, Kano, Lagos)</td>
<td>Rhythm FM (Edo State, FRCN)</td>
<td>Vanguard (Edo State)</td>
<td>*International Centre for Investigative Reporting (ICIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTA Network</td>
<td>KSMC Kaduna (FRCN)</td>
<td>Daily Times</td>
<td>*Premium Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STV Network</td>
<td>Wazobia FM Lagos (in Pidgin English)</td>
<td>*Daily Trust (Abuja/FCT state/Kaduna state)</td>
<td>*Sahara Reporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock City FM (FRCN, Ogun State)</td>
<td>Leadership (Abuja/FCT state/Kaduna state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool FM Abuja</td>
<td>Punch (Lagos State)</td>
<td>Guardian (Lagos State)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nation (Ogun State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * denotes a grantee news source; “Media name” denotes that this source was added in 2018.
Content and Methods: Media monitoring measures the level of coverage related to corruption issues and anticorruption actions, including the degree to which civil society’s and citizens’ anticorruption work is amplified through media coverage. Data consist of (1) numerical frequencies of keyword mentions, which capture the quantity of corruption-related reporting on different topics; (2) the overall tone (perspective) of articles—whether articles are focused on instances of corruption or on anticorruption wins; and (3) an assessment of the quality of investigative journalism (see below). Keywords are specific to each module and cover grantees, “voice” and “teeth” activities, and goods and service delivery. Exhibit A-23 below shows the steps Playspread uses to collect, screen, and analyze the data.

Exhibit A-23: Media monitoring process

1. All media crawled, captured, and extracted; TV and radio audio converted to text
2. All media screened for filter/keyword combinational searches; Data further separated for content relevance
5. Data classified into keyword, subkey, and grantee classes
6. Mentions coded for perspective (corruption evidence, anticorruption efforts, neutral)

EnCompass, with input from Playspread and the On Nigeria team, selected corruption- and anticorruption-related keywords for each module (148 in 2016, 207 in 2018); media monitoring screened for these keywords alongside 35 corruption-related filters. Additional granting necessitated the addition of cross-cutting keywords. The complete list of keywords is provided in Annex 3.

Relevant keywords, also referred to as “mentions,” are reported and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Media monitoring data are analyzed in Excel, using descriptive statistics—primarily counts (frequency distributions and cross-tabulations)—to capture trends over time.

Limitations: Some grantee media sources are not available for retroactive monitoring through digital archives. However, the retroactive media monitoring sample is still large enough to ensure strong coverage of the Nigerian media landscape.

Quality of Investigative Journalism Design and Sample: The 2016 analysis of investigative reporting quality drew from the 1,266 print and online articles in the 2016 media monitoring dataset. A professor in the School of Communications at Lagos State University led this analysis with assistance from graduate student researchers who served as coders, under the Playspread’s supervision and EnCompass’ overall direction.

Before measuring report quality, the lead researcher determined whether or not each article could be classified as “investigative.” Articles had to meet two standards—in-depth and proactive, as defined below. If a report met both, it qualified as an investigative report.

- **In-depth**: Reporting to investigate a single topic in-depth (i.e., examination attempts to be systematic, thorough, or present more than one perspective), typically to “uncover
corruption, review government policies or corporate houses, or draw attention to social, economic, political, or cultural trends.”

- **Proactive:** Reporting proactively gathers information that was not previously public; it is **not** simply a passive reaction/report on press releases, government announcements, or related content.

**Quality of Investigative Journalism Content and Methods:** Originally, only if an investigative article assessed first passed the in-depth and proactive test, it would then be measured for five standards of investigative quality: (1) public interest, (2) report originality, (3) neutrality of investigation, (4) research quality, and (5) source variety. To develop standards for quality, EnCompass conducted a literature review of reports and guides detailing investigative reporting. Sources from this review included the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes (UNODC), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Center for International Media Assistance (CIMA), and International Centre for Investigative Reporting (ICIR), among others. The five domains for quality used in this analysis are based on common themes that emerged from the literature review (See Annex 3 for the full tool).

To ensure inter-coder reliability, the coders received training and took part in inter-coder reliability tests conducted on a sample of 15 percent of articles. Based on coders’ Likert scale scores, the researcher and coders held discussions and determined a final set of scores for each article. EnCompass also audited and independently coded a random sample of 5 percent of the articles to ensure coder agreement.

Because few reports qualified as “investigative” according to the “in-depth” and “proactive” criteria, researchers applied the five standards to all 1,266 reports. The lowest score possible to assign was a “5.” Of the 1,266 articles, 1,242 received a score of “5.” Overall, only six met investigative journalism quality standards, receiving a score of “17” or higher. Similar to traditional media monitoring, the assessment of the quality of investigative journalism also relied on frequencies; however, as the number of articles grows, it is expected that median will be used to measure central tendency.

**Quality of Investigative Journalism Limitations:** Assessing the quality of an article requires coders to make a subjective judgment, which creates possibility that some degree of non-agreement can occur. However, an EnCompass audit found a 4.8-percent non-agreement rate, which is small enough to prevent a bias of overall results.
Document Review 2016–2018

**Design and sample:** Document review provides data for a variety of measures, including court records and legal cases; allocations of service-directed monies and expenditures; supply chain data; meter installment geographical distributions; and studies and reports from civil society, grantee annual reports, government, and the international community.

Document review covers relevant documents published from January 1, 2016 to August 2018. In limited instances, documents published in 2015 that were highly relevant to evaluation questions were also included.

Document review used a screening process to identify relevant documents during each round of data collection and analysis. Document collection compiled news items and reports the MacArthur Foundation and grantees forwarded with documents the evaluation and learning partner independently identified through searches. This first step yielded over 600 documents. At the second stage, documents were screened for relevance; all those deemed relevant to On Nigeria measures or context and assumption questions are included in the review. Documents are drawn from a variety of sources, including the media, international and Nigerian nongovernmental organizations’ reports, donor reports, academia and think tank publications, grantee reports, workshop notes, presentations, and other relevant documents.

**Content and Methods:** Documents varied widely in content. Consequently, the data resulting from this exercise include but are not limited to the following: (1) strength and momentum related to collaboration, capacity, and anticorruption actions; (2) behavior change of key actors, including government, donors, grantees, and citizens; (3) evolution of corruption- and anticorruption-related laws and policies; (4) content containing key contextual information relevant to a particular module or the On Nigeria strategy; and (5) anticorruption-related activities and/or content grantees generated.

**Analysis:** After the initial scan, evaluation team members identified 450 relevant documents, and assigned excerpts from these documents to one or more of the 102 codes related to On Nigeria theory of change measures, context questions, and assumptions across all modules. The team then conducted an analysis of the 1,367 coded excerpts, and produced a summary document related to each module.

**Limitations:** Throughout initial document collection, some documents were unavailable, or contained limited or incomplete information. Due to the volume of documents, limitations within this activity varied based on particular documents. Documents came from a variety of sources, including media, donors, and grantees; therefore, different documents could have particular biases, based on the authorizing source. Similarly, the volume of reports did not necessarily allow for a quality check on all data published in reports, such as government or DISCO reports.
Grantee Data

Grantee monitoring data include available grantee annual reports, data grantees collect as part of implementation activities (e.g., beneficiaries reached, training reports and statistics, public content produced), and data from monitoring and evaluation activities (e.g., tracking, surveys, assessments). The grantee data validation exercise, initiated in summer 2018, verified what data grantees are actually collecting (whether for monitoring or as part of grant activities) and when, and determined which data can be reasonably expected to contribute to the evaluation and learning framework, particularly in 2019.

Because grantee data are a secondary source, the evaluation and learning partner does not control the timeline of their availability. Consequently, this synthesis report only includes data that (1) grantees analyzed into a summary format (e.g., no raw data); (2) mentors and grantees shared with the evaluation and learning partner as part of the grantee validation process as of October 2018; and (3) the evaluation and learning partner determined to be of sufficient quality in method and collection to cite (e.g., reasonable sample sizes for the types of inferences made and valid tools).

This report cites four main pieces from the subset of grantee data that met these criteria:

1. *Grantee Annual Reports 2016 and 2017* (28 reports reviewed during document review process)
2. *CLEEN Household Survey 2017 and 2018* (further detailed below)
3. *SDN Corruption Perception Index Report 2017*
4. *Girl Child Concerns Baseline Assessment Report 2018*

It is expected that both number and type of grantee data available to the evaluation and learning partner will be greatly expanded in 2019.

**CLEEN Household Survey 2017 and 2018 Design and Sample:** Criminal justice grantee CLEEN Foundation conducted surveys in 2017 and 2018, aimed in part at obtaining a better understanding and perception of citizens’ assessment of the implementation of the ACJA. The survey included one set of respondents who were members of the general public, and another who were members of criminal justice agencies, such as police, judges, prosecutors, and others. The 2017 survey included 4,489 members of the public and 610 criminal justice practitioners; in 2018, there were 4,539 public respondents and 618 practitioners surveyed. Enumerators conducted the survey in six states: Abuja Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Adamawa, Cross River, Imo, Kaduna, and Lagos. CLEEN researchers chose respondents through a multi-stage stratified random cluster sample.

**CLEEN Household Survey 2017 and 2018 Content and Methods:** Data collection consisted of in-home, face-to-face personal interviews. The questionnaire was administered in computer-assisted personal interviewing format, using tablet devices. CLEEN researchers assured quality through enumerator training, survey piloting, and spot checking 15 percent of each enumerator’s interviews.

**CLEEN Household Survey 2017 and 2018 Analysis:** CLEEN Foundation produced a report of findings after performing descriptive and inferential statistics to produce population-level estimates.
EnCompass team members conducted secondary data analysis to produce point estimates within a 95-percent confidence interval. Most data were disaggregated by state, and some were disaggregated by age, gender, education, and income. All disaggregations presented in this report were statistically significant. Analysis was conducted in Stata 14 software.

CLEEN Household Survey 2017 and 2018 Limitations: CLEEN Foundation used face-to-face personal interviews; conducting fieldwork in certain sensitive-security regions was challenging. Additionally, there are criminal justice practitioners who work in sectors dealing with sensitive information, and CLEEN enumerators had to obtain formal permission before interviewing some officials.
Corruption Indices

**Content:** The evaluation and learning framework specifies three corruption indices used to measure the extent of corruption in Nigeria, the population’s perceptions of corruption, the degree to which the population prioritizes addressing corruption, and social norms surrounding corruption. These indices are drawn from the following sources:

- World Bank Governance Indicators dataset’s control of corruption indicator
- Gallup’s annual survey of Nigerians’ attitudes about the country’s top priorities
- The Afrobarometer survey

As of December 2018, the evaluation and learning partner was working to add the Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer by addressing gaps in the Nigeria data for critical data points; if these gaps can be addressed, the Global Corruption Barometer is anticipated to be added in future years’ data collection.

The selection of these indices reflects the evaluation and learning partner’s recommendations based on the measures in the evaluation framework and needs the MacArthur Foundation articulated. However, as of December 2018, a final determination regarding the indices to measure On Nigeria’s progress was still pending further reflection within the MacArthur Foundation.

**Methods:** Afrobarometer and Gallup are citizen surveys producing population estimates representative of the Nigerian public, while the World Bank indicator is a composite indicator that uses multiple underlying data sources, including both representative and non-representative sources, which are rescaled to create the aggregate indicator. Each of these data sources contains extensive methodological details available on its website.

Data represent time series data, with each source available for at least three points. Because data are available reaching up to 10 years back, they provide an authentic, high-level understanding of the situation prior to the start of On Nigeria, both at baseline and the trends for the preceding years.

**Limitations:** Corruption indices produced by international organizations and publicly available provide an overall snapshot progress toward On Nigeria’s ultimate goal of reducing corruption at the highest level. Reducing corruption at the country level is the result of a multitude of actors and actions, and cannot be attributed to—or indeed, achieved by—any single intervention. In the long term, at the point where trends in these indices corresponding to On Nigeria’s period of activity are clear, the evaluation framework anticipates that contribution analysis may be able to help understand On Nigeria’s unique role in changes in the level of corruption at this high level. Nonetheless, these indices must be interpreted with extreme caution because they reflect trends much broader than On Nigeria’s sphere of control. They are generally produced for diagnostic, not program evaluation purposes. Best practice guidance within the field of corruption measurement and evaluation recommends that impact measures be directly linked to the reforms a program is
as broad measures of the overall amount or perceptions of corruption in a country, these indices, by their nature, are not directly linked to any one set of anticorruption reforms On Nigeria supports. The extent to which corruption—an illicit behavior that, therefore, occurs out of the public sphere of directly observable actions—can even be measured is a topic that remains controversial among governance experts.