Introduction

The United Nations University (UNU) has been testing a framework and indicators of governance as well as different methodologies of data collection in the pilot phase of a World Governance Assessment (WGA). The WGA is an attempt to provide a better picture of how the quality of governance changes over time in countries around the world. The pilot phase was conducted in 23 countries around the world in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and local institutions. Based on the experience of the pilot phase, this paper presents a preliminary assessment of the methodological issues and highlights some suggestions for the most appropriate way to proceed in a global “roll-out” of the survey.

The paper is organized as follows. It begins with a brief discussion of the conceptual framework of the project and how the field directors and respondents received it. The second section illustrates the scope of the pilot survey and the issues associated with the field design. The third section discusses the data collection exercise and assesses the pros and cons of different approaches. The fourth focuses on the key issues encountered in analyzing the data. The final part draws the necessary conclusion for the task of conducting a worldwide assessment.

The Conceptual Framework

The challenge in developing a suitable framework for this study has been twofold. The first has been the need to give governance a distinct meaning so that it can be distinguished from other activities that governments and civil society engage in. The international community has commonly used the concept to identify the way a country makes and implements policy. There has been no distinction between policy-making, policy
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implementation or any other aspect of public policy. This use of governance is inadequate for this survey since it encompasses everything and therefore tells us nothing. In this project, therefore, we have deliberately made a difference between governance, policy-making and policy implementation. We see governance referring to the way a society sets and manages the rules that guide policy-making and policy implementation. Governance, therefore, operates at a conceptually higher level than policy and its implementation. Adopting an “input-output” model of the political process, we identified six aspects of the political process where governance is relevant.\(^2\) We eventually decided to refer to these as governance arenas. These six arenas are:

- **Civil Society**, where the rules for political participation, socialization and articulation of demands are the main focus;
- **Political Society**, where the rules for aggregating policy are the principal focus, through an assessment of the rules for electing political representatives and their own role both vis-à-vis government and the public;
- **Government**, where we are interested in the norms guiding government’s role as steward of societal or public interests;
- **Bureaucracy**, where we are interested in the rules that influence the operations of the civil service and its interaction with society;
- **Economic Society**, where our interest centers on the rules that shape state-market interactions in a global economy; and
- **Judiciary**, where our interest is foremost in the rules that guide the operations of dispute and conflict resolving institutions.

The other challenge has been to divorce the concept of governance from its close connection to liberal democracy. Because “good governance” has come to be associated with liberal democracy by the mainstream international development agencies, the concept has become unnecessarily contentious. Our design is meant to steer clear of this controversy. It assumes that governance may be perceived as good in a given country even if it does not conform to the Western notion of democracy. By allowing well-informed persons assess the quality of governance in their own country we get a more accurate sense of how they perceive the rules that affect the legitimacy and the effectiveness of the regime in place. We believe we get a better appreciation of what governance means to people in different countries and how perceptions of governance change over time. No such assessment exists at this time and ours is meant to provide this kind of data as a complement to the data on aspects of governance that are generated by various organizations for cross-country comparisons.\(^3\)

Judging from the responses we obtained from the field survey, we feel confident that our approach lives up to the challenges we have identified.\(^4\) Out of a total of 929 persons interviewed, only one questioned the framework, suggesting that it was “biased in favor of

\(^2\) A full background discussion of the conceptualization used in this project is available in Goran Hyden and Julius Court, “Governance and Development: Sorting Out the Basics”, United Nations University, World Governance Assessment Project Working Paper No. 1, February 2001.

\(^3\) Among others, existing sources include the Freedom House Index of Civil Liberties and Political Rights, the International Country Risk Guide on political risks to investors, the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the U.S. Department of State, the Economic Freedom Index of the Heritage Foundation on respect for private property.

\(^4\) A comprehensive discussion on ways to improve the WGA based on comments received from WIPs and country coordinators in the pilot phase is provided in the “Improving the World Governance Assessment: Comments by WGA Respondents and Country Coordinators in the Pilot Phase” by Monica Blagescu, Julius Court, Goran Hyden and Keiko Suzuki, WGA Discussion Note, United Nations University.
the western model of governance.” The majority expressed support for the idea of the survey and the comprehensiveness of the framework, as indicated in a few comments below:

- “The Argentine data validates the hypothesis that critical process variables are often overlooked in favor of outcome measures.” – Argentine Country Coordinator.
- “There were actually no serious constraints in preparing the data collection of the WGA in Indonesia. Many [experts] were keen to be respondents of the survey. This was not only because of the interesting theme of the survey but also because it was the first time ever such a survey on governance was being conducted in Indonesia. The dimensions and the questions presented in the questionnaire cover the comprehensive issue of governance.” – Indonesia Country Coordinator.
- “On the whole, the experts perceived the questionnaire with great interest and appreciation. There were proposals to publish the survey results both for Kyrgyzstan and in comparison with other countries where the survey was administered.” – Kyrgyzstan Country Coordinator.

The project would provide an overall assessment of governance for each country as well as a basis for cross-country analysis and regional comparisons. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to run the kind of public opinion survey that would do justice to perceptions of governance in different social groups. Thus, we expect that wherever interests in these issues exist, our survey may serve as a spring-board for further work by other agencies or groups, academic or activist.

**The Scope of the Pilot Survey**

The WGA survey questionnaire is comprised of thirty indicators, each using the same five-point response scale. Respondents are asked to rate various issues concerning governance as either very high, high, moderate, low, or very low. The items are equally divided into six sections covering six arenas mentioned above. Twenty-eight items were used to calculate the current governance score (WGA) and governance score five years earlier (WGA5). Both measures have a minimum value of 28 and a maximum value of 140.

The survey was administered to groups of well-informed persons (WIPs) in twenty-three countries. The ten groups of WIPs included people working in the government, business, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), parliament, legal professions, international organizations, the civil service, academia, religious organizations, and the media. These were selected by the country coordinator based on instructions to select a cross-section of people who were experienced in, and informed on, governance issues. The index has six theoretically defined principles, which include participation, fairness, transparency, efficiency, decency, and accountability. Table 1 presents the median, mean, standard deviation, and sample size for each item comprising the WGA and WGA5 indices.
Table 1. Modes, Means, and Standard Deviations for the WGA Survey Items

(See Appendix 1 for a link from the acronyms to the full wording of the items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>WGA Items</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FREX</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FPAA</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DIPO</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GFPD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIRE</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LREP</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COPP</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PUPR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LEFU</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PSEC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>STOL</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NATI</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MISU</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PRIC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>HICS</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MEBA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ACCO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>DEPR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EAPS</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PRPR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>REFI</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>COTR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CPPP</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>GLTR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>JUCI</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DMJS</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>JUOA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ILHR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NJPC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation

A country coordinator was identified to implement the survey in each country. The complete set of instructions for country coordinators is available in Appendix 2. Country coordinators were divided between the heads of local research and policy institutes working on governance and/or development issues and senior researchers located at local universities. The senior researchers were mostly political scientists or economists. The country coordinators were paid between US$2,000 and US$3,000 to deliver thirty-five completed questionnaires and to prepare a report. In addition, they were required to transcribe the open-ended comments and enter the results of the completed surveys into an Excel spreadsheet.
The WGA was administered in English, French, Spanish, Russian, Mongolian, Thai, Arabic, and Korean. When the translation was not done by the UNU itself, the local country coordinators translated the questionnaires into the local language (i.e. for Mongolian, Thai and Korean). The study also used several modes, including face-to-face interviews, faxes, and emails. In some countries all surveys were completed face-to-face, while in most others, it was a mixture. See Appendix 3 for the full questionnaire used in the pilot phase.

**Sampling**

The survey was conducted in the spring of 2001 in twenty-three countries. At the time of this report, however, data were available for twenty-one countries. Sample sizes, displayed in Table 2, varied widely from a low of twenty-three in Barbados to a high of forty-two in Bulgaria, Togo, and Thailand. While the goal was to interview an equal number of WIPs from each expert group, many countries had very uneven distributions. The most under-represented group of WIPs was religious organizations at eleven, while WIPs from business numbered the highest, at ninety-two (see Table 3). Some country coordinators did a good job of sampling an equal number of WIPs from each group (e.g., Jordan, Thailand and Togo), while others sampled more WIPs or too few compared to the proposed number.

**Table 2. Sample Sizes of Pilot Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, the usable sample sizes were much smaller due to missing values, with some countries falling into the low teens. It is also unclear in several cases exactly how the sample was drawn, the respondents selected, and the country study managed.

### Table 3. Samples Sizes of the Expert Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of WIPs</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert group-type missing</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Rates

The information available to calculate response rates was very limited and not available for all countries. The overall response rate for the seventeen countries reporting was 57 percent; four countries did not provide any information. Response rates (displayed in Table 4), like the sample sizes, varied considerably. Kyrgyzstan, Togo, Samoa, and Jordan all had response rates above 70 percent, while Argentina and Pakistan were both under 36 percent. Response rates were calculated in the simplest manner, with the numerator consisting of the number of completes and the denominator consisting of the number of WIPs approached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sample Released</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OECD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection Strategies and Constraints

There are various ways of collecting data for a project like this. Most institutions that collect data on various aspects of governance tend to rely on international panels of experts or well-informed persons. Members of these panels exclusively make the country assessments. Such panels have two advantages. First of all, they are relatively cheap. Secondly, they generate information that allow for cross-country comparisons. They also have major drawbacks. The panelists are not necessarily experts on each country they evaluate. They provide highly subjective assessments and they certainly cannot provide a detailed commentary.

We decided against this approach on the following grounds. First, we wanted to generate data that reflected the views of people on the ground in the pilot countries. We wanted the subjective perceptions of governance to come from those to whom the subject was most important. Second, we did not want to duplicate the approaches already used by other agencies. We believe to actually break new ground by transcending the current governance debate that tends to be associated with how well individual countries conform to a Western defined concept of “good governance”. By using a functional framework and allowing people in each country to make a self-assessment, we hope to provide a valuable and necessary complement to the existing data banks and reports.

Data collection within individual countries may also be arranged in different ways. One is a public opinion survey drawing on a representative cross-section of the population. A second is to interview a number of experts. The third is to conduct focus group discussions representing different strata of society.

The public opinion survey approach would have been the most desirable in some ways. Such an approach would help generate credible data on public perceptions of governance. We had to reject this approach on three grounds. The first is simply the cost of conducting such surveys. According to Gallup International, such a survey may cost somewhere in the range of $50,000 per country. We could not justify such expenses, especially since it would have been hard to ask governance questions of a cross-section of the public in each country. A second reason for rejecting it, therefore, was simply that we would not be able to generate the type of data we wanted. The third reason for not embarking on a public opinion survey was the problem of drawing representative samples in many countries. The infrastructure for selecting such samples and how to determine what is representative of the population discouraged us even further from thinking about this approach.

For the main approach, we opted for a survey of well-informed persons (WIPs) in each country. These were individuals who were experienced in and informed about the governance realm. They would be able to provide the most knowledgeable ratings about governance as well as qualitative comments to back up their assessments. We have already referred to the problem of sampling, an issue which the pilot phase has helped us clarify. We believe that it is feasible to develop sampling frameworks that are acceptable for this kind of assessment. A second issue that requires our attention before a full survey can be launched is the phrasing of the questions. According to our respondents, not all questions were as clearly stated as they could have been. We plan to deal with this partly by editing the questions, but also by providing a better explanation of what we are asking the respondents to address in each question. By doing so, we are likely to enhance the validity of the survey.
We had plans to conduct focus group discussions in three pilot countries as a way of learning what type of data that approach will generate. Unfortunately, in the end, we have a very limited experience to draw from since data were submitted only from one country—the Philippines. Nevertheless, a few things came out very clearly from the Philippine study. In terms of strengths, it is clear that the approach can generate information about the background conditions that determine certain ratings. One obtains a much better sense of the independent variables that determine governance ratings. A second advantage is that, because it is highly participatory, it has the potential of generating solutions to the problems identified by the group members.

However, the focus group approach also has certain disadvantages that cannot be ignored. The focus group approach is very demanding and requires very skilled coordinators. We are not sure that it would be possible to find such coordinators in many countries. Second, since the approach catalyzes collective integrated thinking, it makes individual ratings insignificant. Another drawback is that accuracy suffers, as some individuals may not feel comfortable to speak up in public. A third point is that, although it generates more location-specific data, the focus group approach yields less systematic results. For instance, in the Philippine study, there were marked differences between groups depending on social background and geographic location, e.g. Luzon versus Mindanao. While we do not reject the idea that the focus group approach may constitute a complementary approach to data collection, we decided, on balance, that it would not serve our purposes. It simply would have left us with more questions than answers when it comes to assessing the data. Our assessment reflects the consensus view of most researchers, i.e. that focus groups are best used to identify issues and develop surveys rather than as the only source of data.

**Strategy in the Data Analysis**

In survey research, there are often questions regarding whether or not the distribution is normal and if the respondents in the sample were randomly selected and representative of the population of interest. The inconsistent sample sizes of the expert groups in each country led to considerable variations. The loss of usable observations due to missing values reduced the sample size significantly in some countries, and in the case of Samoa, eliminated it completely from the analysis. In addition, response rates also varied widely. That said, since this was a pilot project, these problems are not unusual or unexpected, especially in a complex multi-national study. These factors, however, mandate a conservative approach to the data analysis. In many tables, both the mean and the median statistics are reported. We have chosen to report the median to reduce the effect of outliers. All data analysis was performed using the SAS statistical package Version 8.

**WGA Indices**

**Reliability**

Reliability is the fundamental issue in all research and is especially important in psychological measurement. Scale or index reliability is the proportion of variance explained by the items making up the scale. This can be estimated using various methods, such as Cronbach’s alpha, which is based on the correlation between items. Cronbach’s alpha is calculated as

\[
\alpha = \frac{N}{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\text{Sum of Variances of Items}}{\text{Variance of Total Score}}\right)
\]

where \(N\) is the number of items, and the numerator is the sum of the variances of the items, and the denominator is the variance of the total score.

---

5 See Appendix 5 for a comparison of ratings between the focus groups approach and WIP approach in the Philippines.

attributable to the true score of the latent variable, which in this case is governance. Reliability and statistical power are interrelated: as reliability increases, so does the statistical power of the scale. Reliability is inversely related to errors of measurement; the larger the error, the worse the reliability.7 One way to increase reliability is to increase the number of scale items. In other words, scales with more items are likely to generate greater internal consistency. The most common statistical approach to measure this is Cronbach’s Alpha.8 Internal consistency is attained when the items, designed to measure the same construct, interrelate with one another.9 The number of items in the scale or index affects Cronbach’s Alpha. Generally, the more items in a scale or subscale, the higher the Alpha and, therefore, the higher the reliability.

The WGA consists of twenty-eight positively and two negatively worded items. The number of questions seems reasonable, although a couple of WIPs complained it was too long. The two negatively worded items (#3 and #23), after reversing the values, were negatively correlated with every other item in the WGA. This may suggest that respondents engaged in what is referred to as “satisficing”10 but as the first item occurs in the third question of the survey, it is doubtful that respondent fatigue is the answer. Satisficing occurs when a respondent does not pay close attention to survey questions and takes cognitive shortcuts. Often, respondents will answer in the same way to multiple items, or, in some cases, to the entire survey. An examination of the individual responses from each country uncovered only a handful of cases where a respondent entered the same value for every question in the survey. While there is usually some satisficing in all surveys, there is no indication that the WGA survey had an excessive amount. However, due to the problems with the two negatively worded items, calculations in this paper are based on only twenty-eight items, with questions 3 and 23 having been removed.

Both indices presented in Table 5 have a minimum value of 28 and a maximum value 140. Simply put, the higher the number, the better the perception of governance. The six principles, also presented in Table 5, have varying minimums and maximums, and share some of the same items. The participation principle has a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 50, and consists of the following items from the survey: FREX, FPAA, GFPD, CIRE, COPP, LEFU, HICS, CPPP, JUCI, and NJPC. Fairness also has a minimum value of 10 and a maximum value of 50 and consists of CIRE, LREP, PUPR, STOL, MEBA, EAPS, PRPR, GLTR, JUCI, and ILHR (DIPO and COTR not included). Transparency has a minimum value of 9 and a maximum of 45 and consists of GFPD, LEAP, NATI, MISU, ACCO, DEPR, CPPP, GLTR, and DMJS (DIPO and COTR not included). The efficiency principle has a low value of 6 and a possible high of 30 and consists of HICS, MEBA, DEPR, PRPR, REFI, and GLTR. The decency principle has a low of 8 and a possible high of 40 and consists of PUPR, PSEC, STOL, PRIC, EAPS, REFI, ILHR, and NJPC (DIPO not included). Finally, the accountability principle has a minimum value of 10 and a maximum value of 50 and consists of LREP, COPP, LEFU, LEAP, NATI, MISU, ACCO, CPPP, DMJS, JUOA (COTR not included).

---

The results presented in Table 6 and 7 suggest that the WGA index and the six principles all exhibit very high levels of reliability, as measured by Cronbach’s Alpha. Both the WGA and the WGA5 results showed very high Alpha scores of .94. The theoretically based principles, which share some items, did very well ranging between .86 for Fairness to .79 for the Efficiency principle. These are all well above the threshold of .70 suggested by Nunnally.\(^{11}\) Generally, studies with Alphas above .60 are considered reliable.

Table 5. Modes, Means, and Standard Deviations for the WGA, WGA5 and the Six Principles (See Appendix 4 for a link to the items in each principle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WGA present</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGA 5 years ago</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decency</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. WGA and WGA5 Alpha Scores with and without DIPO and COTR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Scores</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha with negative items DIPO and COTR included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WGA present</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGA 5 years ago</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Alpha Scores for the Six Principles. (See Appendix 4 for a link to the items in each principle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decency</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Validity

A scale or index is valid if it measures what it was designed to measure. Validation usually involves testing a hypothesis about the scale or index. The test that best fits the WGA is the "known groups" validity test. In the case of the WGA we might hypothesize that countries that are considered to have high levels of governance will score higher on the WGA than countries considered to have lower levels. Similarly, the same may be true of different groups of WIPs groups. In Table 8, the WGA (present) and WGA (5 years ago) are compared to governance indicators developed by Kaufmann and his colleagues at the World Bank. While some of the countries, such as Togo, match up quite well in this comparison, others, such as Nigeria and the Philippines, do not. In these specific cases, the difference is due to the fact that both countries have experienced major political shocks that were captured by the WGA but that happened after the Kaufmann data was compiled. More generally, however, the changes in the country and differences in the expert group sample sizes make direct comparisons problematic.

Table 8. Median WGA, WGA5, and the Kaufmann et. al. Governance Ratings by Country (This table is sorted with the lowest WGA country, Togo, heading the list.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample N</th>
<th>Sample and Expert Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>WGA median</th>
<th>WGA5 median</th>
<th>Kaufmann's Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Evenly Distributed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Very Low sample. No Rel, Media</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>No Rel, Media</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No Position in data</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>High NGO and Acad</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Low Rel., media</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>High Acad, low Gov, Parl, IO, CS</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>V High Business, Acad, Media</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Low N no IO, CS, Rel.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>No positions in data</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>High NGO, low Legal – no Rel, Med</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>No –IO, CS, Acad, Rel, Media</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Low N, no Bus, Parl, Acad, Rel, Med</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>High Business</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Low N - no Gov, Parl, Rel, IO</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Low N- low –Gov, IO, CS, Rel, Med</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No IO, CS, Rel.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No IO, Rel.</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No Religious and Media</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low N - no IO, Rel, Media</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Missing q14 on both WGA/WGA5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two types of factor analysis are usually associated with scale construction: confirmatory and exploratory. Confirmatory factor analysis is used to confirm the multidimensionality of a scale or index. Ideally, items in a group, or in the case of the WGA, principles, will interrelate with one another more strongly than they relate to items in other groups. Generally, a correlation of .30 to .35 is the minimum required for loading on a factor. The addition or deletion of a single item can profoundly affect the results of factor analysis. Although a useful tool, factor analysis should be used cautiously and the results interpreted conservatively. So, while factor analysis is a sophisticated mathematical tool, the final judgment or interpretation of results rests as much with subjective judgment as it does with statistical rules.

The results of the confirmatory factor analysis are displayed in Table 9. We are the first to admit that they are not very good. The minimum correlation (reported in bold) is at least .35. At best, one can see glimpses of Decency in Factor 1, Accountability in Factor 3, and Participation in Factor 4. Lowering the threshold to .30 does not improve things significantly. Factor 2 has many items loading very strongly and appears to be a mix of several principles. At this time, the results of the factor analysis are inconclusive. This could be due to a number of things, not the least of which are the problems with the sample, described above. It could also be that we have not attributed the principles to each indicators clearly enough. Another issue to consider is that definitions of decency and fairness may be culture bound. We do not think that this is reason for abandoning the six theoretical principles – there has been widespread support for them. Rather, we will try to better link the principles to the indicators in each arena in the next phase.

---

13 See, Spector, *op.cit.*
14 See, Comrey, *op.cit.*
Table 9. Results of Orthogonal Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>WGA Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FREX</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FPAA</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DIPO*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GFPD</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIRE</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LREP</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COPP</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PUPR</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LEFU</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PSEC</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>STOL</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NATI</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MISU</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PRIC</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>HICS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MEBA</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>acco</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>DEPR</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EAPS</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PRPR</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>REFI</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>COTR*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CPPP</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>GLTR</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>JUCI</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DMJS</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>JUOA</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ILHR</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NJPC</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DIPO and COTR not included in the factor analysis
Expert Group Analysis

Across the countries and across the regions, the scores of certain experts were significantly higher than other groups. Table 10 reports the median WGA (present) and WGA5 (5 years ago) scores for each of the eleven expert groups. The results presented in Table 11 suggest that WIPs in government, the parliament, and the civil service rate the state of governance significantly higher than others. Other groups, such as WIPs in NGOs, business, religious organizations, international organizations, the media, and academia gave significantly lower scores, which offset these high scoring groups. One can speculate that the three high scoring groups may suffer from self-evaluation bias. Another way to view these results is that WIPs in international organizations, business, the media, religious organizations, and academia are more critical of the state of governance. This is an area that provides basis for interesting and insightful analysis of perceptions of governance among different groups of WIPs.

Table 10. Median Values for the WGA and WGA5 of WIPs Expert Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Group of WIPs</th>
<th>WGA</th>
<th>WGA5</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOs</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11  ANOVA - Differences in the Mean WGA Scores between Different Expert Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Group of WIPs</th>
<th>Difference in Mean WGA Score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government higher than Academics</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government higher than Business</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government higher than NGO</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government higher than International Org</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government higher than Religious</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Government</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Civil Service</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Legal</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Media</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than “Other” Category</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Academics</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Business</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than NGO</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than International Org</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament higher than Religious</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service higher than Academics</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service higher than Business</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service higher than NGO</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service higher than International Org</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 displays the ANOVA results examining the potential differences between experts within each country. In the majority of the fifteen countries with expert group data, there were no significant differences between experts at the country level. The variation in the country and expert group samples is reason for caution in interpreting the results in Table 11. Table 13 examines differences among WIPs from various expert groups at the regional level. The sample sizes for the regional data are not sufficient to draw any sweeping conclusions. Only the Asia region has a decent sample size (9 countries) and significant differences among expert groups do exist. The other regions will have to wait for the full survey where the sampling issues will be addressed.
Table 12. ANOVA Results Testing for Expert Group Differences in Each Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.055*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.085*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.027**</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.077*</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.041**</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>(Missing)</td>
<td>(Missing)</td>
<td>(Missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>(Missing)</td>
<td>(Missing)</td>
<td>(Missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.002***</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < 0.10   ** P < 0.05    *** P < 0.01

Table 13. ANOVA Results Testing for Expert Group Differences in Each Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Expert Sample Size</th>
<th>Number of Countries with Expert data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.009***</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures to Consider for a Worldwide Assessment

The pilot phase of the project was aimed at establishing the viability of carrying out a full-scale governance assessment. Besides the substantial feedback received from having asked WIPs to assess the feasibility of such a project and to make proposals for improvement,
many lessons were learned from the data collection exercise. In moving towards the next phase of the project, we plan to pay special attention to the following matters:

**Questionnaire**

The country coordinators and respondents made some very useful suggestions on the questionnaire. Much of the feedback received regarding the questions was positive, supporting both the content covered by the questions and the form in which they were presented. Given the diverse nature of the countries where the pilot phase of the survey was carried out, this was certainly noteworthy.

However, certain observations point to some flaws and provide suggestions for improvement. There were repeated comments that certain questions were too general. Such an approach is somewhat inevitable given that we are trying to identify widely acceptable principles of governance. Other questions were seen as too complex or covered multiple issues. We very much acknowledge there is room for improvement in all these questions. For a future survey, we would certainly generate a more precisely defined and focused set of questions.

There was also the comment that the indicators in some dimensions look at the *de jure* rather the *de facto* aspect of various issues, the argument being that a law or regulation may have already been adopted yet in practice it is not enforced. We believe that for our purposes, the *de facto* situation is relevant and therefore that certain questions would need to be reformulated to avoid any misinterpretation.

In the pilot phase, we wanted to get some indication of the trend over time and thought that the timeframe of “5 years ago” and “now” was appropriate. The five-year time frame, however, was regarded as having been arbitrarily chosen and too short for tracking changes in stable countries such as India and Argentina. In other cases, a change in perceptions over a five-year period might not be appropriate as certain countries might undergo dramatic changes over a shorter period of time. For the full roll-out, we plan to repeat the survey every two years thus providing regular longitudinal data. Therefore, it makes sense that in the next round we should also perhaps seek comments for “2 years ago” so as to provide an initial indication of changes over time. Running the project on a regular basis, so that more than two time-reference points are available, would provide a better background for analysis of the way that processes, institutions and actors are linked and interact.

Finally, one of the main purposes of the pilot phase was to seek comments on the questionnaire and the approach to data collection. In the next round, we would ask the WIPs to provide qualitative and diagnostic comments regarding the main governance challenges in their countries as well as to suggest solutions that they consider would increase the

---

15 See “Improving the World Governance Assessment: Comments by WGA Respondents and Country Coordinators in the Pilot Phase” by Monica Blagescu, Julius Court, Goran Hyden and Keiko Suzuki, WGA Discussion Note, United Nations University.

16 For details see Blagescu et al., *op cit*.

17 A particularly valuable use of the assessment will be in providing a rich overview at the national level. The results should initially be analyzed on a case-by-case basis taking into account historical, cultural and other factors pertaining to each country. In this regard, some WIPs emphasized the need to include a longer comment section for each question/dimension and encourage the respondents to provide more extensive remarks.

18 The problem with the negatively worded questions, (Q3 and Q23) was pointed out previously and will also be changed before moving on to the next project phase.
governance scores.

Sampling

One of the most challenging aspects of a project like this is sampling. The issues that we have to give careful consideration to include: (i) sample size and tightening the criteria for each of the expert groups of WIPs, (ii) estimating the sample population size, (iii) attempting to use lists to randomly select respondents that will address issues of representativeness and randomness. Greater central control of the administration of the project in the field – as discussed further below – should help resolve many of the issues in this area.

Sample Size and Criteria for Selecting WIPs

The sample sizes varied considerably in the pilot study. In some countries, the number of experts in each group was inconsistent. For example, NGOs, and civil society in general, were under-represented in the sampling list during the pilot phase.\(^{19}\) For the next survey, we are planning a sample size of at least five WIPs from each of the ten expert groups. This would increase the sample size in each country to fifty. With more centralized control of the sampling process, the problems of sample size and balance should be reduced.

The WIPs should be a minimum of 35 years of age and should have significant experience in the respective country on governance issues. They should be able to answer questions on the main arenas of governance in their country over the past 5 years and would be selected in a structured random way from the following types of organizations or contexts.

**Government:** This category includes all politically appointed individuals, whether full ministers, deputy or assistant ministers, politically appointed director generals or state secretaries. They should come from a cross-section of ministries and indicate whether they come from central (federal) government or any other level of government.

**Parliament:** This includes all politically elected individuals in legislative institutions. As much as possible respondents should be chosen in accordance with the distribution of seats by party or any other relevant criteria. It should be clear whether respondents come from national (federal) or provincial (regional, state) legislatures.

**Civil Service:** This category includes individuals appointed to positions in the bureaucracy. Respondents should be selected from among the top echelons distributed among a cross-section of departments or ministries, from central (federal) civil service and any other level of government service.

**Business:** This category refers to business-persons. In order to keep this group homogenous, only top managers or directors should be selected. It is likely that country lists would include mostly large and medium-size corporations or companies.

**Media:** This group includes persons employed in the media sector (radio, television, newspapers). Respondents should be selected from a cross-section of the industry, preferably

---

\(^{19}\) Related points were also mentioned by some of the country coordinators; for example regarding the need to better ensure that WIPs were from all major fields pertaining to governance and also from different regions of the country – for details see Blagescu et al., *op cit.*
from both privately and publicly owned institutions. Priority should be given to those who deal with news rather than entertainment or sports.

**Religious Organizations:** This group includes leading figures in churches, mosques, temples and other religious institutions. Respondents should be selected as much as possible so as to reflect the distribution of religious beliefs in the country.

**Legal and Judicial Field:** This group includes judges, magistrates and attorneys. Respondents should be selected from among both those sitting in courts and those who work as private lawyers.

**Institutions of Higher Education:** This group includes professors and lecturers in universities and colleges. Respondents should be selected from different fields of specialization and preferably also from more than one institutions.

**Non-Governmental Organizations:** This category includes domestic organizations active in civil society. Respondents should be selected from a cross-section of such organizations. Effort should be made to include leaders of the main organizations such as trade unions, cooperative movements, environmental organizations or human rights groups.

**International Organizations:** This group includes both intergovernmental organizations, e.g. United Nations or regional bodies, and international NGOs working in the country. Respondents should be selected from a cross-section of both these sub-categories.

**Estimating the Populations of the Groups of WIPs**

Based on subsequent discussions with the pilot country coordinators, we expect it to be possible to create lists of the WIPs in the ten expert groups in most countries. Increasingly, lists of people, who comprise these expert groups, are available on the Internet, in phone directories, through national or international organizations, professional associations, and other sources. While some people may not be on such lists, the trade off of missing some is acceptable when weighed against the advantages of having a defined sampling frame from which to randomly select respondents. The selection of respondents must be as random as possible given the wide range of different countries, cultures, and development. Without such a random selection, the results will likely suffer from problems of reliability and representativeness.

Only in countries where this approach is not deemed feasible will we attempt other types of sampling, such as reputational sampling. By examining newspapers and other sources, a core group of WIPs could be identified. Once a core group of WIPs has been identified, other WIPs can be identified using “snowball sampling”. Such sampling is fairly straightforward to implement. At the close of each interview, or at the end of the questionnaire, the identified WIPs are asked to identify others who are informed on the issues contained in the survey questionnaire. We recognize that while it may become necessary to use this approach in some countries, a potential problem is having a sample with too many like-minded respondents.

**The Data and the Analysis**

One of the major issues we encountered in the pilot study was explaining the rationale and the substantive meaning behind each ranking the respondents gave. Although the questions
provided rough explanations, we did not provide clear guidelines regarding the practical significance of each score for each question. Although overall the ratings and comments by different WIPs did not vary too much within countries, there were certain questions that registered greater variations. Similarly, some respondents provided qualitative comments that were not consistent. Therefore, during the data analysis, it was unclear what explicit and implicit issues the WIPs had in mind when responding to the survey.

Although the WGA would be primarily used as a diagnostic instrument within each country studied, we are interested to explore the possibility of meaningful cross-country analyses and comparisons. In the pilot phase, cross-country analyses and comparisons revealed some rather questionable results. For example, Argentina seems to have one of the least transparent civil services while Nigeria the most transparent among all pilot countries. Such results are not credible, perhaps reflecting the euphoria in Nigeria after the shift away from dictatorship and the current economic problems in Argentina.\(^{20}\) Therefore, based on the pilot phase, the most important issue to resolve before moving on to the next phase is the reliability of the survey as a tool for comparisons across countries. Making credible cross-country comparisons requires that ratings be made against standard global guidelines rather than implicit local ones. Local experts, although highly knowledgeable with the situation in their own country, might not possess the international perspective that would allow them to put their national perceptions in a regional and global context. At the same time, though, as pointed out, international panels of experts would lack the insightfulness local WIPs have, and would not present a better alternative.

We believe that the problem of comparing across countries can be resolved by providing a more standardized method of rating. This would be done by calibrating the choice of responses to each question. Each question would have a brief and clear description covering the main points for each rating. Based on such guidelines, respondents would provide results that can be measured against clear standards, thus facilitating comparisons both across countries and over time. A revised example, based on the reviewer comments is below:

1. **To what extent do citizens enjoy the freedom of peaceful assembly?**

   *In answering this question, please note that we are interested in the real (de facto) opportunities for citizens to participate peacefully in the public realm. It also includes the right that no one is forced to belong to an association.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) a few (usually administrative) restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) some administrative, informal or legal restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate restrictions, with some sanctions for unregistered meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) the state regularly restricts participation &amp; sanctions participants in unregistered meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) most public meetings require considerable state guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{20}\) Including control variables in the next round could also help even out or explain scores like we saw in Nigeria when we try to make cross country or regional comparisons.
It would be relatively simple to prepare such a calibration system for all questions – the description would need to cover the main points for each rating, but not be too lengthy otherwise the questionnaire would be unwieldy and it may actually make it more difficult for respondents in different countries to rate their situation. If respondents in all countries have this sort of guidelines, real cross-country comparisons become much more credible. It would also help facilitate comparisons over time and reduce the effect of extreme events on WIPs’ perceptions of governance in their country – e.g. Nigeria in the pilot phase. Nevertheless, in order to further assess issues of regional or global inter-country assessments, we will also need to use external panels of experts to complement the local panels.21

The qualitative data collected through the open-ended comments from the standard questionnaire could be transcribed into an electronic format and analyzed using text analysis software. The richness gained from this exercise would provide a useful complement to the quantitative data collected with the WGA survey instrument.

Mode

The pilot was conducted using several different modes including email, mail, in-person and by fax. Clearly, when dealing with elites, a variety of modes will be necessary. Often when different modes are employed in a single study, the data can be affected. Numerous studies have documented these differences.22 However, by using some techniques pioneered by Dillman, these differences can be minimized. The questionnaire format used in the WGA is amenable to such techniques. Therefore, whichever mode will be used should not have to adversely affect the reliability of the data. Once the number of countries is increased and more western countries are included in the sample, we are considering the use of a web-based survey. Recently, at the American Association of Public Opinion Research Conference, several papers addressed web-based surveys of elite populations. It would seem that most of the WIPs in the expert groups we are seeking to interview are connected to and use the Internet.

There are many advantages to using a web-based survey. The major benefits include cost, ease of data collection, improved data quality, and for those with access, convenience. For the respondent, there is nothing to send-in or fax, and the survey can be done at any time of the night or day. Considering that many WIPs are very busy people, making the survey task simple and convenient will likely boost response rates. Using this mode also allows for instant access to the data collected, which helps identify trends that can inform sampling decisions. While web surveys are relatively new, it is clear that for certain populations, they can achieve very high response rates and be very cost effective. If successful, it could be possible to increase the size of the samples from fifty to seventy-five or more, per country, for a very reasonable price.

21 Related to this, many comments refer to the need to further simplify and focus the questions and this will need to be done.
Project Management and Field Operations

Central Oversight
We believe that a more centralized management of the sampling and the implementation of the survey is necessary. This survey is too large and the sampling too complicated not to have a formal oversight process requiring the undivided attention of a skilled survey professional, or field director, for several months prior to the survey while the survey is in the field; and for a few months after the survey is out of the field, to coordinate the data entry and coding problems. Once the survey is in the field, the field director should be in regular contact with the country coordinators to exchange information on response rates. Again, assuming all the country coordinators have Internet access, communication is very inexpensive and increasingly reliable in most parts of the world. Important information about individual country samples can be posted on the site for easy access.

Country Coordinators
We suggest that the country coordinators be asked to provide additional information on the conditions of the country, both general and of special significance. What we have in mind are significant event indicators that could capture a political crisis, scandal, regime change, natural disasters, etc., that may have influenced the respondents’ answers. These variables could be coded either as dummy variables or they could use a scale from one to five to be able to gauge the severity of the event. A variable identifying the type of sampling used, the mode of the data collection, the number of contacts, and the language of the survey will also be used in the full survey. Under consideration, finally, is also a short series of questions to gather information on the extent of the respondent’s involvement in politics, sources of news and information, and the closeness with which they follow national and international events. This information will help better understand the extent to which the respondents meet the assumptions associated with being identified as a WIP.

Coverage
When moving on to the next phase, coverage needs to be more carefully considered. Adding the OECD countries – represented in the pilot phase by South Korea only – should pose no problems. We hope that in most Latin American and African countries the problems will be no more severe than the ones encountered while running the pilot phase. But given that certain Asian and Middle Eastern countries are expected to be characterized by more closed and repressive societies, problems will arise when trying to implement the project there.

In the pilot phase we did not seek acceptance and collaboration from governments regarding the survey. Efforts were rather focused on choosing respected researchers with a high degree of integrity and objectivity to be country coordinators. It was the decision of the country coordinator to contact the government or not, and we intend to follow such approach in the full roll-out of the assessment.

We are well aware, however, that some countries cannot be covered by the project (e.g., North Korea). In other countries, undertaking the assessment would require government permit, which may or may not be granted (e.g., in the pilot phase, the potential country coordinator for Egypt advised it would not even be worth applying for such permit).
**Capacity Building**
Based on the results of the pilot phase, it seems that many of the country coordinators could benefit from additional training in the areas of sampling and study management. Building the capacity of professionals engaged in conducting survey research in developing countries could be an important side benefit of the WGA project. These skills are valuable resources for academics and others working in the areas of governance and development. Training would cover sampling, respondent selection, identifying the sampling frame, dealing with missing values, and managing a multi-mode study. This training may be done using the Internet, at a low cost to the project.

**Conclusion**

Pilot studies are conducted to work out the kinks in questionnaire design and sampling. This pilot phase has certainly provided valuable information on these two very important ingredients. Attempting to conduct surveys on a global scale is a relatively new endeavor and much of what has been done in this pilot project is without precedent. The research presented us with significant challenges, yet a lot has been learnt from the exercise. Based on the experience with the pilot phase and the suggestions for improvement stemming from it, we propose that a worldwide assessment is feasible and that it would help us to better understand the processes of governance.
Appendix 1. A link between the acronyms to the full wording of the items

1. FREX: To what extent do citizens have the freedom of expression?
2. FPAA: To what degree do citizens have the freedom of peaceful assembly and association?
3. DIPO: To what extent is there discrimination in politics?
4. GFPD: To what extent do governments facilitate public discussion on major shifts in policy?
5. CIRE: To what extent do citizens respect the system of rule-making?
6. LREP: To what extent is the legislature representative of society?
7. COPP: To what degree is there real competition for political power?
8. PUPR: To what extent does the policy-making process fairly reflect public preferences?
9. LEFU: To what extent does the legislative function affect policy content?
10. LEAP: To what extent are legislators accountable to the public?
11. PSEC: To what extent is the government committed to ensuring the personal security of citizens?
12. STOL: To what extent is the government committed to ensuring an adequate standard of living for citizens?
13. NATI: To what extent are leaders encouraged to make tough decisions that are in the national interest?
14. MISU: To what extent does the military accept its subordination to a civilian government?
15. PRIC: To what extent is the government committed to peaceful resolution of internal conflicts?
16. HICS: To what extent are higher civil servants part of the policy-making process?
17. MEBA: To what extent is there a merit-based system for recruitment into the civil service?
18. ACCO: To what extent are civil servants accountable for their actions?
19. DEPR: To what extent are there clear decision-making processes in the civil service?
20. EAPS: To what extent is there equal access to public services?
21. PRPR: To what extent do persons in public office promote respect for property rights?
22. REFI: To what extent are economic regulations applied equally to firms in the economy?
23. COTR: To what extent is obtaining a business license associated with corrupt transactions?
24. CPPP: To what extent is there consultation on policy between public and private sector actors?
25. GLTR: To what extent does government take the new rules of global trade, finance, and technology flows into account when formulating policy?
26. JUCI: To what extent is there equal access to justice for citizens?
27. DMJS: To what extent are there clear decision-making processes in the judicial system?
28. JUOA: To what extent are judicial officials accountable for their actions?
29. ILHR: To what extent are international legal norms in the human rights field being incorporated into the national rights regime?
30. NJPC: To what extent are non-judicial processes in place for fair resolution of conflicts?
Appendix 2. Guidelines for Country Coordinators – Pilot Phase

The Survey

This survey is a pilot phase of a project to get systematic information on perceptions of governance for countries around the world. This pilot survey is being conducted in over 23 countries by the United Nations University (UNU) and local partner institutions around the world. The ultimate goal is to better understand what aspects of governance matter most and to provide more informed policy advice in this area.

Role of Country Coordinator

Overview

The country coordinator would be a respected researcher with intellectual credibility as well as integrity. Such a person would also need to have high-level contacts in the different spheres related to governance, e.g. from the government, bureaucracy, judiciary and civil society. The coordinator must be able to read and write in English.

The country coordinators would need to undertake the following tasks:

1. Prepare for the survey (and translate the questionnaire).
2. Identify 40-45 experts in different spheres related to governance. We need a minimum of 35 completed questionnaires per country.
3. Collect the data, through sending out and retrieving the questionnaire.
4. Data processing.
6. Send the completed materials to the UNU by Courier (e.g. DHL).

A regional review panel will then assess the findings for countries in each region.

(1) Prepare for the survey (and translate the questionnaire)

The coordinator should be very familiar with the project outline and the questionnaire ahead of the data collection. It may be necessary to translate the questionnaire, which would be arranged locally by the country coordinator.

If there are any questions regarding the content of the questionnaire please contact:
Mr. Julius Court - United Nations University
Tel: 81 3 3499 2811; Fax: 81 3 3499 2810; Email: court@hq.unu.edu

Make a copy of the questionnaire for each potential expert – i.e. 40-45 copies.

(2) Identifying the experts

This research relies on a relatively small number of expert opinions from a cross-section of persons representing different perspectives on governance. Identifying the right persons is absolutely crucial. We need to get a minimum of 35 expert responses for each country. Therefore it would be better to send it to at least 40-45 potential respondents.
The ideal profile of an expert is somebody who has extensive experience in the respective country. They will need to answer questions on the main dimensions of governance in their country over the past 5 years. We want a rough balance between the following different groups:

- High ranking civil servants
- Successful entrepreneurs
- Senior judges or lawyers
- Long-standing parliamentarians or equivalent
- Respected academics, consultants or policy advisors working on relevant issues
- The head or senior officers in local NGOs.
- Editors or senior reporters from the media.
- Any other relevant category.

(Recently retired people from these groups would also be acceptable)

(3) How to conduct the interview and fill in the questionnaire

Ideally, the country coordinator will conduct a personal interview with each expert and help the respondent fill in the questionnaire. However, a second option is to send the questionnaire to the respondent (or leave it with them) and ask him or her to fill it out within a specified time frame. It will then be important to follow-up in collecting the questionnaire and to ensure that the experts have answered all the questions.

The survey instrument is a multiple-choice questionnaire on which respondents will register their perception of governance. It is pre-coded with a scale from 1 to 5. The questionnaire comprises 30 questions and is divided into 6 parts.

   Part I: the extent of participation in the political process.
   Part II: the way interests in society are aggregated into the political process.
   Part III: government stewardship of the system as a whole.
   Part IV: policy implementation, particularly the bureaucracy.
   Part V: the relationship between the state and the market.
   Part VI: institutions created for dispute resolution, particularly the judiciary.

We are well aware that these standard questions cannot capture the full complexities of governance issues. Therefore, please record any additional explanations provided by the experts. We will take these comments into account when we analyze the findings.

In this first round of the survey, we are seeking a rating for the state of governance “now” and “five years ago”. Please add comments if there have been important changes in governance contexts, the date of the changes and the nature of these changes.

(4) Data processing

There are three steps of preliminary data processing that we would appreciate assistance from country coordinators or an assistant.

(i) Input the quantitative data from the questionnaire into an Excel spreadsheet –to be provided.
(ii) Calculate the average score for each question and dimension.
(iii) Transcribe any comments by the experts into English (and in electronic form if possible).
(5) **Preliminary analysis**

There are six areas of preliminary analysis where we would appreciate your comments:

(i) Provide an assessment of the data collection exercise for each country. In addition, please comment on any issues that make you doubt the accuracy and credibility of the findings.

(ii) Please note any major differences in the ratings between the six dimensions of governance and comment on possible explanations of why the dimensions of governance are rated differently.

(iii) Please note any changes in the findings - for dimensions and questions - for “now” and “five years ago” and comment on possible explanations of changes over time in perceptions of governance.

(iv) Try to briefly account for the overall ratings for your country at the collective level. In this regard, it may be useful to refer to the analytical framework on page 22 of the working proposal. It will be interesting to comment on any findings that may or may not fit the analytical framework.

(v) Please note any other country-related issues you think are important.

(vi) Provide an assessment of the data collection exercise for each country. Was the questionnaire clear? Please make any suggestions on how to improve the survey process, including the questionnaire.

(6) **Return**

Please send relevant documents by courier (e.g. DHL) to the UNU Headquarters in Tokyo, Japan. This should include the (i) completed or original questionnaires for all respondents, (ii) the quantitative data processing sheet, (iii) the transcribed comments sheet, and (iv) the document with the survey assessment and country analysis. If possible, it would be very helpful to have this information in electronic format (sent to court@hq.unu.edu). Also, please keep a copy of the questionnaires and your analyses.

If you have any questions please contact: Mr. Julius Court
Tel: 81 3 3499 2811; Fax: 81 3 3499 2828; Email: court@hq.unu.edu

**Honorarium and Acceptance**

The honorarium of US$ 2000 would be paid on receipt of: (i) at least 35 completed questionnaires, (ii) an Excel sheet reporting on the quantitative findings for your country, (iii) a clear transcript of the comments, and (iv) a document outlining the data collection exercise for your country and providing an initial analysis of the findings.

We would be very grateful if you could indicate whether you are willing to serve as the country coordinator as soon as possible. If you accept, UNU will send to you a contract to begin the work. If you cannot coordinate the survey, we would appreciate it if you could suggest someone else who might be willing to undertake the work in your country.

* * * * * * * * * * *
Appendix 3: Governance Perceptions Questionnaire – Pilot Phase

This survey is the pilot phase of a project to get systematic information on governance for countries around the world. This pilot survey is being conducted in over 40 countries by the United Nations University (UNU) and local partner institutions around the world. The ultimate goal is to better understand what aspects of governance matter most and to provide informed policy advice in this area.

In order that we can make effective comparisons over time and across countries, the survey instrument is a pre-coded, multiple-choice questionnaire. It is important to answer all the questions. Your answers should reflect your experience and perceptions of governance for your country.

We are well aware that these standard questions cannot capture the full complexity of governance issues. Therefore, in addition to indicating which standard answer comes closest to describing your case, please provide additional comments to better explain the situation in your country. Also please add comments if there have been important changes in governance contexts over the last five years, noting the date and nature of these changes. We will take these comments into account when we analyze the findings.

The questionnaire should be filled in by an expert who has extensive experience and can answer questions on the main dimensions of governance in the respective country for the past 5 years. Such an expert should be able to fill in the questionnaire in a maximum of 1 hour. Please contact the country coordinator if you would like further clarification on the aims of the project or regarding specific questions.

Note: The information obtained will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Coordinator’s Name: ___________________________ Country: __________________________

Name of Expert: ______________________________________________________

Position of Expert:

Government       Parliament       Civil Service
Business          Legal            Academia
NGO               International Org. Other________

Experience with governance issues: ______________________________________________________

Please send me a copy of the country findings. (Provide address below)

____________________________________________________________

Please return all documents to:

Governance Survey - United Nations University
5-53-70 Jingumae, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo 150-8925 JAPAN
Tel: 81 3 3499 2811; Fax: 81 3 3499 2810; Email: court@hq.unu.edu
The questionnaire comprises 30 questions and is divided into 6 parts.

- Part I: covers the extent of participation in the political process.
- Part II: covers the way interests in society are aggregated in the political process.
- Part III: covers government stewardship of the system as a whole.
- Part IV: covers policy implementation, particularly the bureaucracy.
- Part V: covers the relationship between the state and the market.
- Part VI: covers dispute resolution, particularly the judiciary.

### PART I: PARTICIPATION IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS

#### 1. To what extent do citizens have the freedom of expression?

*This indicator tries to capture the formal and informal rules that affect people’s opportunities to seek, receive and impart information. This indicator would also cover how well the media or other formal or informal channels reflect the views of others than those in power or dominant groups.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (very high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (moderate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (very low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

#### 2. To what degree do citizens have the freedom of peaceful assembly and association?

*This indicator tries to capture the degree of restrictions to people’s opportunities to participate peacefully in the public realm – to join associations or to gather in public. It also includes the right that no-one is compelled to belong to an association.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (very high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (moderate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (very low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

#### 3. To what extent is there discrimination in politics?

*As a governance issue, the level of discrimination is an important indicator of the potential for different groups to enter the political process. Here we refer to distinction according to race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (very high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (moderate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (very low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
4. To what extent do governments facilitate public discussion on major shifts in policy?

For governments to formulate effective policies there will need to be mechanisms for consultation with different groups in society. Mechanisms to promote participation include consultations with citizens groups, public forums or referendums, for example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

5. To what extent do citizens respect the system of rule-making?

The support (or lack of it) that citizens provide for the public realm is an important governance issue. Indicators of responsibilities to society would include issues such as payment of taxes, turning out to vote and not committing crime, for example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

We would appreciate any further comments on the issues affecting participation in the political process. What are some priorities for reform in your country? What important issues does the questionnaire not cover?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________


PART II: INTEREST AGGREGATION IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS

6. To what extent is the legislature representative of society?

This would cover, for example, the degree to which the legislature contains women or minority groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

7. To what degree is there real competition for political power?

Competition is often between political parties. But it need not only be the case. For example, there are examples where there is only one party but the level of competition is high within that party. Competition is essentially non-existent in a dictatorship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

8. To what extent does the policy-making process fairly reflect public preferences?

Ideally, interest aggregation implies being able to fairly accommodate competing preferences into public policy. The contrasting situation would be if the views of certain groups were excluded or if policy was primarily formulated in the interests of dominant groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
9. To what extent does the legislative function affect policy content?

On one hand, the legislature may play a decisive role in shaping policy. In contrast, it might only play a rubber stamping function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. To what extent are legislators accountable to the public?

For many countries, this will refer to the effectiveness of the electoral system. But there could be other ways that legislators might be accountable to the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

We would appreciate any further comments on the issues affecting interest aggregation in the political process. What are some priorities for reform in your country? What important issues does the questionnaire not cover?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

PART III: GOVERNMENT STEWARDSHIP

11. To what extent is the government committed to ensuring the personal security of citizens?

There is a wide range of threats to personal security that governments can influence. These include fear of torture, arbitrary detention, crime, ethnic conflict and domestic violence, for example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
12. To what extent is the government committed to ensuring an adequate standard of living for citizens?

_Equally important is the issue of how government promotes basic economic and social development. This includes issues such as the right to work and the right to social security, for example._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

13. To what extent are leaders encouraged to make tough decisions that are in the national interest?

_Long-term reforms may be necessary for a country but may have drawbacks in the short term. In contrast, short-term populist measures may be harmful in the long run._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

14. To what extent does the military accept its subordination to a civilian government?

_On one hand, the military may play a professional role without engaging in politics. At the other extreme, the military might be entrenched in power. Or the military may exercise influence by infiltrating the political realm in other ways._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
15. To what extent is the government committed to peaceful resolution of internal conflicts?

An emphasis on peaceful resolution of conflicts within countries is important for personal security as well as for national stability and economic development. Alternatively, governments may incite or use conflict for reasons that are harmful to the security and life of individual citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

We would appreciate any further comments on the issues affecting overall stewardship of the governance realm. What are some priorities for reform in your country? What important issues does the questionnaire not cover?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

PART IV: POLICY IMPLEMENTATION, ESPECIALLY THE BUREAUCRACY

16. To what extent are higher civil servants part of the policy-making process?

The extent to which power is given to specialized agencies to formulate policy indicates a strong role for bureaucrats. The existence of deep layers of political appointments in the bureaucracy would indicate a lesser role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
17. To what extent is there a merit-based system for recruitment into the civil service?

The degree of merit in the rules guiding recruitment has long been regarded as a key issue for successful policy implementation, regulation and provision of services. This could include a specific exam, the need to have objective entry requirements or an independent body on public service employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

18. To what extent are civil servants accountable for their actions?

The degree of accountability of civil servants - for corruption or other forms of misuse of public office - is an important indicator of governance. Audits, ombudsman institutions, public censure or courts, if effective, are mechanisms of how civil service accountability can be exercised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

19. To what extent are there clear decision-making processes in the civil service?

Clear rules could reduce or eliminate the risk of misuse of public office whereas unclear rules could encourage it. The rules could be in the form of a code of conduct, informal systems or the presence of laws that make official documents open to the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

20. To what extent is there equal access to public services?

The state may make extra effort to ensure equal access to public services, in remote areas or marginalized groups. In contrast, certain groups or regions may not have any access to services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We would appreciate any further comments on the issues affecting policy implementation, particularly the bureaucracy. What are some priorities for reform in your country? What important issues does the questionnaire not cover?

PART V: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE MARKET.

21. To what extent do persons in public office promote respect for property rights?

*Those in positions of public authority have a vital role in ensuring that property rights, whether private, common or public, are respected. This would include not directly appropriating property and by providing protection from crime or other threats to property.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

22. To what extent are economic regulations applied equally to firms in the economy?

*Applying and enforcing regulations equally is important for the business climate. The other extreme is where regulations are applied in an ad hoc manner or where special treatment is given to cronies of those in power.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
23. To what extent is obtaining a business license associated with corrupt transactions?

The issue here is whether a business license can be obtained in a straightforward and transparent manner or does it involve a number of other transactions that go contrary to the stated rules and regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

24. To what extent is there consultation on policy between public and private sector actors?

Issues relevant here include, among others, the existence and nature of consultation committees and whether firms or business associations are systematically consulted about potential changes in economic policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

25. To what extent does the government take the new rules of global trade, finance and technology flows into account when formulating policy?

International economic interactions (trade, finance and technology flows) have become an increasingly significant factor in national development. The challenge is how to manage these processes so as to enhance the benefits and reduce the negative effects upon people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

We would appreciate any further comments on the issues affecting the relationship between the state and the market. What are some priorities for reform in your country? What important issues does the questionnaire not cover?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
PART VI: DISPUTE RESOLUTION, PARTICULARLY THE JUDICIARY

26. To what extent is there equal access to justice for citizens?

Legal aid and other services may make the judicial arena a more even playing field for all citizens. In contrast, citizens may be prevented from going to court for security, financial or other reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

27. To what extent are there clear decision-making processes in the judicial system?

If procedures are clear and are systematically followed, it is likely to make the role that the judiciary plays more respected. Decision-making includes not just what happens in the courtroom but all other aspects associated with a legal case, including for example the way evidence is collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

28. To what extent are judicial officials accountable for their actions?

Decisions may not be made in an objective manner, due to reasons of political interference or corruption for example. Mechanisms such as appeal, judicial review and special inquiries, if effective, are examples of how legal service accountability can be exercised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 years ago</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
29. To what extent are international legal norms in the human rights field being incorporated into the national rights regime?

Partly at stake here is whether governments sign and ratify international human rights conventions. More important, however, is the degree to which the legal profession incorporates the agreed international norms into the national legal system.

5 years ago       Now
(5) very high
(4) high
(3) moderate
(2) low
(1) very low

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

30. To what extent are non-judicial processes in place for fair resolution of conflicts?

Conflicts arise at different levels and societies develop varied institutional arrangements to cater for these eventualities. The extent and importance of such arrangements, through NGOs or community groups for example, is an important governance concern.

5 years ago       Now
(5) very high
(4) high
(3) moderate
(2) low
(1) very low

Comments:____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

We would appreciate any further comments on the issues affecting dispute resolution, especially the judiciary. What are some priorities for reform in your country? What important issues does the questionnaire not cover?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS

Thank you very much for sharing your expertise. We would appreciate any thoughts you might like to add on the issue of governance in your country. We would also appreciate any suggestions for how to make the questionnaire clearer and more useful.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
## Appendix 4. Relating Principles to Indicators of Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>WGA Item</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Decency</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FREX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FPAA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DIPO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GFPD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIRE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LREP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COPP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PUPR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LEFU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PSEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>STOL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NATI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MISU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>HICS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MEBA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ACCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>DEPR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PRPR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>REFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>COTR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CPPP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>GLTR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>JUCI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DMJS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>JUOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ILHR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NJPC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Note on the focus group approach in the Philippines

The tables below show average ratings given by each group in the focus groups approach to the thirty indicators in the WGA, provide an aggregate of the ratings across regions for each indicator and compare them with the average ratings given by the WIPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs average</strong></td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs average</strong></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs average</strong></td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
<td>~5yrs Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs average</strong></td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>~5yrs</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>~5yrs</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>~5yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs average</strong></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDICATORS**

- Q21. Security of Property
- Q22. Equal Treatment
- Q23. Obstacles to Business
- Q24. Consultation
- Q25. Internat’l Economic Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs Average</strong></td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDICATORS**

- Q26. Equal Access to Justice
- Q27. Due Process
- Q28. Accountability
- Q29. Incorpor’n of International Human Rights Norms
- Q30. Predisposition to Conflict Resolut’n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>~5yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mindanao) 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visayas) 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Central Luzon) 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women – N. Luzon) 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students – N. Luzon) 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIPs average</strong></td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>