

AN ASSESSMENT REPORT:

- 1. U.S. PUBLIC OPINION ON DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE**
 - 2. THE USAID DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM**
-
-

Submitted to:

U.S. Agency for International Development

Under:

The Evaluation IQC AEP-I-00-00-00023-00

Prepared by:

**Rosemarie Philips
Diana Davis, PhD**



Submitted by:

Development Associates, Inc.
1730 North Lynn St.
Arlington, VA, 22209-2023

January 31, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction to The Report	1
Part One: Public Opinion on Development Assistance	2
Introduction.....	2
A. Methodology	2
1. Locating Relevant Information.....	2
2. Interpreting Public Opinion (and Survey) Data.....	4
3. Measures of Development Assistance.....	6
B. Findings.....	7
1. Level of Awareness of Development Assistance.....	7
2. Attitudes About Development Assistance	8
3. Key Themes, Common Misconceptions, Unanswered Questions	10
4. Messages and Themes that Now Resonate with Audiences.....	14
C. Conclusions	16
Bibliography	17
Part Two: Development Education Assessment.....	19
Executive Summary	19
Introduction - The Biden-Pell Program in 2003 and Beyond.....	22
A. Current Program	22
1. Goals, Objectives, Strategy.....	23
2. Lessons Learned.....	23
3. Caveat.....	28
B. Other Approaches To Development Education.....	29
1. Development Education in Europe	29
2. Development Education in Britain and Canada.....	31
3. Other Efforts in the United States	32
C. Looking Ahead	36
1. A Must.....	37
2. Even Better	38

3.	Putting Focus into the USAID Program.....	38
4.	Messages.....	40
5.	Approach/Strategies	42
6.	Is More Possible?	43
	Conclusion.....	43
	References.....	45
	Annex A.....	48
	Annex B.....	57

AN ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. U.S. PUBLIC OPINION ON DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

2. THE USAID DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

Development Associates is pleased to submit this report, undertaken through a task order under our Evaluation Services IQC, to the USAID Bureau of Legislative and Public Affairs.

This report contains two major parts, each of which has been developed and formatted to stand on its own. The theme that unites the parts is a concern for public attitudes on development assistance, the effect on those views of the USAID public education program, and potential strategies for the future.

The first part is a review of U.S. public opinion on development assistance, both before and after the events of September 11, 2001. It was written by Dr. Diana Davis, a full-time survey research expert and Senior Associate on the staff of Development Associates.

The second part is an evaluation of the USAID development education program with recommendations on potential future strategies for the Agency in this field. Its author is Rosemarie Phillips, a consultant to Development Associates who has a strong background in development education.

Together the two parts provide the factual and analytic basis for USAID to re-examine its development education activities and to chart a course for the future.

PART ONE: PUBLIC OPINION ON DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this task was to locate public opinion data concerning development assistance that bracketed September 11, 2001 to determine if views towards it had changed following the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. The public opinion information will be used to guide plans for redesigning the Development Education Program in early 2003. USAID staff had four questions about public opinion regarding development assistance:

1. What is the public's level of awareness of development assistance?
2. What are their attitudes towards development assistance?
3. What are the key themes, common misperceptions, and unanswered questions concerning development assistance?
4. What messages and themes currently resonate with the public?

In the following sections we present the methodology used, the findings, and a summary and conclusions.

A. METHODOLOGY

There is very large volume of public opinion data on foreign aid and foreign policy available and it is easy to be overwhelmed by it. Because public opinion data is extremely subject to manipulation, it is necessary to carefully examine the methods used by each poll, and the actual questions asked, as well as reading reports or press releases, to find data that are both valid and useful for the purposes of this study. Our approach was to collect and digest limited amounts of information culled from recommended sources plus materials at hand at USAID and Development Associates. Given the limited resources available, we decided to find comprehensive studies conducted by reputable organizations with foreign aid as a focus, if not the main focus, of the poll. When interpreting public opinion data, it is imperative to know not only what type of sample provided the information, and the specific wording of questions providing the data, but also what questions preceded questions of interest, to determine if a biasing frame of reference had been established. Our approach is further described in the three sections below: Locating Relevant Information, Interpreting Public Opinion Data, and Measures of Development Assistance.

1. Locating Relevant Information

Our approach to collecting information was to search for reports using the Internet. Several sources of data had been suggested by USAID, such as the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) at the University of Maryland. USAID staff also recommended specific reports and public opinion summaries in their collections. Also, we consulted several general sources of public opinion data with on-line access, such as the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, and the Public Broadcasting System. Finally, we consulted the major journal for public opinion and survey research professionals in the United States, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, and daily newspapers, such as the *Washington Post* and the *Wall Street Journal*.

Pre-September 11, 2001 data: Our primary source of public opinion data on development assistance before September 11, 2002 is a poll conducted by PIPA. The report was titled: *Americans on Foreign Aid and World Hunger: A Study of US Public Attitudes*. It was dated February 2, 2001. The data were collected during November, 2000.¹ The data present the views of 901 adults, age 18 and over, interviewed by telephone by Communications Center, Inc. The participants were reached by telephone using a random digit dialing approach. Not all questions were asked of the 901 respondents. No response rates were reported. Focus groups were conducted in four cities to obtain more in-depth information on how people think about health care issues. These were conducted in June, July, and October in Richmond, Virginia, Cleveland, Ohio, Baltimore, Maryland, and San Mateo, California. PIPA conducts frequent polls on international policy attitudes and intended this poll, in part, as a follow-up to their 1995 poll *Americans on Foreign Aid*.

The report contents are:

- ▶ General Attitudes Toward Foreign Aid
- ▶ Preferred Levels of Aid
- ▶ Humanitarian Aid and Strategic Aid
- ▶ Support for Major Effort Against World Hunger
- ▶ Aid to Africa
- ▶ Development Aid
- ▶ Reservations About Aid's Effectiveness
- ▶ Preferences for Channels for Aid

Post September 11, 2001 data: Our primary source of public opinion data on development assistance after September 11, 2002 is a poll conducted by The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (CCFR) and the German Marshall Fund of the United States. The report was titled: *WorldViews 2002*. The US data were collected in June, 2002. The total sample size for the US was 3,200. Since the mode of data collection was changed from in-person to telephone, 2,800 interviews were conducted by telephone and 400 in person to evaluate the effects on the data of the change in data collection mode. Harris Interactive collected the data: 2,862 interviews with adults age 18 and above by telephone, using a random digit dialing approach with a national probability sample and personal in home interviews with 400 adults age 18 and over also selected using a national probability sample. No response rates were reported.

Worldviews 2002 was the eighth in a series of quadrennial polls conducted by the CCFR since 1974. This provides a sound basis for evaluating current opinions. In addition to the 2002 report, CCFR makes available a topline report, showing each question, the 2002 response, and comparisons of the 2002 data with data from all preceding polls.

The contents are:

- ▶ Refocused Internationalism after 9/11
- ▶ The Goal: Security at Home
- ▶ Superpower with Limits
- ▶ International Cooperation

¹ The questionnaire is included as an appendix to the report and provided here with the supplementary materials.

- ▶ The Global Economy
- ▶ The Changing Geopolitical Landscape
- ▶ The President's Foreign Policy Performance
- ▶ Leaders and the Public

Other relevant data: While the data reported below in the section on findings are based on these two polls, we recommend that USAID staff review some of the reports available under the Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative that describe a number of dimensions of public opinion (if they have not reviewed them already). Through a combined analysis of media coverage of international events (Amundson, et al. 1999, Aubrun and Grady, 2000, and Grady and Aubrun, 1999) and cognitive interviews (Aubrun and Grady, 1999 and Aubrun and Grady, 2001) GII funded researchers make a number of valid points about the nature of public opinion and how it is formed that should contribute to planning for the future of the Development Education Program.² For example, Aubrun and Grady (1999) explain the American public's approach to international issues: "The average person has no cultural model for international relations, other than that borrowed from the interpersonal domain." Therefore: "Americans treat countries as persons, such as parents, children and neighbors andoften take a parental approach to other countries."

2. *Interpreting Public Opinion (and Survey³) Data*

We pay attention to opinions because we believe there is a strong, direct relationship between opinion and behavior. The strength of this relationship depends on specificity: the more concrete and specific the question(s) used to obtain the opinion data, the more likely the opinions predict behavior.

Information on three aspects of the data help us to interpret poll and survey derived opinion data: generalizability, data collection methods, and data comparability.

Generalizability of the data refers to whether or not they legitimately can be used to describe views held by the larger population. Generalizability depends on the scientific rigor of the poll or survey design and implementation and the reviewer's judgment of these based on statistical principles. For example, opinion polls do not report response rates in their documentation because they are conducted rapidly, over a few days, by telephone and each telephone number is called only once. This means the final "sample" of respondents is really one of convenience, not a probability sample. However, if the final sample size (number of completed interviews) is large enough, over 1,000 or so, then the statistical law of large numbers comes into play, the data can be viewed as having a normal distribution and the findings can be interpreted as though they

² Several of these reports, plus an annotated bibliography, are included among the materials provided to USAID staff with this report.

³ In practice, the terms poll and survey are applied to the same activity. Choice of term usually has more to do with the subject of the study and the audience or client than the methods used. Generally polls are conducted rapidly, for example, over a few days, and focus on population data, while surveys have longer data collection periods and focus on both population and subpopulation data. Similarly, poll data analysis is conducted rapidly and consists of reports on the findings of one or a small number of questions, while survey data analysis is conducted over a longer time period and includes a substantial amount of data manipulation (combining questions, analyzing subcategories of the data for subpopulations, and so forth). Both polls and surveys can be well or poorly designed and implemented and result in generalizable or ungeneralizable findings.

are derived from a probability sample, especially if presented with, and bolstered by, comparable data.

Data Collection Methods. Data collection mode and question wording influence opinion data. Both can be sources of considerable bias in the data. There are differences in opinion data based on whether the questionnaire is administered by telephone, mail, e-mail, website, or in-person, and whether it is self-administered or interviewer administered.

Opinions vary according to how the questions are phrased, including their specificity and concreteness, as opposed to questions that are general, vague, or double-barreled. Opinions also vary according to question context, i.e. the content of the questions before the items of interest, and those assumed by the respondent to be following them. Opinions are multidimensional. A person can hold contradictory opinions about a subject, depending on which aspects of the subject are presented.

Opinions also are influenced by personal factors such as life experience, emotion, personality characteristics, moral and ethical precepts held, the views of salient others, knowledge and self-interest.⁴

An example of question wording that biases the respondent's answer comes from the PIPA 2001 report cited above: "The United States should be *willing to share* at least *a small portion of its wealth* with those in the world who are *in great need* (emphasis added)."⁵ The general public considers "wealth" to reside with a small percentage of the US population, among people famous for their wealth, such as Bill Gates. They do not consider themselves to be "wealthy;" therefore it is easy to endorse the notion of giving other people's money to those "in great need." If this question was re-worded using "your tax dollars," or "its budget" in place of "its wealth," the question would become more personal ("your tax dollars") or more neutral ("its budget").

Comparison data, ideally from more than one other source, are used to validate opinion data since opinion data are subject to variation and manipulation. Comparable data are usually derived from other polls or surveys and are useful to the extent that they are from similar samples, and that the data collection methods are documented. Because of the variability within opinion data, it is best to compare general magnitudes and not point estimates. Likewise, a few percentage points one way or the other can easily be due to differences in data collection methods, and other sources of measurement bias and error, rather than actual changes in opinion. Therefore, differences have to be substantial as well as validated with comparison data to be interpreted as indicating actual opinion change. It is safest to interpret opinion data in terms of trends and in terms of rank ordering.

For these reasons we approach and use opinion data using several rules of thumb.

⁴ Therefore, a person may hold contradictory opinions, opinions can be illogical (and the person holding them may be aware of this and still hold them), opinions can be completely fixed or change over time, and they can be situational and specific or general and broad.

⁵ PIPA, Feb. 2001, *Americans on Foreign Aid and World Hunger: A Study of US Public Attitudes*. Question 17.

- ▶ **Review survey design and data collection methods.** Valid polls or surveys provide information about the methods used to collect the opinion data⁶ to demonstrate the generalizability of the findings. We expect to have information on: the sample size (number of people contributing the data), the sample design, the response rate⁷, and how the data were collected. Note that studies where the sample consisted of "registered voters" are worthless for projecting to overall public opinion. "Registered voters" are a subpopulation of the general public, and most likely a poor proxy for the whole population. At best, data from "registered voters" can be generalized back only to "registered voters."⁸

- ▶ **Review data collection mode and question wording.** Since findings can vary depending on data collection mode and question and questionnaire design, we review this documentation. It explains how the data were collected (in person or by telephone, e-mail, Internet, or mailed form; whether an interviewer administered the questionnaire or it was self-administered) and provides the exact wording of the questions. Not only do increasingly specific and concrete questions get "closer" to opinions that the respondent is likely to act on (opinion-behavior connection), but it is also important to collect opinions in context. For example, the often repeated idea that the general public overestimates the percentage of the US budget used for international development and overestimates the absolute amount should be placed in the context of their other beliefs about the budget: what percentage of the budget do they believe is committed to other activities? How large do they believe the budget is? Once an item is put in context, we can better (more validly) interpret it.

- ▶ **Interpret the findings in view of the comparative data presented (or other known comparative data).** Since opinions are multidimensional and subject to wide fluctuation, in addition to some concreteness in collecting opinion data, we look for comparison data to support the findings, or for contrast. Comparison data must be as thoroughly documented as the original poll or survey data. Only when we have valid comparison data can we make justifiable conclusions about the public's preferences based on the views given in an opinion poll.

3. *Measures of Development Assistance*

The final methodological consideration is derived from the previous discussion. Throughout our search for relevant data we found that pollsters use many terms to refer to development assistance. The term "development assistance" was not used in any of the questions we reviewed, although this term was used in the PIPA report. Instead the following terms and phrases were used to indicate it:

⁶ For example, the Office of Management and Budget reviews every federally funded survey design and requires that the survey plan include steps to ensure that the data will be generalizable, including setting minimum response rates of 85 percent or so.

⁷ This assumes the data were collected from a probability sample, the only approach that guarantees, statistically, that the data are generalizable to the larger population. A purposive sample, chosen using non-probability techniques, represents a larger population only as well as the sample's designer is skillful. There is no statistical basis for generalizing from a purposive sample to the larger population.

⁸ Questions about the population of registered voters include: when were these people registered (how recently), how old is the list (people move and have different telephone numbers as time goes by), how was the list compiled (by a political party, by a public agency, from among volunteers), and so forth.

- ▶ foreign aid
- ▶ aid to foreign countries
- ▶ economic aid
- ▶ foreign policy goal
- ▶ foreign policy program

We cannot be sure how the poll respondents interpret these terms. Because there is a documented tendency for the public to include military aid under the term "foreign aid," the CCFR poll frequently differentiated between "military aid" and "economic aid."

A second aspect of the terminology used was how the recipients of development assistance were characterized in the questions. Terms included:

- ▶ other nations
- ▶ needy countries
- ▶ poor countries
- ▶ less developed countries

Again, we cannot be sure how these terms were interpreted by poll respondents.

B. FINDINGS

In this section we present the data on each question. For the first three questions, Level of Awareness of Development Assistance, Attitudes About Development Assistance, and Key Themes, Common Misconceptions, Unanswered Questions, we present first the baseline data from the PIPA study *Americans on Foreign Aid and World Hunger: A Study of US Public Attitudes*, which were collected in November, 2000, followed by the post September 11, 2001 data from the *WorldView 2002* report, which were collected in June, 2002. The data for the final question, Messages and Themes that Now Resonate with Audiences, are taken only from the *WorldViews 2002* report and topline (data) report.

1. Level of Awareness of Development Assistance

From reading the two reports from which we drew these data, and related reports not presented here, it is probably fair to say that few members of the adult public know what development assistance is; especially when using the term "development assistance." However, there are many polls that ask participants to rate the importance of "foreign aid" as a federal government program or otherwise seek a sense of the level of approval for such a concept.

Before September 11, 2001:⁹ Below we present three measures of awareness of development assistance that give us baseline figures on the public's response to the importance of "foreign aid," approval of "[the US] being active in world affairs," and approval of foreign aid. We chose these items since the question from the PIPA poll was flawed.¹⁰

⁹ All data from a PIPA poll report, February 2001, ("Foreign Aid and World Hunger") based on data collected in November 2000, N=901 plus 4 focus groups, except for the NPR/Kaiser/Harvard 1999 data.

¹⁰ As mentioned in Section B, Methodology, above, this question was: "The United States should be willing to share at least a small portion of its wealth with those in the world who are in great need." This is a "loaded" question, which includes terms (share, wealth, great need) designed to elicit positive answers.

- ▶ **60%** believe that "*foreign aid is an important federal government program.*"

This measure comes from a 1999 poll jointly sponsored by National Public Radio, the Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University. It was cited in the PIPA 2001 *Foreign Aid and World Hunger* report, from which the remainder of our baseline figures were taken. We chose this measure over the PIPA question because it was worded in a more neutral fashion and, therefore, less likely to be inflated due to bias. Of the 60 percent who rated "foreign aid" as an important federal government program, 14 percent rated it as "very important" and 46 percent as "somewhat important."

A second measure touches a more general disposition:

- ▶ **88%** agree: "*It's best for the future of our country to be active in world affairs.*"

This measure comes from a Pew Research Center poll conducted in September-October, 1999. Of the 88 percent agreeing, 45 percent reported the "completely agree" and 43 percent reported they "mostly agree." In Pew's prior survey, in 1989, 93 percent agreed with the statement.

Finally, the *Worldviews 2002* report gave 1998 Worldviews data on approval of "giving economic aid to other nations."

- ▶ **47%** favor "*giving economic aid to other nations.*"

After September 11, 2001: Our two measures of post September 11, 2001 are taken from the *WorldViews 2002* data, and include two of the above three questions: "active part in world affairs" and "giving economic aid to other nations."

- ▶ **71%** agree "*...best for the future of our country if we take an active part in world affairs rather than stay out.*"

In their 1998 poll, this same question yielded 61 percent agreement.

- ▶ **54%** favor "*giving economic aid to other nations.*"

These figures show that there have been no dramatic changes in approval for the US taking an active part in world affairs and giving economic aid to others since September 11, 2001.

2. *Attitudes About Development Assistance*

The data provide three dimensions of attitudes towards development assistance: (1) the degree to which people feel that "foreign aid" is an important federal program, (2) views on the magnitude of funding for foreign aid, and (3) how foreign aid is ranked among priorities.

Before September 11, 2001: As presented above, before September 11, 2001 there was a majority of support for foreign aid; the median¹¹ estimate of its portion of the federal budget was at about 20 percent; 10 percent (median) was seen as a more appropriate level; there was support for reducing foreign aid; and the public placed domestic concerns above giving assistance to others.

- ▶ Support for foreign aid: **60%** support foreign aid as important federal program.
- ▶ Foreign Aid's part of the federal budget: **20% (median)**.
- ▶ An appropriate portion of the federal budget for foreign aid: **10% (median)**.
- ▶ **40%** favored "cutting foreign aid." (Question: "*Does this mean you want to cut foreign aid?*" asked of the 61.4% giving the answered "Too much" in the previous question: "*Do you feel that the amount the US spends on foreign aid is too much, too little, or about right?*")
- ▶ **84%** agree that: "*Taking care of problems at home is more important than giving aid to foreign countries.*"

After September 11, 2001: The same five content areas show little change in views after September 11, 2001.

- ▶ Support for foreign aid: **54%** favor. (Question: "*On the whole, do you favor or oppose giving economic aid¹² to other countries?*")
- ▶ Foreign Aid's part of the federal budget: **25% (median)**.¹³ (Question: "*Just based on what you know, please tell me your hunch about what percentage of the federal budget goes to foreign aid.*")
- ▶ An appropriate portion of the federal budget for foreign aid: **10% (median)**. (Question: "*What do you think would be an appropriate percentage of the federal budget to go to foreign aid, if any?*")
- ▶ **48%** would "cut back economic aid to other nations." (Question: "*Now I am going to read a list of present federal government programs. For each, I would like you to tell me whether you feel it should be expanded, cut back, or kept about the same. Education,*

¹¹ The median is that point in a distribution that is "in the middle:" half of the responses are higher than the median and half are lower. We use the median, rather than the mean (arithmetic average), when a distribution is structured so that one or more extreme values distorts the mean. This tends to happen often when money is being estimated or reported. When the median is used, it is good form to also report the mean, so that the critical reader can determine how far apart the two figures are, and our sources have done so.

¹² Note: "economic aid to other countries" and "foreign aid" are different.

¹³ A similar question was asked of a PIPA panel in July 2002¹³. Hypothetically \$100 of "new money" was to be added to "defense spending and foreign aid,"¹³ and participants were invited to allocate this new money between the two programs. They allocated medians of \$75 to defense and \$25 to foreign aid. Observing more than one approach to a question gives us more confidence in our figures when different ways of asking a question yield similar answers.

Defense, Social Security, Military Aid to Other Nations, Economic Aid to Other Nations, Health Care, ...")

- ▶ **Priorities for Foreign Aid:** measures of the extent to which respondents' replies supported the pre-September 11, 2001 PIPA findings that the public supports the notion of "taking care of things at home before helping abroad." The average percent "very important foreign policy goal" for the top five domestic-related issues¹⁴ was **80%** compared to the average percent for the top four foreign policy goals relating only to other countries, **42%**. (Question: *"I am going to read a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. For each one please say whether you think it should be a very important foreign policy goal of the United States, a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all."*)

Among the specific foreign policy goals concerned with other countries, humanitarian issues, such as hunger, (61%) are more popular than the spread of democracy (34% and 43%) and improving the standard of living (30%). However, putting the concerns of other countries second to the personal concerns of US residents did not mean that they thought that foreign aid should not be US policy. *WorldViews 2002* respondents rejected the view of the US as only contributing military support or expertise worldwide.

- ▶ **56% disagree:** *"Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: It makes sense for Europe and the US to specialize in their role in the world. Because the US has the strongest military the US should take the lead responsibility and supply most of the forces when it comes to military conflict. Europe should instead emphasize things like assisting poor countries develop their economies and trying to help reconstruct societies after a war."*

3. **Key Themes, Common Misconceptions, Unanswered Questions**

Since the two main sources of public opinion data had different themes in addition to questions about foreign aid and foreign policy goals, there is less one-to-one comparable data on specifics; however, there was enough joint data to compare views before and after September 11, 2001.

Before September 11, 2001: Within the series of questions on reasons for giving foreign aid we found three key themes, identified five popular programs and three unpopular ones. Finally, in probing reasons for channeling foreign aid in certain ways, the PIPA report identified a concern about foreign aid.

¹⁴ Top five domestic issues and percent very important foreign policy goal: Combating international terrorism, 91%; Protecting the jobs of American workers, 85%; Stopping flow of illegal drugs into the United States, 81%; Securing adequate supplies of energy, 75%; and Controlling and reducing illegal immigration, 70%. Top four related to other countries: Combating world hunger, 61%; Helping to improve the standard of living of less developed nations, 30%; Helping bring a democratic form of government to other nations, 34%; and Strengthening international law and institutions, 43%.

(1) *Key Themes:* the two most highly endorsed reasons for giving foreign aid and the reason with the lowest score¹⁵ were:

- ▶ "To alleviate hunger and disease in poor countries." Score 7.71 (**77%**)
- ▶ "To help poor countries develop their economies" Score 6.42 (**64%**)
- ▶ "To increase US influence over other countries" Score 4.40 (**44%**)

(2) *Popular programs:* the four most highly endorsed ways of giving foreign aid¹⁶ were:

- ▶ "Child survival programs, which includes prenatal care immunizations, and nutrition." score 7.66 (**76%**)
- ▶ "Education and training for people in poor countries." score 7.04 (**70%**)
- ▶ "Programs that focus on helping women and girls in poor countries." score 6.81 (**68%**)
- ▶ "The Peace Corps" score 7.07 (**70%**)

One stand-alone question reinforced the notion of programming for women:¹⁷

- ▶ **66%** "It seems like a good idea for aid programs to put special emphasis on helping women."

(3) *Unpopular programs:* Several less popular programs could also be determined from the question on different forms of giving foreign aid:

- ▶ "Military aid, which provide weapons and materiel to countries that are friendly to the US." score 4.26 (**42%**)
- ▶ "Aid to Israel and Egypt, which includes military and economic aid." score 4.45 (**44%**)
- ▶ "Military aid to Colombia to help them fight drug traffickers." score 5.32 (**53%**)

(4) *Concerns:* Finally, the PIPA poll asked questions about giving foreign aid to countries that do not espouse key US values and difficulties in delivering foreign aid due to corruption.

- ▶ Undemocratic practices: **77%** agree "too much foreign aid goes to governments that are not very democratic and have poor human rights records."
- ▶ Corruption in the assisted country: **50%** (median) "% of US aid money that goes to poor countries that ends up in the pockets of corrupt government officials there." **53%** agree that "the corruption in African governments is so widespread that US aid money does little good there." is a "convincing argument" and **81%** agree "When the US gives aid to

¹⁵Question: "Here is a list of reasons for giving aid to other countries. For each one, please tell me how good a reason it is for giving aid on a scale of 1 to 10, with 0 meaning very bad reasons, 10 meaning a very good reason, and 5 being neutral."

¹⁶Question: "Now I'm going to read you a list of different forms of giving foreign aid. For each one, tell me how you feel about it on a scale of 1 to 10, with 0 being very bad, 10 being a very good, and 5 being neutral."

¹⁷Question: "Some people who study economic development say that aid programs should put special emphasis on helping women, because they are more apt to share the benefits with children and other family members, and because when women are more economically secure they tend to have fewer children. Others argue that is not right to emphasize women because it discriminates against men and it might interfere with the prevailing culture in those countries. Do you think that it seems like a good idea or not a good idea for aid programs to put special emphasis on helping women?"

a country it is generally best to work through programs that directly help the people who really need it, because it is less likely to end up in the pockets of corrupt government officials."

Unanswered question:

- ▶ What percentages of federal budget do people think are assigned to other programs and activities, so we can put the 20%-24% for foreign aid in context?

Bostrom (Oct. 1999 paper) says that John Doble Research Associates did a 1996 qualitative study using 6 focus groups, 6 "National Issues Forums," and 12 in-depth interviews, on "educating people on the real budget percentage for foreign aid and the comparison with other countries." Beliefs did not change. He found that they included everything possible as foreign aid, including any defense spending that benefits other countries. It would be a valid and worthwhile exercise to give respondents a series of federal budget topics (national defense, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and so forth¹⁸) in a questions similar to the one dividing the new \$100 between defense spending and foreign aid cited above, and have them allocate the federal budget "pie."

After September 11, 2001: The *WorldViews 2002* data provide comparative information on two of the three key themes, two of the five popular programs, all three of the unpopular programs, and no information on perceived corruption.

(1) *Key Themes*

- ▶ **84%** favor giving "Food and medical assistance to people in needy countries." as a "type of foreign aid." Compare to pre-data, **77%** (score 7.71) "good reason for giving foreign aid... for alleviating hunger and disease in poor countries."

While the pre and post data are not identical, they are very much treating the same topic. The post data are on a "type of foreign aid," and the pre data are on "good reasons for giving foreign aid." The "food and medical assistance" subject of the post data question is very close to "hunger and disease," the subject of the pre data. Finally, "poor countries" of the post data are very close to the "needy countries" of the pre data. These are similar enough to say that a high level of support continues. Also see in the post data that **61%** rated "Combating world hunger." as a "very important foreign policy goal."

- ▶ **74%** favor "Aid that helps needy countries develop their economies." as a "type of foreign aid." Compared to pre data, **64%** (score 6.42) "good reason for giving foreign aid...help poor countries develop their economies."

Again these questions are very close: the "needy countries" (post data) and "poor countries" (pre data) are very much the same as are "type of foreign aid" (post data) and "reason for giving

¹⁸ *The Fiscal Year 2003 A Citizen's Guide to the Federal Budget*, published by the Office of Management and Budget provides a chart, *How Your Tax Dollars Are Spent in 2003*, on page 4. The budget categories are: Social Security, 22%; National Defense, 17%; Non-Defense Discretionary, 20%; Medicare, 11%; Medicaid, 7%; Net Interest, 9%; Other Mandatory, 8%; and Other Income-Tested Entitlements, 6%. Notice that several of these categories are too vague to include in the "pie" question.

foreign aid" (pre data). We can say that the majority continues to support assistance to less well off countries.

- ▶ "To increase US influence over other countries." There was nothing about influence over other countries in the WorldViews 2002 data.

(2) *Popular Programs*

- ▶ "Child survival programs, which includes prenatal care immunizations, and nutrition." There was nothing with this detail in the WorldViews 2002 data.
- ▶ "Education and training for people in poor countries." There was nothing with this detail in the WorldViews 2002 data.
- ▶ **80%** favor "Aid for women's education in poor countries to reduce population growth." as a "type of foreign aid." Compare to pre data: "programs that focus on helping women and girls in poor countries" **68%** (score 6.81) rate this as a "good reason(s) for foreign aid."

The content of these two items is similar, however the post measure is very specific to educating women about family planning while the pre measure is very general, the "help" could be economic, literacy education, and so forth.

- ▶ "Good idea to put special emphasis on helping women." There was nothing with this detail in the WorldViews 2002 data.
- ▶ **35% favor** increases in economic aid for "African countries." This was the country with the largest percentage in favor of increases. Afghanistan had the second largest percentage in favor of increasing aid, at 22%. In the WorldViews 1998 poll, **24%** favored increases in aid to the African countries.

The 11 point change from 1998 shows a continued positive feeling towards assisting the African countries.

- ▶ "The Peace Corps." There was nothing with this detail in the WorldViews 2002 data.

(3) *Unpopular programs*

- ▶ **76%** positive feeling about NATO.¹⁹ Compare to pre data where **42%** "feel good" about "military aid, which provides weapons and materiel to countries that are friendly to the US," as a "form of foreign aid."

These two items are similar in general.

¹⁹ This includes 65% for "keep the same" and 11% for "increase commitment." Question: "Next, we have a question about NATO, the military organization of Western Europe and the United States. Do you feel we should increase our commitment to NATO, keep our commitment where it is now, decrease our commitment but still remain in NATO, or withdraw from NATO entirely?"

- ▶ **65%** favor "The use of US troops to be a part of an international peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians"²⁰ Note, however, that WorldViews 2002 data show that 71% feel that the US should not take either side, Israel's or Palestine's, in that matter. The only comparable question in the pre data is flawed. It showed that **44%** "feel good about" "aid to Israel and Egypt, which includes military and economic aid" as a "form of foreign aid."²¹

We can say that when the subject is clear, such as the hostility between Israel and the Palestinians, there is currently support for using US troops in a peacekeeping operation as long as the troops remain neutral (do not favor either side), while before September 11, 2001 the PIPA poll showed concerns about giving military and economic aid to Israel and Egypt.

- ▶ **66%** favor "using US troops to fight drug lords in Colombia."²² Compare to pre data: **53%** (score 5.32) "feel good" about this "form of foreign aid:...military aid to Colombia to help them fight drug traffickers."

We can generally say that there is support for using US troops in Colombia's drug prevention attempts. These two items were phrased from different points of view. The WorldViews 2002 questions set up Colombia and drug production as problems for US citizens while the earlier PIPA poll set up Colombia as a recipient of US assistance to help them solve their drug trafficking problem. This shows how a matter can be framed as a domestic problem for the US or as a problem for the country receiving the aid. A good test would be to phrase the question both ways for the same respondents and find out if there is more support for using US troops in Colombia drug interdiction efforts if it is posed as our problem or their problem.

(4) *Concerns*

There were no data in the WorldViews 2002 data on corruption in the assisted country.

4. *Messages and Themes that Now Resonate with Audiences*

The WorldViews 2002 report made an important point about the public's current interest in world news. It states that "Public interest in world news is the highest in 30 years." A total of 84% of their respondents said they were interested in world news: 42% rated themselves as "very interested," and 42% rated themselves as "somewhat interested." In the 1998 WorldViews poll, 29% rated themselves as "very interested" in world news.

A review of the WorldViews 2002 data shows that specific programs are rated more favorably than general terms, for example, 54% favor "giving economic aid to other countries," but 74% favor "aid that helps needy countries develop their economies."

²⁰ Question: "There has been some discussion about circumstances that might justify using US troops in other parts of the world. I'd like to ask your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...to be a part..."

²¹ Israel and Egypt are engaged in two different matters, so it is unclear what respondents are agreeing or disagreeing with. Using two unrelated subjects in a poll question is called "double-barreled" and is a sign of either poor writing or an attempt to produce biased data.

²² Question: "There has been some discussion about circumstances that might justify using US troops in other parts of the world. I'd like to ask your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...to fight drug lords in Colombia."

Likewise, humanitarian programs receive more support than programs aimed at influencing political organization. For example, 84% favor "food and medical assistance to people in needy countries" as a type of foreign aid. In the same question 64% favor "assistance to promote democracy abroad" as a type of foreign aid.

Finally, the magnitude of support for a particular program or goal seems to be context driven. For example, "Improving the standard of living in less developed countries" was rated as a very important foreign policy goal by 30% of respondents, the lowest rated of twenty "foreign policy goals," which included "Combating international terrorism," (91% very important, the highest rated) and "Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons." 90% very important, second highest rated.) Yet, in another question on "types of foreign aid" which included food and medical assistance, economic development, prevention and treatment of AIDS, birth control, and so forth, economic development assistance was endorsed by 74% of respondents.

In the sections below we present specific themes from WorldViews 2002 that were strongly endorsed in the areas of international development, geographic interests, and topical concerns.

(a) International Development

- ▶ Providing food and medical assistance: 84% favor this as a foreign policy goal.
- ▶ Population control: 80% favor foreign aid that would provide education to reduce population growth.
- ▶ Economic development: 74% favor foreign aid "that helps needy countries develop their economies."

(b) Geographic Interests

- ▶ Africa ("African countries") is the most popular place to give foreign aid. Africa received the largest number of endorsements to increase aid to the area: 35% of respondents agreed with this. It appears that humanitarian aid to Africa, solely for the purpose of doing good, is strongly favored.
- ▶ Colombia. Support for helping to reduce drug production in Colombia has a strong self interest strain, in terms of helping to reduce the drug problem in the US. In WorldViews 2002 Colombia was invoked in terms of using our troops to fight Colombian drug lords, which got strong support (66% favor). This compares to 61% in favor of helping Pakistan fight a radical Islamic revolution and 65% in favor of joining an international peacekeeping force in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

(c) Topics of Concern

The WorldViews 2002 poll was conducted earlier in the year than is usual to capture attitudes influenced by the September 11, 2001 attack and to get a report out in a timely fashion. Therefore the international situation was more prominent in this poll than in previous ones. Nevertheless, the respondents showed concern about humanitarian matters in addition to an emphasis on the US and its problems. The key topics of concern were: terrorism, nuclear arms

control, saving American jobs and illegal drugs. Humanitarian issues, hunger, medical need, and population control, are of concern, however. Also important are two matters that affect all life: the spread of nuclear weapons, and the global environment.

- ▶ **Multilateralism:** 61% of the respondents believed that the more important lesson of September, 11, 2001 is "to work more closely with one another."²³
- ▶ **Terrorism:** Was first among the "two to three biggest problems facing" the US today, endorsed by 36% of respondents. "The Economy" was second, with 22%, Education ("improving our schools), was third with 11%, and "National Security/Defense" was fourth with 10%. All other topics were endorsed by fewer than 10% of the respondents. Terrorism was also the most highly rated "foreign policy problems" facing the US today, endorsed by 33%.
- ▶ **Tension in the Middle East:** The "Mid-East Situation" and "Unrest in Israel/Arab/Palestine" were the second and third highest rated "foreign policy problems" facing the US today, endorsed by 12% and 9% (following "terrorism" as noted just above).
- ▶ **Food and Medicine:** Humanitarian issues, especially providing food and medicine, are very important. "Combating world hunger" was rated as a very important foreign policy goal by 61% of respondents and 84% favor giving food and medical assistance to people in needy countries."
- ▶ **The Global Environment:** The public is also very concerned about the earth. "Improving" the environment was rated as a very important foreign policy goal by 66%. The environment was among the top ten most highly rated foreign policy goals, including preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, 90% and combating world hunger, 61%.

C. CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ The American public appears to be more interested now in world news than in the last 30 years.
- ▶ Americans agree that we have a role to play in the world, and that military assistance should not be only what we offer.
- ▶ "Everyday themes" such as hunger and the need for medical assistance, and other non strategic concerns, such as the global environment continue to have universal appeal as worthy areas with which to help other countries and/or use our resources.
- ▶ In terms of specific programs, there is not enough post data available in the WorldViews 2002 data to prioritize programs thought to be most worthwhile. Specific programs, however, will resonant more with the public then general concerns or jargon. In the

²³ Question: "What do you think is the more important less on of September 11th; that the US needs to work more closely with other countries to fight terrorism, or that the US needs to act on its own more to fight terrorism?"

WorldViews data (and in other data) the public continues to respond to improving the plight of women and children in other countries and to have concerns about strengthening other countries' economies.

- ▶ Poll data use different terms in referring to development assistance that have not been shown to mean the same thing to the public. It is important to be critical in accepting public opinion data. The exact words used in the question and the population from which the sample was drawn have everything to do with the validity of the information for policy and program formulation.
- ▶ If the often repeated notion that the public overestimates the proportion of the federal budget committed to development assistance is a concern, there are simple ways to obtain valid and reliable data on the phenomenon. Current measures simply repeat flawed questions, continuing to yield flawed data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amundson, Daniel R., Linda S. Lichter, and S. Robert Lichter. 1999. *The Myopic Neighbor: Local and National Network Television Coverage of the World. September 29, 1999 to October 24, 1999*. The Frameworks Institute. Washington, D.C.

Aubrun, Axel and Joseph Grady. 1999. *American Understandings of the United States' Role in the World: Findings from Cognitive Interviews. October 14, 1999*. The Frameworks Institute. Washington, D.C.

Aubrun, Axel and Joseph Grady. 2000. *A Window on the Storm: How TV News Promotes A Cognitive "Refuge Stance." October 2, 2000*. The Frameworks Institute. Washington, D.C.

Aubrun, Axel and Joseph Grady. 2001 *Policymakers and International Engagement. Findings from Cognitive Elicitations*. The Frameworks Institute. Washington, D.C.

Bostrom, Meg. 2001. *Public Attitudes Toward Foreign Affairs: An Overview of the Current State of Public Opinion, October, 1999*. The Frameworks Institute, Washington, D.C.

Grady, Joseph and Axel Aubrun. 1999. *10 Differences Between Public and Expert Understandings of International Affairs. November, 1999*. The Frameworks Institute. Washington, D.C.

Jussim, Jude. 2002. *From Values to Advocacy, Activating the Public's Support for US Engagement in an Interdependent World. A Three Year Report on the Global Interdependence Initiative*. David Devlin-Foxitz, editor. The Aspen Institute. Washington, DC.

Pew Research Center, 1999. *People & The Press: 1999 Values Update Survey*. Pew Research Center for The People and The Press, Washington, D.C.

Program on International Policy Attitudes. 2001. *Americans on Foreign Aid and World Hunger: A Study of U.S. Public Attitudes*. Program on International Attitudes (PIPA), Center on Policy Attitudes and Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, University of Maryland. College Park, MD. February.

Program on International Policy Attitudes. 2002. *Americans on Defense Spending and the War on Terrorism: A PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll*. Program on International Attitudes (PIPA), Center on Policy Attitudes and Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, University of Maryland. College Park, MD. August.

Public Broadcasting System. 2002. *Talk of War: Jim Lehrer Interview Transcript*. October 7.

Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. 2002. *Search Results: US Public Opinion on the Role of the United States in the World: Attitudes Towards Foreign Policy*. Roper Center for Public Opinion Research., University of Connecticut.

Roper ASW. 2002. *National Geographic-Roper 2002 Global Geographic Literacy Survey*. November. National Geographic Society. Washington, D.C.

PART TWO: DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The USAID Development Education Program was authorized under the Biden-Pell amendment to the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980, and the first grants were awarded in 1982. Since then, the Development Education Program – also known as the Biden-Pell Program – has gone through a number of iterations, each time drawing on the lessons learned and evolving to meet new realities. The program was redesigned in 1993 after an extensive and intensive evaluation, and was restructured again in 1996 to maximize impact in light of considerably reduced resources. Since 1996, the program has tried to reach larger audiences and to expand its impact through partnership projects between U.S.-based development organizations and domestic U.S. organizations with a wide membership base.

This assessment examined the program’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as its future potential in light of:

- ▶ increased American interest in international affairs since September 11, 2001,
- ▶ the program’s experience and results since 1996, and
- ▶ its move within USAID from the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) to Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA).

It is based on interviews with a selected number of grantees, observers and practitioners of development education in the United States and elsewhere, Hill staff who oversee the program, as well as reports and articles examining the current development education field.

The goal of the program has been to “create an atmosphere in the United States of understanding and interest in public and private international development efforts.” It has functioned as a small grants program to fund innovative educational projects that:

- ▶ convey a compelling development education message,
- ▶ reach new and diverse domestic audiences,
- ▶ use partnerships to leverage resources and audiences,
- ▶ have potential to achieve demonstrable results,
- ▶ leverage financial support for development education, and
- ▶ are likely to be sustainable beyond USAID funding.

Lessons Learned

Message. A general focus on the connection between domestic and global concerns has been an essential part of recent Biden-Pell grants. Applicants and grantees can interpret this requirement in a number of ways – looking either at broad links affecting the country as a whole or finding a specific development issue that would be of interest or concern to the specific target audience. In either case, the message must show the links between domestic and international concerns and why international development assistance is in the interest of the United States. *This “local-global” connections theme has ensured that materials and programs were made relevant to the target audience.*

Audience. The focus of the Biden-Pell program has been to promote innovative projects. Target audiences have included church members; farmers and ranchers; geography, agriculture, social studies, and environmental science teachers, medical students, librarians and library patrons; health center managers; faculty and undergraduate students in business, economics, and international trade; African-American women entrepreneurs; members in the Hispanic American community; members of the National Audubon Society and the League of Women Voters; business and labor leaders, returned Peace Corps volunteers; and employees and consumers of rural electric cooperatives, among others. A small grants program promoting innovation can reach a broad and diverse audience.

Partnership. Since 1996, at least one of the project partners was required to have “natural links” through professional affiliation or a membership base other than donors to a particular segment of the U.S. public. *This partnership approach appears to have significantly increased the audience reached per project.*

Evaluation. Limited resources for data collection and ongoing monitoring, combined with the short timeframe of the USAID-funded projects, mean that *relatively little effort has been devoted to systematically evaluating impact or measuring results.*

Resources. The requirement that applicants provide matching funds has been considered a positive aspect of the program forcing organizations to commit seriously to a development education project by investing their own resources. It is not clear how much of this contribution has been in-kind, and some argue that it prevents good organizations from applying. Nevertheless, to obtain USAID funds, *grantees have had to commit their own time and resources to development education.*

Sustainability. Although there are many stories about development education efforts that have continued beyond the funding period, the evidence is largely anecdotal, and *there is no clear picture of whether or how grantees have continued their commitment to development education independent of USAID funding.*

In addition to these findings about the USAID Development Education Program, a number of additional lessons come from the broader field of development education:

- There is a need for success stories about development to incorporate in development education materials and programs — both USAID successes and others’.
- Evaluation has been a neglected component of development education efforts — not just among USAID projects, not just in the United States, but in the field generally.
- There is little evidence that development education projects are learning from each other, building on each other’s experiences, or sharing materials.
- Like other education efforts, and like development itself, development education is an investment in the longer term.

Development education extends well beyond USAID-funded projects, and there is much to be learned from efforts in Europe, Britain, and Canada, as well as from a range of other activities in the United States. For whether the efforts are called “development education” or not, but

considerable effort, thought, and attention is being given in various U.S. sectors to the larger question of:

- How Americans see their role in the world,
- What Americans know and think,
- How they acquire information,
- The kinds of materials that make a difference.

Among all these efforts, there is a clear need for:

- greater synergy and impact among individual efforts,
- longer-term availability and wider distribution of development education materials, and
- better tools and methods for measuring results.

Although far from a complete evaluation, this assessment points to several levels at which USAID can help to meet these identified needs, depending upon its resources and commitment. Action at each of these levels should involve:

- consultation with key organizations and sectors concerned with engaging Americans in development issues,
- development of strategic partnerships in order to maximize effectiveness, and
- awareness of how USAID efforts fit into the larger picture.

USAID could engage in any or all of the following four levels of effort:

- ▶ At a minimum, create a central web-based mechanism for the exchange of materials and lessons learned. Such a mechanism could:
 - capture the best materials and ensure that they are widely available,
 - promote dialog and exchange of ideas about methods that work,
 - allow efforts aimed at similar geographic or issue-oriented audiences to collaborate, and
 - provide a forum for lessons learned.
- ▶ Better still, help launch a more dynamic central mechanism that can do all of the above plus:
 - act as a voice to promote greater attention to the issue of American interests and involvement in developing countries,
 - work actively with key sectors to develop strategies to increase public awareness, and
 - help to improve effectiveness by promoting best practices and better evaluation.
- ▶ Concentrate USAID's direct effort on a particular audience segment or issue. However, the activities and audiences for a concentrated effort should be part of an overall plan

developed with the input and participation of strategic partners in many sectors. A focused plan should be:

- based on messages that have been demonstrated to work,
 - based on good knowledge and understanding of past lessons, existing materials, and relevant actors,
 - made in collaboration with a wide range of organizations that can help shape it, implement it, and take ownership of it,
 - informed by previous efforts in the United States and elsewhere, and
 - able to demonstrate measurable results.
- ▶ Consider taking a convening role in developing a broad-based, high-level, multi-sector educational effort.

INTRODUCTION — THE BIDEN-PELL PROGRAM IN 2003 AND BEYOND

The USAID Development Education Program was authorized under the Biden-Pell amendment to the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980, and the first grants were awarded in 1982. Since then, the Development Education Program – also known as the Biden-Pell Program – has gone through a number of iterations, each time drawing on the lessons learned and evolving to meet new realities. The program was redesigned in 1993 after an extensive and intensive evaluation, and was restructured again in 1996 to maximize impact in light of considerably reduced resources.

In the grants since 1996, the program has sought to reach larger audiences and to expand its impact through partnership projects between U.S.-based development organizations and domestic U.S. organizations with a wide membership base. Initially awarded as one-year grants from 1996 through 1998, the program switched to a two-year grant period in 1999 and 2001, with no new grants in the second year.

This assessment of the effectiveness, impact, and lessons learned of the current program is based on interviews with a selected number of grantees, observers and practitioners of development education in the United States and elsewhere, Hill staff who oversee the program, as well as reports and articles examining the current development education field. It is paired with an assessment of public opinion pre- and post-9/11 conducted simultaneously by Diana Davis of Development Associates. It is not a quantitative evaluation of all projects, but a qualitative examination of the program's strengths and weaknesses, as well as its future potential in light of:

- ▶ increased American interest in international affairs since September 11, 2001 (see separate section on U.S. public opinion since 9/11),
- ▶ the program's experience and results since 1996, and
- ▶ its move within USAID from the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) to Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA).

A. CURRENT PROGRAM

Since the partnership approach was initiated in 1996, the Biden-Pell program has awarded 26 grants:

FY 1996	5 one-year grants (totaling \$350,000 and promising a match of \$580,000, or 1.6 dollars for every USAID dollar)
FY 1997	7 one-year grants (totaling \$750,000 and promising a match of \$1.2 million, or 1.6 dollars for every USAID dollar)
FY 1998	5 one-year grants (totaling \$500,000 and promising a match of \$778,000, or 1.5 dollars for every USAID dollar)
FY 1999	5 two-year grants (totaling \$1.5 million and promising a match of \$2.2 million, or 1.4 dollars for every USAID dollar)
FY 2001	4 grants (totaling \$750,000 and promising a match of \$465,000, or 62 cents for every USAID dollar).

1. Goals, Objectives, Strategy

As stated in the most recent RFA, the goal of the Development Education Program is to “create an atmosphere in the United States of understanding and interest in public and private international development efforts.” It is a public-private effort with the following specific objectives (as identified in recent RFAs):

- ▶ to increase Americans knowledge and understanding of how and why U.S. public and private international development efforts are in the interest of the United States,
- ▶ to increase U.S. citizens’ participation in private and public international development and humanitarian programs, and
- ▶ to increase middle and high school students’ knowledge of global issues and international development and why developing countries are important to the political, economic security, and humanitarian interests of the United States.

The program has functioned as a small grants program to fund innovative educational projects that:

- ▶ convey a compelling development education message,
- ▶ reach new and diverse domestic audiences,
- ▶ use partnerships to leverage resources and audiences,
- ▶ have potential to achieve demonstrable results,
- ▶ leverage financial support for development education, and
- ▶ are likely to be sustainable beyond USAID funding.

2. Lessons Learned

This assessment did not include a formal evaluation of the results achieved by each of the 22 projects completed (reports are not yet in on the most recent round of projects), and thus no definitive statement about the numbers of individuals reached can be made. But a reading of the available grantee final reports (12) and interviews with selected grantees — as well as with observers of the larger field of development education — suggest a number of conclusions.

- ▶ **The “local-global” connections theme ensured that materials and programs were made relevant to the target audience.**

Although there was not a single message, a general focus on the connection between domestic and global concerns has been an essential part of recent Biden-Pell grants. Applicants and grantees can interpret this requirement in a number of ways – looking either at broad links affecting the country as a whole or finding a specific development issue that would be of interest or concern to the specific target audience. In either case, the message must show the links between domestic and international concerns and why international development assistance is in the interest of the United States. Recent RFAs also stressed that the information provided must be balanced, objective, and factual; that it must provide content on the relationship of poverty and hunger to a range of U.S. concerns; and that it must provide “active learning opportunities.” These components have previously been shown to make a difference for program success.

The long-running debate over whether American audiences respond better to humanitarian or self-interest reasons for U.S. development assistance continues to crop up in conversations about development education messages, and is in fact addressed in the public opinion section of this report. But interviews with those who have been doing development education or are close observers of the field suggest a number of points.

- There is not unanimous agreement on what kind of message works best, and it does to some extent vary by audience.
 - The humanitarian message, or one based on religious or moral beliefs, helps to capture initial interest. But sustained interest is built through more direct substantive connections — a U.S. telephone lineman talking to his colleagues about the work of linemen in developing countries electrifying a village; social studies teachers in West Virginia talking to kids about the role of mountains in their own state and Nepal; medical students learning about health issues in other countries; farmers or agriculture students learning about how world food supply affects U.S. farm interests.
 - The message of connectedness in general — and specific connections to the interests of a particular audience — seems to engage participants especially when they can follow up with some action in their area of interest or concern. As identified in the public opinion analysis, U.S. interest in developing countries is stronger since 9/11 than at any point in recent years.
- ▶ **A small grants program promoting innovation can reach a broad and diverse audience.**

The focus of the Biden-Pell program has continued to be to promote innovative projects. As such, it includes a diverse range of organizations, activities, and audiences. For example:

- FY 1996 grants targeted church members, farmers and ranchers, geography and environmental science teachers, medical students.
- FY 1997 grants targeted librarians and library patrons; health center managers; faculty and undergraduate students in business, economics, and international trade; African-American women entrepreneurs; medical students; members in the Hispanic American community; members of the National Audubon Society and the League of Women Voters.

- FY 1998 grants targeted agriculture and social studies teachers; business and labor leaders, returned Peace Corps volunteers; members of the Hispanic American community.
- FY 1999 grants targeted librarians and library patrons; teachers in agricultural education; employees and consumers of rural electric cooperatives; members of the Hispanic American community, and elementary school children.
- FY 2001 grants targeted middle- and high-school teachers in a variety of disciplines, including agriculture, social studies, environmental science.

These and previous grants demonstrate that the messages of development education — that developing countries are connected to local, specific concerns — can be relevant for a wide range of audiences. Annex A lists the intended audience for each project, 1996-1999. If each of these programs succeeded in all of its objectives and in fully reaching its intended audience, important questions nevertheless remain: Is the original audience continuing to use the materials/programs/activities beyond the life of the project? Are the materials available to others who could make use of them? Are they in fact still usable and used?

No systematic evaluation has been done in recent years of these or other grants to determine their ongoing impact. But anecdotal evidence indicates that in at least some cases, program materials continue to be available, programs have continued beyond USAID funding, and grantees have continued to develop other educational activities around development issues and themes.

- ▶ **The partnership approach appears to have significantly increased the audience reached per project.**

Observers of the development education field in general (and the Biden-Pell program in particular) see the partnerships required by recent grants as a significant strengthening of the program. As one observer commented, “it gave legs” to the projects, that is, it ensured a wide outreach by organizations with both a commitment to engaging the U.S. public on development issues as well as some ongoing capacity to do so. At least one of the partners was required to have “natural links” through professional affiliation or a membership base other than donors to a particular segment of the U.S. public. This requirement extended USAID’s development education grants to new audiences.

Grantees and observers cited a number of benefits directly attributable to the partnership approach:

- It extends the message beyond individuals already associated with the development organization to a new audience with potential, but untapped, interest.
- It utilizes existing networks to disseminate new messages. By broadening an audience’s existing involvement with a particular subject (e.g., rural electric cooperatives, gardening, social studies, agriculture, health) to include a development focus, the development message, although new, fits into a known and familiar context.
- When time is allowed, and effort is made, for audience input into the development of materials, the resulting product is better, better received, and more widely used.

Difficulties cited included:

- One-year is a rather short period in which to establish and formalize a working relationship; develop, test, and improve materials; and then complete dissemination. (Where product development is not involved, one-year may be adequate.) A frequently repeated comment was that audience feedback can substantially improve both product and process, and the one-year timeframe does not allow for such a feedback loop from the audience.
 - Organizations and personnel already involved in many activities may have difficulty scheduling adequate time with each other within a short period of time, particularly on the front end of a project that has to get off the ground quickly.
 - The short timeframe does not allow for adequate follow up and assessment.
- ▶ **Relatively little effort has been devoted to systematically evaluating impact or measuring results.**

The stated objectives of the Development Education program are to increase Americans' knowledge and understanding of how and why U.S. public and private development efforts are in the interest of the United States, as well as their participation in such programs. Determining success in this area requires adequate baseline data and capacity to measure change in participants' knowledge, attitude, or behavior as a result of the project. In practice, this appears to be a difficult area for grantees for a number of reasons:

- Limited resources make it difficult to devote adequate effort to data collection and ongoing monitoring.
- The one-year timeframe of most projects means that there is insufficient time to evaluate more than the immediate result at the time of project activities (this aspect has been improved with the recent switch to two-year grants).
- Although grantees can be very clear about the number of people reached directly with project activities, and can make good estimates of the number of people reached indirectly in the immediate aftermath of activities, they cannot really assess the longer-range impact within the short lifetime of the project.

Despite these difficulties, observers of development education regard the partnership approach as a significant scaling up of activity and reach.

- ▶ **The requirement that applicants and/or their partners contribute at least 25 percent of the cost means that grantees have had to commit their own time and resources.**

The data above show that grantees and their partners have made substantial contributions toward funded projects. In general, the requirement has been considered a positive aspect of the program forcing organizations to commit seriously to a development education project by investing their own resources. It is not clear, however, without a closer look at each project how much of this contribution is in-kind rather than a commitment of new resources or whether the in-kind portions are valued realistically.

Some former and potential grantees commented that this kind of requirement could serve to keep potentially good organizations from applying. (In fact, in 2002, USAID clarified that cost-sharing should not be based on a set formula but should be flexible and case-specific.)

- ▶ **There is no clear picture of whether or how grantees have continued their commitment to development education independent of USAID funding.**

In the absence of a systematic evaluation of past grantees, the evidence of grantees continuing to engage in development education beyond USAID funding is anecdotal.

- The Mountain Institute determined that educating about developing countries through its mountain focus should be a new organizational mission, and has developed other curriculum and outreach projects.
- The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International Foundation continues to seek funding for additional development education activities.
- The curriculum *The World of Child Six-Billion* continues to be available through its sponsoring organizations.
- A credit union development education program funded twenty years ago continues in somewhat altered form today. In two decades, more than 500 people have participated in a six-day training program to learn about connections between developed and developing countries. These trained and certified “development educators” then either do service projects in their own communities or volunteer overseas.

In addition to these findings about the USAID Development Education Program specifically, interviews with grantees and observers suggest some broader lessons as well. The following points are not necessarily unanimously agreed to by those interviewed, but they came up often enough, or with enough vigor, to warrant consideration:

- ▶ **There is a need for success stories about development to incorporate in development education materials and programs — both USAID successes and others’.**

Several long-time observers noted that audiences want to hear that public and private efforts can make a difference, but such stories are difficult to find. Several grantees felt that their efforts to incorporate USAID information and speakers were, if not rebuffed, at least ignored by the Agency, and that it was difficult to find suitable materials about USAID projects and programs.

- ▶ **Evaluation has been a neglected component of development education efforts — not just among USAID projects, not just in the United States, but in the field generally.**

As more is being learned about how to conduct good evaluations, there is also a call for sharing information and databases. The lack of emphasis on evaluation also means that too often measurable targets are not set. Not just individual projects — but development education as a whole — should have clear objectives that can be measured.

- ▶ **There is little evidence that development education projects are learning from each other, building on each other’s experiences, or sharing materials.**

At present, there is not a mechanism through which organizations can tap into the expertise and materials created by USAID-funded and other development education projects. A few recent projects have produced CD-ROM or web-based materials, but most activities seem to involve primarily workshops and printed materials. Whether products are print or web-based, they are not easily accessed or shared beyond their originally intended audience.

- ▶ **Like other education efforts, and like development itself, development education is an investment in the longer term.**

Interim goals can be set and results measured, but it must be recognized that development education — successfully increasing Americans' knowledge and understanding of how and why U.S. public and private efforts are of the interest in the United States — is a long-term commitment requiring the engagement of many sectors.

3. *Caveat*

Not answered in a systematic way by this assessment are questions such as the following:

- ▶ How many people has the USAID Development Education Program reached directly and indirectly since 1996?
- ▶ What difference has the Program made in people's knowledge or attitudes?
- ▶ How do the knowledge and attitude of development education participants differ from those of the larger public?
- ▶ Which audiences have been more and which less responsive?
- ▶ Which messages are proven to have been particularly effective?
- ▶ How successful have grantees been at reaching their primary and secondary audiences?
- ▶ What have been the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches?
- ▶ How many grantees have continued either significant or ancillary development education programs beyond the period of USAID funding?

If the intent were to evaluate the current program in order to adjust and make changes to improve it, a comprehensive evaluation similar to ones done earlier would be called for to address such issues. But USAID's already stated intention is to look for a different kind of USAID role in development education – a judgment shared by many of those interviewed, several of whom noted that a small grants program to support a wide array of individual institutional projects may be of diminishing utility. Observers of the development education field, as well as past, current, and potential grantees, expressed the view that USAID can play a leadership role in bringing greater awareness and public attention to development issues, their connection to the United States, and the role of development assistance in addressing those issues.

Thus the focus of the rest of this report is on exploring options for USAID in development education in the future. (It should be noted that among some Hill staffers there is not necessarily agreement that there should be *any* continued role for USAID in this area.)

B. OTHER APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Both in the United States and elsewhere, the question of how to engage various publics in development issues — whether or not the effort is specifically called “development education” — is being vigorously addressed by a few and is of at least some concern to many.

In the earliest days of the USAID Development Education Program, the seed money provided for individual grants helped to focus the attention and resources of a wide range of organizations on the problem of engaging the public in hunger and poverty issues. By funding a variety of organizations using a variety of strategies, the USAID program helped to develop a set of tools and models that could be used by other organizations in reaching their own audiences. The associated annual Development Education conferences were seen as a mechanism for sharing information, lessons, and new ideas. The USAID program helped to create a community of people involved in development education; it also spurred additional foundation money and brought a wide range of other organizations into the field.

Reduced USAID funding since the mid-1990s and the demise of the annual conferences appear upon initial inquiry to have taken the energy and momentum out of the development education field in the United States. However, a closer look suggests that considerable effort, thought, and attention is being given in a range of places to the larger question of how Americans see their role in the world, what Americans know and think, how they acquire information, and the kinds of materials that make a difference. But these individual efforts are not necessarily benefiting from shared experiences. Other organizations do not easily have access to the lessons learned or the materials developed by any one project. There is no longer a place or a vehicle for exchanging information and ideas, and isolated efforts do not add up to a larger outcome.

1. Development Education in Europe

Development education programs operating in isolation of one another is a problem shared by others around the world. The following quote from a survey of development education programs and efforts in Ireland could just as well be written about development education in the United States:

. . . diversity of groups, themes, and target groups. While one may argue the benefit of such diversity, one can also argue that there is a lack of focus in all this activity. Who is the primary target group for development education? Where is the best place to educate that target group? What are the most appropriate themes to use? And what are the most appropriate methodologies? . . . committed and talented individuals, who, though in most cases working cooperatively, also work in various levels of isolation. . . They do not know whether they are doing well or not so well. They are doing their best and they hope this is enough. They are seeking to do their work while managing local/national organizations that are constantly feeding the demands of short-term funders. They deliver activities or produce materials without significant feedback on the impact of those inputs or materials in the end-game of influencing attitudes . . . (Dochas)

A meeting in November 2002 brought together more than 200 delegates from over 50 countries to discuss strategies for engaging European publics in development issues. The Global Education Congress included government agency representatives, legislators, local officials, and civil society representatives from European, African, Asian, and Latin American countries. U.S. private representatives attended; USAID was invited but did not attend.

As background to that meeting, the following trends were identified as characterizing development education in Europe today (Lemmers):

- ▶ *Greater moves toward integrating development issues into formal education.* In much of Europe, education ministries, nongovernmental organizations, and local education structures are moving toward working in partnership to build development education into school curricula.
- ▶ *Growing national coordination among development education by civil society organizations.* Slowly, development education in civil society/development organizations is moving from being a small side program to a focus on building “partnerships with national coordinating structures,” for example, trade unions, youth groups, etc. Such partnerships, says Lemmers, are “leading to greater critical ownership of development cooperation by the most active of publics.”
- ▶ *Greater coherence between national strategies and local and regional strategies,* including strategies for outreach, teacher training, youth and community level development education, as well as development education focused on single issues or single countries.
- ▶ *Increasing focus on quality control, effectiveness, and evaluation.* At national and international levels, models are being developed to measure outcomes. As the Development Education Association in the United Kingdom argues, measuring and evaluating results helps to develop better practices, to demonstrate better practices, and to share them more widely (DEA).

Lemmers is not arguing that there is either a uniform view or practice of development education in Europe, where both the level of effort and the methods of practice differ from country to country. In fact, there is a wide range of models for how governments relate to in-country development education efforts, just as there are variations in levels of government funding. Within Europe, national structures for advancing development education vary along the following dimensions:

- ▶ *Legislative framework* — ranging from non-existent to explicitly legislated.
- ▶ *Political support* — from debated annually to little or no political engagement.
- ▶ *Nature of body* — from NGO coordinating body to foundation to para-statal body.
- ▶ *Proximity to/distance from aid agency* — from internal function of the national aid agency to relative autonomy.
- ▶ *Involvement of nongovernmental organizations and civil society.*

Lemmers notes that despite the wide range of models available for efforts to inform and educate publics about development assistance and broader development issues, national structures of some kind engage in most or all of the following roles:

- policymaking,

- coordinating,
- quality assurance/evaluation/training/support,
- funding, and
- international coordination.

2. *Development Education in Britain and Canada*

In *Britain*, the Development Education Association is a private umbrella organization formed in 1993 “to support and promote the work of all those engaged in raising awareness and understanding of global and development issues.” It has over 240 member and partner organizations, including nongovernmental organizations, local development education centers, community groups, youth organizations, professional associations, the media, unions, church and religious organizations, colleges, and universities. It promotes information exchange among members, publishes material on methods and practices of development education, organizes conferences and training seminars to develop capacity, and has been a staunch proponent of improved evaluation of development education programs.

Its aims are (from www.dea.org.uk):

- ▶ to promote the work of member organizations and to facilitate networking and cooperation among members at local, national and international levels;
- ▶ to influence and develop public policy that impacts on development education practice;
- ▶ to provide information and support that will enable members to increase the effectiveness of development education practice; and
- ▶ to enhance the quality of professional practice in development education.

In addition to its general work on behalf of development education, DEA is organized to support the work of development educators around six major audience groupings: adult learners, higher education, schools, youth, local education centers, and minority organizations.

According to its Executive Director, much of what DEA does is to “encourage a climate of support.” DEA considers partnerships among organizations, or within communities, to be an important ingredient of success and puts time and energy into building coalitions. In England, with a central approach to education, it has been possible to have impact on the school curriculum, and a new citizenship requirement for schools includes the concept of global citizenship. It is not, he says, important that all involved in development education have the same message, approach, or even terminology. But to have impact, development education needs to have a set of clear objectives – such as making the linkages between developed and developing countries central to people’s understanding.

In *Canada*, the momentum and available funding of the early 1990s appear to have slowed. Just as in the United States, funding by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) declined in the mid-1990s, when CIDA’s development education/public participation grants program was phased out. But, as in the United States, a wide array of small public and private development education activities continued, and expertise continued to accumulate.

In 1999, CIDA launched a new effort with a slightly narrower focus than previously – its goal is to generate “greater public understanding and increased public support” for Canada’s foreign

assistance programs rather than the broader issue of involving the public in a range of development issues. As part of the Canadian government's larger effort on "citizen engagement," CIDA began a Public Engagement Strategy and Action Plan. The Plan sites the following challenges as drawing CIDA back into development education work (CIDA):

- ▶ twenty-five years of "development education" have not achieved the desired level of informed action or sustained support for international cooperation;
- ▶ although crises heighten public awareness, that does not always translate into sustained support;
- ▶ moving Canadians from awareness to informed action requires a major shift in current thinking; and
- ▶ public engagement programs require sustained resources and the development of strategic alliances with partners.

The Plan sets out a three-pronged approach:

- ▶ working strategically with partners toward a common vision of engagement in ways that focus on program results and performance indicators;
- ▶ a series of specific activities focused on youth; and
- ▶ operational initiatives within CIDA through its information and program offices (e.g., speakers program, website, media relations, support for umbrella organizations, etc.). Eventually virtually all activities within CIDA are expected to have a development education component.

3. *Other Efforts in the United States*

There is no shortage of efforts to engage various aspects of the U.S. public on international issues. They can be found in schools, development organizations, civic organizations, communities, and the media. Although not evaluated here or even enumerated, the impression is that many creative, thoughtful activities aimed at a range of audiences, using targeted strategies, and producing a wide variety of materials, can be found. But many of these activities occur in isolation, without being informed by earlier experiences, and many may not even think of themselves as "development education." There is not an accessible body of best practices, or easy ability to share materials, curricula, or ideas beyond the community or audience for which they were created. The original USAID goal of creating models that could be replicated or adapted by others has yet to be realized. The widely respected, but not funded, quarterly publication *Ideas and Information about Development Education* folded because its committed author could no longer do it in the absence of financial and institutional support.

Schools

A wide range of organizations produce material about global issues and developing countries for use in elementary, middle, and high schools. Whether or not they are specifically called "development education," these materials are designed to convey connections between the United States and other countries. Of the 26 USAID development education projects funded since 1996, 11 involved developing curricula for elementary, middle, or high school teachers. These curricula addressed a range of issues and were designed for use in a variety of classrooms:

- Urban environmental issues in secondary school classes
- Geography and environmental science in grades 6-12
- Poverty in developing countries for a selected list of interested teachers
- World food supply and agriculture for high school agriculture classes
- Mountain eco-system countries for middle and high school social studies classes
- Environmental issues for K-8 classes
- CD-Rom unit on agricultural development for high school agriculture classes
- Food security and agriculture for high school teachers
- Local-global links on trade, food, malnutrition, natural resources for social studies classes
- Debates on issues chosen by high school students (poverty, environment, foreign aid)
- Biodiversity and development assistance for middle school teachers

Through the partnership requirement, many of these specifically developed units had excellent initial distribution. Education networks for these projects included such organizations as the National Geographic Society's Geography Education Program, National Council for Geographic Education, National Council for Agricultural Education, National Council for Social Studies, American Federation of Teachers, and teacher-training programs. Further inquiry is needed to determine how long these materials continued to be available beyond the life of the grant, and with what level of effort they were distributed.

But USAID-supported and other materials addressing development and global issues face a number of problems in getting used in schools. In most cases, they are not materials that are formally part of the curriculum – their use in the classroom depends on the interest, knowledge, and awareness (first of the issues, then of the specific curriculum) of already harried teachers. National, state, and local standards require teachers to meet specific objectives in every subject, and global education and development education subjects are generally not directly in those standards. Development-related issues (and their connections to the United States) can, however, be used to meet the standards, but this also puts an extra burden on teachers to figure out how to add yet another topic (Baker). Any set of materials developed for use in the classroom should be accompanied by clear directions on how they fit at least the national performance standards, according to Mary Paden, former Director of Environmental Education at the World Resources Institute.

Media

Print, broadcast, and other media outlets are often referred to as either potential targets of development education or potential development educators, when in fact they are neither. Journalists and media decision makers do not want to be told what is news, and they want their programming and education work to come from the stories they identify rather than from an “education” program defined by activists, advocates, or a government agency. Yet they are a major way that Americans obtain information and form views, and their role needs to be clearly understood by all concerned with educating or engaging Americans on development issues.

The most frequent criticisms of the media's handling of international news involve: a) the focus on periodic crises rather than ongoing coverage, b) lack of context for particular crises, causing

viewers, listeners, and readers to assume that a short-term charitable response is needed when the issue may be long-term development needs, and c) excessive focus on the U.S. role alone when the response is international (GIIa).

Such criticisms are widely shared, particularly in the face of continuing evidence that traditional media have fewer foreign correspondents and seem to be giving less time and space to foreign news. But Jack Hamilton, journalist, journalism educator, and now dean of the Manship School of Mass Communication, argues that major forces are acting to change the way Americans receive news about international events and trends (Hamilton).

- ▶ The economics of traditional news coverage is changing the way foreign news is obtained. Foreign news is no longer provided exclusively by elite foreign correspondents, whose presence overseas is expensive to sustain, but also by local reporters sent briefly to another country and resident foreign nationals on the staff of U.S. news organizations.
- ▶ Journalists and media outlets increasingly recognize that international stories have local connections (see the examples below), and they are getting better at finding and reporting on local links to global issues.
- ▶ Technology is increasing the number of sources and the speed with which information is available, turning any interested group or individual into “a publisher, or for that matter, a reporter.” (Hamilton)

Hamilton notes that these trends alone do not indicate much about the quantity or quality of foreign correspondence today. The decline in the number of traditional foreign correspondents and the emergence of new and different sources of information need to be examined in order to “assess what Americans know about the world and how they will act on that knowledge” (Hamilton).

Both before and since 9/11, one can find significant examples of journalists, journalism organizations, and various media outlets devoting time, effort, and resources — on their own terms — to finding ways to provide their audiences with more and better information about development and about developing-country connections to U.S. interests. A relatively cursory look identifies the following incomplete but significant examples:

- ▶ *Bringing the World Home: Showing Readers Their Global Connections*, published in 1999 by the American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE) with support from the Freedom Forum, is a handbook showing journalists “how to cover the world and bring it home to their readers.” Based on ASNE’s recommendation that newspapers should broaden their definition of local news, this volume (available in print and on-line) gives journalists concrete tips on how make international news a local story and offers examples from newspapers around the country (www.asne.org). This effort is based on a similar one conducted a decade before by John Maxwell Hamilton for the Society of Professional Journalists. *Main Street America and the Third World* resulted from his work showing local newspapers and television stations how to make foreign news local, and became a widely used guide for journalists, journalism educators, and development activists seeking to work with the media.
- ▶ A new initiative by Public Radio International to develop “a series of radio documentaries and features to examine a range of global issues, and highlight the role of the U.S. in efforts to address them.”

- ▶ *By the People: America in the World* is a new initiative of MacNeil/Lehrer Productions, PBS, and partners. The partners include the American Library Association, CityCares, the Federation of State Humanities Councils, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Kiwanis International, the League of Women Voters, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, local chapters of the World Affairs, and more are expected. By the People's goal is "to energize and enhance the national conversation on America's role in the world through a series of national and local broadcasts and events that demonstrate the relevance of foreign policy issues to local concerns." The project includes three national PBS specials, local programming to be produced by PBS stations in cooperation with community organizations, national and local forums for civic dialogue, and an interactive web site (www.by-the-people.org).

Development Education Alliance

The Development Education Alliance is a network of development educators who both meet periodically and communicate through list-serves in order to share activities and lessons. Formed in 2000, it involves individuals and representatives of nongovernmental organizations and government agencies and offers a way to network and work collaboratively toward better understanding among the American public of development issues. It was founded on the belief that "the many individual development education activities" being carried out by a wide range of organizations could benefit from closer contact with each other. Its goals include fostering "increased communication between and cooperation among development education practitioners in the United States and abroad" and strengthening the impact of development education activities in the United States.

Run without funds and largely on the energy of a small number of individuals, it nevertheless has some 170 members. It provides a mechanism for sharing information, strategies, resources, and ideas.

Global Interdependence Initiative

The Global Interdependence Initiative (GII) is a multi-year effort begun in 1999 to inform and motivate American public support for U.S. international engagement in an interdependent world. It has produced a body of research on how organizations can communicate effectively about global issues, and is trying to build consensus among a group of "unlikely allies" on "the implications of global interdependence and the positive role that America can play." GII stresses that its goal is not to develop specific policies and programs but to help create a public environment in which such programs will flourish.

GII's extensive body of research on how the American public and policymakers understand global issues is available on-line, and is summarized in its publication *From Values to Advocacy* (GIIa). The research has been developed into a hands-on practical guide for effective communication for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its university partners (Radomski).

GII has also conducted research on the potential constituency for interdependence-related learning. A mapping exercise prepared for GII detailed the activities and interests of some one hundred organizations and their potential for collaborating with a wider range of membership organizations, citizen groups, professional associations, etc., to form an ever-widening circle of

some 500 potential partners (Tarr-Whelan et al.). It also outlines strategies for mobilizing the American public, engaging youth, and engaging female community leaders.

C. LOOKING AHEAD

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

About the USAID Development Education Program

- ▶ The “local-global” connections theme of the USAID program ensures that materials and activities are made relevant to the target audience.
- ▶ A small grants program promoting innovation can reach a broad and diverse audience.
- ▶ The partnership approach appears to have significantly increased the audience reached per project.
- ▶ Relatively little effort has been devoted to systematically evaluating impact or measuring results.
- ▶ The requirement that applicants and/or their partners contribute at least 25 percent of the cost means that grantees have to commit their own time and resources.
- ▶ There is no clear picture of whether or how grantees have continued their commitment to development education independent of USAID funding.

About Development Education Generally

- ▶ There is a need for success stories about development to incorporate in development education materials and programs – both USAID successes and others’.
- ▶ Evaluation has been a neglected component of development education efforts – not just among USAID projects, not just in the United States, but in the field generally.
- ▶ There is little evidence that development education projects are learning from each other, building on each other’s experiences, or sharing materials.
- ▶ Like other education efforts, and like development itself, development education is an investment in the longer term.

The diversity of the small grants program has been both its strength and its weakness. Its *strength* is that it has over time created materials, programs, activities, and messages for a range of audiences, demonstrating that the core message — that what happens in developing countries is directly linked to people’s interests and concerns in the United States — resonates. Moreover, when people understand this, they believe even more strongly that the United States should be involved in assisting those countries. As shown by the public opinion part of this document, since September 11, 2001, people are more interested in, and aware of, international issues than any time in the last thirty years.

The program’s *weakness* is that the model projects remain isolated examples. The materials produced and the lessons learned are not disseminated beyond the original audience — there is no mechanism to do so. Grantees do seem to continue to make the materials available within their own network, but it is not clear how much proactive effort (training, workshops, etc.) continues. The short-term nature (one-year) of most of the recent projects, combined with their relative isolation, means that there has been no real evaluation of their individual or cumulative impact.

This general finding — of many independent, relatively small-scale efforts that may or may not be aware of one another or able to learn from one another — appears to be true outside USAID-funded development education projects as well.

From this, it can be concluded that:

- ▶ USAID can make an important contribution by taking a leadership role in launching a central mechanism through which those engaged in educating Americans about development issues — whether they call it “development education” or something else — can network, share ideas and resources, develop strategies.
- ▶ In addition to putting impetus behind a vehicle that multiplies and improves existing efforts, USAID may want to focus additional, more direct effort into a small number of audiences and/or issues.

The remainder of this chapter explores options for a central mechanism and then discusses potential audiences, messages, and approaches for a focused effort.

I. A Must

The needs identified — for greater synergy and impact in development education as well as for better tools and methods of measuring the results of individual and combined development education efforts — suggest that USAID should consider taking a leadership role in developing a web-based mechanism/structure/clearinghouse for the exchange of materials and lessons learned among organizations that have an interest in and commitment to increasing awareness among the American public.

At its simplest, this would be a way to:

- ▶ Capture the best materials and ensure that they are available beyond the project or immediate audience they were originally designed for;
- ▶ Promote dialog and exchange of ideas about methods that work, and allow efforts aimed at similar geographic or issue-oriented audiences to collaborate (or at least be familiar with one another); and
- ▶ Provide a forum for lessons learned.

Such a site should include materials produced by the Biden-Pell program as well as by other development education efforts; this would initially involve determining which materials are current (probably going back no more than five years), replicable, and can be made accessible through the web. Materials should be presented in ways that make them easily updatable, and mechanisms should be in place to require periodic review.

Such a site should also include a link to basic educational materials about U.S. assistance to developing countries — responding to the voiced frustration by grantees and others that USAID materials are either not available or appropriate for development education projects. Easily accessible, easily used information about actual *levels of foreign aid* (good material is needed to counteract the constant misperception that as much as 20 percent of the U.S. budget is foreign assistance), *basic development issues*, and *positive case examples* should all be readily available to development educators.

The development education materials should be accessible by *theme* (e.g., local-global links, U.S. assistance, case examples), *topic* (poverty, hunger, health, agriculture, etc.), *geography*, and *sponsoring organization* (name, city, and region), in order to facilitate networking among individual projects and activities.

2. *Even Better*

A site that serves as a resource to development educators would be a useful contribution to the field, serve many interests, fit well with the program's move into Legislative and Public Affairs, and would not be controversial even among critics. It would address the concern that there is currently no mechanism for sharing lessons, building on the experience and expertise of others, or using or adapting existing materials and approaches. It can be outsourced, and the cost would be modest.

But a central mechanism could also do much more, giving real impetus to efforts to increase U.S. awareness. It could:

- ▶ Act as a voice to promote greater attention to the issue of American interests and involvement in developing countries,
- ▶ Work with key sectors to develop strategies to increase public awareness,
- ▶ Help to improve effectiveness by promoting best practices and monitoring and evaluation.

The Development Education Association in the United Kingdom provides a model. The DEA is a membership organization whose members are primarily organizations with an interest in development education; they pay an annual fee based on size of budget (approximately 0.1%), with money for specific research and networking projects raised from various ministries, foundations, and partners.

U.S. organizations and individuals concerned about promoting public awareness do not necessarily want a common group plan — believing that each organization must work to and from its strengths — but they do identify the need for a central mechanism to provide leadership and focus. A central mechanism with effective leadership may be the important next step in creating the kind of synergy and mutual learning that will scale up lots of small efforts into something substantial; it can be the vehicle for developing broad development education strategies within and across sectors. Funding should not come from USAID alone but also from the full-range of private sector institutions with interests in this issue (secular and faith-based organizations, business, foundations, education organizations). (ACVFA)

Such a central mechanism need not be a new organization. It can be created by reinforcing capacity in an existing entity.

3. *Putting Focus into the USAID Program*

USAID may also want to support a more focused development education effort around a particular audience or message in order to gain synergy and impact. Any discussion of key audiences produces a long list of potential audiences, but one consistently emerges as a top contender for priority focus — the young.

Focusing on youth has many advantages.

- ▶ For today's young, September 11 will be a defining moment in the way that the Challenger incident was for the children of the 1980s and the civil rights movement and Kennedy and King assassinations were for the 1960s. It will form their early consciousness of the larger world, and be the backdrop to their lives. For them, the sense of being part of the world is a given, and they need information and context to inform the feelings and awareness that 9/11 evokes. For the young, at least, this is a "teachable moment." (Bourne)
- ▶ A focus on youth inevitably brings in a wide range of others — their parents, those who teach them, those involved in their recreational and extracurricular activities, regional officials if it involves a larger event — all of whom learn along with the children.
- ▶ Many previous Biden-Pell projects have in fact involved young people or developed curricula for them, and there are lessons to be learned from those efforts and from other available materials and programs.
- ▶ A focus on young people might be better received than adult education efforts, with their potential slip into advocacy, by those on the Hill who have been critical of USAID's involvement in development education.

Efforts to reach young people (e.g., middle and high school age youth) can take place both through schools and through a vast array of volunteer, extracurricular, and recreational activities (both secular and faith-based). A schools approach should be done in collaboration with organizations experienced in developing curricular material and with partners who can ensure that they will be used. A synergistic effort to reach youth through extracurricular, volunteer, and recreational channels should be multi-pronged and encompass a range of carefully chosen vehicles. Listed below are a few possible activities for illustrative purposes, but any decision should be made based on careful consultation, review, assessed need, and potential for evaluation.

- ▶ *Operation Days Work.* The USAID Program Operation Days Work — with its goal of engaging students "to participate in community service while learning about international affairs and global humanitarian efforts" — is highly praised by those who know it. It allows students to learn by doing and fits well with many schools' community service requirements. By culminating as a community event, it has the additional advantage of providing a reason for local media coverage of both the event and the process behind it. A frequent suggestion by those who know both the Development Education Program and Operation Days Work is to bring greater synergy to those efforts.
- ▶ *A News Service for Youth-Oriented Magazines and Newspapers.* Creating a regular flow of stories and information for newsletters and magazines aimed at youth, as well as children's pages in newspapers, could be a low cost effort with potentially big returns. According to the Newspaper Association of America Foundation, some 160 newspapers have programs or pages aimed at children (although not all are as frequent or lengthy as the Washington Post's KidPage).
- ▶ *A News and Information Service for College Newspapers.*

- ▶ Either at the youth or the college level, the news service could sponsor a *youth/student competition for reporting on local-global connections* — the kind of reporting done first by Jack Hamilton in *Main Street America* and then by newspapers around the country.

It should be noted, however, that these suggestions are only illustrative. The main message of this report is that decisions about particular activities and audiences should not be made simply because someone thinks they are a good idea. Activities and audiences should be part of an overall plan developed with the input and participation of a wide range of strategic partners. The main recommendation is that any plan for future development education work should be:

- ▶ based on messages that have been demonstrated to work,
- ▶ based on good knowledge and understanding of past lessons, existing materials, and relevant actors,
- ▶ made in collaboration with a wide range of organizations that can help shape it, implement it, and take ownership of it,
- ▶ informed by previous efforts in the United States and elsewhere, and
- ▶ able to demonstrate measurable results.

4. Messages

How a message is presented will depend upon the specific audience segment as well as the approach being used. The discussion here focuses on themes that seem to work and should be considered.

We're Connected: Local-Global Links

By almost everyone's account, the message that developing countries and their concerns are closely linked to some or many issues at home (the local-global link) is the most effective. People seem to understand it intuitively and to incorporate facts and information that fit that understanding. The humanitarian message that the United States acts on development issues because of its core values is also well received. Grantees and observers alike report that the narrow self-interest approach does not work as well as "we are all in this together."

Foreign Assistance: It Works

A second area around which there is genuine agreement is that more emphasis is needed on telling "success stories" — letting audiences know that development works. Grantees felt it was difficult to access such information either within USAID or elsewhere and that a body of readily available information is needed.

Working Together: Achieving the Goals

Within the context of looking at local-global links and creating a reservoir of success stories, USAID should choose the message that fits with its overall goals and commitments and is broad enough to encompass a range of topics. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) — to which the United States and more than 180 other countries have subscribed — offer a set of issues around which curricula/messages can be developed.

- ▶ Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- ▶ Achieve universal primary education
- ▶ Promote gender equality
- ▶ Reduce child mortality
- ▶ Improve maternal health
- ▶ Control HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
- ▶ Ensure environmental sustainability
- ▶ Develop a global partnership for development.

The Millennium Development Goals — already embraced by USAID and part of the impetus for the new Millennium Challenge Account — have some advantages as the basis for a public education activity.

- ▶ They offer clear targets that the international community is working collaboratively to meet.
- ▶ They are the focus of development education efforts in many other countries — reinforcing the message that the United States does not have to do this alone.
- ▶ They fit well with the finding that Americans are interested in knowing that the United States is addressing particular issues such as hunger, health, and the environment (see section on public opinion).
- ▶ Curricula/messages can be developed around the *concept* of goals for some purposes and around *particular* goals for others.

Any attempt to craft a message(s) to increase Americans' awareness of development issues should take account of the three-year-long research conducted by the Global Interdependence Initiative to determine the most effective partners, messages, and strategies for engaging the American public in international issues. GII argues that the underlying *values* of the public (such as efficacy, education, prevention) support U.S. involvement in the world, and that an education program works best when it taps into those values — communicating information without understanding the message that information actually conveys is ineffective and potentially counterproductive. GII's research produced a lengthy list of tools — or frames — that can help communicate why Americans should care about what happens abroad (GIIfb). Just a few examples:

Partnership

- ▶ Just as in the workplace, success depends on collaboration with others.
- ▶ When other societies are in good shape, they're good partners.

Investment

- ▶ Development dollars (foreign aid) *now* help prevent crises in the future.
- ▶ Improving the neighborhood. Like homeowners who care about the quality of life in their neighborhoods, the United States has a stake in the surrounding world.

Mentoring for Autonomy

- ▶ A helping hand/not a handout.

- ▶ Aid helps move countries forward (or upward).

America as a Decent Person

- ▶ Fairness. Americans want the United States as a country to act fairly toward others.
- ▶ Responsibility. We teach kids responsibility. As the world's most powerful country, the United States also has responsibilities.

Local-Global Connections

- ▶ Americans' ties to the world in daily life.
- ▶ Solving domestic problems such as health requires focus on their international aspects.

The GII research finds health, environment, and children to be particularly powerful themes around which to draw connections, and has also identified issues that do not appear likely to work well (e.g., starvation, suffering children, fear-based efforts). This body of material is an important resource for developing future messages.

5. Approach/Strategies

Whether the choice is to focus on youth or any of the other audiences frequently proposed, USAID should take a number of steps in developing its strategy.

Take Inventory

Before deciding to focus on any particular audience, an inventory should be taken to determine:

- What is already being done to reach that audience (not just by USAID former grantees but by anyone)?
- What materials already exist for that audience?
- Who are the relevant actors, and which are particularly effective?
- What has previously been learned about best practice for that audience?
- What has worked? What has failed? Why?

Develop Partnerships and Consult Widely

The partnership approach of recent grants — pairing an organization that has development expertise with one that has a broad network — was a very effective evolution in the grant program. It can be used on a much wider scale by developing strategic partnerships with the range of organizations interested in engaging the American public on development issues. Whether or not they specifically call what they do “development education,” a wide range of partners could advise, for example, on how to reach youth. (The GII database of organizations with potential interest could provide a start.) A consultative process should be established with key strategic partners to help identify needs and propose approaches.

Learn from Past Efforts and from the Experience of Other Countries

In developing *curricular* material for formal education, much can be learned from organizations already engaged in this effort. Materials should be developed in collaboration not only with partners who have development expertise, but with partners experienced in curriculum development and the networks that determine or influence what gets used. With respect to *extracurricular* efforts, other countries – especially Britain and Canada – have extensive youth-oriented programs. Their experiences/lessons should be tapped, along with the expertise and networks of youth organizations in this country. All are potential partners in this effort.

Identify Results-Oriented Measures of Success

Those involved in development education and similar efforts are increasingly aware of the need to find ways of determining success that are not input measures but actually show results. Any new effort should set up clear results-oriented measures, drawing on the work done by the Development Education Association and others. At the same time, it appears clear that one or even two years is too short a timeframe to determine impact, and that USAID and its partners must recognize that development education must be a longer-term commitment.

6. *Is More Possible?*

Ultimately, engaging the public on issues of development and foreign assistance requires both a broad coalition and strong leadership to motivate a range of sectors to become part of the effort and discussion (ACVFA). U.S. law prohibiting agencies from advocating on their own behalf may make it impossible for USAID to play a role in ratcheting up public discussion, but those who care about increasing Americans' awareness and understanding look at other efforts to focus public attention and wonder why not. Foundations, business leaders, universities ought not to be the audience for development education efforts but strategic partners, just as nongovernmental and private voluntary organizations are partners.

America's Promise and the *Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids* are two broad-based coalitions with strong leadership that pooled human and financial resources to develop a shared message to which a wide range of individuals and organizations could commit. Increasingly, other developed countries are moving toward a position where an understanding of developing countries and their connections to developed countries are considered part of being a well-educated person. Are there educational messages to which a broad range of U.S. interests can commit? Can USAID at a high level approach leaders of other sectors to build a strategic alliance around such messages? Is it time to look at development education as a high-level/high-profile USAID activity?

CONCLUSION

Interviews with a wide range of individuals – and public opinion data showing higher levels of interest among the general U.S. public in development issues than at any time in the last thirty years – suggest that it is an appropriate time to look at how to build on lessons learned from USAID's Development Education Program. Recently moved from the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) to Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA), the Program has focused since 1996 on creating partnerships between development-oriented organizations and

organizations with broad-based memberships or professional affiliations. No matter how successful individual programs may have been, interviews, reports from grantees, and a review of other efforts suggest there is need for the following:

- greater synergy and impact among individual efforts,
- longer-term availability and wider distribution of development education materials, and
- better tools and methods for measuring results.

Although far from a complete evaluation, this assessment points to several levels at which USAID can help to meet these identified needs, depending upon its resources and commitment. Action at each of these levels should involve:

- consultation with key organizations and sectors concerned with engaging Americans in development issues,
- development of strategic partnerships in order to maximize effectiveness, and
- awareness of how USAID efforts fit into the larger picture.

USAID could engage in any or all of the following four levels of effort:

- ▶ At a minimum, create a central web-based mechanism for the exchange of materials and lessons learned. Such a mechanism could:
 - capture the best materials and ensure that they are widely available,
 - promote dialog and exchange of ideas about methods that work,
 - allow efforts aimed at similar geographic or issue-oriented audiences to collaborate, and
 - provide a forum for lessons learned.
- ▶ Better still, help launch a more dynamic central mechanism that can do *all of the above plus*:
 - act as a voice to promote greater attention to the issue of American interests and involvement in developing countries,
 - work actively with key sectors to develop strategies to increase public awareness, and
 - help to improve effectiveness by promoting best practices and better evaluation.
- ▶ Concentrate USAID's direct effort on a particular audience segment or issue. However, the activities and audiences for a concentrated effort should be part of an overall plan developed with the input and participation of strategic partners in many sectors. A focused plan should be:
 - based on messages that have been demonstrated to work,
 - based on good knowledge and understanding of past lessons, existing materials, and relevant actors,

- made in collaboration with a wide range of organizations that can help shape it, implement it, and take ownership of it,
 - informed by previous efforts in the United States and elsewhere, and
 - able to demonstrate measurable results.
- ▶ Consider taking a convening role in developing a broad-based, high-level, multi-sector educational Effort.

REFERENCES

Interviews

Anne Baker, Director, Global Education and Technology, National Peace Corps Association

Doug Bourne, Director, Development Education Association, United Kingdom

Alton Byers, Director, Mountain Institute

Charles Flickner, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Republican staff (Chairman Jim Kolbe, R-AZ)

Heather Flynn, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Democratic staff (Chairman Joseph Biden, D-DE)

David Devlin-Foltz, Director, Global Interdependence Initiative

John Maxwell Hamilton, Dean,anship School of Mass Communication, Louisiana State University

Joan Joshi, Development Education Consultant

Adele Liskov, Deputy Director, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation, USAID

Noreen O'Meara, Director, Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid; former director, USAID Biden-Pell Program

Mary Paden, Editor, Academy for Educational Development; formerly, Environmental Education Director, World Resources Institute

Carol Radomski, Development Education Consultant

Andrew Rice, Editor, *Ideas and Information on Development Education*; Founding Member, Development Education Alliance;

Susan Saragi, USAID Development Education Program

John W. Sewell, Senior Scholar, Woodrow Wilson International Center; formerly President, Overseas Development Council

Peter Smith, House International Relations Committee, Republican staff (Chairman Henry Hyde, R-IL)

Elise Storck, former Director, USAID Development Education Program, now with IBM

Bruce Wheeler, Development Education Program Director, World Council of Credit Unions

Bruce White, Project Director, Food for Everyone Program, National Council for Agriculture Education; now at the Department of Agriculture

James Willis, Director, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International Foundation

Documents

Advisory Committee for Voluntary Foreign Aid (ACVFA). “2000 and Beyond: Creative Approaches for Reaching New Constituencies for Development.” Report of the Quarterly Meeting, January 6, 2000. Available at www.usaid.gov/hum_response/pvc/acvfadir.

Baker, Anne. “Development Education in U.S. Formal Education.” *Hunger Notes* 1999. Available at www.worldhunger.org.

Bourne, Doug. “Is This a Teachable Moment? Global Education in the United States Post-September 11.” *Development Education Journal* 9, No. 1 (2002), pp. 15-18.

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). *Public Engagement Strategy and Action Plan*. November 1999. Available at <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/publicengagement>.

Development Education Association (DEA). www.dea.org.uk.

Dochas. The Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations. *Development Education in Ireland: Challenges and Opportunities for the Future*.

Global Interdependence Initiative (GIIa). *From Values to Advocacy: Activating the Public’s Support for U.S. Engagement in an Interdependent World*. Washington, D.C.: Aspen Institute, 2002. Based on a series of commissioned papers individually available on the web, and summarized by Margaret Bostrum in “Summary of Global Interdependence Initiative Research,” available at www.aspeninstitute.org/gii.

Global Interdependence Initiative (GIIb). “Promoting American Engagement: A Catalog of Recommended Frames and Language,” by Axel Aubrun and Joseph Grady. 2001. Available at www.aspeninstitute.org/gii.

Hamilton, John Maxwell, and Eric Jenner. “Redefining Foreign Correspondence.” Schorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Affairs, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. December 2002.

Legault, Francois. "Development Education in Canada, Then and Now." *Hunger Notes* 1999. Available at www.worldhunger.org.

Lemmers, Jos. "Building Public Awareness, Deepening Public Knowledge and Increasing Critical Public Support for Development Cooperation." Lisbon: North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, European Center for Global Interdependence and Solidarity, November 2002.

Radomski, Carol. "Global Interdependence in Agriculture: A User's Guide for Effective Communication." Prepared for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the International Programs Office of the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service (CREES/IP). October 2002. Available at www.aspeninstitute.org/gii.

Rice, Andrew E. "Is There a Future for Development Education in the USA?" *Hunger Notes* 1999. Available at www.worldhunger.org.

Tarr-Whelan, Linda; Keith Tarr-Whelan, and Lori Severens. *Discussion and Action on the United States and Global Interdependence: Mapping the Potential Wider Constituency*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute and Tarr-Whelan Associates, 2001. The report and the database of organizations are available at www.aspeninstitute.org/gii.

Meetings

Center for Global Development. "Making the News – Inspiring Views: How the Media Educates and Inspires Us about International Development." December 3, 2002.

Development Education Alliance Meeting, December 10, 2002. Report by Anne Baker on the Council of Europe Global Education Congress, November 2002. Detailed information about the Congress is available at www.globaleducationeurope.net.

ANNEX A
PROJECTED AUDIENCES:
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION GRANTS, 1996-1999

FY 1999

1. *Global Learning*

(Partner: American Library Association (ALA))

“Libraries Build Sustainable Communities” will focus on educating the American Library Association’s membership about the linkages between sustainability concerns in U.S. communities and global sustainability issues. Local libraries throughout the country will dedicate displays and educational events to this theme.

- ▶ 100 public librarians who will become state trainers
- ▶ 480 workshop participants at four conferences
- ▶ 1,500 librarians who participate in 50 interactive state workshops
- ▶ 60,000 ALA members and subscribers
- ▶ 150,000 members of the American public

2. *Indiana University*

(Partners: National FFA Organization, Purdue University)

“Global Leadership Through Agricultural Development: A 21st Century Solution for Youth” will develop an innovative CD-Rom-based educational technology that will be used by high school students and teachers in the agricultural education system. Electronic case studies will be disseminated that include real-life scenarios that enable students to understand and come to terms with the relationship between local concerns and global agricultural development.

- ▶ 2,500 High School Teachers
- ▶ 75,000 High School Students (grades 9-11)
- ▶ State agricultural education staff and teacher educators
- ▶ 450,000 student members of the FFA and other members of agricultural education-related organizations

3. *National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International Foundation*

(Partners: National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Association of Purchasing Management-Rural Electric Utility)

This project, entitled “Bringing Light and Prosperity to the Developing World,” will reach a diverse audience to increase awareness of and interest in international development issues and concerns throughout the domestic rural electrical cooperatives and the rural U.S. communities in which they operate, while also strengthening their volunteer programming.

- ▶ 9,000 electric cooperative Board of Directors
- ▶ 1,050 electric cooperatives
- ▶ 77,000 employees and consumer/owners

- ▶ 32 million consumers

4. *Partners of the Americas*

(Partners: National Council of La Raza, Hispanic Council on International Relations, Hispanic Link Journalism Foundation)

This project, "Latinos and Latin America: Local-Global Messages and Linkages," seeks to increase awareness of, involvement in, and support for international development programs and issues through an extensive campaign of public education and outreach targeted at the Hispanic-American community; it will also provide opportunities to expand and enhance the Latino voice in U.S. foreign policy making.

- ▶ 10,500 affiliates of NLJF, HCIR, and targeted affiliates of NCLR
- ▶ 45,000 (75 other NCLR affiliate organizations in targeted states)
- ▶ 15 million members of the Hispanic American community not in NCLR affiliates organizations

5. *Technoserve, Inc.*

(Partner: National Gardening Association)

Technoserve will work with children in grades K-8 around the U.S. who use the National Gardening Association's GrowLab curriculum. The curriculum will be used to provide information on the similarities between U.S. school children and those in the developing world through agriculture, gardening, and the environment.

FY 1998

1. *The Mountain Institute*

(Partner: National Council for the Social Studies — NCSS)

"Enhancing U.S. Public Awareness for Mountains: A Global Resource" will produce curricula and background articles geared toward middle and high school students. The development education content of the materials will focus on three key elements:

(a) commonalities of mountain eco-systems, mountain communities, and mountain problems worldwide; (b) the history and value of U.S. foreign assistance toward the conservation of mountain environments, advancement of mountain cultural heritage, and the improvement of livelihoods for mountain people; and (c) domestic applicability of lessons learned in international development projects to U.S. mountain environments. Internet homepages of both organizations will be used to highlight the materials produced. This audience includes:

- ▶ 23,000 NCSS individual and organizational members and their subscribers to *Social Education*
- ▶ 325 U.S.-based organizations and individuals through The Mountain Institute's coordinated Mountain Forum network
- ▶ 800 students and 30-40 teachers from The Mountain Institute's Mountain Learning program

- ▶ A core group of 75-90 NCSS member teachers will develop the materials and provide training for up to 4,500 additional teachers

2. *National Council for Agricultural Education*

(Partner: Bread for the World Institute)

The theme of this project is to develop and disseminate materials covering issues related to providing a safe and plentiful food supply to feed a growing world population. Materials will be designed for use in high school agriculture classrooms across the U.S. and will address two basic questions: What is the status of the world's food supply and peoples' ability to access it, and, what are the causes of this situation? How do these issues affect the U.S. farmer and the agribusiness community? The project will enhance the effectiveness of these materials through the use of a national train-the-trainer workshops and subsequent state train-the-teacher workshops across the country. These workshops will provide teachers with a greater understanding of the general subject matter, elevate their interest in the subject, and provide ideas on how to more effectively utilize the instructional materials. Those targeted are:

- ▶ 5,000 high school agriculture teachers and social studies teachers
- ▶ 50,000 high school students across the U.S.
- ▶ Members of National FFA and others involved in the agriculture education community (approximately 500,000), including agriculture staff in the state departments of education, agricultural education teacher educators in U.S. Land Grant Colleges and Universities, 1890s Schools (Historically Black College and Universities' agriculture educational programs), and 1994 Schools (Native American two-year colleges).

3. *National Policy Association*

(Partners: National Alliance of Business, International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers)

Building on the National Policy Association's successful development education project from 1993-1997, this project will present and receive information and ideas on the role and impact of foreign aid in a globalized economy, where the private sector has taken an increasingly large and important role in development efforts. Business and labor leaders will have the opportunity to share their views with each other and with policy-makers at USAID and other public and private sector development assistance officials. The project will focus on how U.S. public and private sector efforts to promote economic growth and development in the world's poorer nations impact our own economy. It will foster interest in, and discussion about, current development assistance strategies by soliciting business and labor views on what those strategies should be and will cover such topics as emerging markets, worker rights, microenterprise development, education and training, rural development and regional trade. Audiences to be reached:

- ▶ 280 business and labor leaders
- ▶ 106,000 members of the National Alliance of Business, Bricklayers Union and NPA
- ▶ 25,000 National Alliance of Business-related professionals
- ▶ 1,200 business, labor, academic, nonprofit and government representatives

4. *Partners of the Americas*

(Partners: National Council of La Raza, Hispanic Council on International Relations)

This project is a one year follow-on partnership to the 1997 Partners project, "Partners Reach Out to the Hispanic American Community." It will build on Partners' previous project with the National Council of La Raza and add a strategic partnership with the Hispanic Council on International Relations. The project will increase awareness of international development programs and issues through public education and outreach efforts targeted at the Hispanic American community. Audiences to be reached include:

- ▶ 300 members of the Hispanic Council on International Relations
- ▶ 2,125 affiliates of the National Council of La Raza
- ▶ 57 other NCLR affiliate organizations in the target states with an audience of 30,000
- ▶ 2,000 in media
- ▶ 785 local, state and federal public officials
- ▶ The audience will also include members of the Hispanic American community not in NCLR affiliated organizations in targeted states, estimated number 12,000,000

5. *Population Reference Bureau*

(Partner: National Peace Corps Association)

The Population Reference Bureau will collaborate with the National Peace Corps Association to produce and disseminate presentation and teaching materials around the theme "The World of Child Six-Billion" for use by educators and other public speakers. The project will provide a broad overview of the world in which child six-billion is likely to live by focusing on six basic needs of people everywhere. Using developing-country examples, the project will connect specific local concerns to larger human development issues and to people in the U.S. Learning materials will include "The World of Child Six-Billion" discussion guide, curricular and presentation guides, presentations by educators and others to students and community groups nationwide, and workshops at regional and national NPCA conferences. The project intends to reach:

- ▶ 100,000 Returned Peace Corps Volunteers
- ▶ 18,000 Peace Corps World Wise Schools
- ▶ 16,000 National Peace Corps Association members
- ▶ 4,000 Population Reference Bureau members
- ▶ 7,700 educators on PRB's list
- ▶ 55,000 National Geographic Society UPDATE subscribers

FY 1997

1. *Global Learning, Inc.*

(Partner: American Library Association)

"Libraries: Local Touch, Global Reach" will provide practical methods and resources, including a Global Awareness Discussion/Action Guide, for involving school and public librarians in creative programming for global awareness. It will reach:

- ▶ 270 school and public librarians directly engaged in project activities
- ▶ 400 librarians who pilot the materials
- ▶ 17,000 who receive project materials
- ▶ 40,000 additional members of ALA
- ▶ 4,800 library patrons with whom members of the primary audience use project materials

2. *Management Sciences for Health (MSH)*

(Partner: Nat'l Association of Community Health Centers, Inc.)

This project will educate members of the National Association of Community Health Centers (NACHC) about international health programs and approaches used overseas to improve the lives of under-served populations who are similar to clients served by U.S. community health centers. Those reached by this project include:

- ▶ 3,000 health center managers, service providers and board members who participate in NACHC's annual conference
- ▶ 300 participants in the annual meetings of three state or regional Community Health Center affiliates
- ▶ 24,000 managers, providers and board members of NACHC's 850 member organizations
- ▶ Plus community leaders, national and local politicians, and health associations of primary audience members

3. *Mercy Corps International*

(Partner: Coalition for Christian Colleges and Universities)

"Defining Global-Local Linkages Between Business, Economics and Civil Society" will develop and pilot curriculum modules that examine macro and micro business, economic and international trade environments and their relationship to democratic processes, human rights, and the rule of law. Those targeted are:

- ▶ 400 faculty and
- ▶ 7,500 undergraduate students in business, economics and international trade departments of the 90 CCCU institutions
- ▶ All deans and faculty of CCCU institutions
- ▶ Public audiences in 15 communities where pilot programs are initiated
- ▶ Professional colleagues in academic, international development and human rights communities

4. *National Council of Negro Women*

(Partner: National Association of Negro Business & Professional Women Clubs, Inc.)

This project will utilize the business and regional interests of the target audience of African-American women entrepreneurs, providing them with the international development content and background on the revolutionary impact of micro-enterprise on women in developing countries. The audience includes:

- ▶ 120 boards and staff of NCNW and NANBPWC
- ▶ regional representatives

- ▶ 250 Section Presidents
- ▶ NCNW Global Education Advocates
- ▶ 65,000 members of NCNW and NANBPWC
- ▶ 100,000 members of the NCNW and NANPBWC constituent organizations

5. *Partners of the Americas, Inc.*
(National Council of La Raza)

"Partners Reach Out to the Hispanic American Community" will build on Partners' experience in international development, its successful Reach Out development education program, and its extensive volunteer network at the grassroots level in the U.S. The project will provide educational programs promoting local and global linkages in the development areas of trade, community development, and citizen participation. It will also strengthen U.S. Partner chapters and National Council of La Raza (NCLR) affiliates through developing collaborative outreach programs and through education efforts at the national level by sharing experience of collaborations at the NCLR's national conference. This project will also work towards promoting the development of a Hispanic perspective on U.S. engagement with the world, especially in international development.

- ▶ 2,975 affiliates of NCLR and Partner Chapters in New Mexico, Texas, California, Illinois, Michigan, Washington and Wisconsin
- ▶ 30,000 in the 65 other NCLR affiliate organizations in the targeted states
- ▶ 60 Hispanic American alumni of Mexican American Solidarity Foundation leadership program
- ▶ 10,000 conference participants from 150 other NCLR affiliates
- ▶ 5,000 visiting displays
- ▶ 150 workshop participants
- ▶ 200 members of the Hispanic Council on Int'l Relations
- ▶ 350 local and state public officials
- ▶ 2,000 media
- ▶ 10 million members of the Hispanic American community not in NCLR-affiliated organizations in targeted states

6. *Population Reference Bureau*
(National Audubon Society and League of Women Voters Population Coalition)

This project is entitled "U.S. in the World: Connecting People and Communities." Audubon and League of Women Voter (LWV) leaders will be trained to facilitate in-depth discussions which will lead to increased public awareness of population, environment, and development-related connections between the U.S. and the developing world. The resources produced will be incorporated into ongoing education outreach activities with the members of the National Audubon Society and the League of Women Voters.

- ▶ 600 Audubon leaders
- ▶ 1,200 Leaders in the League of Women Voters
- ▶ 500,000 Audubon members
- ▶ 90,000 League members
- ▶ 4,000 Population Reference Bureau members

- ▶ General public

7. *Project Concern International*

(American Medical Student Association and OPTIONS)

This project, "Global-Local Health Links 1997," is a follow-on to the 1996 project and will educate medical students and practicing health professionals about specific links between international health development and domestic health concerns (e.g., how development programs curb infectious diseases of serious concern to the U.S.; and how community health care strategies developed in international aid programs can and are being applied to solve U.S. public health problems). It will reach:

- ▶ 28,000 members of AMSA who are students from 150 medical schools
- ▶ Students at more than 1,600 of America's dental, pharmaceutical, nursing and physician's assistants schools
- ▶ OPTIONS members who are medical professionals from a broad range of specialists
- ▶ 7,000 medical professionals on the OPTIONS mailing list
- ▶ 10,000 PCI donors
- ▶ 1 million Southern California cable subscribers through cable network programs

FY 1996

1. *Christian Reformed World Relief Committee*

(Bread for the World Institute)

"Education for Action" focuses on creating awareness and interest about international development, hunger, poverty, and foreign aid through a network strategy linking various activities with U.S. grassroots leaders. It will reach:

- 44,000 recipients of Bread for the World Institute's newsletters
- 3,600 congregations (Bread For the World's "covenant churches" and contributing churches)
- 18 million people linked to this project as members of the networks which are the responsibility of the Network Leaders,
- broader faith group members, and
- communities where these networks are active.

2. *The Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs*

(American Farm Bureau Federation)

"Expanding Partnerships with American Farmers: Grassroots Outreach for Global Growth" focuses on increasing awareness of international development programs throughout the U.S. agricultural community, highlighting the impact of these programs through workshops and presentations that offer opportunities for Farm Bureau members to become involved in development activities in other countries. Of the 4.5 million members of the American Farm Bureau Federation aware of the project, workshops and training activities will target:

- 15,000 farmers and ranchers
- Participants at board meetings, the women's and young farmers' meetings.

- Trade shows will be reached by educational media activities conducted by returned American Farm Bureau Federation Farmer-to-Farmer program volunteers

3. *Population Reference Bureau, Inc.*

(National Geographic Society's Geography Education Program and the National Council for Geographic Education)

"Adventures on Earth: Exploring Our Global Links" develops and provides teaching materials to help students in grades 6-12 make the connections between local actions, global systems, and international development. The materials will be prepared with the assistance of geography and environmental science teachers. Audiences include:

- ▶ 108 master teachers, who in turn will train an average of 75 other teachers each: 8,100 teachers total
- ▶ 500,000 students of the above (each of the 8,100 teachers used materials with 60 students)
- ▶ 170,000 members of National Geographic Society's Alliance Network (classroom teachers and university professors)
- ▶ 46,000 readers of the Population Reference Bureau's educational newsletter
- ▶ 8,000 members of Population Reference Bureau and the National Council for Geographic Education

4. *Project Concern International*

(American Medical Student Association., OPTIONS Service, and the United Nations Association of San Diego)

"Global-Local Health Links 1996" creates an atmosphere of understanding about international health and development and its importance to American interests. It also stresses the links between international health and development programs and America's domestic health and economic concerns, thus increasing the number of health professionals and others knowledgeable about, and committed to, participating in international development activities. The project is targeted to:

- ▶ 30,000 members of the American Medical Student Association at 160 U.S. schools of medicine
- ▶ 7,000 physicians who have participated as medical volunteers in developing countries through the OPTIONS program
- ▶ 10,000 supporters of Project Concern International
- ▶ 1 million viewers of UNA-San Diego's cable channel

5. *World Resources Institute (WRI)*

(Joint Center for Sustainable Communities and the U.S. Network for Habitat II)

This project will create and publish a new unit in the "Teacher's Guide to World Resources" series (a highly acclaimed set of curriculum materials that connect global and local environmental issues) geared to secondary school classes. This Teacher's Guide is based on WRI's World Resources Report and teaches U.S. students about urban environmental problems

in major cities worldwide and how innovative and courageous solutions have been devised to deal with some of them.

- ▶ 40 master teacher participants in training sessions, each of whom will receive incentives and materials to train 40 additional teachers: 1,600 teachers total
- ▶ 40,000 students of the above (each teacher reaches 25 students)

Source: USAID Development Education Program.

ANNEX B SAMPLE OF INTERVIEW COMMENTS

Audience

“If there is one country in the world in which it matters whether there is an international perspective, it is the US.”

“Youth.”

“The young.”

Messages/Themes

“Not good neighbor, but good citizen.”

“Humanitarian message rings a better bell.”

“Enlightened self interest.”

“Connectedness – mutual benefit.”

“You don’t build public support with a narrow self-interest message, but humanitarian arguments limit how much you are going to do”

“Rainforests, oceans, wetlands, all have penetrated the consciousness of the young,” but not development

“Focus on prospects for a better, safer world”

Strategies/Approaches

“Problem with a schools approach is that you can’t publish at the national level.”

“Education generates knowledge/understanding, but not action or attitudes – goals of the Biden-Pell program have been mismatched.”

“Need to talk to people to find out what drives them – what are their fears?”

“We have tried to sell aid in short-term ways with arguments that are our own worst enemy.”

“Partnership approach had many unanticipated consequences – led to new partnerships.”

“Cannot have enough foreign exchange.”

“Short-term does not work – need longer-term to develop a stake in development.”

“Dev ed is an investment in the long term, but you can see change within 5 to 10 years.”

“Great USAID programs – Lessons Without Borders, Operation Days Work.”

“Will get nowhere without an emphasis on education.”

“Operation Days Work a great idea.”

The Current USAID Dev Ed Program

“Move to LPA makes good sense”

“LPA has done some very good things that are dev ed but not called dev ed – Operation Days Work.”

“The partnership approach was a great improvement.”

“One-year too short.”

“Partnerships should have clear roles and responsibilities.”

“Quarterly reporting too much.”

“Too many hoops to jump through for the amount of money – organizations deserve a lot of credit.”

“Most important USAID contribution in early years was to create a community of people involved in dev ed – and to spur additional foundation money.”

“Biden-Pell programs have been good – question is how to scale up.”

“Biden-Pell put dev ed on the map.”

“Should now build on its success – make it add up to something.”

“Educate without lobbying – can be done in a very non-self-serving way.”

“Federal information should only be in response to requests from outside groups.”

“USAID must stop acting as though it is the Department of Education.”

“Has not been very good at results reporting.”

“Partnerships too dependent on a single individual.”

“Two-year grants have disadvantages as well as advantages.”

“Indoctrinating not a proper role for the Executive Branch.”

“Must either do away with it or have the Agency demonstrate why it is needed.”

Future Possibilities

“Not sure piecemeal efforts are worth it anymore.”

“Dev ed messages have been too weak.”

“People who care about aid should start thinking about it in a global way.”

“No to a campaign – too close to propaganda.”

“Campaign is too passive.”

“Don’t trust that government can come up with a campaign message that works.”

“Working with teachers is cost effective – training one teacher exposes 100 kids each year.”

“If you want change, get them while they are young”

“You need at least some consensus among the major players about what you are trying to achieve.”

“USAID should invest in a small number of organizations at strategic level.”

“Focus on education of the young.”

“PVOs do not know how to do formal ed; need education organizations.”

“A portion of every USAID project should be devoted to education.”

“Work with companies to get them to advertise/educate – e.g., Starbucks on environmental degradation.”

“Avoid the problems associated with curriculum development, focus on service (ala Americas Promise).”

“Operation Days Work is great because it not only gets students excited, it gives them something to do.”

“Create synergy with Operation Days Work.”

“Operation Days Work very staff intensive.”

“There is a great deal going on that can be tapped, mobilized.”

“Need both an immediate short-term (emergency) effort and a longer-term investment in the young.”