

Online appendix D: Coding sheet for eligible studies

| | Number | Question | Description |
|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Administrative Details | 1.1 | Date coded | |
| 2. Publication Details | 2.1 | Full citation | |
| | 2.2 | Study title | |
| | 2.3 | Authors | Last name, first initial for all authors |
| | 2.4 | Year of publication | |
| 3. Basic Information | 3.1 | Country | Country of intervention |
| | 3.2 | Region | 1 = North America; 2 = South America; 3 = Europe; 4 = Sub-Saharan Africa; 5 = North Africa/Middle East; 6 = Asia |
| | 3.3 | Country income level | According to the World Bank (see http://data.worldbank.org/country). 1 = high; 2 = middle, 3 = low |
| | 3.4 | Policy area | Policy area of focus in intervention. 1 = health; 2 = environment; 3 = water/sanitation; 4 = education; 5 = womens rights; 6 = politics/democracy/voting/corruption; 0 = other |
| 4. Context | 4.1 | Risk level faced by advocates | High risk is an environment in which advocated would likely experience severe repercussions of their work and/or must to hide their activities due to a political, cultural or social context. Medium risk is when advocates may experience some repercussions and/or may choose to hide their activities. Low risk is when an advocates will most likely not face repercussions and/or will most likely not need to hide their work. No risk is when advocates are completely safe to advocate. 1 = high; 2 = medium; 3 = low; 4 = none |
| | 4.2 | Type of government | Only answer if relevant to the intervention. 1 = democracy; 2 = oligarchy; 3 = dictatorship; 4 = monarchy; 5 = military rule, 0 = other) |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|--|
| | 4.3 | Perceived receptivity of target | As noted by authors. For example, a registered voter may be open to a campaign to get people to vote. A corrupt politician would be averse to budget monitoring. 1 = open; 2 = somewhat open; 3 = mostly averse; 4 = averse; 5 = unknown |
| | 4.4 | Is the target accountable? | Is he or she accountable for the decisions that he or she makes? If the target is a government official, for example, is he or she elected? If the target is a teacher, can he or she be fired? 1 = yes, highly accountable; 2 = yes, somewhat accountable; 3 = no, not accountable at all; 0 = irrelevant/unknown. |
| 5. Characteristics of the Intervention | 5.1 | Intervention title | If applicable |
| | 5.2 | Brief description of the intervention or initiative | |
| | 5.3 | Implementer of the intervention or initiative | Name of group or individual, if one is mentioned |
| | 5.4 | Type of advocacy initiative | 1 = information campaign = 2-organizing; 3 = campaign/protests; 4 = direct contact/lobbying with politicians; 5 = Litigation or use of legal system; 6 = media campaign; 7 = community budget review; 0 = other, explain |
| | 5.5 | Goal of advocacy initiative | 1 = behavior change of beneficiaries (seeks to change the behavior towards improvement for the betterment of an individual or wider population) ; 2 = opinion/attitude change of beneficiaries (seeks to change the attitudes or opinions of beneficiaries); 3 = improved material situation of individuals (aims to improve the quality of lives of individual or group, such as higher income, better access to health care); 4 = change public policy (aims to get an issue on the agenda of policymakers, or a bill or law passed or policy enacted); 5 = get policy/program implemented (aims to get an active policy or law implemented or the implementation of it improved); 6 = budget allocation/reallocation (aims to get a policy or program funded or a budget removed, increased, |

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| | | decreased or reallocated); 7 = private sector change (seeks change in the actions of a private sector entity); 8 = civil society capacity building/organizing/building of alliances (Aims to create a civil society that is capable of advocating for change on their own terms and holds a government accountable); 9 = democratic change (seeks new channels for citizen involvement in politics and policy); 10 = change behavior or politician/public servant (aims to change the behavior of a politician or public servant towards a specific agenda)t; 0 = other |
| 5.6 | Specific goal of advocacy initiative | Describe |
| 5.7 | If the intervention was an information campaign, how was the information provided? | 1 = written in leaflet/pamphlet; 2 = written in newspaper or other mass media; 3 = orally/phone; 4 = text message; 5 = orally/in-person, 6 = in a group setting/public event; 0 = other |
| 5.8 | If the intervention was an information campaign, what information was provided? | 1 = absolute info about world or a topic; 2 = absolute info about beneficiary; 3 = absolute info about beneficiary's group or community; 4 = comparison info about beneficiary or group, 5 = absolute about politician, 6 = comparative about politicians, 7 = absolute about policy, 8 = comparative about policy, 9 = comparative about world or a topic, 0 = other) |
| 5.9 | If the intervention was an information campaign, who conveyed the information? | 1 = surveyor; 2 = NGO; 3 = service provider; 4 = peer/neighbor/friend; 5 = government representative; 6 = researcher/research team; 0 = other |
| 5.11 | Were the targets or beneficiaries provided any monetary or in-kind support for their participation in the intervention? | 1 = yes; 2 = no; 0 = not relevant. This does not include items provided that were inherently necessary for the intervention, such as a flier, pamphlet or informational video. |
| 5.12 | Advocate | Detailed description |

| | | | |
|--|------|--|---|
| | 5.13 | Advocate type | 1 = INGO; 2 = beneficiaries themselves; 3 = IGO; 4 = Local NGO/CSO; 5 = government; 6 = service provider; 7 = research team; 0 = other |
| | 5.14 | Beneficiaries | Detailed description |
| | 5.15 | Beneficiary type | 1 = individual, 2 = physical group/community (i.e. a village); 3 = identity group/community (i.e. persons with disabilities); 0 = other |
| | 5.16 | Target | Detailed description |
| | 5.17 | Target type | 1 = local government; 2 = national government; 3 = International community; 4 = business; 5 = citizen population; 6 = beneficiaries, 0 = other) |
| 6. Study Design & Methodology | 6.1 | Methodology | 1 = Randomized control trial (RCT); 2 = Quasi-experimental (such as regression discontinuity design, or instrumental variables; 0= other, please explain |
| | 6.2 | Sample size | Total sample, total treatment size, total control size |
| | 6.3 | Unit of treatment | Description |
| | 6.4 | Unit of analysis | Description |
| | 6.5 | Sampling strategy | Description |
| | 6.6 | Length of intervention | Only the period assessed in the evaluation |
| | 6.7 | Length of time of evaluation | When appropriate, from baseline to endline |
| 7. Findings | 7.1 | Was the advocacy intervention successful | According to the authors' results. 1 = yes; 2 = no; 3 = ambiguous/unclear; 4 = mixed results (i.e. positive for some of the population, but not for others) |
| | 7.2 | What was/were the specific outcomes of the study | List all outcomes by subpopulation if available |
| | 7.3 | Were there any caveats to the results mentioned? | If yes, please explain in detail |