



OECD DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

Working Paper No. 238

PUBLIC OPINION POLLING
AND THE
MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

by

Jude Fransman, Alphonse L. MacDonald, Ida Mc Donnell
and Nicolas Pons-Vignon

Research programme on:
Social Institutions and Dialogue



DEVELOPMENT CENTRE WORKING PAPERS

This series of working papers is intended to disseminate the Development Centre's research findings rapidly among specialists in the field concerned. These papers are generally available in the original English or French, with a summary in the other language.

Comments on this paper would be welcome and should be sent to the OECD Development Centre, Le Seine Saint-Germain, 12 boulevard des Îles, 92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux, France.



THE OPINIONS EXPRESSED AND ARGUMENTS EMPLOYED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THOSE OF THE OECD OR OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF ITS MEMBER COUNTRIES

CENTRE DE DÉVELOPPEMENT DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL

Cette série de documents de travail a pour but de diffuser rapidement auprès des spécialistes dans les domaines concernés les résultats des travaux de recherche du Centre de Développement. Ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans leur langue originale, anglais ou français ; un résumé du document est rédigé dans l'autre langue.

Tout commentaire relatif à ce document peut être adressé au Centre de Développement de l'OCDE, Le Seine Saint-Germain, 12 boulevard des Îles, 92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux, France.



LES IDÉES EXPRIMÉES ET LES ARGUMENTS AVANCÉS DANS CE DOCUMENT SONT CEUX DE L'AUTEUR ET NE REFLÈTENT PAS NÉCESSAIREMENT CEUX DE L'OCDE OU DES GOUVERNEMENTS DE SES PAYS MEMBRES

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate all or part of this material should be made to:
Head of Publications Service, OECD
2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CÉDEX 16, France

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	4
LIST OF ACRONYMS	5
PREFACE	6
RÉSUMÉ.....	7
SUMMARY	8
I. INTRODUCTION.....	9
II. TACKLING THE DATA PROBLEM: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE “POP” PROJECT.....	11
III. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES.....	17
IV. NEXT STEPS.....	23
BIBLIOGRAPHY	24
ANNEX I MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS, TARGETS AND INDICATORS	25
ANNEX II BASIC QUESTIONNAIRE	28
ANNEX III VERSION FOR MAIL SURVEY	34
ANNEX IV VERSION FOR TELEPHONE SURVEY	40
OTHER TITLES IN THE SERIES/ AUTRES TITRES DANS LA SÉRIE.....	47

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper brings together the results of two projects supported by members of the informal network of DAC Heads of Information (HOI): “Public Opinion Polling (POP)” and “POP Plus”. An earlier version was presented and discussed at the network’s annual meeting in Stockholm on 14-15 June 2004. The annexed questionnaire is also freely available in its various versions on the Development Centre’s website: www.oecd.org/dev/opinion.

The Development Centre wishes to express its gratitude to HOI members for their backing, and in particular to the governments of Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Sweden, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom for their financial support to the “POP” and “POP Plus” processes.

The Centre also wishes to thank the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the Economic Commission for Europe, United Nations, for lending the extremely valuable expertise of Alphonse L. MacDonald throughout the two projects.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BMZ	Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
DCD	Development Co-operation Directorate
DG DEV	Directorate-General for Development of the European Commission
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
HOI	Informal network of DAC Heads of Information
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MORI	Market and Opinion Research International
NCDO	Nationale Commissie voor Internationale Samenwerking en Duurzame Ontwikkeling (National Commission for International Co-operation and Sustainable Development, The Netherlands)
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Development and Co-operation
ODA	Official development assistance
PIPA	Program on International Policy Attitudes (United States)
POP	Public Opinion Polling group (established by the informal network of DAC HOI)
SIDA	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

PREFACE

Ten years ago, the OECD Development Centre and the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) brought together policy makers, academics, parliamentarians and journalists for an Informal Experts' Consultation on Public Knowledge and Public Attitudes to International Development Co-operation. This was the first occasion that this issue had been addressed at the OECD. *Inter alia*, this *Consultation* called for "the establishment of clear goals for development policy, so that the people will know the standards against which performance should be measured, and will understand the stakes involved" (Foy and Helmich, 1996). These have since become a reality in the form of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Since this time, the Heads of Information in DAC member countries' development co-operation agencies – many of whom took part in the seminal *Consultation* – have widened and deepened their collaboration within their own Informal Network. The MDGs are providing them with a unified framework for communication on development issues. The Centre has accompanied the Network's growth by undertaking analysis and brokering policy dialogue, thus building a unique expertise in public engagement towards development.

A key result of this work has been to point to the lack of regular, consistent and comparable DAC-wide data on public attitudes. The initiative by several members of the informal network of DAC HOI to develop a single, common survey questionnaire on the MDGs, presented in this paper, is therefore welcome. It is timely too: on the condition that it is implemented rapidly and in a large number of countries, it will provide the Heads of State gathering at the September 2005 UN Summit with a uniquely valuable database on public attitudes in industrial countries towards the MDGs.

The common survey initiative will be taken further as part of the Development Centre's 2005-2006 Programme of Work. This will be achieved with the help of the European Commission's Eurobarometer polling mechanism and through greater collaboration with the Informal Network of DAC Heads of Information.

Prof. Louka T. Katseli
Director
OECD Development Centre
29 October 2004

RÉSUMÉ

Il est particulièrement difficile de suivre avec précision l'évolution de l'opinion publique dans les pays riches au sujet de l'aide internationale et des autres politiques de développement : en l'absence d'enquêtes systématiques, il n'y a tout simplement aucune base de données fiables et comparables pour l'ensemble des pays membres du Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'OCDE. Ce document propose une solution : un questionnaire commun destiné à tous les pays du CAD, prêt à l'emploi dans leurs enquêtes nationales, et centré sur les Objectifs de développement du millénaire (ODM). Il en synthétise le processus d'élaboration, analyse brièvement les principaux problèmes méthodologiques et rassemble en annexe les trois versions finales (face à face, par téléphone ou par courrier). Ce questionnaire devrait permettre aux professionnels de l'information et de la communication, ainsi qu'aux décideurs politiques, d'améliorer la comparabilité des enquêtes d'opinion dans les pays membres du CAD sur le développement et les ODM, surtout si, comme l'a proposé la Direction Générale pour le Développement de la Commission européenne, une partie des questions est incluse dans le prochain sondage Eurobaromètre sur le développement dans tous les pays de l'Union européenne (prévu en 2005).

SUMMARY

Monitoring changes in public awareness and attitudes in rich countries towards aid and other international development policy issues is extremely difficult: due to lack of systematic polling or monitoring, there is no reliable, comparable data across DAC member countries. This paper suggests a way to address this problem: a common questionnaire for all DAC countries to use in their national surveys, centred on the Millennium Development Goals. It sums up the process that led to the setting up of this questionnaire, provides a short analysis of the main methodological issues and brings together three versions, respectively for face-to-face, phone or mail processing. These should allow information and communication professionals, as well as policy makers, to improve the comparability of public opinion surveys in OECD DAC member countries on development and the MDGs, especially if — as proposed by the European Commission's Directorate General for Development — parts of the questionnaire are included in the next Eurobarometer survey on development across EU member countries (possibly in 2005).

I. INTRODUCTION

To what extent are citizens in OECD DAC member countries aware of the challenges of poverty alleviation and development in poorer countries? How much do they know about the Official Development Assistance (ODA) and other development-related policies which their governments wage on their behalf? How supportive are they of those policies? Elected representatives and politicians need to know the answers to those questions, but not only them. Information officers and policy makers in aid and development co-operation administrations also need to have fairly good and regularly updated information on what people think and how far they support the government's development co-operation efforts. Finally, public opinion research is an essential input into communication and educational programmes aimed at raising awareness of development-related issues: data will help identify knowledge gaps, information and education needs, potential target groups, and so on.

On the whole, however, efforts to research and monitor public attitudes in OECD countries *viz.* global poverty and the MDGs have been inadequate and scattered. The data on DAC Member countries is still largely limited to measuring public support for the *principle* of giving aid in general, and public satisfaction with levels of ODA¹. Some countries have not conducted any surveys, and, where data exists for several countries for a particular year, questions are phrased differently in each case, making it difficult to draw a reliable comparison. Moreover, public opinion polling is notoriously difficult, with responses influenced by lack or misinterpretation of basic information, as well as by issues that are given prominence in the media at the time of fieldwork. Most surveys and polls that do exist focus on support for ODA, but they tell us little about awareness and support for MDGs and they fail to bring non-ODA-related policy choices such as trade, debt, and migration policies into the picture. In questionnaires related to ODA, expenditure is rarely compared with that in other sectors, and too little information is given for deeper conclusions to be drawn about individual opinions. For all these reasons, survey findings sometimes appear contradictory or ambiguous.

Several members of an informal network of Heads of Information (HOI) in development agencies or ministries of DAC countries have decided to tackle the issue in a collaborative manner. The next section describes how they jointly developed a set of common questions on the

1. Overall, the trend revealed by this data has been consistent over the last two decades: citizens in OECD DAC member countries are overwhelmingly supportive of international development co-operation in principle, but awareness of international development issues and policies remains very low. In particular, people tend to overestimate their government's aid effort considerably, and support for foreign aid is mostly based upon the erroneous assumption that it will be spent on humanitarian crises. See Fransman and Solignac Lecomte (2004), for an update of the main data in Mc Donnell *et al.* (2003).

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), translated them into national languages, they were tested in one national survey (the “POP” and “POP Plus” projects). Section III reviews the main methodological issues they were confronted with. Finally, section IV sums up the follow-up actions envisaged by members of the HOI network at their 2004 meeting.

Box 1

The “POP” Project

The original Public Opinion Polling group (POP, 2002-2003) comprised agencies from Canada, Germany, Sweden and the United States, together with the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD), UNDP and the OECD Development Centre.

The “POP PLUS” Project

POP PLUS (2003-2004), a successor to the POP initiative, was set up by Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, in collaboration with the UN Economic Commission for Europe, UNDP, UNFPA, the UN Millennium Campaign and the World Bank. It was co-ordinated by the OECD Development Centre, in close collaboration with the DCD.

II. TACKLING THE DATA PROBLEM: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE “POP” PROJECT

The Public Opinion Polling Group

In October 2001, participants in an informal meeting of experts in Dublin on “International Development Co-operation in OECD Countries: Public Debate, Public Support and Public Opinion”² stressed the scarcity of comparable data in DAC Member countries on public opinion about development co-operation. There was broad support for a proposal to develop a common methodology for surveying public attitudes. It was suggested that the issue of data gathering and monitoring become the topic for the next meeting of the informal network of DAC Heads of Information (HOI) in 2002³.

There, the desirability and feasibility of conducting a joint DAC survey of public opinion about international development co-operation and the MDGs were explored. A Public Opinion Polling (“POP”) group was established to develop some common questions on the MDGs that DAC Members would be able to use in their national public opinion surveys. It comprised representatives of the governments of Sweden (SIDA), Germany (BMZ), Canada (CIDA) and the United States (USAID), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), as well as the Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) and the Development Centre of the OECD. This was considered as a first step towards harmonising public opinion data in OECD countries. Alphonse L. MacDonald (the Director of the UNFPA Geneva office) agreed to advise the project in light of his experience and scientific knowledge of surveying public attitudes, especially at the international level. On behalf of the Group, the Development Centre would prepare a study to be discussed at the 2003 HOI meeting (see Terms of Reference in Box 3).

Adopting the MDGs as a Framework

While the intention of the OECD DAC in its 1996 selection of the objectives that led to the adoption of the MDGs was to give a new direction to aid agencies’ thinking and practice, the Goals also provided a good instrument for illustrating what development co-operation is about,

2. See www.oecd.org/dev/opinion.

3. Directors of public information in development co-operation agencies of several DAC member countries have been meeting informally since 1988. Concerned with the fact that, in spite of the wide recognition that public support is essential to sustaining and improving international development co-operation, public information and development education have been a neglected sector in aid agencies, they aimed to create an opportunity to regularly share best practices and swap ideas across DAC countries.

making its aims more transparent and more understandable for the general public. Therefore, they eventually emerged as a new communications tool to raise public awareness, and were put by several donor agencies – most notably the UN – at the heart of their communication strategies. They are all the more likely to appeal to the general public that they are measurable, time-bound targets, and that they put the priority on basic needs. They thus seem particularly helpful at a time when information officers face the challenge of communicating about increasingly “intangible” aspects of development co-operation such as programme aid, sector wide approaches and budget support.

Moreover, the MDGs provide a useful tool to analyse public opinion in greater detail and allow for asking more precise questions. The initial POP study thus aimed to use the MDGs to develop a set of common questions which could be included either in national surveys carried out by DAC members, or in an international poll. Through the use of “common” questions (and a common methodology), the POP Group seeks to obtain more harmonised data on public opinion in OECD countries, thereby facilitating comparative analysis of trends in opinion at the international level. If an international poll was undertaken and repeated at regular intervals, a real comparison of trends in public attitudes towards the MDGs would be possible. The survey results would in turn supply communicators with useful data to develop and target awareness-raising campaigns better – both national and international.

Box 2

How much do people know about the MDGs?

Early results from polls in Canada, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States reveal that there is very little awareness about the existence of the Goals. When people do know about the MDGs, they are sceptical about the possibility of achieving them, especially those concerning the environment and halving extreme poverty. There are also wide country differences; if Swedish and United States respondents give priority to all eight MDGs, Canadians think the Goals are too numerous and too vague. Women and young people, however, tend to be more optimistic than men and the older age groups. It thus seems fair to say that, on average, in DAC countries, the proclaimed global anti-poverty consensus and the MDGs have not trickled down to national public debates.

Source: Mc Donnell (2004).

Core Elements of the Questions

The ultimate aim of the POP study was to create examples of common questions. Based on best practice in public opinion measurement⁴, seven key issues were kept in mind while preparing the questionnaire:

4. See Price (1992).

1. What exactly is this about? Opinion about what?
2. What alternative choices have framed or constrained the response?
3. How well considered is the response?
4. How is this opinion organised, if at all, with other views?
5. How strongly is it held? With what degree of certainty?
6. What are the chances it will result in committed political action?
7. What is the perceived social context within which this opinion has been formed and expressed?

In coming to conclusions about the modalities for using the questions, researchers were confronted with additional questions:

- Resources: time and financial. When should a first survey be conducted? How would it be financed?
- Ownership of the survey: DAC Members in collaboration with International Organisations?
- Participation of civil society: how and which organisations?
- Central or decentralised management: options include UN Millennium Campaign in collaboration with DAC Members; DAC Members individually but also serving the needs of the UN Millennium Campaign; outsourcing, other. A co-ordinating unit will always be needed.
- Frequency of data collection (if time series are required).
- How consistent should the questions be over time? Can there be deviation from the initial study, which provides baseline data, to more specific questioning about the Goals in later years?
- How to differentiate between *Goals*, *targets* and *indicators* within the MDGs? Is there a need to do so?
- How to allow for themes – certain campaigns may focus on specific Goals and want to measure specific awareness over the years.
- How to deal with Goal 8 in the questions⁵?

It has thus been suggested that the following selected characteristics for each of the 18 targets be measured:

- Level of priority;
- Likelihood of Goal/target being achieved.

5. Goal 8 is different from the other Goals, it is more complex, and more political in nature, which made it more difficult to decide how best to include it in a questionnaire, or to agree on common questions about it.

In relation to the MDGs as a group, a survey should find out:

- Importance of country X's and other developed countries' contribution for the achievement of the MDGs.
- Should Government increase its ODA to help achieve MDGs? If YES, by how much?
- Has the respondent done something in the last year to help achieve the Goals? If YES: What?
- Personal willingness to do something to achieve Goals? If YES: What?
- Assessment of own government's role on achieving the Goals.
- Knowledge about the roles of relevant development co-operation actors.

Early Results

A review of surveys on the MDGs showed fairly similar situations across Canada, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States and helped prepare the "common" questions. The key points emerging from the review included the following:

- There is very little awareness about the existence of the MDGs. Earlier British surveys also demonstrated this.
- Public opinion is not convinced that the Goals will be achieved.
- People are least convinced about achieving environmental sustainability and halving extreme poverty.
- More than a majority of respondents (in Sweden and the United States) think that all Goals are a priority.
- Public opinion tends to be most optimistic about reaching the target of access to safe drinking water in the United States and access to family planning in the United Kingdom⁶.
- Canadians are sceptical *viz.* the abundance of many Goals and targets. They think that they are somewhat vague.
- Women and young people are more optimistic about achieving the Goals than men and older age groups.

The report, presented at the June 2003 annual HOI meeting in Ottawa, provided a basic set of questions on the MDGs and made the following recommendations:

- To include the questions in a broader, nationally representative survey on development co-operation;
- To use a standardised methodology for the MDGs part and ideally for the broader part of the survey;
- To centralise the management and implementation of the survey programme.

6. "Access to family planning" is no longer part of the Goals. However, the survey organisers in the United Kingdom have decided to keep it in their annual survey for continuity.

Taking these results into account, nine countries (Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States) decided to take the POP work further to design improved and comparable questionnaires. They again asked the OECD Development Centre to co-ordinate this project and to assist countries in the design of comparable questionnaires which would take national (in particular linguistic) specificities into account.

POP Plus: Laying the Foundations for Better Public Surveys on Development

Comments by the participants in the Ottawa meeting covered the details of the proposed set of questions, relevance of and preferences for certain questions, how a medium-term project researching and monitoring attitudes to the MDGs might be managed, next steps, who to include and consult with and who would participate in a possible piloting of the questions.

It was suggested by SIDA that the questions could be asked in a global World Value Surveys (WVS) in 2005 and that a partnership with WVS on this might be possible. UNDP participants commented that they were interested in collaborating with the project, especially if attitudes in developing countries would also be surveyed. Additionally, it was proposed that the project group consult with international social research bodies, notably the Eurobarometer of the European Commission and commercial companies such as Environics and MORI.

There was a proposal to make the questions a “public good” (freely available e.g. on the Internet) so that the survey could also be used on a voluntary basis. Consultation with the broader development community including NGOs was stressed as especially important. Strong links should also be maintained with the Millennium Campaign, Global Education Network Europe, the World Bank and the European Commission. DAC members absent from the Ottawa HOI meeting should also be brought into the loop.

Still, there was no consensus about the immediate adoption of questions and commitment to a standard survey. The issue of the relevance of questions and the methodology needed to be explored on a closer basis with agencies and other stakeholders. An initial step agreed upon at the meeting was the development of a pilot phase by a group of interested countries. This group of countries includes: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States. The results of the pilot were presented at the 2004 HOI meeting in Sweden. The Development Centre and project advisor Alphonse L. MacDonald were asked to be responsible for the next stage of the project: POP Plus.

Box 3

Terms of Reference for POP Plus

1. Refine the basic set of questions based upon input from DAC heads of information and other agencies/organisations linked to the project.
2. Refine the methodology for the surveys. A number of methodological inconsistencies which exist between countries should be addressed in an attempt to standardise procedures as much as possible.
3. Firm up the English version of the questions (involve the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the United States).
4. Invite non-Anglophone participating countries to translate the English version at own cost.
5. POP Plus project team will manage the back-translation and fixing with the relevant translators from other participating countries.
6. Discuss with the European Opinion Research Group (EORG) for the Development Directorate of the European Commission, World Value Surveys, Environics, MORI, etc., the possibility of an OECD-wide/global survey on the MDGs.
7. Have the near-final basic questions ready for use by Canada/CIDA in September 2003 (August 15 deadline – which was met).
8. Submit POP Plus report to POP Group members by spring 2004.
9. Outreach with so-far uninvolved DAC Members, national NGOs/Social researchers with the basic set of questions.

Regarding issues which the set of core questions should address, proposals by participants in the meeting included:

- Validity of the questions – how the outcomes from the survey will support work on the MDGs.
- What developing countries should do themselves to achieve the Goals.
- Importance of Goal 8.
- Asking about consumer and lifestyle issues.
- Keep in mind how to apply questions to developing countries.
- A focus on the Pacific.
- Allow space/flexibility for country specificities.
- Ways to test key messages; use survey to get key messages on how to communicate on the MDGs; test the impact of MDG campaigns. If 5-10 year time framework be sure what we are trying to measure/ will we be testing the same thing?
- Focus on themes knowing they are interdependent.

III. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

In pursuing the harmonisation of public opinion data and the realisation of comparative regular (longitudinal) studies relating to knowledge and public support for the MDGs, the team had to tackle several methodological concerns, as discussed below.

Common Issues in Comparative Longitudinal Sample Surveys and their Relevance for Setting up a Questionnaire on the MDGs

The objectives of the survey are to provide communicators with the material to develop publicity campaigns and to measure the public's knowledge, perception and support for the MDGs. The survey will hence have two main dimensions; extension over time, and extension over space or territory. Extension over time assumes that the instruments developed will be sensitive to changes that occur in public knowledge, perception and support for the MDGs, and will be able to measure the same phenomenon in different locations, hence accommodating possible cultural variations. The proposed survey is a multinational/comparative longitudinal survey⁷. This translates into the following methodological considerations:

1. Identical conceptual framework (or at least conceptual equivalence)
2. Validity
3. Reliability
4. Cross-country comparability
5. Historical comparability

A Shared Framework

In order to obtain useful, i.e. valid and reliable results, it is imperative that the same framework be used *i)* for all the countries involved as well as *ii)* every time a survey is carried out. In this case the *identical framework* is given: the main concepts (variables) are provided by the MDGs as published by the United Nations (see Annex I). However, the way in which they are presented in the questionnaire is a matter of choice and, in order to harmonise the data (and its collection), the choice must be consistently followed by all countries and over time.

7. See Przeworski and Teune (1970); Galtung (1979); Ember and Ember (2001).

Validity

Validity refers to the characteristic of a measure, basically, that it measures what it purports to measure⁸. This study should measure knowledge, perception and support for the MDGs. The measures for these variables must be clearly defined and the indicators have to be consistently applied. Here the question is: up to what level of detail will the knowledge, perception and support of the respondents be measured? There are 8 Goals, 18 targets, and 48 indicators. The implication of the validity criterion is that for the measurement of *knowledge*, *perception* and *support* there must be clear instructions as to what the objective of assessing *knowledge*, *perception* and *support* is. This is of particular importance for the knowledge questions. If the study simply wants to measure knowledge at the Goal level, clear rules need to be established to record the answer of the respondent when s/he mentions targets or even indicators.

Reliability

Reliability refers to the constancy and precision with which the variables are measured⁹. In other words, the extent to which repeated measurements that use the same instrument and procedures will produce the same results under similar circumstances. This depends on the stability (constancy/invariability) of the answers that the questions elicit, and this is a function of the formulation of the questions, their complexity, level of clarity and on the sample size that is used. The reliability requirement mandates that the methodology used (including the design, instruments, data processing and analysis systems) is the same for all surveys over space and time.

Cross-country Comparability

Cross-country comparability will be guaranteed (and data will be harmonised) if the same methodology is used in all countries. The underlying assumption is that the cultural framework of all participating countries is identical or at least sufficiently similar. This implies that the questionnaire, the methodologies of data collection, editing, processing and analysis have to be identical. The same questions need to be used by all parties in the same order. To ensure questionnaire comparability there should be a reliable translation. It was thus decided to use the translation-retranslation technique (see next section). The definition of the study population and the sample design should be identical. Ideally, the same data collection procedure should be used, face-to-face interviews or telephone interviews; self-standing questionnaire or omnibus approach. In cross-country studies it is important to ensure that the answer categories of self-reported subjective categories are really comparable. This is especially important when one deals with value-related answer categories like "too much" or "too little". It is essential to ensure that with such categories some "objective" measure is also used, for example, "How much would be too much/too little, etc.?"¹⁰.

8. Classical statistical and methodological studies dealing with this concept, its components and relation to eligibility are: Weiss (1968) and Selltitz *et al.* (1959).

9. See Galtung (1979, pp. 65-81).

10. Statistical methods exist that allow the analyst to calibrate the answers and to correct for different cultural values, but this is usually not done in opinion research.

Historical Comparability

Historical comparability will be achieved if the same methodology and questionnaire is used over time, taking into consideration the issues related to cross-country comparability. Nevertheless, in order to accommodate increased knowledge on the MDGs it is necessary to anticipate modifications in the level of detail without affecting the validity of the measurements.

A Single Survey, yet in Different Countries

From the beginning, it was clear that the main challenge in establishing comparable surveys was to combine *i*) consideration for national specificities with *ii*) more or less identical questions. “National specificities” refer to language, but also to particular traditions of surveying, and to embedded references which vary from one place to another. The response to this challenge was to design a questionnaire in English which would be adapted on the basis of feedback from the different participating countries, and where a number of questions would have an element of case-sensitivity (e.g. when a question refers to “the government”, each country has to phrase it in the way that is best suited to its language).

For the non-Anglophone countries in the group, it was decided that they would translate the questionnaire into their language, and then have it back translated so it could be screened (and compared with the original as well as other back translations) by the Development Centre team.

The translation-retranslation technique is a procedure whereby a questionnaire is first prepared in a standard language version – English in the present case. Then, individual language versions are prepared by having the standard version translated by professional, preferably native speakers. This version is then retranslated into the standard language by a team of native speakers of the two languages. Differences in the two standard versions are reconciled by a team of native speakers of the two languages and knowledgeable individuals on the relevant subject matter.

Once agreement had been reached on the standard English questionnaire (i.e. face-to-face and a mail version designed for Denmark), the team supervised the translation-back translation process within each of the non-Anglophone participating countries, insisting on the importance of using two different translators to avoid self-correction¹¹. This allowed for flaws in the original questionnaires to be identified and corrected.

After reviewing the back translations, the team provided each non-Anglophone country with a detailed review, including comments and editing suggestions to ensure harmonisation.

Data collection modality also turned out to be an issue. It was understood, at the beginning, that all countries but Canada would be using face-to-face interviews, except Denmark where a mail survey would be used. It turned out that the Netherlands would also be using a telephone survey system like Canada. This led to the design of three basic questionnaires (for face-to-face, mail and telephone interviews) which are different but nonetheless comparable (see

11. Slight changes in meaning are common in translations, but they can jeopardise the comparability of surveys which are to be administered to large numbers of respondents.

Annexes II, III and IV). Face to face and telephone interviews are more comparable with one another than they are with the mail survey. The reason is that, in the latter, the interviewer has no “control” over the interview situation. This can lead to differences in the results especially where knowledge questions are concerned. Also, the mail survey precludes the assessment of the respondent’s knowledge of the level of ODA provided by the country.

Specific Methodological Issues related to the MDGs

Clarifying Goals and Targets

The differentiation between *Goals* and *targets* tends to be unclear, partly due to the compromises that were necessary for finding an agreement amongst UN member countries in drafting them. This raises several issues for surveys. Public support for the MDGs has been measured through *targets*, whilst reference was made to the *Goals*. This is partly because some of the targets, as described in the Millennium Declaration, are a re-statement of the Goal. However, in other instances more than one target has been assigned to a given Goal, and the Goal may not explicitly refer to the target. It is at this point that a non-distinction between Goals and targets could make it messy and complex to analyse knowledge of the MDGs. United Nations publications also confound Goals with targets. In an October 2002 fact sheet published by the United Nations Department of Public Information the “Millennium Goals to be achieved by 2015” are described as follows:

- Halve extreme poverty and hunger;
- Achieve universal primary education;
- Empower women and promote equality between women and men;
- Reduce under-five mortality by two-thirds;
- Reduce maternal mortality by three-quarters;
- Reverse the spread of diseases, especially HIV/AIDS and malaria;
- Ensure environmental sustainability;
- Create a global partnership for development, with targets for aid, trade and debt relief.

At present, there are two ways in which the Goals are presented to the public. UN publications refer to the officially agreed text of the Goals, targets and indicators (see Annex I). In publicity material the description of the Goals is paraphrased and in many cases the language of the targets is used. This inconsistency of messaging makes the measurement of knowledge, assessment and support for the Goals problematic. Admittedly, few members of the general public will normally read the official UN publication and hence will be more often exposed to the hybrid way in which the Goals confounded with targets are presented. Such inconsistent messaging will have adverse consequences on the measurement of one’s knowledge of the Goals. Nevertheless, if participating countries agree on a “mix” of Goals and targets in the survey, confusions can be avoided. It was agreed to restrict the number of targets that would be considered to 15 instead of the original 18. The POP Plus team therefore tried to find a balance between clarity and accuracy in reformulating them for the purpose of the questionnaire. This process is summed up in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Text of the Goals as used in UN Documents,
the Draft Version and the Final Version of the Questionnaire**

Targets ^a	Official text	Draft questionnaire (POP, 2003)	Final questionnaire (POP Plus, 2004)
1	Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day.	Halve the number of extremely poor people (living on less than [national equivalent of \$1] per day).	Halve, by 2015, the proportion of extremely poor people living on less than \$1 a day.
2	Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.	Halve the number of hungry people.	By 2015, halve the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.
3	Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.	Ensure that all boys and girls complete primary education.	Ensure that, by 2015, all boys and girls, everywhere in the world, complete primary education.
4	Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015.	Ensure that girls have the same opportunities to go to and benefit from primary and secondary school as boys.	Ensure that, by 2015, girls everywhere in the world have the same opportunities to benefit from primary and secondary school as boys.
5	Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.	Reduce by two-thirds the number of children that die before they are five years old.	Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of children who die before they are five years old by two-thirds.
6	Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.	Reduce by three-quarters the number of women dying while giving birth.	Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of women who die of pregnancy related causes by three-quarters.
7	Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.	Stop the spread of HIV/AIDS.	Stop the spread of HIV/AIDS by 2015.
8	Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.	Reduce the number of people suffering from malaria and other major diseases.	Reduce, by 2015, the number of people suffering from malaria and other major diseases.
9	Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.	Reverse the loss of environmental resources.	By 2015 reverse the loss of environmental resources.
10	Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water.	Halve the number of people who have no access to safe drinking water.	Halve the proportion of people who have no safe drinking water by 2015.
11	By 2020 to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers.	Improve the lives of at least 100 million people currently living in slums.	By 2020 improve the living conditions of at least 100 million people currently living in slums.
12	Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system.	Develop a fairer international trading system.	By 2015 develop a more equitable international trading system for developing country goods.
13	For LDCs, tariff and quota-free access for least-developed countries' exports.	Remove tariffs and quotas on exports from poor countries	By 2015, remove tariffs and quotas on exports from the poorest countries.
14	For LDCs, enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC and cancellation of official bilateral debt.	Cancel government-to-government debt.	By 2015, cancel government-to-government debt for the poorest countries.
15	For LDCs, more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction.	Increase aid to poor countries.	By 2015, increase aid to the poorest countries that are committed to poverty reduction.

Note: a) Targets 16, 17 and 18 are not addressed in the questionnaire.

Putting the MDGs in Context

Measuring public knowledge, assessment and support for the MDGs and their targets is best done in the context of a survey that measures public knowledge, assessment and support for development co-operation in general. MDG questions should be asked after the more general questions about technical co-operation and financing of foreign aid have been asked.

While most of the surveys on the MDGs did not review the concept of “Millennium Development Goals”, this should be done, and even form part of the standard questionnaire. The concept is, after all, central to the publicity campaign around efforts to enhance financial support for development activities.

Elsewhere, reference has been restricted to the content of the first seven Goals of the MDGs. Knowledge of the MDGs should be measured after a suitable introduction where respondents are asked whether they have ever heard of the term “Millennium Development Goals”, and if so, whether they know what they entail. To allow for maximum possible coverage, all 18 targets pertaining to the eight Goals should be allowed as valid answers. Knowledge of the MDGs will be inferred from the answers given that they coincide with the targets.

Interview Modalities

The way in which interviews are carried out varies considerably among DAC Member countries. The most commonly used data collection modalities are:

- The *face-to-face interview* in which a paper questionnaire/computer is used. This procedure is relatively costly and time consuming. However, it is generally considered to yield more valid and reliable results because the interviewer can observe the reaction of the respondent, which may provide an indication of the veracity of his/her answers.
- The (at present computer-assisted) *telephone interview* is a relatively inexpensive and less time-consuming procedure. However, there is no direct interviewer – respondent interaction, which makes it difficult to assess whether answers are genuine.
- The mail survey, in which the questionnaire is either mailed or hand-delivered to the respondents, and either mailed back to the survey organiser or again hand-collected after a certain period. This procedure is the least expensive option, but poses methodological problems, as the survey organiser has no control over the interview situation. This is especially serious in the case of knowledge questions.

These three procedures imply special requirements regarding the design of the questionnaire and the formulation of questions. Because of the different methodological characteristics of the three procedures, it is advisable and preferable that one of the procedures be used in comparative survey programmes.

IV. NEXT STEPS

The basic sets of questions presented in Annex II to IV should allow Heads of Information and policy makers to improve the comparability of public opinion surveys on development and the MDGs. The results of the polls should not only identify knowledge gaps, but also help to understand better the ways in which citizens relate to the issues. Synergies could then be explored between, on the one hand, efforts of donors to improve aid effectiveness and increase policy coherence, and, on the other hand, public awareness raising initiatives. Ultimately, this should help enhance citizens' critical understanding of development policies.

During their June 2004 meeting in Stockholm, where those questionnaires were presented and discussed, members of the informal network of DAC heads of information reached the following conclusions:

- Public Opinion Polling questions may be considered a “public good” and will be disseminated over the Internet, so that they can also be used on a voluntary basis by any organisation who may deem it useful (www.oecd.org/dev/opinion).
- The survey should be implemented as broadly and as coherently as possible ahead of the September 2005 UN Summit on MDGs, so as to provide analysts and policy makers with the most reliable and useful picture of the state of public opinion¹².
- Very importantly, members welcomed the European Commission's proposal to include parts of the POP questionnaire – especially the questions on MDGs – in a forthcoming EUROBAROMETER survey on development. This would greatly simplify the task of DAC member countries which are also EU members, since the survey would be carried out on their behalf.
- The monitoring of data collection and analysis over time would be co-ordinated on behalf of the informal network by the Development Centre.
- Finally, several members expressed interest in polling public opinion in aid-recipient countries. This could be looked into with all relevant partners in the framework of the MDGs campaign. The “POP” experience so far suggests that DAC could – formally or informally – play a major role in such an endeavour.

12. The financial costs of a comparative public opinion survey programme can be minimised, and the quality greatly enhanced if national surveys are carried out in co-operation with the National Statistical Office of the OECD/DAC member countries. All these countries have well developed statistical systems that carry out nationally representative surveys on a regular basis. Such systems can be used as the basis for the MDG opinion surveys, the add-on module or the basic set of questions. Subcontracting to independent national research institutes or commercial survey companies might be less cost-effective and may result in less comparable data and results, unless a strictly comparable methodology can be adhered to.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EUROBAROMETER, http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/.

FOY, C. and H. HELMICH (eds.) (1996), *Public support for international development*, jointly published by OECD Development Centre and Development Assistance Committee, OECD, Paris.

FRANSMAN, J. and H.-B. SOLIGNAC LECOMTE (2004), *Mobilising Public Opinion against Global Poverty*, Policy Insight No. 2, OECD Development Centre, Paris.

EMBER, C.R. and M. EMBER (2001), *Cross-Cultural Research Methods*, AltaMira, Walnut Creek.

GALTUNG, J. (1979), *Papers on Methodology: Essays in Methodology*, Volume II, Christian Ejlertsen, Copenhagen.

MC DONNELL, I. (2004), *An International Perspective on Communication Strategies for the Millennium Development Goals*, NCDO and OECD Development Centre, Tweetalige uitgave Engels/Nederlands.

MC DONNELL, I., H.-B. SOLIGNAC LECOMTE and L. WEGIMONT (eds.) (2003), *Public Opinion and the Fight against Poverty*, Development Centre Studies, OECD Development Centre and North-South Centre, Paris, order from www.oecd.org/dev/opinion.

PROGRAM ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY ATTITUDES, www.pipa.org/.

PRICE, V. (1992), *Communication Concepts 4: Public Opinion*, Sage, Newbury Park.

PRZEWORSKI, A. and H. TEUNE (1970), *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*, Wiley-Interscience, New York.

SELLTIZ, C., M. JAHODA, M. DEUTSCH and S. COOK (1959), *Research Methods in Social Relations*, John Holt, New York.

WEISS, R.S. (1968), *Statistics in Social Research: An Introduction*, John Wiley, New York.

ANNEX I

MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS, TARGETS AND INDICATORS

Goals and targets	Indicators
Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger	
Target 1: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day.	1. Proportion of population below \$1 parity purchasing power (PPP) per day. 2. Poverty gap ratio. 3. Share of poorest quintile in national consumption.
Target 2: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.	4. Prevalence of underweight children under-five years of age. 5. Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption.
Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education	
Target 3: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.	6. Net enrolment ratio in primary education. 7. Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5. 8. Literacy rate of 15-24 year olds.
Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women	
Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015.	9. Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education. 10. Ratio of literate females to males of 15-24 year olds. 11. Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector. 12. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament.
Goal 4: Reduce child mortality	
Target 5: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.	13. Under-five mortality rate. 14. Infant mortality rate. 15. Proportion of 1 year old children immunised against measles.
Goal 5: Improve maternal health	
Target 6: Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.	16. Maternal mortality ratio. 17. Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel.
Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases	
Target 7: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS.	18. HIV prevalence among 15-24 year old pregnant women. 19. Condom use rate of the contraceptive prevalence rate. 20. Number of children orphaned by HIV/AIDS.
Target 8: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.	21. Prevalence and death rates associated with malaria. 22. Proportion of population in malaria risk areas using effective malaria prevention and treatment measures. 23. Prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis. 24. Proportion of TB cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment short course.

Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability	
<p>Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.</p> <p>Target 10: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water.</p> <p>Target 11: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers.</p>	<p>25. Proportion of land area covered by forest.</p> <p>26. Ratio of area protected to maintain biological diversity to surface area.</p> <p>27. Energy use (kilogram oil equivalent per \$1 gross domestic product (PPP)).</p> <p>28. Carbon dioxide emissions and consumption of ozone-depletion chlorofluorocarbons (CFC).</p> <p>29. Proportion of population using solid fuels.</p> <p>30. Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source, urban and rural.</p> <p>31. Proportion of urban population with access to improved sanitation.</p> <p>32. Proportion of households with access to secure tenure (owned and rented).</p>
Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development*	
<p>Target 12: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system.</p> <p>Includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally.</p> <p>Target 13: Address the Special Needs of the Least Developed Countries</p> <p>Includes: tariff and quota free access for the least developed countries exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to Poverty reduction.</p> <p>Target 14: Address the Special Needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly).</p>	<p>Some of the indicators listed below will be monitored separately for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Africa, landlocked countries and small island developing states.</p> <p>Official Development Assistance</p> <p>33. Net ODA, total and to the least developed countries, as a percentage of OECD/DAC donors' gross national income.</p> <p>34. Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services.</p> <p>35. Proportion of bilateral ODA of OECD/DAC donors that is untied.</p> <p>36. ODA received in landlocked countries as a proportion of gross national income.</p> <p>37. ODA received in small island developing States as a proportion of gross national income.</p> <p>Market Access</p> <p>38. Proportion of total developed country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and from the least developed countries admitted free of duties.</p> <p>39. Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries.</p> <p>40. Agricultural support estimate for OECD countries as a percentage of their gross domestic product.</p> <p>41. Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity.</p>

<p>Target 15: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term.</p>	<p>Debt Sustainability</p> <p>42. Total number of countries that have reached their HIPC decision point and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative).</p> <p>43. Debt relief committed under HIPC initiative.</p> <p>44. Debt services as percentage of exports of goods and services. Low income and middle-income countries.</p> <p>45. Unemployment rate of 15-24 year olds.</p>
<p>Target 16: In co-operation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth.</p>	
<p>Target 17: In co-operation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable, essential drugs in developing countries.</p>	<p>46. Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis.</p>
<p>Target 18: In co-operation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications.</p>	<p>47. Telephone lines and cellular subscribers per 100 persons.</p> <p>48. Personal computers per 100 persons and Internet users per 100 population.</p>

Source: United Nations, General Assembly, Fifty-seventh session, Item 44 of the provisional agenda, Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit, Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, Report of the Secretary-General, New York, 31 July 2002, A/57/270.

ANNEX II BASIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1

Are you Very interested and actively involved, Interested but not actively involved, A little interested, or Not at all interested in global or development issues?

- (1) Very interested and actively involved
- (2) Interested but not actively involved
- (3) A little interested
- (4) Not at all interested

Question 2

Have you heard of the Millennium Development Goals?

- (1) Yes (Go to Question 3)
- (2) No (Go to Question 4)
- (3) Don't know

Question 3

In September 2000, the (*Prime Minister, country specific*) and leaders from all countries of the world met at the United Nations in New York for the Millennium Summit. At this meeting, they made a commitment to reaching a number of Goals that are now called the Millennium Development Goals.

Can you tell me what these Goals are about?

INTERVIEWER: CODE ALL THAT APPLY - DO NOT PROMPT
IF YOU CODE AS "OTHER" PLEASE RECORD VERBATIM

1. Reduce poverty.
2. Reduce hunger.
3. Make sure that all children complete primary school.
4. Eliminate differences between boys and girls in primary and secondary education.
5. Make sure that women have the same opportunities as men.
6. Reduce child mortality (the number of children dying before they are 5 years old).
7. Reduce the number of women who die of pregnancy-related causes.
8. Eradicate HIV/AIDS or reduce the number of HIV/AIDS infections.
9. Eradicate malaria (and other diseases) or reduce the number of people suffering from malaria (and other diseases).
10. Enable all countries to take care of their natural resources or stop pollution.
11. Provide more development aid.
12. A more equitable international trading system.
13. Debt relief.
14. Agricultural subsidies.
15. Development.
16. Other: INTERVIEWER, PLEASE RECORD VERBATIM:

Question 4

As I mentioned before, in 2000, the world leaders representing all countries of the world agreed to carry out a number of programmes to improve the lives of people in developing countries, that is the countries of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean, by the year 2015.

I will now tell you what these programmes are. For each of the programmes, do you think that it is Very likely, Fairly likely, Not very likely, or Not at all likely that its Goal will be achieved in 2015?

INTERVIEWER: IN THE TABLE BELOW ENTER THE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

Questions	Very likely	Fairly likely	Not very likely	Not at all likely
4.1. Halve, by 2015, the proportion of extremely poor people living on less than \$1 a day.				
4.2. By 2015, halve the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.				
4.3. Ensure that, by 2015, all boys and girls, everywhere in the world, complete primary education.				
4.4. Ensure that, by 2015, girls, everywhere in the world, have the same opportunities to benefit from primary and secondary school as boys.				
4.5. Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of children who die before they are five years old by two-thirds.				
4.6. Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of women who die of pregnancy related causes by three-quarters.				
4.7. Stop the spread of HIV/AIDS by 2015.				
4.8. Reduce, by 2015, the number of people suffering from malaria and other major diseases.				
4.9. By 2015, reverse the loss of environmental resources.				
4.10. Halve the proportion of people who have no safe drinking water by 2015.				
4.11. By 2020, improve the living conditions of at least 100 million people currently living in slums.				
4.12. By 2015, develop a more equitable international trading system for developing country goods.				
4.13. By 2015, remove tariffs and quotas on exports from the poorest countries.				
4.14. By 2015, cancel government-to-government debt for the poorest countries.				
4.15. By 2015, increase development aid to the poorest countries that are committed to poverty reduction.				

From the list of Goals for 2015, please choose the three Goals that you think are the most likely to be achieved. Start with the most likely, then the next most likely and so on.

INTERVIEWER: CODE THREE ONLY and SHOW THE RESPONDENT SHOW CARD 1.

PLEASE WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF THE PROGRAMME IN THE BOXES:

- (1) Most likely
- (2) Second most likely
- (3) Third most likely

Question 5

I would like you to tell me how important certain actions are that the Government can undertake to help developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Are they Very important, Somewhat important, or Not important in helping countries to achieve the Goals?

INTERVIEWER: IN THE TABLE BELOW ENTER THE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

Questions	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
5.1. Working to improve the effectiveness of the European Union?			
5.2. Cancelling developing countries' debts to our country [<i>NAME of country</i>]?			
5.3. Working to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations?			
5.4. Promoting more private investments in developing countries?			
5.5. Working for a more equitable world trading system for developing country goods?			
5.6. Reducing the possibility of armed conflict and war?			
5.7. Increasing our development aid to developing countries?			
5.8. Provide training and technical expertise to developing countries?			
5.9. Making sure that the developing countries get a more equitable price for their agricultural, fishery and textile products?			
5.10. Implementing international environment agreements?			

From the list of these actions, please choose the three that you think are the most important in helping developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Start with the most important, then the next most important and so on.

INTERVIEWER: CODE THREE ONLY and SHOW THE RESPONDENT SHOWCARD 2.

PLEASE WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF THE ACTIONS IN THE BOXES BELOW:

- (1) Most important
- (2) Second most important
- (3) Third most important

Question 6

As far as you are aware, does the Government provide enough political support for developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (3) Don't know

Question 7

What percentage of the national budget do you think our Government uses for development aid to developing countries?

INTERVIEWER: RECORD THE ANSWER THE RESPONDENT GIVES, EVEN IF IT IS A RANGE OF VALUES.

- (1) ----- per cent
- (2) Don't know

Question 8

The current level of development aid given by the government was {local currency per person per year in 2002, equal to X per cent of public spending {*up-to-date date will be provided – this data is needed a) so respondents can relate to the scale of the numbers and b) to provide the context for question 7*}. Do you think that this amount will be too high, too low or about right to reach the Goals for 2015?

1. Too high
2. Too low
3. About right
4. Don't know

Question 9

I would like you to tell me how important certain actions are that persons like you can undertake to help developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Are they Very important, Somewhat important, or Not important in helping countries to achieve the Goals?

INTERVIEWER: IN THE TABLE BELOW ENTER THE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

Questions	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
9.1. Paying taxes - a proportion of which is spent on development aid by the Government.			
9.2. Donating to charities or other appeals on behalf of developing countries.			
9.3. Supporting socially responsible business and investment.			
9.4. Buying Fair Trade goods.			
9.5. Supporting charities, religious organisations or campaign groups that help developing countries.			
9.6. Working in a developing country to reduce poverty.			
9.7. Travelling to a developing country as a tourist.			
9.8. Putting pressure on politicians to increase assistance to developing countries.			
9.9. Putting pressure on politicians to improve the access of developing countries to our markets, by eliminating agricultural subsidies and abolishing tariffs and quotas for their agricultural products and textiles.			
9.10. Putting pressure on politicians to cancel the debts that developing countries owe to <i>[NAME of country]</i> .			

From the list of these actions, please choose the three that you think are most important in helping countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Start with the most important, then the next most important and so on.

INTERVIEWER: CODE THREE ONLY and SHOW THE RESPONDENT SHOWCARD 3.

PLEASE WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF THE ACTIONS IN THE BOXES BELOW:

- (1) Most important
- (2) Second most important
- (3) Third most important

Question 10**Have you done any of these things in the last year?**

MULTICODE OK

1. Given money to a charity or other non-profit organisation.
2. Given money to an urgent telephone appeal.
3. Specified a charity or other non-profit organisation in your will (even if you first specified it more than 2-3 years ago).
4. Chosen to invest ethically or support only ethical businesses.
5. Bought Fair Trade goods.
6. Written (to a charity or other non-profit organisation) asking for information.
7. Volunteered to raise funds or help a charity or aid organisation.
8. Been a member of a charity or campaigning group, even if you joined more than 2-3 years ago.
9. Worked in a developing country to reduce poverty.
10. Travelled to a developing country as a tourist.
11. Written a letter to a Member of Parliament or councillor.
12. Written a letter for publication to a newspaper.
13. Helped with a campaign.
14. Taken part in a demonstration or sit-in.
15. Displayed a poster in your window, car or place of work.
16. None of these.

ANNEX III VERSION FOR MAIL SURVEY

INSTRUCTION TO RESPONDENTS: General country specific instruction as to which agency carries out the survey, how respondent was selected, and objective of the survey.

Instructions to return the completed questionnaire.

INSTRUCTIONS HOW TO FILL IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY AND ENCIRCLE THE ANSWER THAT BEST REFLECTS HOW YOU THINK.

Question 1

Are you Very interested and actively involved, Interested but not actively involved, A little interested, or Not at all interested in global or development issues?

- (1) Very interested and actively involved
- (2) Interested but not actively involved
- (3) A little interested
- (4) Not at all interested

Question 2

Have you heard of the Millennium Development Goals?

- (1) Yes (Go to Question 3)
- (2) No (Go to Question 4)
- (3) Don't know

Question 3

In September 2000, the (*Prime Minister, country specific*) and leaders from all countries of the world met at the United Nations in New York for the Millennium Summit. At this meeting, they made a commitment to reaching a number of Goals that are now called the Millennium Development Goals.

Do you know what these Goals are about?

IN THE BOX BELOW PLEASE WRITE DOWN WHAT YOU THINK THESE GOALS ARE ABOUT:

Question 4

As mentioned above, in 2000, the world leaders representing all countries of the world agreed to carry out a number of programmes to improve the lives of people in developing countries, that is the countries of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean, by the year 2015.

In the table the Goals of some of these programmes are mentioned. For each Goal please mark with a CROSS (X) in the space provided whether you think that these Goals are: Very likely, Fairly likely, Not very likely, or Not at all likely to be achieved by 2015?

Questions	Very likely	Fairly likely	Not very likely	Not at all likely
4.1. Halve, by 2015, the proportion of extremely poor people living on less than \$1 a day.				
4.2. By 2015, halve the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.				
4.3. Ensure that, by 2015, all boys and girls everywhere in the world complete primary education.				
4.4. Ensure that, by 2015, girls everywhere in the world have the same opportunities to benefit from primary and secondary school as boys.				
4.5. Reduce by 2015, the proportion of children who die before they are five years old by two-thirds.				
4.6. Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of women who die of pregnancy related causes by three-quarters.				
4.7. Stop the spread of HIV/AIDS by 2015.				
4.8. Reduce, by 2015, the number of people suffering from malaria and other major diseases.				
4.9. By 2015, reverse the loss of environmental resources.				
4.10. Halve the proportion of people who have no safe drinking water by 2015.				
4.11. By 2020, improve the living conditions of at least 100 million people currently living in slums.				
4.12. By 2015, develop a more equitable international trading system for developing country goods.				
4.13. By 2015, remove tariffs and quotas on exports from the poorest countries.				
4.14. By 2015, cancel government-to-government debt for the poorest countries.				
4.15. By 2015, increase development aid to the poorest countries that are committed to poverty reduction.				

From the list of Goals for 2015, please choose the three Goals that you think are the most likely to be achieved. Start with the most likely, then the next most likely and so on.

PLEASE WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF THE PROGRAMME IN THE BOXES:

- (1) Most likely
- (2) Second most likely
- (3) Third most likely

Question 5

Governments can undertake certain actions to help developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Below is a list of such actions. For each action please mark with a CROSS (X) in the boxes provided whether you think that these actions are: Very important, Somewhat important, or Not important in helping countries to achieve the Goals?

Questions	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
5.1. Working to improve the effectiveness of the European Union?			
5.2. Cancelling developing countries' debts to our country [NAME of country]?			
5.3. Working to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations?			
5.4. Promoting more private investments in developing countries?			
5.5. Working for a more equitable world trading system for developing country goods?			
5.6. Reducing the possibility of armed conflict and war?			
5.7. Increasing our development aid to developing countries?			
5.8. Provide training and technical expertise to developing countries?			
5.9. Making sure that the developing countries get a more equitable price for their agricultural, fishery and textile products?			
5.10. Implementing international environment agreements?			

From the list of these actions, please choose the three that you think are the most important in helping countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Start with the most important, then the next most important and so on.

PLEASE WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF THE ACTIONS IN THE BOXES BELOW:

- (1) Most important
- (2) Second most important
- (3) Third most important

Question 6

As far as you are aware, does the Government provide enough political support for developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (3) Don't know

Question 7

What percentage of the national budget do you think our Government uses for development aid to developing countries?

- (1) ----- per cent
- (2) Don't know

Question 8

Do you think that this is too much, too little or about right?

- (1) Too high
- (2) Too low
- (3) About right
- (4) Don't know

Question 9

There are several ways in which people like you can help developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. In the table are some of these activities, please read them carefully and mark with a CROSS (X) in the boxes provided whether you think that these actions are Very important, Somewhat important, or Not important in helping countries to achieve the Goals?

Questions	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
9.1. Paying taxes - a proportion of which is spent on development aid by the Government			
9.2. Donating to charities or other appeals on behalf of developing countries			
9.3. Supporting socially responsible business and investment			
9.4. Buying Fair Trade goods			
9.5. Supporting charities, religious organisations or campaign groups that help developing countries.			
9.6. Working in a developing country to reduce poverty			
9.7. Travelling to a developing country as a tourist			
9.8. Putting pressure on politicians to increase assistance to developing countries.			
9.9. Putting pressure on politicians to improve the access of developing countries to our markets, by eliminating agricultural subsidies, and abolishing tariffs and quotas for their agricultural products and textiles.			
9.10. Putting pressure on politicians to cancel the debts that developing countries owe to our country.			

From the list of these actions, please choose the three that you think are most important in helping countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. Start with the most important, then the next most important and so on.

PLEASE WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE BOXES BELOW:

- (1) Most important
- (2) Second most important
- (3) Third most important

Question 10

In the table there are a number of things that people do. Please read them carefully and mark YOUR ANSWER with a CROSS (X) in the boxes provided.

Have you done any of these things in the last year?

Number	Question	YES	NO
1	Given money to a charity or other non-profit organisation		
2	Given money to an urgent telephone appeal.		
3	Specified a charity or other non-profit organisation in your will (even if you first specified it more than 2-3 years ago)		
4	Chosen to invest ethically or support only ethical businesses.		
5	Bought Fair Trade goods.		
6	Written (to a charity or other non-profit organisation) asking for information.		
7	Volunteered to raise funds or help a charity or aid organisation.		
8	Been a member of a charity or campaigning group, even if you joined more than 2-3 years ago.		
9	Worked in a developing country to reduce poverty.		
10	Travelled to a developing country as a tourist.		
11	Written a letter to a Member of Parliament or councillor.		
12	Written a letter for publication to a newspaper.		
13	Helped with a campaign.		
14	Taken part in a demonstration or sit-in.		
15	Displayed a poster in your window, car or place of work.		

Thank you for your co-operation.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MAIL COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO SURVEY ORGANISATION.

ANNEX IV VERSION FOR TELEPHONE SURVEY

Question 1

Are you Very interested and actively involved, Interested but not actively involved, A little interested, or Not at all interested in global or development issues?

- (1) Very interested and actively involved
- (2) Interested but not actively involved
- (3) A little interested
- (4) Not at all interested

Question 2

Have you heard of the Millennium Development Goals?

- (1) Yes (Go to Question 2)
- (2) No (Go to Question 3)
- (3) Don't know (Go to Question 3)

Question 3

Can you tell me what these Goals are about?

INTERVIEWER: CODE ALL THAT APPLY - DO NOT PROMPT
IF YOU CODE "OTHER", PLEASE RECORD VERBATIM IN THE SPACE PROVIDED

0. Don't know.
1. Reduce poverty.
2. Reduce hunger.
3. Make sure that all children complete primary school.
4. Eliminate differences between boys and girls in access to schooling.
5. Make sure that women have the same opportunities as men.
6. Reduce child mortality (the number of children dying before they are 5 years old).
7. Reduce the number of women dying of pregnancy-related causes.
8. Eradicate HIV/AIDS or reduce the number of people infected with HIV/AIDS.
9. Eradicate malaria (and other diseases) or reduce the number of people suffering from malaria (and other diseases).
10. Enable all countries to take care of their natural resources or stop pollution.
11. Provide more development aid.
12. More equitable international trading system.
13. Debt relief.
14. Agricultural subsidies.
15. Development.
16. OTHER: INTERVIEWER, PLEASE RECORD VERBATIM:

Question 4

In September 2000, the (*Prime Minister, country specific*) and leaders from all countries of the world met at the United Nations in New York for the Millennium Summit. At this meeting, they made a commitment to reaching a number of Goals that are now called the Millennium Development Goals.

I will read you some of these programmes, and I would like you to tell me if you think that it is “Very likely, Fairly likely, Not very likely, Not at all likely” that these Goals will be achieved in 2015?”

These programmes intend to:

- 1) Halve, by 2015, the proportion of extremely poor people living on less than \$1 a day.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 2) Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 3) Ensure that, by 2015, all boys and girls, everywhere in the world, complete primary education.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 4) Ensure that, by 2015, girls, everywhere in the world, have the same opportunities to benefit from primary and secondary school as boys.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 5) Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of children that die before they are five years old by two-thirds.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely

- 6) Reduce, by 2015, the proportion of women who die of pregnancy related causes by three-quarters.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 7) Stop the spread of HIV/AIDS by 2015.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 8) Reduce, by 2015 the number of people suffering from malaria and other major diseases.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 9) By 2015 reverse the loss of environmental resources.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 10) Halve the number of people who have no safe drinking water by 2015.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 11) By 2020 improve the lives of at least 100 million people currently living in slums.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly likely
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely
- 12) By 2015 develop a more equitable international trading system for developing country goods.
 1. Very likely
 2. Fairly like
 3. Not very likely
 4. Not at all likely

13) By 2015, remove tariffs and quotas on exports from poor countries.

1. Very likely
2. Fairly like
3. Not very likely
4. Not at all likely

14) Cancel government-to-government debts.

1. Very likely
2. Fairly like
3. Not very likely
4. Not at all likely

15) Increase aid to poor countries.

1. Very likely
2. Fairly like
3. Not very likely
4. Not at all likely

Question 5

I will now read you a number of actions governments in rich countries such as the United States, Japan, [name of country] and others in Europe can undertake to help developing countries. I would like to you to tell me how important you think each is for helping developing countries to achieve the Millennium Development Goals for by the year 2015. Are they: Very important, Somewhat important, or Not important?

1. Working to increase the effectiveness of the European Union?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
2. Cancelling the debts developing countries owe [*NAME of country*]?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
3. Working to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important

4. Promoting more private sector investments in developing countries?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
5. Working for a more equitable world trading system for developing country goods?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
6. Reducing the possibility of armed conflict and war?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
7. Increasing our development aid to developing countries?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
8. Provide training and technical expertise to developing countries?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
9. Making sure that developing countries get a more equitable price for their agricultural, fishery and textile products?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important
10. Implementing international environment agreements?
 1. Very important
 2. Somewhat important
 3. Not important

Question 6

As far as you are aware, does the Government provide enough political support for developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Question 7

As you know [*NAME of country*] is giving aid to developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. What percentage of the national budget do you think our Government uses for development aid to developing countries?

1. ----- per cent
2. Don't know

Question 8

In 2002 the amount of foreign aid given by [*NAME of country*] was X per cent of the government's budget. Do you think this is too high, too low or about right?

1. Too high
2. Too low
3. About right
4. Don't know

Question 9

There are several ways in which people like you can help developing countries to achieve the 2015 Goals. I will read you some and would like you to tell me whether you think that these actions are Very important, Somewhat important, or Not important in helping countries to achieve the Goals?

Questions	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
9.1. Paying taxes - a proportion of which is spent on development aid by the Government.			
9.2. Donating to charities or other appeals on behalf of developing countries.			
9.3. Supporting socially responsible business and investment			
9.4. Buying Fair Trade goods.			
9.5. Supporting charities, religious organisations or campaign groups that help developing countries.			
9.6. Working in a developing country to reduce poverty			
9.7. Travelling to a developing country as a tourist.			
9.8. Putting pressure on politicians to increase assistance to developing countries.			
9.9. Putting pressure on politicians to improve the access of developing countries to our markets, by eliminating agricultural subsidies, and abolishing tariffs and quotas for their agricultural products and textiles.			
9.10. Putting pressure on politicians to cancel the debts that developing countries owe to our country.			

Question 10

I will now read you a number of things that people do. Have you done any of these things in the last year?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ CATEGORIES 1 – 15 AND RECORD THE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSES IN THE BOXES PROVIDED.

Number	Question	YES	NO
1	Given money to a charity or other non-profit organisation.		
2	Given money to an urgent telephone appeal.		
3	Specified a charity or other non-profit organisation in your will (even if you first specified it more than 2-3 years ago).		
4	Chosen to invest ethically or support only ethical businesses.		
5	Bought Fair Trade goods.		
6	Written (to a charity or other non-profit organisation) asking for information.		
7	Volunteered to raise funds or help a charity or aid organisation.		
8	Been a member of a charity or campaigning group, even if you joined more than 2-3 years ago.		
9	Worked in a developing country to reduce poverty.		
10	Travelled to a developing country as a tourist.		
11	Written a letter to a Member of Parliament or councillor.		
12	Written a letter for publication to a newspaper.		
13	Helped with a campaign.		
14	Taken part in a demonstration or sit-in.		
15	Displayed a poster in your window, car or place of work.		

OTHER TITLES IN THE SERIES/ AUTRES TITRES DANS LA SÉRIE

The former series known as “Technical Papers” and “Webdocs” merged in November 2003 into “Development Centre Working Papers”. In the new series, former Webdocs 1-17 follow former Technical Papers 1-212 as Working Papers 213-229.

All these documents may be downloaded from:

<http://www.oecd.org/dev/wp> or obtained via e-mail (cendev.contact@oecd.org).

Working Paper No.1, *Macroeconomic Adjustment and Income Distribution: A Macro-Micro Simulation Model*, by François Bourguignon, William H. Branson and Jaime de Melo, March 1989.

Working Paper No. 2, *International Interactions in Food and Agricultural Policies: The Effect of Alternative Policies*, by Joachim Zietz and Alberto Valdés, April, 1989.

Working Paper No. 3, *The Impact of Budget Retrenchment on Income Distribution in Indonesia: A Social Accounting Matrix Application*, by Steven Keuning and Erik Thorbecke, June 1989.

Working Paper No. 3a, *Statistical Annex: The Impact of Budget Retrenchment*, June 1989.

Document de travail No. 4, *Le Rééquilibrage entre le secteur public et le secteur privé : le cas du Mexique*, par C.-A. Michalet, juin 1989.

Working Paper No. 5, *Rebalancing the Public and Private Sectors: The Case of Malaysia*, by R. Leeds, July 1989.

Working Paper No. 6, *Efficiency, Welfare Effects, and Political Feasibility of Alternative Antipoverty and Adjustment Programs*, by Alain de Janvry and Elisabeth Sadoulet, December 1989.

Document de travail No. 7, *Ajustement et distribution des revenus : application d'un modèle macro-micro au Maroc*, par Christian Morriçon, avec la collaboration de Sylvie Lambert et Akiko Suwa, décembre 1989.

Working Paper No. 8, *Emerging Maize Biotechnologies and their Potential Impact*, by W. Burt Sundquist, December 1989.

Document de travail No. 9, *Analyse des variables socio-culturelles et de l'ajustement en Côte d'Ivoire*, par W. Weekes-Vagliani, janvier 1990.

Working Paper No. 10, *A Financial Computable General Equilibrium Model for the Analysis of Ecuador's Stabilization Programs*, by André Fargeix and Elisabeth Sadoulet, February 1990.

Working Paper No. 11, *Macroeconomic Aspects, Foreign Flows and Domestic Savings Performance in Developing Countries: A "State of The Art" Report*, by Anand Chandavarkar, February 1990.

Working Paper No. 12, *Tax Revenue Implications of the Real Exchange Rate: Econometric Evidence from Korea and Mexico*, by Virginia Fierro and Helmut Reisen, February 1990.

Working Paper No. 13, *Agricultural Growth and Economic Development: The Case of Pakistan*, by Naved Hamid and Wouter Tims, April 1990.

Working Paper No. 14, *Rebalancing the Public and Private Sectors in Developing Countries: The Case of Ghana*, by H. Akuoko-Frimpong, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 15, *Agriculture and the Economic Cycle: An Economic and Econometric Analysis with Special Reference to Brazil*, by Florence Contré and Ian Goldin, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 16, *Comparative Advantage: Theory and Application to Developing Country Agriculture*, by Ian Goldin, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 17, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize in Brazil*, by Bernardo Sorj and John Wilkinson, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 18, *Economic Policies and Sectoral Growth: Argentina 1913-1984*, by Yair Mundlak, Domingo Cavallo, Roberto Domenech, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 19, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize In Mexico*, by Jaime A. Matus Gardea, Arturo Puente Gonzalez and Cristina Lopez Peralta, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 20, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize in Thailand*, by Suthad Setboonsarng, July 1990.

- Working Paper No. 21, *International Comparisons of Efficiency in Agricultural Production*, by Guillermo Flichmann, July 1990.
- Working Paper No. 22, *Unemployment in Developing Countries: New Light on an Old Problem*, by David Turnham and Denizhan Eröcal, July 1990.
- Working Paper No. 23, *Optimal Currency Composition of Foreign Debt: the Case of Five Developing Countries*, by Pier Giorgio Gawronski, August 1990.
- Working Paper No. 24, *From Globalization to Regionalization: the Mexican Case*, by Wilson Peres Núñez, August 1990.
- Working Paper No. 25, *Electronics and Development in Venezuela: A User-Oriented Strategy and its Policy Implications*, by Carlota Perez, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 26, *The Legal Protection of Software: Implications for Latecomer Strategies in Newly Industrialising Economies (NIEs) and Middle-Income Economies (MIEs)*, by Carlos Maria Correa, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 27, *Specialization, Technical Change and Competitiveness in the Brazilian Electronics Industry*, by Claudio R. Frischtak, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 28, *Internationalization Strategies of Japanese Electronics Companies: Implications for Asian Newly Industrializing Economies (NIEs)*, by Bundo Yamada, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 29, *The Status and an Evaluation of the Electronics Industry in Taiwan*, by Gee San, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 30, *The Indian Electronics Industry: Current Status, Perspectives and Policy Options*, by Ghayur Alam, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 31, *Comparative Advantage in Agriculture in Ghana*, by James Pickett and E. Shaeeldin, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 32, *Debt Overhang, Liquidity Constraints and Adjustment Incentives*, by Bert Hofman and Helmut Reisen, October 1990.
- Working Paper No. 34, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize in Indonesia*, by Hidjat Nataatmadja *et al.*, January 1991.
- Working Paper No. 35, *Changing Comparative Advantage in Thai Agriculture*, by Ammar Siamwalla, Suthad Setboonsarng and Prasong Werakarnjanapongs, March 1991.
- Working Paper No. 36, *Capital Flows and the External Financing of Turkey's Imports*, by Ziya Önis and Süleyman Özmucur, July 1991.
- Working Paper No. 37, *The External Financing of Indonesia's Imports*, by Glenn P. Jenkins and Henry B.F. Lim, July 1991.
- Working Paper No. 38, *Long-term Capital Reflow under Macroeconomic Stabilization in Latin America*, by Beatriz Armendariz de Aghion, July 1991.
- Working Paper No. 39, *Buybacks of LDC Debt and the Scope for Forgiveness*, by Beatriz Armendariz de Aghion, July 1991.
- Working Paper No. 40, *Measuring and Modelling Non-Tariff Distortions with Special Reference to Trade in Agricultural Commodities*, by Peter J. Lloyd, July 1991.
- Working Paper No. 41, *The Changing Nature of IMF Conditionality*, by Jacques J. Polak, August 1991.
- Working Paper No. 42, *Time-Varying Estimates on the Openness of the Capital Account in Korea and Taiwan*, by Helmut Reisen and Hélène Yèches, August 1991.
- Working Paper No. 43, *Toward a Concept of Development Agreements*, by F. Gerard Adams, August 1991.
- Document de travail No. 44, *Le Partage du fardeau entre les créanciers de pays débiteurs défaillants*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy et Ann Vourc'h, septembre 1991.
- Working Paper No. 45, *The External Financing of Thailand's Imports*, by Supote Chunanunthathum, October 1991.
- Working Paper No. 46, *The External Financing of Brazilian Imports*, by Enrico Colombatto, with Elisa Luciano, Luca Gargiulo, Pietro Garibaldi and Giuseppe Russo, October 1991.
- Working Paper No. 47, *Scenarios for the World Trading System and their Implications for Developing Countries*, by Robert Z. Lawrence, November 1991.
- Working Paper No. 48, *Trade Policies in a Global Context: Technical Specifications of the Rural/Urban-North/South (RUNS) Applied General Equilibrium Model*, by Jean-Marc Burniaux and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, November 1991.
- Working Paper No. 49, *Macro-Micro Linkages: Structural Adjustment and Fertilizer Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa*, by Jean-Marc Fontaine with the collaboration of Alice Sindzingre, December 1991.
- Working Paper No. 50, *Aggregation by Industry in General Equilibrium Models with International Trade*, by Peter J. Lloyd, December 1991.
- Working Paper No. 51, *Policy and Entrepreneurial Responses to the Montreal Protocol: Some Evidence from the Dynamic Asian Economies*, by David C. O'Connor, December 1991.
- Working Paper No. 52, *On the Pricing of LDC Debt: an Analysis Based on Historical Evidence from Latin America*, by Beatriz Armendariz de Aghion, February 1992.
- Working Paper No. 53, *Economic Regionalisation and Intra-Industry Trade: Pacific-Asian Perspectives*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku, February 1992.
- Working Paper No. 54, *Debt Conversions in Yugoslavia*, by Mojmir Mrak, February 1992.
- Working Paper No. 55, *Evaluation of Nigeria's Debt-Relief Experience (1985-1990)*, by N.E. Ogbe, March 1992.
- Document de travail No. 56, *L'Expérience de l'allègement de la dette du Mali*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy, février 1992.
- Working Paper No. 57, *Conflict or Indifference: US Multinationals in a World of Regional Trading Blocs*, by Louis T. Wells, Jr., March 1992.
- Working Paper No. 58, *Japan's Rapidly Emerging Strategy Toward Asia*, by Edward J. Lincoln, April 1992.
- Working Paper No. 59, *The Political Economy of Stabilization Programmes in Developing Countries*, by Bruno S. Frey and Reiner Eichenberger, April 1992.

- Working Paper No. 60, *Some Implications of Europe 1992 for Developing Countries*, by Sheila Page, April 1992.
- Working Paper No. 61, *Taiwanese Corporations in Globalisation and Regionalisation*, by Gee San, April 1992.
- Working Paper No. 62, *Lessons from the Family Planning Experience for Community-Based Environmental Education*, by Winifred Weekes-Vagliani, April 1992.
- Working Paper No. 63, *Mexican Agriculture in the Free Trade Agreement: Transition Problems in Economic Reform*, by Santiago Levy and Sweder van Wijnbergen, May 1992.
- Working Paper No. 64, *Offensive and Defensive Responses by European Multinationals to a World of Trade Blocs*, by John M. Stopford, May 1992.
- Working Paper No. 65, *Economic Integration in the Pacific Region*, by Richard Drobnick, May 1992.
- Working Paper No. 66, *Latin America in a Changing Global Environment*, by Winston Fritsch, May 1992.
- Working Paper No. 67, *An Assessment of the Brady Plan Agreements*, by Jean-Claude Berthélemy and Robert Lensink, May 1992.
- Working Paper No. 68, *The Impact of Economic Reform on the Performance of the Seed Sector in Eastern and Southern Africa*, by Elizabeth Cromwell, June 1992.
- Working Paper No. 69, *Impact of Structural Adjustment and Adoption of Technology on Competitiveness of Major Cocoa Producing Countries*, by Emily M. Bloomfield and R. Antony Lass, June 1992.
- Working Paper No. 70, *Structural Adjustment and Moroccan Agriculture: an Assessment of the Reforms in the Sugar and Cereal Sectors*, by Jonathan Kydd and Sophie Thoyer, June 1992.
- Document de travail No. 71, *L'Allègement de la dette au Club de Paris : les évolutions récentes en perspective*, par Ann Vourc'h, juin 1992.
- Working Paper No. 72, *Biotechnology and the Changing Public/Private Sector Balance: Developments in Rice and Cocoa*, by Carliene Brenner, July 1992.
- Working Paper No. 73, *Namibian Agriculture: Policies and Prospects*, by Walter Elkan, Peter Amutenya, Jochbeth Andima, Robin Sherbourne and Eline van der Linden, July 1992.
- Working Paper No. 74, *Agriculture and the Policy Environment: Zambia and Zimbabwe*, by Doris J. Jansen and Andrew Rukovo, July 1992.
- Working Paper No. 75, *Agricultural Productivity and Economic Policies: Concepts and Measurements*, by Yair Mundlak, August 1992.
- Working Paper No. 76, *Structural Adjustment and the Institutional Dimensions of Agricultural Research and Development in Brazil: Soybeans, Wheat and Sugar Cane*, by John Wilkinson and Bernardo Sorj, August 1992.
- Working Paper No. 77, *The Impact of Laws and Regulations on Micro and Small Enterprises in Niger and Swaziland*, by Isabelle Joumard, Carl Liedholm and Donald Mead, September 1992.
- Working Paper No. 78, *Co-Financing Transactions between Multilateral Institutions and International Banks*, by Michel Bouchet and Amit Ghose, October 1992.
- Document de travail No. 79, *Allègement de la dette et croissance : le cas mexicain*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy et Ann Vourc'h, octobre 1992.
- Document de travail No. 80, *Le Secteur informel en Tunisie : cadre réglementaire et pratique courante*, par Abderrahman Ben Zakour et Farouk Kria, novembre 1992.
- Working Paper No. 81, *Small-Scale Industries and Institutional Framework in Thailand*, by Naruemol Bunjongjit and Xavier Oudin, November 1992.
- Working Paper No. 81a, *Statistical Annex: Small-Scale Industries and Institutional Framework in Thailand*, by Naruemol Bunjongjit and Xavier Oudin, November 1992.
- Document de travail No. 82, *L'Expérience de l'allègement de la dette du Niger*, par Ann Vourc'h et Maina Boukar Moussa, novembre 1992.
- Working Paper No. 83, *Stabilization and Structural Adjustment in Indonesia: an Intertemporal General Equilibrium Analysis*, by David Roland-Holst, November 1992.
- Working Paper No. 84, *Striving for International Competitiveness: Lessons from Electronics for Developing Countries*, by Jan Maarten de Vet, March 1993.
- Document de travail No. 85, *Micro-entreprises et cadre institutionnel en Algérie*, par Hocine Benissad, mars 1993.
- Working Paper No. 86, *Informal Sector and Regulations in Ecuador and Jamaica*, by Emilio Klein and Victor E. Tokman, August 1993.
- Working Paper No. 87, *Alternative Explanations of the Trade-Output Correlation in the East Asian Economies*, by Colin I. Bradford Jr. and Naomi Chakwin, August 1993.
- Document de travail No. 88, *La Faisabilité politique de l'ajustement dans les pays africains*, par Christian Morrisson, Jean-Dominique Lafay et Sébastien Dessus, novembre 1993.
- Working Paper No. 89, *China as a Leading Pacific Economy*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku and Mingyuan Wu, November 1993.
- Working Paper No. 90, *A Detailed Input-Output Table for Morocco, 1990*, by Maurizio Bussolo and David Roland-Holst, November 1993.
- Working Paper No. 91, *International Trade and the Transfer of Environmental Costs and Benefits*, by Hiro Lee and David Roland-Holst, December 1993.
- Working Paper No. 92, *Economic Instruments in Environmental Policy: Lessons from the OECD Experience and their Relevance to Developing Economies*, by Jean-Philippe Barde, January 1994.
- Working Paper No. 93, *What Can Developing Countries Learn from OECD Labour Market Programmes and Policies?*, by Åsa Sohlman with David Turnham, January 1994.

Working Paper No. 94, *Trade Liberalization and Employment Linkages in the Pacific Basin*, by Hiro Lee and David Roland-Holst, February 1994.

Working Paper No. 95, *Participatory Development and Gender: Articulating Concepts and Cases*, by Winifred Weekes-Vagliani, February 1994.

Document de travail No. 96, *Promouvoir la maîtrise locale et régionale du développement : une démarche participative à Madagascar*, par Philippe de Rham et Bernard Lecomte, juin 1994.

Working Paper No. 97, *The OECD Green Model: an Updated Overview*, by Hiro Lee, Joaquim Oliveira-Martins and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, August 1994.

Working Paper No. 98, *Pension Funds, Capital Controls and Macroeconomic Stability*, by Helmut Reisen and John Williamson, August 1994.

Working Paper No. 99, *Trade and Pollution Linkages: Piecemeal Reform and Optimal Intervention*, by John Beghin, David Roland-Holst and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, October 1994.

Working Paper No. 100, *International Initiatives in Biotechnology for Developing Country Agriculture: Promises and Problems*, by Carliene Brenner and John Komen, October 1994.

Working Paper No. 101, *Input-based Pollution Estimates for Environmental Assessment in Developing Countries*, by Sébastien Dessus, David Roland-Holst and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, October 1994.

Working Paper No. 102, *Transitional Problems from Reform to Growth: Safety Nets and Financial Efficiency in the Adjusting Egyptian Economy*, by Mahmoud Abdel-Fadil, December 1994.

Working Paper No. 103, *Biotechnology and Sustainable Agriculture: Lessons from India*, by Ghayur Alam, December 1994.

Working Paper No. 104, *Crop Biotechnology and Sustainability: a Case Study of Colombia*, by Luis R. Sanint, January 1995.

Working Paper No. 105, *Biotechnology and Sustainable Agriculture: the Case of Mexico*, by José Luis Solleiro Rebolledo, January 1995.

Working Paper No. 106, *Empirical Specifications for a General Equilibrium Analysis of Labor Market Policies and Adjustments*, by Andréa Maechler and David Roland-Holst, May 1995.

Document de travail No. 107, *Les Migrants, partenaires de la coopération internationale : le cas des Maliens de France*, par Christophe Daum, juillet 1995.

Document de travail No. 108, *Ouverture et croissance industrielle en Chine : étude empirique sur un échantillon de villes*, par Sylvie Démurger, septembre 1995.

Working Paper No. 109, *Biotechnology and Sustainable Crop Production in Zimbabwe*, by John J. Woodend, December 1995.

Document de travail No. 110, *Politiques de l'environnement et libéralisation des échanges au Costa Rica : une vue d'ensemble*, par Sébastien Dessus et Maurizio Bussolo, février 1996.

Working Paper No. 111, *Grow Now/Clean Later, or the Pursuit of Sustainable Development?*, by David O'Connor, March 1996.

Working Paper No. 112, *Economic Transition and Trade-Policy Reform: Lessons from China*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku and Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, July 1996.

Working Paper No. 113, *Chinese Outward Investment in Hong Kong: Trends, Prospects and Policy Implications*, by Yun-Wing Sung, July 1996.

Working Paper No. 114, *Vertical Intra-industry Trade between China and OECD Countries*, by Lisbeth Hellvin, July 1996.

Document de travail No. 115, *Le Rôle du capital public dans la croissance des pays en développement au cours des années 80*, par Sébastien Dessus et Rémy Herrera, juillet 1996.

Working Paper No. 116, *General Equilibrium Modelling of Trade and the Environment*, by John Beghin, Sébastien Dessus, David Roland-Holst and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, September 1996.

Working Paper No. 117, *Labour Market Aspects of State Enterprise Reform in Viet Nam*, by David O'Connor, September 1996.

Document de travail No. 118, *Croissance et compétitivité de l'industrie manufacturière au Sénégal*, par Thierry Latreille et Aristomène Varoudakis, octobre 1996.

Working Paper No. 119, *Evidence on Trade and Wages in the Developing World*, by Donald J. Robbins, December 1996.

Working Paper No. 120, *Liberalising Foreign Investments by Pension Funds: Positive and Normative Aspects*, by Helmut Reisen, January 1997.

Document de travail No. 121, *Capital Humain, ouverture extérieure et croissance : estimation sur données de panel d'un modèle à coefficients variables*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy, Sébastien Dessus et Aristomène Varoudakis, janvier 1997.

Working Paper No. 122, *Corruption: The Issues*, by Andrew W. Goudie and David Stasavage, January 1997.

Working Paper No. 123, *Outflows of Capital from China*, by David Wall, March 1997.

Working Paper No. 124, *Emerging Market Risk and Sovereign Credit Ratings*, by Guillermo Larraín, Helmut Reisen and Julia von Maltzan, April 1997.

Working Paper No. 125, *Urban Credit Co-operatives in China*, by Eric Girardin and Xie Ping, August 1997.

Working Paper No. 126, *Fiscal Alternatives of Moving from Unfunded to Funded Pensions*, by Robert Holzmann, August 1997.

Working Paper No. 127, *Trade Strategies for the Southern Mediterranean*, by Peter A. Petri, December 1997.

Working Paper No. 128, *The Case of Missing Foreign Investment in the Southern Mediterranean*, by Peter A. Petri, December 1997.

Working Paper No. 129, *Economic Reform in Egypt in a Changing Global Economy*, by Joseph Licari, December 1997.

- Working Paper No. 130, *Do Funded Pensions Contribute to Higher Aggregate Savings? A Cross-Country Analysis*, by Jeanine Bailliu and Helmut Reisen, December 1997.
- Working Paper No. 131, *Long-run Growth Trends and Convergence Across Indian States*, by Rayaprolu Nagaraj, Aristomène Varoudakis and Marie-Ange Véganzonès, January 1998.
- Working Paper No. 132, *Sustainable and Excessive Current Account Deficits*, by Helmut Reisen, February 1998.
- Working Paper No. 133, *Intellectual Property Rights and Technology Transfer in Developing Country Agriculture: Rhetoric and Reality*, by Carliene Brenner, March 1998.
- Working Paper No. 134, *Exchange-rate Management and Manufactured Exports in Sub-Saharan Africa*, by Khalid Sekkat and Aristomène Varoudakis, March 1998.
- Working Paper No. 135, *Trade Integration with Europe, Export Diversification and Economic Growth in Egypt*, by Sébastien Dessus and Akiko Suwa-Eisenmann, June 1998.
- Working Paper No. 136, *Domestic Causes of Currency Crises: Policy Lessons for Crisis Avoidance*, by Helmut Reisen, June 1998.
- Working Paper No. 137, *A Simulation Model of Global Pension Investment*, by Landis MacKellar and Helmut Reisen, August 1998.
- Working Paper No. 138, *Determinants of Customs Fraud and Corruption: Evidence from Two African Countries*, by David Stasavage and Cécile Daubrée, August 1998.
- Working Paper No. 139, *State Infrastructure and Productive Performance in Indian Manufacturing*, by Arup Mitra, Aristomène Varoudakis and Marie-Ange Véganzonès, August 1998.
- Working Paper No. 140, *Rural Industrial Development in Viet Nam and China: A Study in Contrasts*, by David O'Connor, September 1998.
- Working Paper No. 141, *Labour Market Aspects of State Enterprise Reform in China*, by Fan Gang, Maria Rosa Lunati and David O'Connor, October 1998.
- Working Paper No. 142, *Fighting Extreme Poverty in Brazil: The Influence of Citizens' Action on Government Policies*, by Fernanda Lopes de Carvalho, November 1998.
- Working Paper No. 143, *How Bad Governance Impedes Poverty Alleviation in Bangladesh*, by Rehman Sobhan, November 1998.
- Document de travail No. 144, *La libéralisation de l'agriculture tunisienne et l'Union européenne: une vue prospective*, par Mohamed Abdelbasset Chemingui et Sébastien Dessus, février 1999.
- Working Paper No. 145, *Economic Policy Reform and Growth Prospects in Emerging African Economies*, by Patrick Guillaumont, Sylviane Guillaumont Jeanneney and Aristomène Varoudakis, March 1999.
- Working Paper No. 146, *Structural Policies for International Competitiveness in Manufacturing: The Case of Cameroon*, by Ludvig Söderling, March 1999.
- Working Paper No. 147, *China's Unfinished Open-Economy Reforms: Liberalisation of Services*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku, Yu Ma and Qiumei Yang, April 1999.
- Working Paper No. 148, *Boom and Bust and Sovereign Ratings*, by Helmut Reisen and Julia von Maltzan, June 1999.
- Working Paper No. 149, *Economic Opening and the Demand for Skills in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory and Evidence*, by David O'Connor and Maria Rosa Lunati, June 1999.
- Working Paper No. 150, *The Role of Capital Accumulation, Adjustment and Structural Change for Economic Take-off: Empirical Evidence from African Growth Episodes*, by Jean-Claude Berthélemy and Ludvig Söderling, July 1999.
- Working Paper No. 151, *Gender, Human Capital and Growth: Evidence from Six Latin American Countries*, by Donald J. Robbins, September 1999.
- Working Paper No. 152, *The Politics and Economics of Transition to an Open Market Economy in Viet Nam*, by James Riedel and William S. Turley, September 1999.
- Working Paper No. 153, *The Economics and Politics of Transition to an Open Market Economy: China*, by Wing Thye Woo, October 1999.
- Working Paper No. 154, *Infrastructure Development and Regulatory Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Air Transport*, by Andrea E. Goldstein, October 1999.
- Working Paper No. 155, *The Economics and Politics of Transition to an Open Market Economy: India*, by Ashok V. Desai, October 1999.
- Working Paper No. 156, *Climate Policy Without Tears: CGE-Based Ancillary Benefits Estimates for Chile*, by Sébastien Dessus and David O'Connor, November 1999.
- Document de travail No. 157, *Dépenses d'éducation, qualité de l'éducation et pauvreté : l'exemple de cinq pays d'Afrique francophone*, par Katharina Michaelowa, avril 2000.
- Document de travail No. 158, *Une estimation de la pauvreté en Afrique subsaharienne d'après les données anthropométriques*, par Christian Morrisson, Hélène Guilmeau et Charles Linskens, mai 2000.
- Working Paper No. 159, *Converging European Transitions*, by Jorge Braga de Macedo, July 2000.
- Working Paper No. 160, *Capital Flows and Growth in Developing Countries: Recent Empirical Evidence*, by Marcelo Soto, July 2000.
- Working Paper No. 161, *Global Capital Flows and the Environment in the 21st Century*, by David O'Connor, July 2000.
- Working Paper No. 162, *Financial Crises and International Architecture: A "Eurocentric" Perspective*, by Jorge Braga de Macedo, August 2000.
- Document de travail No. 163, *Résoudre le problème de la dette : de l'initiative PPTE à Cologne*, par Anne Joseph, août 2000.
- Working Paper No. 164, *E-Commerce for Development: Prospects and Policy Issues*, by Andrea Goldstein and David O'Connor, September 2000.

- Working Paper No. 165, *Negative Alchemy? Corruption and Composition of Capital Flows*, by Shang-Jin Wei, October 2000.
- Working Paper No. 166, *The HIPC Initiative: True and False Promises*, by Daniel Cohen, October 2000.
- Document de travail No. 167, *Les facteurs explicatifs de la malnutrition en Afrique subsaharienne*, par Christian Morriison et Charles Linskens, octobre 2000.
- Working Paper No. 168, *Human Capital and Growth: A Synthesis Report*, by Christopher A. Pissarides, November 2000.
- Working Paper No. 169, *Obstacles to Expanding Intra-African Trade*, by Roberto Longo and Khalid Sekkat, March 2001.
- Working Paper No. 170, *Regional Integration In West Africa*, by Ernest Aryeetey, March 2001.
- Working Paper No. 171, *Regional Integration Experience in the Eastern African Region*, by Andrea Goldstein and Njuguna S. Ndung'u, March 2001.
- Working Paper No. 172, *Integration and Co-operation in Southern Africa*, by Carolyn Jenkins, March 2001.
- Working Paper No. 173, *FDI in Sub-Saharan Africa*, by Ludger Odenthal, March 2001
- Document de travail No. 174, *La réforme des télécommunications en Afrique subsaharienne*, par Patrick Plane, mars 2001.
- Working Paper No. 175, *Fighting Corruption in Customs Administration: What Can We Learn from Recent Experiences?*, by Irène Hors; April 2001.
- Working Paper No. 176, *Globalisation and Transformation: Illusions and Reality*, by Grzegorz W. Kolodko, May 2001.
- Working Paper No. 177, *External Solvency, Dollarisation and Investment Grade: Towards a Virtuous Circle?*, by Martin Grandes, June 2001.
- Document de travail No. 178, *Congo 1965-1999: Les espoirs déçus du « Brésil africain »*, par Joseph Maton avec Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, septembre 2001.
- Working Paper No. 179, *Growth and Human Capital: Good Data, Good Results*, by Daniel Cohen and Marcelo Soto, September 2001.
- Working Paper No. 180, *Corporate Governance and National Development*, by Charles P. Oman, October 2001.
- Working Paper No. 181, *How Globalisation Improves Governance*, by Federico Bonaglia, Jorge Braga de Macedo and Maurizio Bussolo, November 2001.
- Working Paper No. 182, *Clearing the Air in India: The Economics of Climate Policy with Ancillary Benefits*, by Maurizio Bussolo and David O'Connor, November 2001.
- Working Paper No. 183, *Globalisation, Poverty and Inequality in sub-Saharan Africa: A Political Economy Appraisal*, by Yvonne M. Tsikata, December 2001.
- Working Paper No. 184, *Distribution and Growth in Latin America in an Era of Structural Reform: The Impact of Globalisation*, by Samuel A. Morley, December 2001.
- Working Paper No. 185, *Globalisation, Liberalisation, Poverty and Income Inequality in Southeast Asia*, by K.S. Jomo, December 2001.
- Working Paper No. 186, *Globalisation, Growth and Income Inequality: The African Experience*, by Steve Kayizzi-Mugerwa, December 2001.
- Working Paper No. 187, *The Social Impact of Globalisation in Southeast Asia*, by Mari Pangestu, December 2001.
- Working Paper No. 188, *Where Does Inequality Come From? Ideas and Implications for Latin America*, by James A. Robinson, December 2001.
- Working Paper No. 189, *Policies and Institutions for E-Commerce Readiness: What Can Developing Countries Learn from OECD Experience?*, by Paulo Bastos Tigre and David O'Connor, April 2002.
- Document de travail No. 190, *La réforme du secteur financier en Afrique*, par Anne Joseph, juillet 2002.
- Working Paper No. 191, *Virtuous Circles? Human Capital Formation, Economic Development and the Multinational Enterprise*, by Ethan B. Kapstein, August 2002.
- Working Paper No. 192, *Skill Upgrading in Developing Countries: Has Inward Foreign Direct Investment Played a Role?*, by Matthew J. Slaughter, August 2002.
- Working Paper No. 193, *Government Policies for Inward Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries: Implications for Human Capital Formation and Income Inequality*, by Dirk Willem te Velde, August 2002.
- Working Paper No. 194, *Foreign Direct Investment and Intellectual Capital Formation in Southeast Asia*, by Bryan K. Ritchie, August 2002.
- Working Paper No. 195, *FDI and Human Capital: A Research Agenda*, by Magnus Blomström and Ari Kokko, August 2002.
- Working Paper No. 196, *Knowledge Diffusion from Multinational Enterprises: The Role of Domestic and Foreign Knowledge-Enhancing Activities*, by Yasuyuki Todo and Koji Miyamoto, August 2002.
- Working Paper No. 197, *Why Are Some Countries So Poor? Another Look at the Evidence and a Message of Hope*, by Daniel Cohen and Marcelo Soto, October 2002.
- Working Paper No. 198, *Choice of an Exchange-Rate Arrangement, Institutional Setting and Inflation: Empirical Evidence from Latin America*, by Andreas Freytag, October 2002.
- Working Paper No. 199, *Will Basel II Affect International Capital Flows to Emerging Markets?*, by Beatrice Weder and Michael Wedow, October 2002.
- Working Paper No. 200, *Convergence and Divergence of Sovereign Bond Spreads: Lessons from Latin America*, by Martin Grandes, October 2002.
- Working Paper No. 201, *Prospects for Emerging-Market Flows amid Investor Concerns about Corporate Governance*, by Helmut Reisen, November 2002.
- Working Paper No. 202, *Rediscovering Education in Growth Regressions*, by Marcelo Soto, November 2002.

- Working Paper No. 203, *Incentive Bidding for Mobile Investment: Economic Consequences and Potential Responses*, by Andrew Charlton, January 2003.
- Working Paper No. 204, *Health Insurance for the Poor? Determinants of participation Community-Based Health Insurance Schemes in Rural Senegal*, by Johannes Jütting, January 2003.
- Working Paper No. 205, *China's Software Industry and its Implications for India*, by Ted Tschang, February 2003.
- Working Paper No. 206, *Agricultural and Human Health Impacts of Climate Policy in China: A General Equilibrium Analysis with Special Reference to Guangdong*, by David O'Connor, Fan Zhai, Kristin Aunan, Terje Berntsen and Haakon Vennemo, March 2003.
- Working Paper No. 207, *India's Information Technology Sector: What Contribution to Broader Economic Development?*, by Nirvikar Singh, March 2003.
- Working Paper No. 208, *Public Procurement: Lessons from Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda*, by Walter Odhiambo and Paul Kamau, March 2003.
- Working Paper No. 209, *Export Diversification in Low-Income Countries: An International Challenge after Doha*, by Federico Bonaglia and Kiichiro Fukasaku, June 2003.
- Working Paper No. 210, *Institutions and Development: A Critical Review*, by Johannes Jütting, July 2003.
- Working Paper No. 211, *Human Capital Formation and Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries*, by Koji Miyamoto, July 2003.
- Working Paper No. 212, *Central Asia since 1991: The Experience of the New Independent States*, by Richard Pomfret, July 2003.
- Working Paper No. 213, *A Multi-Region Social Accounting Matrix (1995) and Regional Environmental General Equilibrium Model for India (REGEMI)*, by Maurizio Bussolo, Mohamed Chemingui and David O'Connor, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 214, *Ratings Since the Asian Crisis*, by Helmut Reisen, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 215, *Development Redux: Reflections for a New Paradigm*, by Jorge Braga de Macedo, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 216, *The Political Economy of Regulatory Reform: Telecoms in the Southern Mediterranean*, by Andrea Goldstein, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 217, *The Impact of Education on Fertility and Child Mortality: Do Fathers Really Matter Less than Mothers?*, by Lucia Breierova and Esther Duflo, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 218, *Float in Order to Fix? Lessons from Emerging Markets for EU Accession Countries*, by Jorge Braga de Macedo and Helmut Reisen, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 219, *Globalisation in Developing Countries: The Role of Transaction Costs in Explaining Economic Performance in India*, by Maurizio Bussolo and John Whalley, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 220, *Poverty Reduction Strategies in a Budget-Constrained Economy: The Case of Ghana*, by Maurizio Bussolo and Jeffery I. Round, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 221, *Public-Private Partnerships in Development: Three Applications in Timor Leste*, by José Braz, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 222, *Public Opinion Research, Global Education and Development Co-operation Reform: In Search of a Virtuous Circle*, by Ida Mc Donnell, Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte and Liam Wegimont, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 223, *Building Capacity to Trade: What Are the Priorities?*, by Henry-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 224, *Of Flying Geeks and O-Rings: Locating Software and IT Services in India's Economic Development*, by David O'Connor, November 2003.
- Document de travail No. 225, *Cap Vert: Gouvernance et Développement*, par Jaime Lourenço and Colm Foy, novembre 2003.
- Working Paper No. 226, *Globalisation and Poverty Changes in Colombia*, by Maurizio Bussolo and Jann Lay, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 227, *The Composite Indicator of Economic Activity in Mozambique (ICAE): Filling in the Knowledge Gaps to Enhance Public-Private Partnership (PPP)*, by Roberto J. Tibana, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 228, *Economic-Reconstruction in Post-Conflict Transitions: Lessons for the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)*, by Graciana del Castillo, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 229, *Providing Low-Cost Information Technology Access to Rural Communities In Developing Countries: What Works? What Pays?* by Georg Caspary and David O'Connor, November 2003.
- Working Paper No. 230, *The Currency Premium and Local-Currency Denominated Debt Costs in South Africa*, by Martin Grandes, Marcel Peter and Nicolas Pinaud, December 2003.
- Working Paper No. 231, *Macroeconomic Convergence in Southern Africa: The Rand Zone Experience*, by Martin Grandes, December 2003.
- Working Paper No. 232, *Financing Global and Regional Public Goods through ODA: Analysis and Evidence from the OECD Creditor Reporting System*, by Helmut Reisen, Marcelo Soto and Thomas Weithöner, January 2004.
- Working Paper No. 233, *Land, Violent Conflict and Development*, by Nicolas Pons-Vignon and Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, February 2004.
- Working Paper No. 234, *The Impact of Social Institutions on the Economic Role of Women in Developing Countries*, by Christian Morrisson and Johannes Jütting, May 2004.
- Document de travail No. 235, *La condition des femmes en Inde, Kenya, Soudan et Tunisie*, par Christian Morrisson, août 2004.
- Working Paper No. 236, *Decentralisation and Poverty in Developing Countries: Exploring the Impact*, by Johannes Jütting, Céline Kauffmann, Ida Mc Donnell, Holger Osterrieder, Nicolas Pinaud and Lucia Wegner, August 2004.
- Working Paper No. 237, *Natural Disasters and Adaptive Capacity*, by Jeff Dayton-Johnson, August 2004