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Abstract

The aim of this master thesis is to investigate how the new aid architecture has changed the way Sida conducts dialogue with the Government of Tanzania. The new aid architecture, as it is presented in the Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness, focuses on strengthening partner country ownership, but it also inexplicitly highlights old unsolved dialogue problems, such as asymmetrical power relations, which needs to be dealt with, if the development cooperation is to have the effect it wants. The problem then is to find it whether or not the new aid architecture enforces or diminishes these unsolved dialogue problems. We use Sven-Eric Liedman’s method on critique of ideology to see how the gathered data’s (policy documents, semi-structured interviews, field notes and so on) different perceptions of the communicative ‘reality’ clash and we explain this clash with Jürgen Habermas’ theory on communicative action. The study has resulted in several conclusions; it is clear that the new aid architecture has had an enormous impact on the development cooperation between Sida and the Government of Tanzania. Firstly, the dialogue has become politicised, thus excluding ordinary Tanzanian citizens from the development process. Secondly, Sida will find it increasingly difficult to promote important Swedish positions because of the new aid architecture. Thirdly, the asymmetrical power relations depend on how much the Government of Tanzania is willing to listen to the donors. If the Government of Tanzania ignores the donors they can have full ownership over their own development process, at the moment this seems to be the case. This means that the new aid architecture has produced a gap in the dialogue between Sida and the Government of Tanzania.
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1 Introduction

Once again the world stands at crossroads when it comes to the development cooperation. Once again the old ways of doing development are being discarded for something new. And once again the rhetoric’s are filled to the brim with good intentions and hopes of a better future for all human beings on the planet. The entire buzz is backed up by two separate documents, which hold the promises of ownership instead of donorship, of increased aid and reduction of poverty. One of the documents is the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) agreed on by all of the world’s countries; the other is the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, formulated by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and endorsed by more than a hundred countries. The idea is that the partner countries for far too long have adjusted to the wishes of different donors; donors who, over and over again, have interfered with the course for their partner countries development. Instead; it is now time for the partner countries to be ‘in the driver’s seat’ of their own development, and it’s time for the donors to adapt to their needs. This change requires new aid modalities and a change of routines. One of the major changes, which have already taken place in countries such as Tanzania and Zambia, is the formation of Donor Partner Groups (DPGs) aiming at coordinating the donors efforts to the partners countries own development strategies. The intention is that the donors should no longer meet with the partner country one at the time. Instead Lead Agents within every sector must be appointed from the DPG, then, these Lead Agents will go into dialogue with the partner country on issues concerning that sector. This is meant to be both a time and capacity saving measure for the partner countries and a chance for them to focus on other issues.

If this dialogue is to work ideally it is important that all parties have equal opportunities to express their views and can do so freely. This is what has caught our interest; the free dialogue! We are wondering if the dialogue really is, or can be, free within the structures of development aid, and we wish to find out if the stated new course for the development cooperation also means that the partner countries are finally heard, or if the DPGs are just donors ganging up in order to get their views across. After all, it makes for little difference that you are driving the car of development if someone else tells you where to go with it. Thus our purpose is to find out whom the directions for the road ahead is coming from – in short; who controls the dialogue – the DPGs or the partner country, and how is it performed?
1.1 Point of departure/Aim

The significance of communication and dialogue is essential in all forms of development cooperation since communication is part of interaction, which in turn is a way to cooperate (Eriksson and Modin 2003:4). It is obvious that the efficiency of international development cooperation is dependent on a well-functioning communication and dialogue between all the involved partners (Palm and Wiklund 2006:3), which also serves as a fundamental cornerstone when implementing a genuine partnership in development cooperation. Without a well-functioning communication and dialogue, a partnership, which is based on; agreed objectives of cooperation; shared basis of values, and mutual trust and respect (Karlsson 1998:257) is impossible to obtain.

A well recognized constraint to international development cooperation is that the relationship between the partners from the South and the North is of an asymmetrical character. This is reflected in how dialogues are distorted structurally and according to status, both vertically and horizontally between the different institutional actors in international development cooperation. The dialogues on a horizontal level between the Northern partners (donors) and the Southern partner (receiver) are affected by the power imbalance that is linked to the resources that the donor have. This creates an unequal relationship from the start, regardless of the claims made for mutuality (Eriksson Baaz 2002:8). The donors, who are in possession of the well sought after resources, also, dictate the conditions of the cooperation. This complicates the dialogue, since the partners in the cooperation participate on completely different conditions (Olsson and Wohlgemuth 2003:1). On a vertical level, there is a larger diversity of actors that are hierarchically arranged according to respective level of power and status, a relationship that produces gaps in the communication and fragments the dialogue in the development cooperation. The problems presented have been known to actors involved in development cooperation from the early days of development aid in the 1960’s, resulting in many reports and evaluations. The tendency, however, has been to solve the problems on a theoretical level, rather than on a practical. This results in an absence of improvement for the people that development cooperation is meant to target (Albinson 1996:12ff).

The formation of DPGs is partly a result of the new aid architecture, which is drawn up in the Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness. Today the horizontal dialogues are increasingly being held between DPGs and the partner country, as an effort to achieve aid effectiveness (Sida
To ensure ownership the partner country should be ‘in the driver’s seat’ in the dialogue with the donors, and is assumed to encourage donor coordination. The donors on the other side speak with ‘one voice’ and are supposed to be sensitive to the political context in the partner country (Palm and Wiklund 2004:20).

On a horizontal level the new aid architecture changes the working conditions for Sweden/Swedish international development agency (Sida) and its ability to put forward important Swedish positions. “The challenge for a Sida employee today is to communicate well in this context which is, in part, new and more complex. The ability of the individual to “drive processes forward” is becoming increasingly important” (Sida 2006a:5). At the same time, the new process of donor harmonisation has proven to be time-consuming, which means a tougher pressure on smaller donor countries, such as Sweden, who must be well staffed in order to meet the challenge (Odén and Tinnes 2003:4; Hök 2007:5). On a vertical level there is a fear that increased donor coordination, would make Sida pursue dialogues with other donors to a larger degree than with partner country representatives on different levels (Sida 2006a:19).

Thus, the new aid architecture, as it is presented in the Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness, comes not only with an assumed strengthening of ownership, it also highlights old unsolved dialogue problems, as well as posing new questions, which needs to be dealt with, if the development cooperation is to have the effect it wishes to have. Our scientific problem is then; to find out, how the new aid architecture affects the way dialogue is performed within development cooperation. We have chosen to do so, by focusing on the relationship between Sweden/Sida and the Government of Tanzania (GoT).

Thus, the overall aim of our study is to investigate how Sida’s dialogue with Tanzania has changed with the new aid architecture. Our focus will primarily be on the shift from a strict bilateral partnership dialogue between Sida and the Tanzanian partners on government level, to partnership dialogues between DPGs and the Tanzania partners on government level. Potential problems within this new type of dialogues will also be investigated.
1.2 Research questions

The following questions are derived from the above mentioned aim.

- How has the new aid architecture changed the way Sida conducts dialogue with the GoT?
  - Is Sida able to promote, for Sweden, important positions or is it constrained by other donors?
  - How has the donor coordination process affected the communication and power structures between donors and Tanzania?

1.3 Delimitations

Even though grass root perspectives might come through in the study, the focus will be on Sida, the DPGs and GoT. The study is not goal oriented, rather method oriented towards dialogues as a tool of enhancing the aid relationship between Sida and GoT. Therefore, we will not debate whether or not development cooperation is beneficent for its target as a whole and we will not be focusing on other variables making development cooperation un/successful. It should also be noted that this study is about the changing platform for conducting dialogues between Sida and Tanzania. Its aim is not to assess broader issues, such as the outcome of general budget support, and project support versus programme support.

Lastly, we have not conducted any interviews with Tanzanian representatives. This may be found problematic, and could, in the light of the power relations we have pointed to above, be somewhat disqualifying for the study. However, we have found, based on our personal experience in Tanzania, that getting answers, which differentiate greatly from the ones the donor country delivers, takes time and an earned trust, which is above the timeframe and scope of this study. We therefore find that the openness and self-criticism we have received from the interviewed, active and retired Sida personnel to a great extent compensate for the lack of the Tanzanian side being represented in this study. Nonetheless, it is, due to the above mentioned fact, impossible for us to say, with any reliability, what the GoT’s perception of the dialogue process is or how they feel their part in the dialogue has been affected. We can only see the GoT through the eyes of the Sida personnel we have interviewed, and as such it can only be their perception and understanding of the GoT’s part in the dialogue we bring forward here.
1.4 Relevance of the study
The relevance of our study can be summed up in the following quote, which for us is to be understood in a threefold manner:

‘Development cooperation comes down to relationships. The quality of this relation determines whether development cooperation is successful or not.’ (Wohlgemuth 2007-03-31)

It is the relationships between Sida and the GoT; Sida and the DPG; and the DPG and the GoT that must have a certain quality if the development cooperation is to be successful. We see the quality of this relationship as highly dependant on a certain quality of dialogue, and we believe that there is a gap in prior evaluations and undertakings in understanding how dialogue works and can be enhanced. It seems that it is a common feature of evaluations concerning development cooperation that the communication between donors is an area in which relatively little research has been done (Palm andWiklund 2004:32). This should not, however, be understood as if no attempts have been made, actually the question of dialogue has been receiving more and more attention the last couple of years. We will thus turn to some of the recent developments and conclusions that this attention has amounted to. As with the interviews our focus will remain with Sida and the DPGs.

1.4.1 Sida’s own findings
Sida acknowledge the importance of dialogue in the relationships with its partner countries and other donors. In the guide for Sida’s staff on working methods and procedures, Sida at Work (2005), it is stated that it doesn’t matter for the partner country whether the resources are delivered by Sweden or other donors, as long as they are “well-coordinated, based on a common, coherent approach and a well developed dialogue […]” (Sida 2005:38). However, the most recent Policy Paper from Sida on dialogue issues: Dialogue and Strategic Communication in Development Cooperation, which is based on extensive interviews with Sida Personal, found that Sida at Work was lacking some key perspectives on how to pursue dialogue within the new aid architecture. For instance, there is no mentioning of how Sida is to perform dialogue with a large number of international actors, such as DPGs, Development Assistance Committee (DAC), and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This means that Sida only has the capacity for conducting bilateral dialogues (Sida 2006a:10).
Another point missing, is that the dialogue gradually is shifting towards a more political dimension, parallel with the shift in aid from project based support to programme support (see figure below).

In other words Sida’s dialogue-capacity is still on forms of project support.

For us this points to the fact, that there is a need for research in this area. Even though Sida in the report attempts to bring forward measures that could steer dialogue in the right direction, we believe that there is a need for Sida-outsiders to engage themselves in the matter. Not because we find Sida to be untrustworthy, but rather because we think that a scrutiny, of your own organisation financed by yourself, as the mentioned rapport, can lead to unfortunate conflicts of interest. Furthermore we believe that it is always important for the academic world to raise questions, formulate problems and shed light on matters, which active agents in the studied subject, in our case the development cooperation, may find hard to view from anything but the inside.

1.4.2 International Studies

A few studies have been undertaken on the new aid relations in Tanzania that the emergence of the new aid architecture together with the joint assistant aid strategies has created. The studies we have read include: A study from 2003 by OECD/DAC: *Draft report for the study on Risk in Increased Donor Cooperation*; a joint report by the Government of Tanzania and Development Partners from 2004: *Tanzania’s Experience in Aid Coordination, Harmonisation and Alignment - From Chaos to Harmony*; a report made by the Economic

Common for these reports and studies are that they, even though their main focus is broader and on the new aid modalities as whole, point to the fact that dialogue problems exists. They do not, however, spend much time in exploring these problems but simply raise a couple of core challenges and conclusions. Some of these are: Firstly, that, cross-cutting issues dominate a great deal of the dialogue session and leaves less room for sector specific challenges (ESRF 2005:31); secondly, that an open broad-based dialogue among government, development partners and civil society stakeholders is crucial if a widespread acceptance and support of development and aid harmonisation efforts and a securing of their sustainability are to be achieved (Government of Tanzania and Development Partners 2004:21), thirdly, that donors have not established a common language, meaning that the DPG may speak with one voice but with a variety of different accents (OECD/DAC 2003:15) and lastly, there seems to be, in all of the studies, the problem with great unreliability in how often scheduled meetings actually take place.

As stated in our aim we wish to see how Sida’s dialogue with Tanzania has changed with the new aid architecture. We are not interested in the changes in the entire relationship. It seems to us that there is a gap in the studies we have found. Sida’s own studies show that something has changed and that Sida right now doesn’t seem ready, but it does not ask; how power relations within the donor community has changed or how the quality of dialogue has changed? The international studies focus on the entire process, wherein changes in dialogue are just a part of that change, but they don’t deal with the changes in dialogue with a bilateral donor as point of departure. The reports and studies wishes to understand the puzzle as a whole. Our focus is on a piece of that puzzle, we believe that one must understand all the pieces separately if one wishes to see the whole puzzle clearly, and we feel that the relevance of this study is justified by just that.

1.5 Disposition
In chapter two follows a description of the methods adopted to collect and analyze the data for this study. It also briefly describes the selection, validity, and problems with the methodology. Chapter three presents the theoretical framework used to understand the surrounding power
aspects that influence the context of the dialogue, where the gathered material has been created, regardless if spoken or written. Chapter four gives a background that serves as a reference map for the empirical material collected. It includes facts about Tanzania and the development cooperation between Sweden and Tanzania; the emergence of aid coordination in Tanzania; and how Sida view dialogue and communication in development cooperation, and possible challenges for dialogue and communication in the new aid architecture. Chapter five presents the results together with analyses of the empirical investigation. Chapter six and seven contains conclusions and a discussion of the overall result as well as some concluding remarks on the study.
2 Methodology

Tanzania has a long history of development cooperation, dating back to independence in the early 1960s. Currently, external finance to Tanzania is composed of loans, guarantees and grants from 22 multilateral institutions and 21 bilateral donors (Omari 2007-03-28). We have chosen to study the change in dialogue between Sida and Tanzania that the new aid architecture results in for three reasons. First is the long engagement Sida has in Tanzania and therefore the large availability of both written material and first hand experiences of development cooperation between the countries. Second is that Tanzania has come far in terms of the new aid modalities and their interplay with the donor coordination process (Odén and Tinnes 2003:4). Third is our own experience of the development cooperation between Sweden and Tanzania, within our academic studies.

Our study is mainly based on empirical data given by Sida workers own experiences and interpretations of their work with its Tanzanian counter parts, either through semi-structured interviews or from notes taken at a study visit in Tanzania between 25th of March and 4th of April, 2007. The secondary data gathered mainly includes reports and policy papers concerning the new aid architecture, recent trends in the Tanzanian development cooperation, and Sida’s view on dialogue in development cooperation. Since the empirical and secondary data are difficult to measure we choose to use critique of ideology (Liedman and Nilsson 1989) as a qualitative method to analyse the gathered data. By using a qualitative method to analyse the gathered data we believe we “can provide a ´deeper´ understanding of social phenomena than would be obtained from purely quantitative data” (Silverman 2001:32).

2.1 Data collection

Three types of methods concerning data collection were used in this study: Semi-structured interviews, note-taking at study visits in Tanzania and document search on the Internet.

2.1.1 Semi-structured interviews

To increase the value of the gathered data and create a foundation for a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the phenomena studied, we used qualitative semi-structured interviews as our primary tool for the collection of empirical data in this study. That means that a randomized selection of the respondents can’t be used (Holme and Solvang 1997:101). Instead we used systematic sampling based on the following criteria: Must have worked for Sida and had frequent contacts with its Tanzanian counter part during the last seven years. A total of seven persons were asked to take part in the study. One person didn’t consider himself
to be suitable for the study, and another was not available at the time. The final sample of five respondents is a result of rather tight criterion and can be regarded as a small sample, but that doesn’t concern us, since we strive to describe a specific context with the empirical examples given by the respondents, who are all highly qualified within their field and have long careers in development cooperation. Furthermore we triangulate their statements with our own field notes and other rapports, which we feel gives us a solid ground for our study.

Semi-structured interviews are based on a set of core questions, but allow for some variation from those questions in order to explore relevant topics that emerge in the interview process. This approach allows efficient collection of qualitative data and the flexibility for respondents to participate in the creation of this data. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews prevent the collection of identical bits of data. Rather, it allows for topics to be covered that have yet to be sufficiently covered and for respondents to talk about issues they feel most comfortable and knowledgeable with (Kvale 1997:124ff).

The interview guide (See appendix 1a and 1b) include questions partly deriving from central themes in the new aid architecture, from the theoretical framework chosen, and from a series of core guiding recommendations on how successful dialogues in development cooperation should work according to policy papers provided by Sida and other actors in the development field. Other complementary questions are formulated to further suit the aim of the study. During the interviews we allowed a high degree of flexibility so that the questions could be expanded in the interview process and with the aim of obtaining more valid descriptions of the respondent’s work within the development cooperation with Tanzania.

We used written notes as a method to record the data collected during interviews. This can be better than using a tape recorder as there are several disadvantages associated with using tape recorder during interviews. One of the main disadvantages is that it can be inhibiting to the respondent. This results in less spontaneous answers and therefore less reliable data. A potential disadvantage associated with writing notes during the interview is that it can be offending for the respondent or suspicious if notes are only taken sporadically (Trost 1997:52). Five interviews were conducted (three with men and two with women), all in Sweden between the 21st of May and the 11th of June, 2007. Two of the respondents had recently retired from Sida and the rest still works at Sida where the interviews took place. Each interview lasted between one and one and a half hour. Both respondents and interviewer
felt comfortable during the interviews. Once the respondents realized that we had background information on the subject, they tended to become more free-spoken and went more in-depth. This resulted in a better interview flow since they could use their technical language.

In order to minimize possible ethical dilemmas we performed the interviews with the informed consent of the participants and explained to the respondent’s the importance of their participation in this study. The information given to the respondent’s regarding this study was brief, since by giving full information there is a possibility of distorting the behaviour and actions of the respondent’s. At the same time, giving too little information can create severe ethical problems regarding “informed consent” as well as suspicions and bad relations between the respondent’s and us as interviewers, thus harm the study even more (Silverman 2001:54f). Furthermore, to protect the respondent’s anonymity we separated the identity of the respondent’s from the information given. By doing this it will not be possible to identify particular information with a particular respondent (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1996:86ff). We regard this as important since it increases the reliability of the information given by the respondents as they feel more comfortable to express their experienced reality than if they were mentioned by name and position within Sida. Interviews will in the text be referred to as: (Interview X), where X marks the number of the specific interview used. The respondents are anonymously presented in a separate column in the list of references.

2.1.2 Notes taken at study visits
As students of the course Africa and International Development Cooperation we participated in a field trip to Tanzania, 25/3-5/4 2007, which included several visits (see appendix 2) to actors involved in development cooperation, both Tanzanian and donors. The visits all had a strong focus on the new aid architecture in common. During the visits we took exhaustive notes of the presentations as well as the answers to questions that arose during the presentations. Taking notes made us interpretative subjects, recording bits of the reality in which these actors are positioned. From a qualitative perspective there are high demands on us as interpretative subjects, since we are active instruments in the methodology. Because this data collection is rather unstructured and aims at a holistic understanding of the issues presented we are aware of the possible biases we as instruments can contribute to (Backman 1998:53). This awareness is widely considered within the social sciences to be a requirement and it has close connection to the researcher’s own interests. It is therefore important to present our own interests and values as researchers (Holme and Solvang 1997:31,330). It is
essential to point out that we are doing this study on our own behalf and are not commissioned by neither Sida nor any other institution/organisation. We are both interested in development cooperation on an international level and as critical academics we believe in room for improvements within the same field. In our study we try to be as objective as possible. Through clarification of our interests and a detailed description of our methodological procedures we show that we have a wish for transparency; a transparency, which has led us in our approach to the studied object.

The field notes are not, as the interviews, anonymous since the setting of the meetings were of a more open and official character. Furthermore the field notes are shared by students as well as teachers and as such easily recognizable. This might inhibit the sharing of more sensitive information, but we still believe that they are a good complement to our interviews, because they are interpretations of the present development cooperation reality from within it. References to the field notes will be indicated as the following: (Name, Date). Field notes will have a separate column in the list of references.

2.1.3 Document and literature collection
Most of the documents have been found on the websites such as www.sida.se, www.aidharmonisation.org, and www.tzdpg.or.tz. Other documents, such as the Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness and Sida's working manuals, have been gathered through our studies. A central document that expresses the problems with carrying out dialogue within the new aid architecture is the Sida (2006a) study Dialogue and Strategic Communication in Development Cooperation which inspired us to investigate this new situation and where from we have derived some central questions for this study. Our searches have often started by using terms such as “aid coordination” together with “Tanzania”, or “dialogue in development cooperation” on www.google.com. The relevant documents found have often resulted in a snowball effect, where further related documents have been found in the references. More theoretical and other literature not found on the Internet has been found through Göteborg University online library catalogue, GUNDA. The gathered documents and literature has been a good way of obtaining supplementary data, which contribute to making this study more profound and thus increase the validity of the study.

Regarding all the different kinds of data that we have collected for this study, we might add that we consider their reliability to be somewhat different for our purpose. The data collected
from the conducted interview has the highest level of reliability, because the respondents were speaking for themselves and knew that their statements were given anonymously. Our field notes have the second highest level of reliability; because they were taken under circumstances were the respondents were representing an organisation instead of him/her-self. Lastly the official rapports and studies we have used have the lowest grade of reliability, because they can only be expected to be an expression of the current ideology.

2.2 Data analysis
When the data has been collected there is a need to organize it, so that it can give an insight and logical understanding of the studied phenomena. The aim of the data analysis is to process the data to be appropriate and suited for interpretation. In this way it can be related to the study’s original point of departure (Backman 1998:53). We chose Critique of ideology as a method for analysing the data, since it allows us to understand the power structures behind the presented problem and therefore suit our theoretical framework based on Jürgen Habermas theory on communicative action. However, compilation and processing the data in itself doesn’t give answers to the presented problem. This isn’t done until in the next step, the analytical part of the study (Ibid. 29). Our data is thus dealt with in a three phases, a compilation phase, a processing phase and an analytical phase.

2.2.1 Critique of ideology
The critique of ideology derives from different research traditions, but has its origin in Marxism, structuralism and critical theory. It is a method where the world is approached with a critical view by comparing the dominant ideology with the surrounding reality (Bergström and Boréus 2000:155f). That is why critique of ideology doesn’t only involve ideas and opinions, but also making the power structures behind them visible (Liedman and Nilsson 1989:30). This is important in order to understand why the dominant ideology not always is practiced in reality. Thereby making the ideology explicit, or rather reveal it. This is what differs from other types of ideology analysis, associating ideology with power.

Nevertheless, the concept of ideology is central within the method critique of ideology. The definition of ideology has since its breakthrough in the 19th century developed in different directions. A contemporary common perception of ideologies is that they are a collection of ideas that concerns society and politics. Another perception is the existing relationship between power and ideology, where an ideology primarily legitimate certain power structures, for example by promoting the advantages of its values and making them self evident; and
presenting them as natural and inevitable. Resistance to the ideology is made invisible and excluded. The nature of the context where the ideology is practiced is made inaccessible by ‘obscuring’ the reality to ‘mystification’. These strategies to maintain the ideologies’ way of legitimizing the power structures are useful tools to understand how a certain ideology works. For this view to be valid there is a need for a broad definition of the concept of ideology, so that both dominant and non-dominant ideologies can be included. The political philosopher Martin Seliger gives us just that by defining ideology as:

‘sets of ideas by which men [sic] posit, explain and justify ends and means of organised social action, and specifically political action, irrespective of whether such action aims to preserve, amend, uproot, or rebuild a given social order’ (Eagleton 1991:6f).

Certain power structures can hi-jack an ideology and through it present a false form of consciousness to maintain a specific social order. The falsity of the ideas behind an ideology can be said to be made as part of the “truth” of a certain condition. Does critique of ideology then really present a more true form of consciousness? The answer is no. What critique of ideology can do is to propose “the thesis that all ideas, true or false, are grounded in practical social activity, and more particularly in the contradictions which that activity generates” (Eagleton 1991:72). We are not interested in examining whether or not ideas are true or false, but rather use critique of ideology as a tool to reveal and describe the clashes between views and experiences of a certain order.

2.2.2 Performing the text analysis
The written texts used in this study will include all material compiled. That is transcribed interviews, notes taken at a study visit in Tanzania and other secondary material. To analyse these texts we have used a text analysis based on critique of ideology. Several tools can be used when making such an analysis. However the common and main characteristic of critique of ideology as a text analysis is that certain features of the texts analyzed will always be related to a surrounding context of power aspects (Bergström and Boréus 2000:165). In this study Habermas theory on communicative action will be used as a tool to understand the power aspects, which are in place, within the context that the texts analyzed are created. The analyzed texts have an ideological message about a subject. By using the critique of ideology as text analysis, the power structures, which are often hidden behind an area of subject, will be evident, thus, making the invisible visible.
We will first outline Sven-Eric Liedman’s guidelines on how to perform a text analysis based on critique of ideology and then describe how we apply them when working with the texts used for this study. The guidelines that Liedman include for a text analysis based on critique of ideology contains the following three dimensions:

1. The subject of interpretation: the structure of the text and key concepts related to Sida policies and aid effectiveness.
2. The reality that the texts describe: The reality described in the policies and guidelines, and the reality described by the respondent’s.
3. The wider context that the subject of interpretation is part of (Liedman and Nilsson 1989:30ff).

The three dimensions, or rather steps are primarily about the text in itself and its intermediary message. The two first steps in the analysis will be to identify the claim for reality presented in two types of texts, since they all include expressions of the context studied, whether explicit or inexplicit. Consequently we derive the following model from Liedman’s guidelines.

1. The first step will be to identify the structure and the key concepts of the texts related to policies and guidelines for the current discourse on development cooperation. Some key concepts identified in the analyzed texts include ownership, development cooperation, donor development group, donor coordination, partner country, dialogue, harmonisation, and aid effectiveness. The reality presented in the texts that relate to Sida’s position and the ideology in the Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness is a transformation towards more efficient development cooperation where the partner country dictates the development strategies. The structure and the key concepts of the texts contribute to the identification of the ideology within the current discourse on development cooperation.

2. The second step is about understanding the reality that the texts derived from interviews and field notes describe. The realities described by the respondent’s are reflections of their experiences of working in the reality described in the first step.

3. The third and last step is to put these descriptions of reality that all the texts reflect into a wider context. Here we compare how the content of the ideologies presented in the two first steps correspond to each other i.e. the ideology presented in the first step,
with the emergence of the current discourse on development cooperation compared to the experienced reality of the respondent’s presented in the second step. Therefore it is the realities expressed in the analysed texts that produce the results for this study. In order to do that, we not only need to describe possible differences the realities presented in the texts, but also explain why they might occur. In accordance with the critique of ideology, the content of the current discourse on development cooperation is about power. Consequently the concept of power must be used when analysing the wider context wherein the different texts are analysed (Bergström and Boréus 2000:169).

The above mentioned concept of power will be understood with the help of Habermas theory on communicative action. Habermas theory brings the concept of power into a context of communication, making it an excellent choice for our study. The following chapter will present this theory, as well as other theory on dialogue and communication.
3 Theoretical framework

The Russian linguist Bakhtin argues that we can only establish meaning through dialogue – meaning is fundamentally dialogic. The premise for this is that every participant in any dialogue defines the other participants as being different. They are the other participants, as well as ‘other’ to the self. Meaning is thus created through difference, which means that dialogue is the construction of meaning through the recognition of the different ‘other’ (Hall 2003:235f). The relationship between the partner country and the development partner is also about the construction of meaning, together they must find and come to terms on which path to choose, where to go and what to do. If the underlying principles for this dialogue change, then the way of constructing meaning must change as well.

In order to make any conclusions on how Sida’s dialogue has changed within the new aid architecture, it is fundamental then, that one first understands what a dialogue involves and how it is being done. This understanding not only affects whether or not dialogue may or may not be judged as either good or bad; it also affects whether or not we can speak of dialogue at all, if it doesn’t fulfil certain key criteria. It is against this backdrop we can understand the changes and evaluate them.

3.1 Buber

One finds a similar understanding of dialogue as Bakhtin represents in the writings of German philosopher Martin Buber. Buber’s theory on dialogue is based on the difference between two sets of human relationships: the first one is the I-Thou relationship wherein dialogue can take place; the second one is the I-It relationship wherein no dialogue can take place. The I-Thou relationship involves an immediate human contact where one will relate to, experience and accept another person as a person, which is different from one self. Buber’s theory is tied to an understanding of the human being as having a spirit which lies behind all statements put forward by that person. The acceptance of the person is thus linked to the acceptance of that person’s spirit (Buber 1995:43ff). Within an I-It relationship the other person is perceived as an object. An object is spiritless and therefore never reveals it’s true self, so to speak. Since the acceptance so important for dialogue is closely connected with the understanding of the person as a whole, there can be no dialogue when the person is objectified (Ibid. 45ff). For Buber thus dialogue is a case of either/or, either it takes place or it doesn’t. Therefore it is impossible to speak of any improvements when it comes to dialogue; one cannot say that the
dialogue within the development cooperation has improved or changed for the worse, either there is a dialogue or there isn’t, either there is an acceptance of the others spirit or there isn’t.

For our purpose Buber’s view is a bit too narrow, because it would leave us with absolutely no tools in understanding how, for example, different power structures affect the way dialogue is being done. However, there are some strong points in Buber’s theory that shouldn’t be discarded so easily. The acceptance of the ‘other’ links in our context not so much to the acceptance of that person’s spirit; rather, one could view the spirit as an expression of the partner country’s cultural and historic background. Thus the acceptance of the spirit would be the acceptance of that difference presented in the partner country. This acceptance ties together with, knowledge about and understanding of that background and therefore one could, as a first parameter of an improved dialogue, investigate if the level of knowledge and acceptance of the partner country, from the perspective of Sida, has improved.

3.2 Habermas

In order to have a broader understanding of what constitutes as dialogue, we have shifted our focus on to the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas. For Habermas there is no division between what constitutes as dialogue and what doesn’t. Habermas sees the history of mankind as dialogue, however a heavily distorted dialogue due to oppression and power relations (Andersen 2000:330). Habermas’ project takes its point of departure in the fact that humans are – or rather could be under the right circumstances – the best judges of their own interests, which are formulated and discovered through a free dialogue amongst everyone involved (Alvesson 2002:93). Habermas believes that language facilitates reflection and critique and with it, it is possible to examine if consensus about ideas, beliefs and norms is justified rationally and is in keeping with universal interests; or if it is an expression of open or covert coercion, deceit, or manipulation, and thus the result of illegitimate power relations (Andersen 2000:330). One could say that Habermas’ ideal dialogue is one, which is free of any distortion.

3.2.1 System vs. Life World

Habermas distinguishes between the System and the Life-World as being two sets of perspectives for viewing society and social life. The system is governed by money and power, what Habermas calls the Steering Media, and is based on demands of functionality and efficiency. Within the System communication is reduced, because the steering media leaves no room for rational decisions based on anything else than what the steering media dictates, it
is so to speak a fixed environment (Ibid. 331f). Habermas doesn’t reject the existence of the System as such, but he denies that it should include all forms of social life. For Habermas the Life-world, culture, social norms, morality, and personal identity of human beings are connected with principles of action, action coordination and action integration, which are completely different from the steering media. The Life-world is the world as it is perceived from a participant’s perspective. It is structured by meaningful symbols, which are communicated through verbal actions that are oriented towards understanding (Andersen 2000:332). The coordination and integration of actions build on a consensus, which is established communicatively through recognizing the validity of verbal statements. The content can therefore be scrutinized and subjected to rational reflection and critique in a dialogue. Mutual understanding then becomes a question of voluntary recognition of the validity of arguments for truth, moral rightness and truthfulness, where the validity, in order to be rational, must be substantiated by arguments (Ibid. 333). These arguments can be references to, three, by Habermas identified, worlds: Firstly, an objective factual and external world. This corresponds to validity claims based on the best way to obtain some desired state of affairs. Secondly, there is a social world of interpersonal relations regulated by social norms and so forth. This corresponds to validity claims based on the normative rightness of what is being argued. Lastly, there is the world of subjective experience according to which validity claims are based on the sincerity and authenticity of a person’s advice to another (Layder 2006: 218ff). These three worlds are not to be understood as individual worlds, which never mix or interrelate during an argument. Rather they often co-exist and are used together in order to validate an argument.

If we shortly are to connect this with Bakhtin’s theory about dialogue as the creation of meaning, then according to Habermas, the construction of meaning is the same as rational reflections and critique of verbal statements which are judged on the premise of validity.

One may argue that the question of a validity based on truth, moral rightness and truthfulness is somewhat controversial. It would probably be safe to say that different cultures have, for instance, different sets of moral codes. A critique that could be raised is if Habermas writes from and to a Eurocentric philosophical tradition. Habermas has dealt with this critique and put forward a discourse ethics that deals with this problem.
3.2.2 Discourse Ethics
First of all Habermas claims no universality for his validity accounts. What he claims is that there must be as a precondition for any valid norm within communication, that all affected can accept the consequences and the side effects, which its general observance can be anticipated to have for the satisfaction of everyone’s interests (Andersen 2000:334). What everyone can be said to be affected by, in the case of communication, is the existence of certain valid rules for argumentative discourse, including social norms. That means that anyone taking part in the communication must agree on the same rules for how the communication should take place. These are rules for how to use logic and semantics, procedural rules and rules for the setting and the discourse itself. The last category makes the assumption that, firstly, everyone is allowed to participate in the discussion; secondly, everyone is allowed to introduce and problematise any assertion; thirdly, everyone is allowed to express attitudes, desires, and needs and lastly, no one may be prevented from exercising these rights through coercion. This in summary is Habermas understanding of an ideal speech situation (the domination-free dialogue) (Ibid. 335).

One thing however is the ideal situation, another is the reality. What Habermas has found is that free dialogue has always to some extent been prevented by different forms of inequality, suffering and violent oppression.

3.2.3 Life-world under siege
The free dialogue belongs, as stated above, to the realm of the life-world. The system denies this sort of communicative freedom. But the two worlds do not exist side by side without intertwining. The system’s inbuilt tendencies and dysfunctions toward crisis, makes it continuously expand its purposive-rational steering capacity at the expense of the communicative rationality of the life-world - one could say that the system is colonizing the life-world. For instance if a company experience harsh competition or a state experiences a failing market, they may in the first case try to influence consumer ‘needs’ and identity perceptions; or in the second case expand public steering instruments and introduce compensatory subsidies that may threaten self-esteem and personal autonomy. Since these steering instruments function according to a strategic rationality they suspend communicative rationality and thus the free dialogue. This leads to crises in the life-world, which is perceived as meaninglessness, loss of faith in the political institutions, the undermining of solidarity, and uncertainty about personal identity and belonging (Andersen 2000:336ff).
3.3 Summary of Theory and translating Habermas into the language of the development co-operation

Habermas theory thus brings forward certain central elements, which we can use in order to understand how dialogue works within the development cooperation. Central to Habermas theory is the distinction between the system and the life-world, wherein free-dialogue can only exist in the latter. This free dialogue must be founded on equal terms, meaning that everyone participating in the dialogue must have the same opportunities of putting forward statements, be allowed to express any attitude, desire or need, be able to problematise any assertion and under no circumstances have any of the above rights infringed through coercion. The statements put forward in this dialogue should be validated by references to either: a factual and external world; interpersonal relations of social norms or subjective experience where the authenticity and sincerity of the speaker defines the statements validity. The prime goal for this dialogue is to establish consensus through these statements. The System, however, spreads its influence and tries to colonize the life-world. This leaves no room for free dialogue, but replaces it with a controlled and strategic dialogue, where there is no place for rationality.

Our analysis will be based on Habermas’ theory on communicative action and conducted the following way: As analytical variables we use the equal terms, which must be in place in order to have a free dialogue, and the three worlds of validity which Habermas presents. These analytical variables will enable us to understand the nature of the communication between the GoT and Sida/DPG in a twofold manner. Firstly, with the help of the equal terms we can see if the dialogue sessions live up to, or try to live up to, Habermas idea of a free dialogue. If this is not the case, we will be able to see what part of the dialogue sessions that is being done on un-equal terms. Secondly, we can use the worlds of validity to see if there is a distortion of communication based on the fact, that perhaps, the world of validity are too different to meet or be accepted, by the partner, as valid.

Using Sven-Eric Liedman’s guidelines on how to perform a text analysis based on critique of ideology we will thus have the following structure on our communication analysis:

1. We investigate how the communicative reality is presented and established in Sida policy papers and other documents on aid effectiveness. There will be a specific focus on how this reality is presented in the light of our own analytical variables.
2. With the same analytical variables in focus, we then proceed to our own field notes and performed interviews. They describe the same communicative reality as the policy
papers and other documents but do so from an experienced reality. In this step we will be presented with first account statements about how communication is affected by the new framework for aid effectiveness and how the entire cooperation is affected as a whole.

3. The last step of our analysis is to see how these ‘two’ realities meet. If there are discrepancies between how the respondents and the policy papers present the reality, we will, with the help of Habermas theory, try to explain them. Furthermore, this meeting will also enable us to see if communication is distorted and how this distortion affects the development cooperation.
4 Background
In this chapter we will present the background, which is important for the understanding of the contextual setting that will be studied in the next chapter. The part discussing Tanzania and the Swedish development cooperation with Tanzania will be held on a very general level with the intention that the presented information should function as a reference map when reading about the empirical findings. After that a presentation of the road towards increased donor coordination in Tanzania is made, since the study partly uses it as a frame of reference. Finally Sida’s view on communication is discussed, because it is important to understand under what premises they enter the transformed platform for dialogue.

4.1 Facts about Tanzania
Tanzania is East Africa’s largest country with its 945 087 km² and is located on the East Coast of Africa, south of the equator. The name Tanzania originates from the political union of 1964 between Tanganyika (mainland of Tanzania), and the Zanzibar Archipelago. With a population of around 3 million, Dar es Salaam is Tanzania’s major city and capital in everything but name. It is located at the coast of the Indian Ocean and is the residence of the Government of Tanzania and the main economic centre of the country. The official capital is Dodoma, located in the centre of the country, it is here the parliament resides. Agriculture is regarded as the backbone of the country’s economy, employing around 85 % of the workforce. The most exported crops include cultivated products, such as coffee and tea. Other important economical sectors include mining industry and tourism. The industrial sector is considered weak compared to other countries on the continent (Swedish institute of international affairs 2003:3ff).

4.2 Development Cooperation between Sweden and Tanzania
Sweden’s presence in Tanzania started before independence when missionaries were active in the cooler parts of the country. After independence a closer relation grew between the countries due to coinciding political ideologies. Since the 1960s, Tanzania is one of the countries that have received most support from Sweden in the form of aid. During the 1960s and 1970s, the Swedish aid was mainly of project-oriented form, directed towards schools, hospitals, water supply and the industrial sector. In recent years Sweden’s aid to Tanzania

---

1 By cooler parts of the country is meant the parts of Tanzania, which resides on higher altitudes, such as the slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro.
makes up 12% of Tanzania’s total bilateral support (Omari, 2007-03-28) and has focused on democracy development, pro-poor growth, and human development, with the overall aim to combat the widespread poverty in the country. Assistance in these fields is mainly through budget support, but also through support to the Public Financial Management Reform and to the Anti Corruption Strategy (www.swedenabroad.se). The objective for Sida’s budget support is to reduce poverty by supporting the implementation of Tanzania’s own national strategy for growth and reduction of poverty (MKUKUTA) with an outcome approach based on: growth and reduction of income poverty, improved quality of life and social well being, and good governance and accountability; rather than support to specific priority sectors as the case was when the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) was supported (Omari, 2007-03-28).

4.3 Towards increased donor coordination in Tanzania

The recent consensus on a global level concerning increased donor coordination has according to Odén and Tinnes been taken further in Tanzania than in other countries (2003:4). One explanation is, that the discussion on this topic started early in Tanzania as a result of deteriorating aid relations in the early 1990’s. In order to rid the relations of these tensions, the Nordic countries took an initiative in 1994 to form an independent monitoring group, which was commissioned to evaluate Tanzania’s relationship with its donors and come up with recommendations on how to improve the situation (GoT and Development Partners 2004:5). The initiative resulted in the Tanzania Assistance Strategy (TAS) in 2002, with the aim of improving the aid coordination and harmonisation under Tanzanian leadership and thus giving the ownership of the development cooperation back to Tanzania. This was in line with the Rome Declaration on harmonisation published one year later, in 2003.

In early 2004 the GoT started discussion on, how to evolve the TAS into a Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAST) in order to further deepen the impact of the relationship between GoT and its many donors. During these discussions the donors’ local DAC group changed name to Development Partner Group to avoid confusion with DAC at OECD level.

2 The donors started questioning the GoT commitment to reform as they perceived the fiscal management and governance to be poor and corruption as being widely spread. The government on the other hand blamed the donors for making unrealistic demands on the GoT and for an excessive interference in government policy reforms without being consistent with the agreed support. The tension culminated when the IMF, the World Bank and some principal partners suspended its credits to the GoT (GoT and Development Partners 2004:5).

3 The aim of the Rome Declaration was to “harmonize the operational policies, procedures, and practices of our institutions with those of partner country systems to improve the effectiveness of development assistance, and thereby contribute to meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)” (Rome Declaration on Harmonisation 2003:1).
DAC practices were to be formalised in the DPG with the aim to improve the response to TAS and the Rome Declaration. The DPG was to serve as a complement to the GoT’s own coordination efforts by improving internal coordination within the DPG. The GoT welcomed the creation of the DPG and redefined consultations between GoT to become less frequent and detailed (ESRF 2005:8). The JAST was adopted in 2006 as the new national medium-term framework for managing development cooperation between GoT and its donors. The aim of the JAST was to achieve the national development goals as outlined in the MKUKUTA. As a more comprehensive framework than the TAS, all individual bilateral agreements and country strategies are expected to be brought in line with JAST.

In March 2005 the Paris declaration on aid effectiveness was adopted. The JAST is in line with the principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and domestic and mutual accountability included in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which Tanzania has endorsed. The indicators for the JAST are also drawn on the Paris declaration indicators, but adapted to the Tanzanian context.

4.4 Sida’s views on Dialogue and Strategic Communication in Development Cooperation

The following section deals with Sida’s own views on how to do dialogue and strategic communication in the development cooperation. Sida’s views are especially focused on how communication takes place within the new emerging framework for the development cooperation, which has come into play with the recent trends of donor coordination and the Paris declaration. Sida’s views also reflect some of the shortcomings with the old system and the challenges that lie ahead.

4.4.1 The Role as Dialogue Partner

In Sida at Work from 2005 Sida distinguishes three different roles which describe the nature of Sida’s work. These three roles are: firstly, the role as analyst; secondly, the role as dialogue partner and lastly, the role of financier. It is the role of dialogue partner which holds a particular interest to us. The role as dialogue partner is perceived by Sida as a way of enabling and dealing with certain situations, which arise within the framework of the development cooperation. The importance of this role is believed by Sida to have increased with the new framework for the development cooperation, which has many actors involved in the different processes of this cooperation.
Sida describes three typical situations where the role as dialogue partner comes into play. Firstly, Sida takes part in a dialogue in order to put forward important Swedish positions; secondly, Sida participates in an ongoing dialogue with many partners which is intended to improve the process of cooperation in line with the principles of the international agenda for aid effectiveness; and lastly, Sida strengthens the capacity of the partner countries in a programme or project, so that it includes strategic communication as a tool in their cooperation aimed at the achievement of the objectives of the programme or project. We will come back to the term strategic communication below. As stated above dialogue is an important part if the international agenda for effectiveness is going to have any positive effect. But this also entails that the dialogue, which is taking place within the new aid architecture, is of at least some quality if it is to be constructive. Sida stresses that the dialogue should be open, transparent, based on mutual trust and respect and include all important stakeholders, such as representatives of government, beneficiaries, civil society, the private sector and development partners (Sida 2005:47f). Furthermore, Sida recognizes that all involved parties must acknowledge that dialogue is an opportunity for mutual learning where different positions can be re-examined and that this must be done by not avoiding sensitive issues but rather they should be discussed openly and in a frank manner.

4.4.2 Being an Active Partner

As stated above, Sida defines three different tasks, which are a typical for the role as dialogue partner. The tasks are performed by taking an active part in the dialogue. As an active partner it is important that the dialogue is creating consensus towards the international agenda on aid effectiveness as well as creating a platform for joint action. Sida therefore stresses the importance of a high level of preparedness when one is taking part in a dialogue session. Being prepared means according to Sida, that the Swedish positions are formulated in advance even if the dialogue session is open-ended, because it is meant to sharpen knowledge and analysis (Ibid 48). Sida also lists three typical situations, which arise in the active dialogue. The active dialogue is firstly, in a quest for a common platform, where there is no prejudice or ready-made answers; rather the main objective is to identify common ground and potential starting points for further interaction (Ibid. 48). Secondly the active dialogue is part of a process of negotiations, with the primary goal to, facilitate planning and, provide
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4 This is opposed to a silent partnership, where the role of dialogue partner is delegated to another development partner, Sida does this as well but in these situations the role of dialogue partner is limited (Sida 2005: 41).
opportunities for determining the best way forward in an on-going cooperation. This type of situations involves a result-oriented and well planned dialogue, with an idea of overcoming differences so that concrete solutions can be agreed upon. Lastly, active dialogue can be a way of facilitating and broadening the understanding and importance of dialogue amongst the partner country’s (in our case Tanzania’s) stakeholders. Sida will use their offices and broad experience to set up contacts, forge alliances and facilitate interaction between participants in the development process (Ibid. 49).

4.4.3 Strategic Communication in Development

Strategic communication in short means a way of communication, which is based on analysis and strategically made choices, which form the foundation for a communication plan (Sida 2006a:6). Strategic communication is closely related to Planned communication, but whereas Strategic communication deals more with strategically getting Sida’s positions on matters related to the development cooperation across, Planned communication focus on analysis of goals, focus group, message, method, resource needs, responsibility and finance (Ibid. 6).

Strategic and Planned communication then, are frameworks which seeks to guide communication in the direction Sida wishes it to go and a way of facilitating forums, so that stakeholders from all layers of society can participate in the formulation of the specific development plan, and in this way make sure that the development process is owned by a broad spectre of society (Sida 2005:49f). Furthermore, strategic communication is a way for Sida to make sure that important issues aren’t overlooked or forgotten, when, for instance, a new partnership is starting up. This relates to the fact that it is easier to implement and change projects/programmes before they have begun, than when they are rolling, so to speak.

4.4.4 Challenges

Sida recognizes that there are several challenges, which are directly linked with doing dialogue within the new aid architecture. As mentioned earlier in this paper the level of dialogue has moved from a micro to a macro and more political level. This means that Sida must take part in a political dialogue, an area of dialogue, which previously has been the task of the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This has created a sense of uncertainty amongst Sida personnel, who are unsure about whether or not they are entitled to enter into such a dialogue (Sida 2006a: 9).
A challenge connected with the DPGs is the issue of ‘pushiness’. Sida workers feel that Sweden has an un-pushy way when dialoguing, which is appreciated amongst the partner countries because it leaves them a larger room for manoeuvre. However as a part of a DPG Sida can no longer solely control how pushy the dialogue with the partner country should be. In the sectors where Sida isn’t lead agent they must remain silent outside the DPG meetings and in the sectors where Sida is lead agent they must represent the entire DPG. This is a problem in two ways, firstly there is a fear that the DPG with a more pushy dialogue, bamboozle the partner country. Secondly Sida workers feel that they within the DPG have inferior opportunities of getting their views across. This means that Swedish positions are filtered out or constrained by the DPG and never makes it to the partner country (Ibid.9ff). Similar views were found in our study, this point was substantiated by interview 2 and 4.

In turn this could mean that Sweden would continue to pursue a bilateral dialogue in order to safeguard that their views come through. This is in direct opposition with the international framework for donor harmonisation and could be an enormous drain on the partner countries capacity. Some Sida workers still feel, however, that Sida must uphold the bilateral dialogue as a complement to the DPG-driven dialogue (Sida 2006a:11 and Interview 1, 3).

Sida is aware of that the DPGs could be interpreted as a way for donors to gang up against the partner countries (Sida 2006a:19f). The question of donors ganging up deals with the power relations that are inbuilt in the development cooperation. Most donors agree that the so-called power of the purse, for far too long have superseded the wishes of the partner country. The fear amongst Sida workers is thus that a group of donors would have even more power of the purse and therefore would be able to, in a greater extent, ignore the wishes of the partner countries (Interview 1). This view was contested by one of our interviews, which saw different possibilities for more partner country ownership in the new structure. We will return to this point in the following chapter.

Some Sida workers feel that the DPGs are somewhat an all or nothing business. If one country decides to freeze its aid, the other members of the DPG must do so as well. This works the other way around too. If one country decides to increase its aid, the others must follow suit. This might hinder the room for manoeuvre for the partner country because they deal with the donor group as one, and have no way of choosing amongst different proposals on how to move forward Ibid.18ff). Deus Kibamba gave us a similar argument at the NGO Tanzania
Gender Networking Programme (TGNP) in Dar es Salaam. He perceived the new macro-framework as an obstacle for the GoT to implement important measures, if they for example were in violation with the World Bank guidelines and rules (2007-02-29).

Sida furthermore recognizes that there might be a conflict between promoting for Sida important dialogue issues such as gender, democracy and human rights while trying to harmonise with the partner country. Sida workers feel that it is a rather sensitive issue, to balance between being a listening partner and at the same time trying to put forward these important issues (Ibid.18).

The last challenge we will bring forward here, is the fear amongst Sida workers that donors spend more time doing dialogue with each other instead of doing dialogue with the partner country. This might be problematic since the real focus for the development cooperation is building a good relationship between the donors and the partner countries, not building a relationship amongst the donors. Three of our respondents expressed similar thoughts. They found that the transition period, between the old and the new aid architecture, were taking either too long or removing focus from more important issues. The dialogue has, one could say, been concentrated on the framework itself, and not so much on the purpose of the new framework (Interview 2, 4, 5).

The above mentioned challenges will reappear in the following chapter. They are obviously central to the understanding of the problems with the new aid architecture. As they stand now they are largely uncontested, because the intention of the chapter was to present a background for our problem. The Result and Analysis chapter will thus go more in-depth with them and hold them up against our theory on communicative action as well as our other findings, in order to understand them in another context than Sida’s own.
5 Results and analysis

As we have presented earlier the purpose with this study is to empirically investigate how the new aid architecture affects the dialogue between Sida and GoT as well as to a smaller extent other donors. The specified questions that will lead the empirical investigations, that helps to fulfil this purpose, is *How has the new aid architecture changed the way Sida conducts dialogue with the GoT? Is Sida able to promote, for Sweden, important positions or is it constrained by other donors? How has the donor coordination process affected the communication and power structures between donors and Tanzania?*

This chapter will be structured after the analytical model that we outlined in our methodological and theoretical chapters. Thus, we will firstly describe how the ‘reality’ is perceived in the policy documents, then proceed with our field notes and interviews, to show another perception of the same reality, and then, in the end, point to any discrepancies between the two perceptions and try to explain, with the help of our theoretical framework, why these discrepancies exist.

5.1 The politicised aid and its consequences regarding broad participation

5.1.1 The ‘reality’ as seen by the policy documents

A central theme in the Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness is the focus on strengthening of the partner countries own national development strategies and encourage participation of civil society (Paris declaration on aid effectiveness 2005:1ff). According to Sida, support to the partner countries national development strategies need to involve several different stakeholders within this broad framework where “a well-structured dialogue and plan for communication is a key to the success of these efforts” (Sida 2005:49). This statement seems to be uncontested among many actors involved in development cooperation within Tanzania, such as UNDP (2007-03-28), FINIDA (2007-03-29), TGNP (2007-03-29); students at the Institute for Development Studies at University of Dar es Salaam (2007-03-31); as well as in the communication strategy for the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of poverty, MKUKUTA (GoT 2005:7). In the document *Where we are. Where we are going* Sida’s management points out the direction for Sida’s continued development regarding working methods and organisation. It is stated that focus should be on poor people and that Sida “will work with the whole society in our partner countries, see the micro level and civil society, contribute to pluralism and examine power” (Sida 2006b:3).
5.1.2 The ‘reality’ perceived from the inside

The current aid discourse with the Paris agenda has shifted the aid dialogue from micro to macro level (Interview 4), i.e. Sida’s support to Tanzania through the general budget support, that in turn is to finance the MKUKUTA, has resulted in a gradual shift to a more political type of aid (Åkesson 2007-03-25 and Interview 1). This means that Sida, in the DPGs, on an increasing level conducts dialogue with the Tanzanian Ministry of Finance where the staff is very competent (Interview 1). The MKUKUTA process has also witnessed a gradual shift in participation from micro to macro level. The broad participation during the preparation of the MKUKUTA that was expected to continue during the implementation has been limited to urban senior officials in major line ministries (GoT 2005:7). This gradual shift in dialogue from micro to macro level in the overall MKUKUTA process and in the development cooperation results in a better overall insight for the high level civil servants in the central ministries regarding the aid resources, which makes it easier to discipline the budget (Interview 2), but less participation of other stakeholders which are regarded as important for Sida. This has also been recognized as a risk by Sida that states that “political dialogues may be carried out between the partner government and the donors and not between the government and the local opinion or with the people” (Sida 2006a:21).

The narrowing level of participation that the shift from micro to a macro level results in reinforces the already strong hierarchical structures in the Tanzanian society, that further limit the citizen to speak out, which leads to disintegrating interest in national development and that people rather act in self-interest than in public interest (Mhamba 2007-03-25). There is evidence that not all Sida employees are happy with this development (Sida 2006a:9). One respondent was dissatisfied because the ordinary Tanzanian citizens aren’t part of the dialogue, since “aid is about people. It is not like we are there to repair something on a technical level” (Interview 3).

5.1.3 Understanding the discrepancy

Citizen’s lack of interest in national development and the public good, and Sida employee’s blurred identities are, if we use a Habermasian approach, results of the suspension of communicative rationality and thus the dialogue free from distortion. According to Habermas it’s a typical crisis, which occurs in the life-world when the system tries to colonize the life-world, because of the systems in built tendency to expand its steering capacity. Habermas
states that it results in; that people loose faith in the political institutions; solidarity is undermined, and uncertainty about personal identity and belongings arise (Andersen 2000:337). The System in our case would be the GoT and the DPGs, who are experiencing changes that they are not ready to handle yet. This means that they, at the expense of the life-world, in our case the Tanzanian society, expand there powers effectively excluding the many stakeholders e.g. the civil society, from the decision making process. Why then, does this expansion happen now, when the policy documents in principle state that the new aid architecture is supposed to have an opposite effect i.e. bring more ownership to the stakeholders. In Habermas’ theory the system expands, because its part of its ‘nature’, the system expands and it does so at the expense of the communicative rationality. One could thus argue that it is a relatively natural step for the system to take, in spite of the stated good intentions. What perhaps is needed then, to prevent this expansion, is strong actors within the civil society, but this is not the case in Tanzania, where there are a lot of NGO’s, but many are so-called briefcase NGO’s just wanting to have their piece of the pie (Kibwana 2007-03-26), and the rest are often focused on one strong leader, with hardly any members (Åkesson 2007-03-25). The road is thus paved for the system to colonize the life-world, which have resulted in this discrepancy, where the communicative rationality is suspended.

5.2 The room for promoting Swedish positions

5.2.1 The ‘reality’ presented in the policy documents
A central part of Sida’s organisation is the role as dialogue partner (Sida 2005:47f). However, the Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness encourages the partner countries to take the lead in co-ordinating the dialogue with donors in order to strengthen ownership (Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness 2005:3). This means that Sida as well as other donors should harmonise with, in this case Tanzania’s, own dialogue structures. At the same time Sida is adapting the way it does dialogue to be in line with the Swedish Policy for global development (PGD) (Sida 2006b:6), which is given, or at least should be given top priority for all departments within the Swedish Government and other organisations closely linked to the government such as Sida.
5.2.2 The ‘reality’ perceived from the inside
There seems to be a very scattered perception about how well Sida can promote its positions. It is more difficult now because the other members of the DPGs have more resources, but the right people representing Sweden can make a big difference for Sida to get its voice through to the DPGs (Interview 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5). If the other development partners have faith in his/hers abilities then Sida would be heard (Interview 4). The positions presented by Sida thus seem to take part in some sort of negotiation process, as one of the respondents commented: “there is a lot of give and take” (Interview 1), and this may cause some of the positions presented by Sida to loose momentum if the other members of the DPG aren’t particularly interested in that position (Interview 2). Even if Sida are successful in promoting its positions in the DPGs obstacles arise when that position is put forward to the civil servants representing Tanzania, because they don’t have any political power. The reason for this is that civil servants usually don’t have any political backing and therefore can’t get their knowledge/views integrated into the political decision making process (Interview 2, 3).

What we then see is that most respondents feel that Sida have difficulties getting its voice through the DPG and therefore the goal mentioned above, about being in accord with the PGD, might not be reached. However, some of the respondents voiced thoughts on other outcomes of the new aid architecture, which in fact may counter-effect this problem. First of all it seems that there is a rather wide-established and shared consensus amongst the members of the DPG concerning such issues or positions that Sida might put forward (Interview 4). The positions are in a context of the development cooperation rather uncontroversial (Interview 1) and there should thus be no need for Sida to mark a particular position with Sida’s own flag (Interview 3). What this means then is that, even though the donors may value issues differently, the core issues are the same (Interview 4) and as such Sida might not need an individual strong voice. Furthermore, some ideas may not make it further than the DPG because other development partners find that they are no good. This can to some extent work as a quality control of all the suggestions that the individual partners bring to the table (Interview 2), but at the same time, it may quench good ideas that perhaps deserved a better response. It may be noted here, that Thorbjörn Pettersson at the Swedish embassy in Dar es Salaam stated that, unfortunately Tanzania is an extreme case of donor fragmentation (2007-03-26). Thus there seems to be an overhanging risk of good ideas being quenched.
Not getting the response one is seeking may lead to an increase in bilateral dialogue, which would go directly against the ideas of the Paris Declaration. Views on the future need for a bilateral dialogue varied from respondent to respondent. The former general secretary at Sida Maria Norfalk has expressed that it might be a comparative advantage to conduct a certain level of bilateral dialogue, because Sweden can do things that other countries can’t permit (Hök 2007:5). Other Sida staff goes further and states that:

‘The dialogue between partner country and donor players often does not work too well. We need to complement this collective dialogue with another bilateral dialogue. The bilateral dialogue is needed as a complement and can never be dropped’ (Sida 2006a:11)

One respondent didn’t see the need or justification for bilateral dialogue what so ever (Interview 2), another thought that it was ok to have a continued bilateral dialogue as long as it wasn’t in conflict with the messages sent out by the DPG (Interview 1), and yet another thought that informal meetings, just to be informed, would be ok, even though they formally shouldn’t take place (Interview 5). One of the respondents felt that it was alright to have a bilateral dialogue concerning some of the sectors (Interview 3), while another felt that there are many ways of being heard and referred to the Public Diplomacy that took place during Bo Göransson’s time as ambassador in Kenya (Interview 4).

Whether or not Sida still has some bilateral dialogue on the side seemed to be a difficult question to answer. Some of the respondents said that some bilateral dialogue still existed because it was connected with the remaining project aid that is still running but that it is being phased out (Interview 1, 5).

5.2.3 Understanding the discrepancy
As the above written states there is no conclusive answer that shows how Sida is supposed to deal with the increased pressure on putting forward important Swedish positions from the home office and the demands of coordination put forward in the Paris declaration.

The aim of promoting Swedish positions is somewhat out of sync with the reality of the current development cooperation. On one hand Sida has expressed, forwarding Swedish positions, as one part of the role as a dialogue partner, on the other hand there seems to be
very little controversy or specifically Swedish over the issues that Sweden regard as important. The question is: why does Sida insist on promoting Swedish positions when they in fact are normative within international development cooperation? What is the point to complement DPG-driven dialogue with a strict bilateral dialogue, when the DPG-driven dialogue should be sufficient? One reason might be that the, so often stated, good old relationship between Sweden and Tanzania is perceived as being threatened with the decreased strict bilateral dialogue that the Paris agenda results in. Another reason might be, that Sida simply doesn’t want to loose too much ground on what they perceive as being their home field.

If we view it with the eyes of Habermas, one could say that the DPGs are a gathering of systems, which together form a new system, but the systems that make out the new ‘super-system’ aren’t dissolved, but remain as individual systems steered by their own egocentric rationality. Habermas would call the DPGs an example of system integration, where different systems go together to maximise their own individually determined objectives (Andersen 2000:332). Perhaps Sida’s hesitation then should be understood as a hesitation towards full system integration, and thus towards the new aid architecture, which Sida at the same time endorses. In all cases, there is a clear risk that a continued bilateral dialogue from Sida would jeopardize the new framework as stated in the Paris agenda. This because, the system integration i.e. the DPGs, relies on the individual systems participation, if they no longer pursue the same objectives, then the ‘super-system’ collapses or looses its value. In the end this would mean that the new aid architecture would fail. As we stated above there are no conclusive answer that shows how Sida should forward important Swedish positions, but the answer, if the new architecture is to be successful, is not to pursue a bilateral dialogue.

5.3 The relationship between the Sida/donors and the Government of Tanzania

5.3.1 The ‘reality’ presented in the policy documents
The Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness puts great emphasis on partnership commitments where the issue of ownership is central, which mean that the partner country should exercise “leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions” (Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness 2005:3). The partner country therefore commits to coordinate aid resources in dialogue with donors (Ibid.). Sida’s approach to
ownership is similar to the one stated in the Paris declaration. It aims to shift the balance of power from the donor, where the “power of the purse” is reduced in favour of the partner, thus towards “power of the owner”. This means that the partner country should play a leading role in consultations with donors (Sida 2005:20). The Paris agenda also calls for partner countries to uphold accountability towards their own citizens, as well as towards development partners (Paris declaration on aid effectiveness 2005:1).

By conducting dialogue with many stakeholders it becomes more intense and complex, which increases the importance of a well-structured and planned dialogue. This in turn makes it important for Sida employees to be well prepared for each dialogue session (Sida 2005:47f). Sida’s Africa Department has encouraged the Swedish embassies in Africa to use the dialogue matrices designed for Sida in order to assist planning of dialogues with its partner countries (Sida 2006a:12), but at the same time Sida states the importance of dialogues based on mutual trust and respect. This includes; being sensitive, a good listener, having good knowledge of the context in order to develop and adapt Sida’s work to its partners in cooperation (Sida 2005:48 and Sida 2002:3f).

5.3.2 The ‘reality’ perceived from the inside
Donor coordination and the establishing of DPGs has made it less time consuming for GoT to administrate aid and decreased the transaction costs on the Tanzanian side (Interview 5). However the so-called “one voice of the donors”, can also be interpreted as a risk, as some of the respondents and other Sida personnel have expressed, of donors “ganging up” (Interview 1, 2, 4 and Sida 2006a:20). In other words: donors getting stronger and more powerful in relation to their Tanzanian partner. Again the resources determine the asymmetrical power relations which threatens a “true” partnership built on equality (Interview 1). However, compared to previous aid modalities, such as project aid, the Tanzanian ownership is considered to be stronger (Interview 5) now that the central ministries have a better overview of the aid flows that general budget support implies (Interview 2).

Tanzania as a partner can’t match the broad competence that the donors as group posses, but this is only a problem if the relation isn’t good. The donor’s broad competence can be an advantage to Tanzania if they can make use of it. The challenge is for Tanzania to seize the opportunity to utilize its stronger position that an increased ownership offers, and to do so
Tanzanian must have the capacity in terms of competent people attending meetings with the donors etc. (Interview 1, 2).

The trend concerning human capacity in Tanzania is positive today. There are now more educated people with a high competence and awareness of their rights of owning the country’s development process than ever before, so they don’t accept being pushed around anymore by powerful donors with their harsh conditionalities. The increased donor coordination has in turn put pressure on Tanzanian partners to be prepared for meetings (Interview 3, 4). Still it is common that Tanzanian officials attend meetings unprepared, as the following quote indicate: “At meetings were government officials attend there is often only one person that knows the agenda, the rest doesn’t know what is going to be discussed” (Svenskerud 2007-03-30). The low preparation grade before meetings are considered to be due to lack of time (Interview 2) or due to offered sitting allowances to people attending the meeting, but without an obligation to report back to their ministries (Svenskerud 2007-03-30).

The asymmetrical power relation between the donors and Tanzania doesn’t only have to be just a matter of “power of the purse”; it is much more complex than that. The partner country, which is always regarded as the underdog, can often do whatever it wants. This has to do with two facts:

1. Donors rarely withdraw aid.
2. Unpredictability, such as political changes in the partner as well as the donor country that can result in new directives being imposed at any time.

This result in increased room for manoeuvre, a possibility to diverge from agreed principles, procedures and working methods. This tolerance is amplified with the donor coordination, since it becomes even more difficult to withdraw aid from a joint donor collective. Before a donor enters a cooperation agreement with a partner country it is much easier to influence the development agenda. When the donor is already involved, it is taken for granted that you participate in development cooperation, you don’t withdraw (Interview 4). Only huge deterioration regarding e.g. corruption, human rights and democracy must occur in Tanzania in order for donors to withdraw (Interview 1 and Pettersson 2007-03-26).
‘That, which Sida stands for today, within the mainstream issues, tend to become no more than empty words. This creates a gap between the partner country and the donors, since the partner country after all doesn’t listen to the donors, but rather learns to say the “right” things at dialogue sessions. It becomes mumbo jumbo. Everyone says the same things that are ‘in’ within the aid business right now, without any concretizations.’ (Interview 4)

The Tanzanians are aware of this and know how to act to get resources from the donors (Interview 1). The presumed asymmetrical power relations are therefore put out of order and Tanzania can pursue their own agenda, whether or not it coincides with the donors. At the same time the donors are more accountable towards the Tanzanian citizens since they are direct financiers of the state budget. This creates problems related to the accountability towards both citizens and donors (Interview 4).

It is not only Tanzania that needs to have the right capacity to dialogue. This holds for the donors as well, since all the conditions for a good dialogue concern the individuals taking part in a dialogue (Interview 4). In contrast to the Sida document (2006a) Dialogue and strategic communication in development cooperation, the respondents put more emphasis on personal qualities among Sida personnel participating in dialogues with Tanzania than on planned and strategic communication. There is a consensus among the respondents that the Sida personnel in Tanzania need a different competence today than during the era of project aid. Sida personnel must have more diplomatic skills not to “take over” the issues discussed. This requires a long experience of working in East Africa (Interview 1, 3). Today Sida employs “snotty-nosed” young academics without any knowledge about Tanzania to the embassy in Dar es Salaam, which to a large degree only meet young white academics from other donor countries. To function well in dialogue sessions where Tanzanians are represented, Sida personnel must have a better cultural knowledge and know about the informal structures, such as “who is related to whom etc” (Interview 3). If this is missing the mutual respect can be endangered; as in the situation when a delegation of five senior Tanzanians came on a mission to Sweden and were scheduled to meet a group of young newly employed civil servants from the Swedish Ministry of Finance (Ibid.).

Planned and strategic communication is, as shown above, not always enough for a satisfactory dialogue. “We had a dialogue matrix at the embassy, but it was difficult to find occasions where the questions fit. Mainly the ambassador had the chance to bring up the issues. One
important occasion was when we had a ministerial visit from Sweden” (Sida 2006a:13). There needs to be a balance between planned/strategic communication and a dialogue that by nature is fruitful, incorporating mutual giving and taking. However, it is not easy to be a good dialogue partner during complex alteration processes. There might be a need of some individual professional guidance’s since many of the Sida staff in Tanzania work alone with major issues (Interview 4).

5.3.3 Understanding the discrepancy
The politicizing of the aid has required an increased diplomatic skill among the Sida personnel. However, it has proven to be insufficient. There is a demand for a combination of diplomatic skills with a broader general knowledge about the Tanzanian context where cultural codes play an important part. Furthermore, a complex dialogue environment with increased importance of flexibility makes dialogue matrices difficult to use.

The Paris Agenda states that the partner country must have ownership over its own development process, and therefore the donor countries must coordinate and align with that development process. However our study has shown that Tanzania can gain ownership solely by ignoring the donors’ rhetoric’s and/or mimic what the donors say. What thus arises is a gap between the two systems and a partnership that is nothing more than a façade of convenience, where the donors, who must participate in the development cooperation, can, and where the GoT receive the money they want. The current structure of the two systems i.e. GoT and the Donors, hinders a dialogue free of distortion but at the same time annuls a concrete communication what so ever. This is particularly troublesome because neither the GoT nor the donors can be accountable to each other or the Tanzanian citizens. Habermas states that systems are fixed environments where the steering media determine the outcome of the decisions made. This however doesn’t necessarily mean that interaction between different systems can’t happen, as we mentioned above Habermas calls this system integration. System integration under the heading of alignment and coordination, as it is stated in the Paris Agenda, is there not only to improve ownership, but also and most importantly to improve the Tanzanian life-world, i.e. improve the quality of life for Tanzanian citizens. In our case the structure of the two systems creates a gap between them and therefore they never really integrate, which in turn makes the stated goals of improving the Tanzanian life-world impossible. Not only does this result in lack of rationally based decisions it creates a lack of
joint decision making between the donors and GoT. This is the main problem with the development cooperation in current Tanzania. It is very hard to apply Habermas theory on communicative action to understand this situation. Habermas’ theory rely on the fact, that communication actually takes place, and try to view whether or not it is being distorted. It seems thus that our finding in this situation falls back on Buber’s broader theory on dialogue, as something that either is or isn’t. Our case is very much a dialogue, which doesn’t take place. The reasons for this can be many. Buber states there must be an acceptance of the person, in our case the system that one is pursuing a dialogue with. If this is the case then our result would be, that both systems involved in the Tanzanian development cooperation objectify the other, and therefore the relationship becomes of the I-it character. This coincides very well with what some of our respondents stated. They argued that only some personal relationship between the individuals on either side account for some interaction, meaning that a few people can bridge the gap between the two systems. Our study has shown these individual interactions are becoming more and more central for GoT/donor-communication, but if that is satisfactory in the long run, remains an unanswered question. We believe that it will become increasingly difficult to defend the donors’ involvement in this kind of partnership. Firstly, because an entire organisation can’t rely on the results of a few individuals, secondly because the donors are accountable to their home country tax payers, who wants to see results and thirdly because of their ‘nature’ as systems, which doesn’t allow them to loose the control of the steering media. What we might expect then, is new changes and a new aid architecture, which goes against everything stated in the one currently being applied.
6 Conclusions
The overall aim of this study was to investigate how Sida’s dialogue with Tanzania has changed with the new aid architecture. We have found that the adoption of the Paris agenda in international development cooperation has had a substantial impact on how the dialogue between Sida and Tanzania is conducted. The current aid discourse with focus on the Paris agenda has shifted the aid dialogue from micro to macro level and thereby excluded the larger part of the Tanzanian society. This shift endangers ordinary citizen’s trust in government institutions, which is critical, because it is so important for a sustainable development in any country. This conclusion is substantiated by Sida’s own findings, but whereas Sida at the moment leave the problem there, we feel that we by using Habermas theory on communicative action through Liedman’s method have found a deeper understanding of the problem. Sida recognizes the problem, but apparently fails to link it with the development cooperation on a greater scale. Our study has shown that the exclusion of ordinary Tanzanian citizens is a ‘natural’ step for the development cooperation to take, because of the way it works as a system. This conclusion also means that the solving of these problems requires a complete restructuring of the development cooperation, the system must, so to speak, change it self. It can probably only do so if it experiences increased pressure from strong civil societies working for change in both Tanzania and Sweden, and at the moment it seems that, at least the Tanzanian, civil society is too weak to mount such a pressure.

Considering Sida’s role within the new aid architecture it seems quite clear that the organisation will find it very hard to promote Swedish positions. One thing is getting through the DPG-‘filter’ another is getting it further to the GoT, in both cases the task has been made more difficult. Our study has shown that effectiveness in promoting the Swedish positions rely to a great extent on the individual skill and capacity of the Sida employee and not so much the utilisation of the dialogue structures, which are in place in the development cooperation. Furthermore it seems clear, at least in our case of Tanzania, that the positions that Sida wishes to promote are shared by the majority of the donors and as such the Swedish flag is harder to place on any specific position. At the same time the asymmetrical power relations within the DPGs are themselves an obstacle to obtaining a well functioning dialogue between the donors. Even though the MDGs are guiding the donors, some of the most dominant are still pursuing their own agenda uncoordinated. In all cases it is safe to say that Sida’s voice definitely is constrained by the other donors. Whether or not this is a good or a
bad thing is not for us to judge, however from a alignment point of view it seems natural that
the donors abandon their need for claiming different positions as their own, and instead see
these positions as shared amongst the different agents within the specific country’s
development, not the least owned by the partner country it self. At the moment Sida seems a
bit uncertain on whether or not they should pursue a bilateral dialogue outside the DPG in
order to make sure that their positions are promoted. It is our conclusion that this would
jeopardize the entire process of harmonisation and undermine not only the DPGs but also the
ideas of the Paris agenda.

Even though it seems quite clear that the donor coordination process has affected the
communication and power structures between donors and Tanzania, it is almost impossible to
conclusively say whether or not the donors use the new aid architecture to gang up on the
partner country. Our study has shown that there are indications that the “power of the purse”
still plays a central part in the relationship, but at the same time the power structure appears to
be more complicated than that. The partner countries can take control over their development
simply by saying what they expect the donors want to hear. Naturally this has always been a
possibility, but it is easier now because the DPGs must act as one and therefore also sanction
as one. To get all the donors to withdraw its aid at the same time is almost unthinkable and
therefore the room for manoeuvre widens and thus shifts the power to the partner country’s
side. One could argue that this in fact is a true form of ownership, but it is however, not the
idea of ownership stated in the Paris declaration and this type of ownership effectively shuts
down any form of dialogue.

Finally, the current dialogue structures within the development cooperation appear to be
floating in some kind of vacuum, where neither partner country nor donor knows how to act.
This result in a situation where none of the systems meet and/or integrate, which in turn
means that the help that is sought and the help that is offered can do nothing else but bounce
against each other in the outer periphery of either system. Dialogue is supposed to be about
making changes together, it should be a way for the donor and the partner country to sort out
differences and agree upon the road ahead. Currently, two systems, i.e. the partner country
and the donors, are proceeding forward like two trains on parallel tracks, they never intersect
each other nor do they arrive at the same stations of ownership, harmonisation or alignment.
All they are doing is waving to one another from the windows, while hoping that they got on
the right train.
7 Concluding Remarks

As a final remark we would like to point out that the findings in this study are only applicable to this specific development cooperation i.e. between the GoT and Sida. In order to state something more general about the structures of the development cooperation as a whole, one would have to undertake a larger study, which should specifically investigate the multitude of relationships that exist within any development cooperation regardless of where it is found. We do however feel that our results, and specifically the method and theory they rely on, would be very helpful tools in such an investigation. We feel that the framework for this study could easily work as a framework for other similar studies.

If we are to mention any shortcomings in our choice of theory it could be that it can only be applied were communication actually exist. It is obviously very difficult to explain lack of communication with a theory on communication. The strong point of our method is the fact that it abstains from valuing the findings; it becomes a task for the reader to make his/hers own conclusions on what is the correct understanding of a specific problem. We have tried to be objective about the study, but at the same time share our views and our understanding of the problems we have encountered; this is what we believe that we as academics do best. At the same time we also must remember, that we are sitting in Sweden trying to understand these problems, and we both believe that a larger study would benefit greatly from more views expressed from the partner countries side.

Nonetheless, we feel, considering the scope of this study and the aim that we proposed, that the conclusions we have made are valid for the specific context of this study.
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Appendix 1a, Intervjuguide

Namn, det de har jobbat med, länder de jobbat i, hur länge de har jobbat i TZ och vilka sektorer.

1. Hur var det att föra dialogen under den tidigare biståndsarkitekturen, alltså innan givarkoordinationen?

2. Har du fört dialogen för Sverige under den nya biståndsarkitekturen?

3. Hur upplever du/har du några synpunkter på skillnaden mellan de två sätten att föra dialog?
   a. Vilka fördelar ser du med att föra dialog med Tz nu under en ökad givarkoordination?
   b. Vilka nackdelar upplever du finns under den nya strukturen?
   c. Upplever du att det finns en skev maktrelation i dialogen?
   d. Har maktrelationen förändrats i och med den nya biståndsarkitekturen
      i. Har Tz bättre möjligheter för att få sin röst igenom?
      ii. Har alla givare samma möjlighet att få fram sin röst?
      iii. Hur anser du att Sida kan uttrycka sina värderingar inom den nya formen för dialog?
      iv. Ser du någon motsättning mellan att jobba med en ökad harmonisering till Tz’s egna prioriteringar och samtidigt främja för Sverige/Sida viktiga frågor så som jämställdhet mellan könen och demokrati/MR?

4. Skulle du kunna beskriva hur ett dialogtillfälle ser ut i praktiken?
   a. Är givarna överens om hur ’pushiga’ man ska var i dialogen. Sverige anses ju som en ganska lugn partner, men är alla lika lugna i dialogen?

5. Anser du att det finns hinder i dialogen som är relaterat till skillnader i sociala normer mellan Tz och Sida?

6. Lägger Sida/DPG sig fortfarande i TZ prioriteringar inom olika sektorer baserat på olika uppfattningar av vad som är viktigt?

7. Vilka dialogproblem finns associerade till de individer som för dialogen?
   a. Språk, förkunskap, förberedelse, personlig kemi etc.
8. I vilken utsträckning förs fortfarande en strikt bilateral dialog med Tz?
   a. Kort, varför tror du man behåller denna dialogform?
   b. Kort, anser du att den strikta bilateralala dialogen fortfarande behövs som ett komplement till den givarkoordinerade dialogen?

9. Har Sida kapaciteten att delta i den ökade gruppen av internationella nätverk som diskuterar utvecklingsprocessen i Tz?
Appendix 1b, Interview guide

Name, job description, and countries the respondents have worked in, how long they have worked in Tanzania and in which sectors.

1. How did you pursue dialogue during the former aid architecture, i.e. before donor coordination?

2. Have you pursued dialogue on Sweden’s behalf within the new aid architecture?

3. How do you feel about/do you have any views on, the difference between the two ways of pursuing dialogue.
   a. What advantages do you see with pursuing dialogue with Tanzania under increased donor coordination?
   b. What disadvantages do you feel are present in the new aid architecture?
   c. Is it your experience that there are asymmetrical power relations within the dialogue?
   d. Have this power relation changed with the new aid architecture?
      i. Does Tanzania have a better chance of getting its voice through?
      ii. Do all the donors have equal chances of getting their voice through?
      iii. How do you think Sida can express its positions under the new forms of pursuing dialogue?
      iv. Do you see any conflict in working towards an increased harmonization to Tanzania’s positions and at the same time pursuing for Sweden important positions such as gender equality and democracy/HR?

4. Could you describe how a dialogue situation takes place?
   a. Do the donors agree on how ‘pushy’ the dialogue should be? Sweden is considered to be relatively ‘un-pushy’, but are the other donors the same way?

5. Do you believe that there are problems in the dialogue, which relate to differences in social norms between Sweden and Tanzania?

6. Does Sida/DPG still interfere with the way Tanzania prioritize their sectors because of difference of opinions about what is considered to be important?

7. Which dialogue problems relate to the individuals that are pursuing the dialogue?
   a. Language, prior knowledge, preparation, personal chemistry etc.
8. To what extent is a strict bilateral dialogue with Tanzania still being pursued?
   a. In short, why do you think that this way of dialogue is continuously being pursued?
   b. In short, do you feel that a strict bilateral dialogue is needed as a complement to the donor coordinated dialogue?

9. Does Sida have the capacity to participate in the increased number of international networks, which are discussing the development process in Tanzania?
Appendix 2, Agenda field visit to Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Saturday-Sunday – 24-25 March
- Lectures on Tanzanian politics, the economy, corruption and on Swedish views on latest developments in Tanzania
  - Muhammed Bakari, political analysis
  - Robert Mhamba, economical analysis
  - Torvald Åkesson Swedish Ambassador

Monday morning – 26 March
- Meeting with Moses Kibwana former Director of external finance of Tanzania Treasury 8.00
- Meeting with
  - Swedish Embassy. Swedish assistance to Tanzania 11.00-13.00
  - Anders Frankenberg and Torbjörn Pettersson
- How does Sweden implement its aid policies in the field?
- Introduction to Swedish support in the field of education

Monday afternoon – 26 March
- National Audit office 14.00 K.Å Gerden
- Local NGO, HakiElimu on NGO participation in planning for education and for foreign assistance to education Rashid Rajani, 15.30

Tuesday morning – 27 March
- EU delegation. EU and its field activities 9.30. Douglas Carpenter

Tuesday afternoon – 27 March
- Study visit Kibaha 11.30

Wednesday morning – 28 March
- IBRD 9.00 Rest Lasway
- UNDP.11.00 Kari Vestbo

Wednesday afternoon – 28 March
- Representative from External Aid Unit of Treasury Judica Omari. How does Tanzania programme and manage aid. Donor coordination. PRSPs and PERs. 13.30

Thursday morning – 29 March
- Tanzanian NGO – Tanzanian Networking Gender Programme 9.00
- Vicky Mushi former inspector for secondary education at Elimu and presently working at Canadian Embassy on foreign support to projects, programmes or Swaps seen from both sides. 11.00

Thursday afternoon – 29 March
- Nokkala Marko Finland 13.30
- IOGT/NTO – Per Eriksson Swedish NGO 15.00

Friday morning – 30 March
- Norway. How does Norway implement its aid policies in the field? 15.30
- Walter Bogoya, Publisher of books and learning materials 09.30-10.30
- Representative of ministry of education, Oliver Mhaiki 11.00-12.30
- Bahame Nyanduga Barrister and Commissioner for the African Commission for Human and Peoples Rights 14.00
- Kabenga Nsa Kaisi

Saturday
- diskussionsseminarium Universitetet with students from IDS
- Halima, Mwinsheike. Swahili and or English as Medium of instruction in Tanzania