

Exercise 4: Assessing strengths and weaknesses

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

- ☞ Have a joint understanding of their WSI's strengths and weaknesses related to the most important risk areas and guiding questions
- ☞ Have documented the status of integrity and will have mapped strengths and weaknesses in the priority risk areas of the initiative.

time	activity	materials
20 min.	4.1. Turn around the three priority risk cards and put each on one box of the brown paper. Ask the group to pick from the board the cards with guiding questions indicated on the risk cards. ¹ Put the guiding questions in the box of the relevant risk. In case of new risk areas (added during the previous exercise, without pre-defined guiding questions), participants should establish a set of three to five questions related to the selected risks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Color cards with guiding questions ✓ Pin board with brown paper divided into 3 boxes
30 min.	<p>4.2. Hand out scoring sheets with the guiding questions and answering options for the priority risk areas. Ask the group to go through the guiding questions and answering options, and clarify any unclear terms. Explain to the participants that the answering options shall provide only a rough picture and that the specific situation of the WSI will be discussed in the next step. The participants should then <i>anonymously</i> answer the questions using the available answering options.</p> <p>During a 5-minute break, the facilitator collects the scoring sheets and generates the average scores based on the answers to each question.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Scoring sheets for the guiding questions related to the priority risk areas
10 min.	4.3. Explain the same hat approach (see box) and the annotation process around the answers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Presentation to introduce the same hat approach
90 min.	<p>4.4. The facilitator presents the average scoring results for the first risk area by writing the scores next to the cards with the guiding questions for that risk area.</p> <p>Depending on the group, the facilitator may kick off the dialogue by opening the floor to an initial discussion. You can then do a card exercise by asking the participants to write down the arguments for the level below the average scores (weaknesses), and after having discussed these cards, do another round for the level above (strengths).</p> <p>This exercise is repeated for each of the guiding questions. The output is a map of strengths and weaknesses for each of the prioritized risk areas.²</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Color cards and pens for each participant ✓ Pin board with brown paper divided into 3 boxes ✓ AWIS facilitator's guide (Visscher and Hermann-Friede, 2011, pp. 22–24) for instructions for the facilitation process

¹ Each risk card indicates the relevant guiding questions on the back.

² It might be advisable to have a coffee break between weakness and strength scoring to make this exercise less tiring.

Adopting the same hat approach

WSI participants have different types of information, which may affect their perception of the integrity situation. For example, consider the guiding question: *How well have risks with regard to public sector collusion and policy capture been identified? Are they being managed?* Average score of 1.8 implies that some participants may have given an answer that scores 1 and others have given an answer scoring of 2 or higher. The corporate partner may have spent significant time discussing capture risks with the WSI manager, but other WSI participants are not aware of this analysis and provide lower scores. When discussing their perception with others, several participants may tend to stick to their opinion and will try to convince the other party. This may lead to a long debate with winners and losers.

Therefore we suggest adopting an approach based on the concept of the “thinking hats” to facilitate the discussion of the guiding questions (School of Thinking, 1983). This method encourages participants to collectively look at the guiding questions from different angles. This approach stimulates dialogue and blocks debate, as all participants have to adopt the same way of thinking (they wear the same hat) — for example, by giving only positive remarks about a guiding question in the first round. In the next round, everyone then changes their attitude (hat) to give only negative remarks. This implies doing away with the famous phrase “yes but ...,” which is a root cause of unproductive debate.

For more guidance on the concept of the thinking hats, refer to Visscher and Hermann-Friede (2011), pp. 12–13.