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ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT ENGAGEMENT LAB (DEL)

DEL is a research organisation examining public attitudes and engagement with aid and sustainable development. DEL conducts research in France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States.

DEL is a grantee of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and is based at University College London and the University of Birmingham.

Formerly known as the Aid Attitudes Tracker (AAT), DEL uses tracking, panel and experimental data to provide evidence and insights for development communicators.
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Tracking the German public’s engagement with global poverty and sustainable development
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THREE KEY CHANGES SINCE JUNE 2022

15% have donated to a global poverty charity in the past 12 months in Germany

45% are concerned about economic crises, job security and wages

14% think German aid gets where it is needed

After we observed higher levels of donations in June against the backdrop of war in Ukraine, engagement with global poverty is reverting to more typical levels in Germany, including a 5% points fall in the percentage of donors to 15%.

Concern for economic crises is rising significantly in Germany, making it the second most concerning issue following war. In third place, concern for climate change and the environment is steady since June.

Fewer people think aid gets where it is needed the most. This goes hand in hand with falling levels of support for aid as the cost-of-living crisis bites into public engagement with global poverty.

Question listed in each box
Sample size n=6,008 | Base: DE adults | Data are weighted to be nationally representative | Fieldwork by YouGov, 30 Sep - 3 Nov 2022
Comparison to Jun 2022
Concern for economic crises is quickly climbing the ranks of public priorities in Germany, up 10% points to 45%. Nevertheless, concern for war, conflict and terrorism remains the most concerning issue for almost 3 out of 5 respondents, up a further 4% points (although this change is not significantly different from June). Climate change also remains a top 3 concern, at 43%.

Concern for migration and refugees is also on the rise significantly, up 7% points to 33%, while concern for global pandemics has fallen again, this time by 4% points to 19%.
After the peak we observed in June in Germany, donations fell back to more typical levels in October 2022. Donations also fell by 3% points in France and by 6% points in Great Britain. However, donations in the United States have risen by 3% points since June.

15% have donated to a global poverty charity in the past 12 months in Germany.

Question: Thinking about global poverty and development, have you donated money to an international NGO or charity working on the issue in the past 12 months? (% who donated)

Sample size n=6,008 | Base: DE adults | Data are weighted to be nationally representative | Fieldwork by YouGov, 30 Sep - 3 Nov 2022 | Comparison to Jun 2022
Support for aid is still falling in Germany, down by a further 3% points since June, down 7% points since last year, but remains comfortably with majority support.

Support is also falling in Great Britain (-6% points) and France (-2% points). Support is increasing in the U.S., where it is up by 5% points to 59%.
You asked we did: Survey items from DEL Partners on ODA investments, supporting Ukrainian refugees, and balancing China in Africa
The majority of the German public think the government should invest more of the development cooperation budget to address economic inequalities in Germany.

Almost half of Germans think the government should invest more of the development cooperation budget to address climate change.

The public is divided almost equally on investment to address the Russian invasion of Ukraine. While the level of concern has increased, there is no consensus about whether Germany should invest more from the development cooperation budget.

Question: Do you think the German government should or should not invest more or less development cooperation to address each of the following areas, or do you think the current level is about right? | Base: DE adults | Sample size: n = 6,008 | Fieldwork by YouGov 30 Sep - 3 Nov 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Should invest less</th>
<th>The current level is about right</th>
<th>Should invest more</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic inequalities in Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fallout from the Russian invasion of Ukraine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We delved more into the investment towards Ukraine question and asked a question on whether the government should increase the development cooperation budget to prioritise Ukrainian refugees?

There is more disagreement (38%) than agreement (28%) with increasing the development cooperation budget to prioritise support for Ukrainian refugees fleeing the conflict.

Greater support comes from 18–24 age group (30%) and 45–54 & 55+ (27%), relatively less support from 25–34 (23%) and 35–44 (25%) – effectively a U-shape.

Income matters for supporting increased investment for Ukrainian refugees. Higher income groups display greater levels of support support than lower income groups.
We were asked to test how important the German public thought it was for German foreign policy to balance against the influence of China in Africa. In addition to asking about how important respondents felt it was, we also randomized the region (Africa, Asia, the Pacific) and randomized whether the way in which Germany chose to balance.

Balancing China in Africa was seen as more important than Asia and the Pacific.

Meanwhile, the foreign policy tools seen as more important varied by region:
- **Economic-Africa (51%)**, Strategic-Africa (50%) & Political-Africa (49%)
- **Security-Asia (49%)**
- **Political-Pacific & Strategic-Pacific (48%)**

These are not meaningful or statistically significant differences. Roughly half of German respondents say it’s important to balance China while only c.10% say it’s not.
An experimental test of the factors that increase and decrease support for aid in Germany
UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC PREFERENCES FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF AID PROJECTS

• We looked at 8 different attributes or features of aid projects and analyzed which matter more for support.

• General approach
  • Respondents were shown two different aid projects and asked to indicate which project they support more based on the profile of the country and the attributes of the project
  • All of the attributes were randomly assigned
## Attributes and Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the Project</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Levels of Extreme Poverty in Recipient Country (Less Than $1.90/Day)</th>
<th>Nature of Relationship Between Germany and Recipient Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To support education provision</td>
<td>• The recipient country is in East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>• 5% of the country’s population</td>
<td>• Primarily historical or cultural ties – i.e. shared language, colonial history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support health provision</td>
<td>• The recipient country is in Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>• 10% of the country’s population</td>
<td>• Primarily diplomatic or strategic ties – i.e. voting along similar lines at the United Nations, or part of a shared political or defence alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support economic growth and jobs</td>
<td>• The recipient country is in Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>• 20% of the country’s population</td>
<td>• Primarily economic ties – i.e. commercial, investment or trade deals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support providing water, sanitation, and hygiene</td>
<td>• The recipient country is in South Asia</td>
<td>• 40% of the country’s population</td>
<td>• No strong ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support social protection and welfare provision</td>
<td>• The recipient country is in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>• 80% of the country’s population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support providing transport and communications infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support providing food and food security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support delivering peace and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support environmental protection, climate, and biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support delivering gender equality and women’s rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRIBUTES AND LEVELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPICAL EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moderately effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not very effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANNEL OF PROJECT DELIVERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Germany’s aid agency, e.g. BMZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International organisations, e.g. the UN or World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International charities and NGOs, e.g. das Rote Kreuz or Oxfam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Businesses and the private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY OF RECIPIENT COUNTRY’S INSTITUTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong rule of law, accountability from public officials, transparency in public decisions and low levels of corruption and bribery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moderate rule of law, accountability from public officials, transparency in public decisions and moderate levels of corruption and bribery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weak rule of law, accountability from public officials, transparency in public decisions and high levels of corruption and bribery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONDITIONS AROUND PROVIDING AID TO RECIPIENT COUNTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social policy – e.g., on the recipient government’s policies on unemployment support and training, pensions, health and social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic policy – e.g., on the recipient government’s macroeconomic policy framework, such as debt sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Democracy and human rights – e.g., on the recipient government’s protection of human rights and holding of free and fair elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No conditions – no political, economic, or social conditions are attached to providing the aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure and social protection are less likely to be chosen and WASH more likely.

Region does not make a difference

Higher levels of poverty associated with likelihood of being chosen and lower levels less likely

Higher levels of effectiveness more likely to be selected

Private sector less likely to be selected

Higher corruption and worse accountability and rule of law less likely to be chosen and the reverse is also true.

Economic conditionality and no conditionality are associated with a lower likelihood of being selected and democracy and human rights condition and social policy condition are associated with a greater likelihood of being chosen.
WHY DOES THE PUBLIC SUPPORT AID PROJECTS?

The sector matters. Infrastructure and social protection projects are less likely to be chosen and WASH more likely. Aid opponents are still more likely to support WASH projects.

Region does not make a difference, ever.

Higher levels of poverty associated with greater likelihood of being chosen and lower levels less likely, though this matters less for aid opponents.

Higher levels of expected effectiveness makes a project more likely to be chosen.

Private sector delivery make a project less likely to be selected.

Higher corruption and worse accountability and rule of law less likely to be chosen and the reverse is also true – and this is consistent across supporters and opponents.

Economic conditionality and no conditionality are associated with a lower likelihood of being selected and democracy and human rights condition and social policy condition are associated with a greater likelihood of being chosen. Aid opponents also more likely to support human right conditionality and less likely to support no conditionality.
NOT HERE, NOT NOW?

GERMAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE CLIMATE CRISIS

The impact of climate change and responsibility to take action
On average, the perceived impact of climate change increases with distance – that is, climate change has a greater impact on those who are further away spatially and temporally. Just over half of the German public (51%) say climate change will impact them and their family, compared to 70% who say it will impact people in other countries.

Future generations are seen to be most impacted by climate change (75%).

The pattern is similar across age groups, with decreasing perceived impact on themselves and their family with age (older perceive lower impact on them – 43% of 55+ vs. 54% of 18-24s).

The patterns are consistent with July 2021 and March 2022 data.
Food and water shortages remain as the top area of impact across age groups and partisanship.

Loss of biodiversity and wildlife and flooding remain in the top 3 across the different demographic traits (although they switch places sometimes by the specific demographic trait).

Just 4% of the German public ranked adverse economic impacts as the top impact of climate change – and overall just 19% said ranked it in the top three impacts.
When asked to rank who needs to take more action to reduce the negative effects of climate change, the dominant response from the German public was that the German government should do more. This is followed by “others in Germany” and lastly, “I personally”. This pattern is consistent across age groups and gender.

There are some partisan differences in responses: 56% of Green party voters think the Government should do more. The highest % for “I personally should do more” comes from FDP voters at 16% and the lowest from AfD voters (9%). On the issue of individual action, the German public look most like the AfD.

Question: Below are three statements about who needs to take more action to reduce the negative effects of climate change. Please indicate which one you agree with the most, second most and third most. Base: DE adults | Sample size: n = 6,008 | Data are weighted to be nationally representative | Fieldwork by YouGov 30 Sep - 3 Nov 2022
A majority (50%) of the German public say it’s very or extremely urgent that the government take action on climate change.

This view is shared across both genders (49% men, 50% female), all age groups, especially 18-24s (47%) and 45-54s (52%), and party lines, with even 48% of AfD responding “fairly” to “extremely” urgent.
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Compared to the majority of the German public wanting the government to take action, a little less than the majority want German global leadership in international climate policy. This is shared across gender, age groups and party lines. Men show slightly higher support for Germany’s leadership than women (47% vs. 44%). The strongest agreement in the younger generations (18-24) at 46%. Over 50% of CDU/CSU, SPD, Die Linke, and Die Grünen voters support German leadership in international climate policy.

Question: Do you think Germany should or should not be a global leader in international climate policy? | Base: DE adults | Sample size: n = 6,008 | Fieldwork: 30 Sep - 3 Nov 2022
The German public want around a third of the development cooperation budget to be invested to support poor countries climate change adaptation and mitigation.

Even when the public is informed of the trade-off international climate funds will bring, they think 39% (4pp more) should be spent on adaptation and mitigation for climate change.

The difference is in fact statistically significant.

Younger respondents and those who identify with left-learning parties, suggested higher percentages for each option. Right-leaning AfD voters said an average of 26% in the control group and 28% in the treatment group.
German global leadership and action in climate change is largely supported by the public across the socio-demographic traits.

There is also very little support for individual action; just 9% of the public saw personal action as key to reducing the impacts of climate change.

Climate change is still seen as something that happens in other countries and to future generations. There is not yet a sense of urgency or jeopardy.
COST OF LIVING: CHARITY DOESN’T END AT HOME

An experimental test of relative change in economic status and propensity to give
COST OF LIVING EXPERIMENT

• How charitable is the German public in light of the cost of living crisis?
• What difference does it make to their propensity to give when people are asked about the change in the economic situation of their household, their community, and people in poor countries (2019 vs. 2022)?
COST OF LIVING: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN (CONTROL)

• Control group is simply asked **how they will divide €1000 to themselves, people in their community, and people in a poor country**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You and your household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in your local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in a poor country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

€
COST OF LIVING: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN (T1)

- Treatment group 1 is asked to think about **how their economic position has changed from 2019 to 2022**

Thinking back to 2019, in your opinion, where do you think you were on the scale in 2019?

0 - Poor 100 - Rich

Now, in your opinion, where do you think you are on the scale **today (September 2022)**?

0 - Poor 100 - Rich

42
COST OF LIVING: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN (T2)

- Treatment group 2 is asked to think about how their & their community’s economic position has changed from 2019 to 2022

Next, imagine an average person in your local community. Thinking back to 2019, in your opinion, where do you think they were on the scale in 2019?

0 - Poor  |  100 - Rich

58

Now, in your opinion, where do you think they are on the scale today (September 2022)?

0 - Poor  |  100 - Rich
Treatment group 3 is asked to think about how their & people in people poor country’s economic position has changed from 2019 to 2022.

Next, imagine an average person in a poor country. Thinking back to 2019, in your opinion, where do you think they were on the scale in 2019?

Next, in your opinion, where do you think they are on the scale today (September 2022)?
When primed to think about **themselves** only, they keep **more** to themselves.

When primed to think about **people in a poor country**, the amount donated on average to both the people in their **community and people in a poor country increases significantly** compared to when they are primed to think about only themselves.

**Why would the amount donated to the people in their community increase when primed to think about those in a poor country?**

Our hypothesis: When respondents are primed to think about poor countries, the priming takes them **out of their own context** and the respondents are able to think beyond themselves in the allocation process.

Question: Imagine you have been unexpectedly given €1000. You can divide the money in any way between yourself, people in your local community, and people in a poor country. Please indicate how much you would allocate to... | Base: DE adults | Sample size n= 6,008 | Fieldwork: 30 Sep - 3 Nov 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>T1 (Self)</th>
<th>T2 (Community)</th>
<th>T3 (Poor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To myself and my household</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To people in my community</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To people in a poor country</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBGROUP ANALYSIS: RESULTS

We look at subgroups of respondents based on whether they think they and others have gotten better off/worse off

1. “I’m better off compared to 2019”
   - They keep more to themselves (€33 more compared to control) and less to the people in poor countries (€40 less compared to control)

2. “I’m better off, but people in poor countries have gotten worse off”
   - They keep less to themselves (€40 less compared to the control group)
   - They donate more to community compared to control group (€20 more)
   - They on average donate more to poor (€20 more), but this effect not significant
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION

• Are women more generous?
On average, across all conditions, women donate more to their community and to the people in a poor country.

• Any age group differences?
The younger (18-24, 25-34) are more responsive to the treatments about people in their community and people in poor countries than the older generations (44-54, 55+) who keep to themselves more regardless of the treatment group. The differences are not statistically significant, however.

• How about income?
Lower income public are in fact the most generous to people in poor countries. When they are asked to think about the poor countries, the amount donated to them shifts significantly.
KEY INSIGHTS

• Priming works
  • When the public’s minds are put on their own difficulties, they respond to it by keeping more to themselves
  • But when they are primed to think of themselves and others, they respond accordingly as well in the allocation
    • Reminding them of the relative position vis-à-vis people in poor countries can work create perspective and to incite empathy from the public
**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNT?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNATIONAL POLITICS</th>
<th>CLIMATE</th>
<th>COST OF LIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Domestic concerns trump international concerns right now</td>
<td>• Germans say government, not individuals, should do more to take action to reduce the impacts of climate change.</td>
<td>• Reminding the public of their relative position vis-à-vis people in poor countries can work to shift their attitudes to be more empathetic and hence increase donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More people disagree than agree with increasing the development cooperation budget for Ukrainian refugees fleeing the conflict</td>
<td>• Half of German public think government action on climate change is very/extremely urgent.</td>
<td>• Priming works better for certain groups of the public, including the young and the lower income groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balancing China in Africa was seen as more important than Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>• German global leadership and action on climate change is largely supported across socio-demographic groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ODA WASH projects with higher effectiveness to countries with lower corruption and with human rights conditionality were most supported</td>
<td>• Climate change is still seen as something that happens in other countries and to future generations: there is little sense of jeopardy for Germans/Germany.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Development Engagement Lab (DEL) is a five-year study of public attitudes and engagement with global development in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States (2018-2023).

DEL is a partner focussed research programme, convening and co-producing research and insights with over 30 international development NGOs and government agencies to understand the drivers of engagement and inform development communications.

Fieldwork is carried out by YouGov and surveys are weighted to be a nationally representative of the adult population. DEL is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and led by Professor Jennifer Hudson (University College London) and Professor David Hudson (University of Birmingham).

The Development Engagement Lab (Aid Attitudes Tracker Phase 2) has three goals:
1. Co-production of an evidence base for development campaigning
2. Enabling collaboration across the sector
3. Increasing advocacy capacity through the sharing of research and strategic insights

You can find out more information about DEL research at www.developmentcompass.org, follow us on Twitter @DevEngageLab or by contacting del@ucl.ac.uk.

Cover photo: Denys Nevozhai on Unsplash, Section photos: (1) Cédric VT on Unsplash, (2) Oxfam on Flickr, (3) Photo by Etienne Girardet on Unsplash, (4) Photo by Eva Blue on Unsplash, Photo by Andrew Moca on Unsplash, Photo by Josh Calabrese on Unsplash