

Research Report: **Monitoring Public Opinion
Towards Overseas Aid:
Wave 2: 2001**

Prepared for: **AusAID**

April 2001

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1. Introduction.....	3
2. The Newspoll Survey.....	4
3. Executive Summary.....	5
4. Importance of Issues Facing the World Today.....	8
5. Support for Overseas Aid.....	10
6. Motives for Overseas Aid.....	13
7. More Important Reason for Overseas Aid.....	15
8. Main Reasons Against an Overseas Aid Program.....	17
9. Effectiveness of Overseas Aid.....	19
10. Types of Overseas Aid.....	20
10.1 'Emergency' Aid versus 'Long Term Development' Aid.....	20
10.2 Reason for Emphasising 'Emergency' Aid.....	20
10.3 Reason for Emphasising 'Long Term Development' Aid.....	21
11. Level of Expenditure for Overseas Aid.....	23
11.1 Assessment of Australia's Current Expenditure on Overseas Aid....	23
11.2 Opinion as to Government Spending More or Less on Aid.....	26
12. Unaided Recall NGOs.....	28
13. Personal Contribution of Time or Money for Foreign Aid.....	31
14. Identifying Targets for Messages About Overseas Aid – Multivariate Analyses.....	33
14.1 Introduction.....	33
14.2 The Methodology.....	33
14.3 Analysis of the Six Natural Groupings Segments.....	34
14.4 Positioning the Six Segments.....	36
14.5 Apriori Quadrant Analysis.....	40
Appendix A: Statistical Significance.....	44
Appendix B: Questionnaire.....	47

1. Introduction

Over the years a great deal of research has been conducted in relation to the Australian public's attitudes to overseas aid. These research studies, conducted on behalf of non government agencies (NGOs) and by the Federal government, have been extensively summarised and reviewed in a report for AusAID by Barry Elliott – *Review of Community Attitude Surveys on Overseas Aid*, January, 1997, Elliott & Shanahan Research.

The above-mentioned review recommended that a more integrated and strategic perspective be implemented with respect to future research. The Simons Review Committee report (*Report of the Committee of Review of Australia's Overseas Aid Program*), May 1997, recommended:

“The possibility of AusAID conducting co-ordinated public attitudes research into overseas aid and development should be explored with NGOs. Cost effective options to commence a jointly funded annual tracking survey should be developed, to establish a sound basis for public information and development education programs”. (Recommendation 19.4)

This Recommendation was accepted in The Hon. Alexander Downer MP Minister of Foreign Affairs Seventh Annual Report to Parliament on 'Australia's Development Co-operation Program and the Government's Response to the Committee of Review of Australia's Overseas Aid Program: *Better Aid for a Better Future*, November, 1997.

The research reported in this volume represents the second monitor designed to track public opinion. The original benchmark monitor was carried out in June 1998. The March 2001 monitor used identical questions and again was conducted by Newspoll.

2. The Newpoll Survey

The second round of the survey to monitor public opinion involved 12 questions on the Newpoll National Omnibus survey conducted in March, 2001.

The study was conducted nationally among **1200 respondents** aged 18 years and over. Respondents were selected by means of a stratified random sample process which included:

- a quota set for each capital city and non-capital city area. Within each of these areas a quota was set for each telephone area code.
- random selection of household telephone numbers drawn from current telephone listings for each area code.
- random selection of an individual in each household by a 'last birthday' screening question.

The data was weighted to reflect population distribution based upon a combination of age, age left school, gender and geographic area.

Interviewing was conducted by telephone over the period of 16-18 March. Interviewers were fully trained and personally briefed on the requirements for the study.

To ensure the sample included those people who spend a lot of time away from home, a system of call backs and appointments was incorporated.

The questions used in the Omnibus survey were identical to the initial Benchmark monitor and appear in the Appendix. The aid questions were included at the beginning of the survey instrument and the demographic questions formed the last part of the questionnaire.

3. Executive Summary

The 2001 Monitor Survey

A second monitor was conducted in March 2001 to update the June 1998 benchmark monitor. The survey instrument was identical for both studies which involved twelve questions on the Newspoll National Omnibus involving 1200 respondents aged 18 years and over interviewed by telephone between March 16-18.

The Results

1. 'Reducing poverty' is regarded as one of the important issues facing the world today as are 'ensuring peace', 'improving health' and 'safe guarding the environment'. 'Opening up world trade' was the only issue to decline in importance between 1998 and 2001 (4).
2. The very high level of support for aid in 1998 (84%) increased marginally in 2001 with 85% approving of overseas aid. The size of the majority of people who approve of aid *a lot* increased from 52% in 1998 to 58% in 2001. Since 1994 support for overseas aid has continued to grow from 72% in 1994 to 85% in 2001 (5).
3. Compared with 1998 considerably more people volunteered reasons for an aid program and especially humanitarian reasons. The incidence claiming there is no reason for an aid program declined from 12% to 9% in 2001 (6).
4. Those who would argue against an overseas aid program are more likely to cite 'needs back home' as in need of a higher priority rather than lack of efficacy or efficiency with respect to overseas aid. Four out of every ten could cite no reason for not having an aid program (8).
5. Support for aid is not only widespread, it is deep for most Australians who see it is our moral responsibility and, as well, in Australia's interests as a nation. Our moral responsibility remains the main motive behind aid.
6. More people rate NGOs aid as effective than Government aid. Whilst support for aid is very high, the level of belief as to effectiveness is considerably lower with 63% claiming NGO aid is effective and 53% for Government aid. Only a minority see aid as *very* effective (12% for Government and 25% for NGOs). The levels rating aid as *very* or *somewhat* effective have increased for both Government aid and NGOs since 1998 (9).
7. The majority surveyed believe that the emphasis on aid should be on long term development aid (51%) rather than emergency aid (38%). However, there is considerable support for both forms of aid depending on circumstances. The support for long term development aid declined somewhat from 1998 (54%) (10.1).
8. Where emergency aid is seen as the priority it is because the need is desperate now (10.2). Those advocating emphasising long term development aid believe that change is required if poverty is to be reduced and this will only come if development aid is provided (10.3).

9. As with all previous studies when it comes to the level of expenditure for overseas aid the most likely response is to support the status quo (no change). Forty percent (43% in 1998) believe the one percent of government expenditure is the *right amount*. However 34% believe it *not enough* (up from 28% in 1998) versus 13% claiming it is *too much* (down from 17% in 1998) (11.1).
10. When compared with other Budget expenditures (defence and social security) 42% believe that aid spending should remain the *same as now* (as in 1998). However 40% believe we should be spending *more* (up from 36% in 1998) versus 10% *less* (down from 15% in 1998) (11.2).
11. Fifty percent (50%) claimed to have contributed money or time to an overseas aid agency in the past 12 months. This is up from 47% in 1998 (13).
12. Whereas in 1998 World Vision had the highest *unprompted* recall, in 2001 it is Australian Red Cross (12).
13. Significant differences exist in relation to support aid, type of aid preferred, increase/decrease in budget for aid. Gender is not a significant variable but the following generalisations hold:

**In favour of aid/more aid/
prefer long term aid**

younger
better educated
highest income
live in capital cities
white collar occupation
moral responsibility
personal contribution
aid is effective

**Not in favour of aid/less aid/
prefer emergency aid**

older
left school early
lowest income
not live in capital cities
blue collar occupation
Australia's – self interest
no personal contribution
aid not effective

14. Segmentation analyses were carried out to more narrowly define possible target segments for communication. The analysis reveals that the segments more in favour of overseas aid and especially government aid have grown since 1998 (14.4).
15. Whilst support for aid is widespread and growing there remains a sizeable but declining segment who can be classified as 'fickle' supporters 48% in 1998 to 39% in 2001 (14.5).

Conclusions

- Community attitudes to overseas aid would appear to be more positive in March 2001 when compared to June 1998.
- More people surveyed were positive and less were negative.
- The biggest gain appears to be in relation to the number who are *strongly* in favour of overseas aid including the Australian Government's involvement.
- There has been an increase in the incidence of people in favour of an increase in the Government's budget for overseas aid.
- Without qualitative diagnostic research it is only possible to speculate why these gains have come about. It could be due to positive communication by AusAID, NGOs or lack of negative news stories by the media or both or none of these.

4. Importance of Issues Facing the World Today

The first question in the Benchmark survey asked those surveyed to rate the importance of seven 'issues'.

In both 1998 and 2001 almost eight out of every ten persons surveyed rated each issue as important (to varying degrees).

In 2001, as in 1998 'reducing poverty' is seen as either *extremely* or *very important* by nine out of every ten persons surveyed along with 'ensuring peace around the world', 'improving health' and 'safeguarding the environment'. Thus the mean score (3.4) was halfway between *extremely* and *very*.

<i>Importance of Issues Facing the World Today (Q.1)</i>						
Issues		Degree of Importance			Total Important	Mean Score
		<i>Extremely</i> (4)	<i>Very</i> (3)	<i>Somewhat</i> (2)		
Reducing poverty	1998	48	40	9	97	3.4
	2001	47	43	7	97	3.4
Ensuring peace around the world	1998	52	39	8	98	3.4
	2001	51	41	6	98	3.4
Improving health	1998	47	44	7	98	3.4
	2001	48	46	4	98	3.4
Safeguarding the environment	1998	44	45	9	98	3.3
	2001	48	44	7	99	3.4
Promoting human rights	1998	30	44	21	95	3.0
	2001	31	45	17	94	3.1
Opening up world trade	1998	17	40	28	85	2.7
	2001	12	35	31	78	2.5
Slowing down population growth	1998	20	30	27	77	2.5
	2001	19	30	28	77	2.5

'Slowing down population growth' had the lowest mean score (2.5). Even though most survey respondents rated this issues as *important* it was the only issue where almost two in every ten rated the issue as *not really important*.

'Opening up world trade' was the only issue to show a noticeable reduction in importance between the two surveys.

The relationship between people's opinions regarding the amount spent on overseas aid or (should be spent) and the incidence judging issues as *extremely important* found in 1998 continued in 2001. Those who believe we 'don't spend enough now' or 'should spend more' were more likely than the sample average to rate 'safeguarding the environment' and 'promoting human rights' as *extremely important*.

Conversely, those respondents believing 'too much is spent now' on overseas aid or 'should spend less' were less likely than the sample average to rate 'reducing poverty' and 'promoting human rights' as *extremely important*.

The greatest difference between those who believe we should spend more/or don't spend enough now versus those who want less spent on aid occurred for the issue 'promoting human rights'.

Importance of Promoting Human Rights		
	2001	
	<i>Extremely</i>	<i>Very</i>
	%	%
Total Sample	31	45
Spend now		
- too much	19	42
- not enough	40	44
Should Spend		
- less	17	40
- more	39	46

5. Support for Overseas Aid

Previous research from Australia and overseas has indicated that people are more likely to give an informed opinion if they are given a chance to think about overseas aid. Thus the level of support for overseas aid is likely to be lower if measured by a single question in an omnibus survey versus being measured at the end of a series of questions on aid. Accordingly, the global evaluative support question was asked towards the completion of the questions on overseas aid.

Respondents were asked: *Overall, would you say that you approve or disapprove of Australia giving foreign aid to poor countries around the world?* Q.10.

The level of **support for overseas aid increased slightly between 1998 and 2001 from 84% of persons surveyed to 85%** and, like every other question in the survey, there was no statistically significant difference according to gender in 1998 or 2001. The increase in support occurred in the incidence of people approving 'a lot' in 2001.

<i>Approval of Foreign aid (Q.10)</i>		
	1998	2001
	%	%
Approve a lot	52	58
Approve a little	32	27
(Total approve)	(84)	(85)
Disapprove a little	7	5
Disapprove a lot	6	6
Neither/don't know	3	4
	100	100

The increase in *approve a lot* in 2001 is statistically significant. Thus in 2001 there are more people **strongly** committed to overseas aid than was the situation in 1998.

The following table indicates where support for overseas aid is strongest and weakest in 2001.

Approve/Disapprove of Overseas Aid						
	Mean Score		Percentage Approve a lot		Percentage Disapprove a lot	
	1998	2001	1998	2001	1998	2001
Total Sample	3.3	3.4	52%	58%	6%	6%
Highest Levels of Approval						
More should be spent on aid	3.8	3.8	79	82	1	0.5
Not enough spent on aid	3.8	3.8	79	83	1	1.5
Income \$60,000 plus	3.6	3.6	67	71	2	2
Emphasis on long term aid	3.6	3.6	65	70	3	2
Age left school 17 plus	3.6	3.7	65	72	3	2
Made personal contribution	3.6	3.6	64	71	3	3
Government aid effective	3.6	3.6	63	67	2	2
18 – 24 years	3.5	3.6	63	59	4	-
White collar	3.5	3.6	62	70	3	3
Moral responsibility reason	3.5	3.6	60	70	3	2.5
Lowest levels of Approval						
Should spend less	2.1	1.9	8	4	36	43
Spend too much now	2.2	2.2	6	9	32	53
NGOs aid not effective	2.9	3.0	32	39	15	15
Government aid not effective	3.0	3.0	37	41	13	14
Prefer emergency aid	3.0	3.2	34	44	11	9

As with most of the other survey questions there is a consistent pattern showing that support for aid is strongly related to:

- age (inversely)
- income
- occupational status
- city living
- education
- belief in long term aid
- aid as effective - government and NGOs
- personal contribution in last 12 months
- moral responsibility reason for aid
- desire for spending more on aid.

Support for overseas aid has continued to increase since 1994.

Comparison of Approval for Overseas Aid 1994, 1998, 2001

	May 1994 <i>Aidab</i> Morgan Survey N = 2011 %	June 1998 <i>AusAID</i> Newspoll N = 1200 %	March 2001 <i>AusAID</i> Newspoll N = 1200 %
Approve of Aid	72	84	85
Neither/can't say	9	3	4
Disapprove	19	13	11

The following table indicates the incidence approving of overseas aid for each demographic variable in 2001.

Approve/Disapprove of Overseas Aid (Q.10) 2001

	Mean Score	Approve a lot	Approve a little
	%	%	%
Total Sample	3.4	58	27
Male	3.4	58	26
Female	3.5	58	29
18-24	3.6	59	36
25-34	3.5	61	27
35-49	3.5	64	20
50+	3.3	50	31
5 Capital city	3.5	63	24
Non city	3.3	49	33
White collar	3.6	70	19
Blue collar	3.3	46	36
Left school aged 16 or less	3.3	48	32
Aged 17 or more	3.7	72	21
Household incomes	3.3	47	35
less than \$30,000			
\$30,000 - \$59,999	3.5	61	25
\$60,000 plus	3.6	71	19
Sydney	3.4	57	29
Rest of NSW	3.5	54	33.5
Melbourne	3.5	68	19
Rest of Victoria	3.3	49	31
Brisbane	3.4	65	21
Rest of Queensland	3.2	42	34
Adelaide	3.5	60	30
Rest of South Australia	3.3	49	37
Perth	3.5	67	21
Rest of West Australia	3.2	44	36

6. Motives for Overseas Aid

The third question in the National survey asked people 'What do you think are the main reasons why Australia should have an overseas aid program? What else? The question was open-ended so as to establish the public's salient reasons in favour of or against an overseas aid program. This open-ended approach also allowed people to disagree, i.e. no reason for aid/against. it.

The table which follows indicates the variety of reasons volunteered in favour of Australia having an overseas aid program in 1998 and 2001. Most people surveyed had no trouble volunteering at least one reason. Most of the reasons related to humanitarian grounds (H) rather than self-centred reasons (S). Most significantly, **survey respondents in 2001 volunteered more reasons in support of aid than in 1998 in keeping** with the more positive attitudes (ie greater incidence of support for aid) as will emerge in later questions.

Main Reasons Australia Should Have an Overseas Aid Program							
		Total Sample		Approve of Aid		Disapprove of Aid	
Main Reason		1998	2001	1998	2001	1998	2001
		%	%	%	%	%	%
(H)	Help look after people in need/less fortunate	30	43	34	47	12	17
(H)	Humanitarian/morally right	20	18	21	20	9	4
(H)	Australia is wealthy, can afford it	14	22	17	25	1	4
(S)	Trade reasons	7	3	6	3	7	6
(S)	Positive relations with other countries	5	8	6	8	3	5
(H)	Australia/government obligation/responsibility	4	10	5	11	-	3
(H)	Promote world peace stability	3	7	4	7	2	5
(S)	Gain/maintain good reputation/image	3	6	3	6	1	5
(H)	Show we care	2	2	2	2	-	1
(H)	Promote goodwill	1	3	2	4	-	2
(S)	Protect ourselves/defence	1	2	1	2	1	4
(S)	Other countries help us in need	-	4	-	4	-	-
	Other	1	2	1	1	4	2
	None/don't know	14	12	12	11	25	19
	Should <u>not</u> have aid program/fix Australia first	12	9	6	4	42	47
	TOTAL	116%	149%	118%	154%	106%	123%

The incidence citing 'none/don't know' is a mixture of 'no reason' and 'don't know' since 11% of those approving aid presumably said 'don't know' rather than 'none' whilst 19% of those who disapprove of aid presumably said none rather than 'don't know'.

Those who disapprove of Australia's overseas aid program were most likely not to provide a reason in favour of aid with two out of every three indicating 'none/don't know' or should *not* have an aid program/fix Australia first.

At an unaided level the majority of those surveyed proffered a humanitarian reason for overseas aid rather than a self-centred benefit for Australia and Australians. The focus was on the recipients rather than the donor.

7. More Important Reason for Overseas Aid

Some argue that overseas aid benefits both recipients and donor countries. In Question 7 in the Newspoll survey respondents were asked to *choose between two* major reasons why we give overseas aid, indicating the more important reason of the two. The results indicate there is a moral imperative to help those in need. This imperative goes deep and wide.

Reason "More" Important for Overseas Aid (Q.7)						
Degree of Importance	Total Sample		Approve Aid		Disapprove Aid	
	1998	2001	1998	2001	1998	2001
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Australia's Moral Responsibility</i>	54	52.5	58	56	36	34
- lot more important	32	32	35	35.5	15	15
- little more important	22	20	23	21	21	19
<i>Australia's Long Term Interest</i>	33	35	33	35	31	39
- lot more important	16	17	16	17.5	11	14
- little more important	17	18	17	17	20	26
<i>Neither/don't know</i>	13	13	9	9	34	27
	100	100	100	100	100	100

The above table indicates that more people believe the **more important reason** for overseas aid is '**moral responsibility**'. However, there has been a marginal increase in favour of Australia's long term interest and especially for those who disapprove of overseas aid such that for this group this reason now exceeds moral responsibility.

Even more discriminating than approve/disapprove of overseas aid were attitudes to amount spent now and amount should spend.

Reason More Important for Overseas Aid (Q.7)

	<u>Amount Spent Now</u>		<u>Amount Should Spend</u>	
	Too much	Not Enough	Less	More
			<u>1998</u>	
	%	%	%	%
<i>Australia's Moral Responsibility</i>	37	67	37	68
<i>Australia Long Term Interest</i>	36	28	34	28
<i>Neither/don't know</i>	28	5	30	4
			<u>2001</u>	
<i>Australia's Moral Responsibility</i>	28	67.5	29.5	68
<i>Australia Long Term Interest</i>	42	26	44	27
<i>Neither/don't know</i>	29	6	27	4

There is clearly a very strong relationship between a belief in Australia's moral responsibility and increasing the overseas aid budget. Conversely, those who want the budget decreased as just as likely to see the rationale for overseas aid as Australia's long term interest or neither reason or can't decide. This situation prevailed in both 1998 and 2001.

8. Main Reasons Against an Overseas Aid Program

The fourth question in the Newspoll Omnibus survey asked respondents for the main reasons for Australia *not* having an aid program. As in 1998 the 2001 results indicate that many people in favour of overseas aid could find no reason to support *not* having an overseas aid program. Conversely, those who are against an overseas aid program believed that charity begins at home and the priorities are domestic.

Main Reasons Australia Should NOT Have an Overseas Aid Program (Q.4)							
	Main Reason Against	Total Sample		Approve Aid		Disapprove Aid	
		1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %
(D)	Should look after Australians first	18	11	14	10	32	25
(D)	Address problems at home first/clean up own backyard	12	13	10	11	25	26
(D)	People in Australia are living in poverty	7	6.5	6	6	14	14
(D)	Aid money should go to Australia/better spent at home	5	10	5	8	10	23
(E)	Money not reach people who need it	4	6	4	6	5	8
(E)	Funds are misused/corruption	2	4	2	4	1	3
(D)	Australia has unemployment	2	2	2	2	2	5
(D)	To save money	1	3	2	3	1	7
(E)	Money used for military reasons/arms/weapons	1	1	1	1	1	1
(D)	To improve Australia's living standard	1	1	1	1	2	3.5
(E)	Money is kept by government/officials	1	4.5	1	4	-	7
	Other	3	4	3	3	5	7
	None/don't know	9	14	9	15	7	11
	None-should <u>have</u> aid program	42	42	49	47	9	9
TOTAL		108%	124%	107%	120%	115%	149%

The survey results indicate:

- many people would argue Australia **must have** an overseas aid program (i.e. no legitimate reason for not having one).
- the main reason for considering *not* having an overseas aid program is the pressing needs back home in Australia (D).

- weaknesses with respect to efficiency (E) are relatively unimportant reasons for not having an overseas aid program, especially for those against an overseas aid program.
- non supporters of overseas aid volunteered more reasons against aid.

9. Effectiveness of Overseas Aid

As already indicated (Q.10 section 5) there is widespread support for overseas aid and, to a degree, support for *'more'* rather than *'less'* overseas aid (section 11). At the same time, there is concern as to the "effectiveness" of overseas aid. The results of the second question of the Newspan survey reveal that doubts as to the "effectiveness" of overseas aid are considerably greater with respect to Government aid than aid provided by NGOs. However between 1998 and 2001 there has been a significant increase in the incidence believing both government and non government overseas aid is effective.

Effectiveness of Aid Given by Type of Organisation (Q.2)				
	Australian Government		Non-Government Organisations & Charities	
	1998	2001	1998	2001
Effectiveness	%	%	%	%
(4) Very effective	10	12	20	25
(3) Somewhat effective	36	41	40	38
(2) Not effective enough	23	19	15	14
(1) Not effective at all	11	10	9	6
Neither/don't know	20	19	17	17
Mean Score	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0

Two unequivocal findings are evident from the table above. *First*, the incidence believing Government overseas aid is effective is considerably lower than for NGOs but it has improved somewhat since 1998. *Second*, there is a sizeable incidence of people surveyed who believe overseas aid is *not effective enough or at all*. Around one in every five were uncertain as to whether or not overseas aid was effective. Since 1998 however, the incidence concerned has declined especially with respect to Government overseas aid.

The incidence believing in the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness varies substantially according to overall support for aid in 2001. Further, most of those who don't support the Government's overseas aid program do not believe it is effective.

Effectiveness of Government Overseas aid 2001			
	Total Sample	Approve Aid	Disapprove of Aid
	%	%	%
Very effective	12	13	7
Somewhat effective	41	45	19
Total effective	53	58	26
Not effective enough	19	17	27.5
Not effective at all	10	6	37
Neither/don't know	19	19	10
	100	100	100

10. Types of Overseas Aid

10.1 'Emergency' Aid versus 'Long Term Development' Aid

Question 5 in the Newspoll Omnibus survey asked participants to decide where the emphasis should be between two types of overseas aid. As in 1998, **the majority in 2001 (51%) opted for long term aid** with only 38% choosing emergency aid. The balance were undecided.

Preferred Emphasis Between Two Types of Overseas aid (Q.5)				
	1998		2001	
	Emergency %	Long Term %	Emergency %	Long Term %
Total Sample	38	54	38	51
Approve of aid	33	59	35	56
Disapprove of aid	67	23	56	24
Not enough spent	23	71	28	63
Too much spent	65	28	58	14
Should spend more	26	67	26	64
Should spend less	61	33	55	24
5 Capital cities	32	60	38	54
Non capital cities	48	44	38	48
White collar	31	60	31	59
Blue collar	48	44	44	44
Left school 16 years or less	41	50	44	45
Left school 17 plus	33	60	29	61
Household income less than \$30,000	43	47	43	44
30,000 - \$59,999	37	58	40	51
\$60,000 and over	31	62	27	66
Contributed personally	32	60	33	59

There is a strong correlation between support for aid and a preference for long term aid. The demographic profile of those more in favour of aid is very similar to the profile of those preferring long term aid. It should be noted that the incidence of those who disapprove of aid choosing emergency aid declined from 67% to 56% in 2001.

10.2 Reason for Emphasising 'Emergency' Aid

Question six of the Newspoll survey asked people to provide a reason as to why they believed the emphasis should be on the option they chose. The results appear in the following table with respect to their rationale for emergency aid.

Reasons for Emphasising 'Emergency' Aid (Q.6) (Incidence = 38% in 2001)						
Reasons	Total Sample		Approve Aid		Disapprove Aid	
	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %
Urgency, people need it immediately	37	53	40	58	32	33
Situation unexpected, not their fault/ natural disaster	18	16	16	12	22	29
To help people	14	21	16	21.5	8	13
People are suffering	10	7	12	7	7	2.5
Want other countries to help us if we need it	4	4	3	3	5	6
The haven't got resources to fend for themselves	3	4.5	3	5	-	3
To get people started and back on their feet	2	9	3	6.5	1	17
Countries support themselves, not depend on aid	-	5	-	3.5	-	14
Other	11	4	10	4	17	5
None/don't know	4	5	3	5	4	5
Should NOT give aid/ look after Australia first	4	3	3	3	7	3
TOTAL	106%	130%	108%	130%	102%	130%

In 2001 people volunteered more reasons than in 1998, and especially in relation to emphasising emergency aid to overcome the desperation and urgency requiring immediate action in order to alleviate suffering. Even those who disapprove of overseas aid understand that emergencies arise and help is urgently required. Indeed, it is the main rationale for aid for those who disapprove of aid but believe the emphasis should be on emergency aid.

10.3 Reason for Emphasising 'Long Term Development' Aid

In the table below the reasons for emphasising long term development overseas aid are presented for both those in favour and those who disapprove of overseas aid. It should be noted that three times as many who disapprove of aid chose emergency aid (67%) rather than long term aid (23%).

Reasons for Emphasising 'Long Term Development' Overseas Aid (Q.6) (Incidence = 51% in 2001)						
Reasons	Total Sample		Approve Aid		Disapprove Aid	
	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %
Teaches/educates people to help/look after themselves	32	28	31	28	48	37
Long term aid more effective	22	23	23	23.5	11	4.5
Help develop own skills/ infrastructure/medical/ agriculture	12	15	12	14	15	21
Emergency aid short term effect only	12	15.5	12	16	8	13
Reduces need for emergency aid/ can deal with prevent crises	11	17	12	16	12	29
Allows people to become self reliant	8	16	7	17	11	11
They will need on going help	4	12	4	12	9	3.5
Improves standard of living	2	3	2	3	4	-
Stimulates their economy	2	6	2	6.5	-	4
Helps promote independence	2	2	2	3	-	-
Promotes relations between countries	1	1	1	1	-	-
Other	2	<1	2	<1	-	-
None/Don't Know	1	3.5	1	2.5	4	19.5
TOTAL	111%	143%	111%	143%	121%	142%

The main reasons for emphasising long term development aid relate to **changing things** rather than focusing on the immediate problem. The benefit of long term aid is seen to be less reliance on emergency aid because people and economies can help themselves due to better education or health or infrastructure.

The small incidence of those who disapprove of aid who preferred the emphasis to be on long term development also recognise that long term aid would allow people to help themselves. Their disapproval is more related to other priorities.

11. Level of Expenditure for Overseas Aid

11.1 Assessment of Australia's Current Expenditure on Overseas Aid

An earlier report by Barry Elliott* detailed the difficulties in obtaining opinions as to expenditures on overseas aid. Numerous surveys and studies reveal that the Australian public have no real conception as to the size of the overseas aid budget nor, for that matter, any other aspect of the 'Budget'. The notion of billions of dollars is largely incomprehensible - even hundreds of millions of dollars sounds excessive to some.

Recognising these difficulties, the original survey was designed, and carefully piloted, in group discussion sessions using "relative" data, i.e. a percentage, equivalent of a loaf of bread etc., and in a later question relative to other 'Budget' expenditures.

Respondents were told in Q.8:

Australia spends one percent of total government expenditure, the equivalent of the cost of one loaf of bread per week for every Australian, on overseas aid to assist poor countries around the world."

and asked:

"Do you personally believe Australia spends too much money, the right amount of money, not enough money assisting poor countries?"

In keeping with virtually every other survey the current study found that the most likely response is for the status quo. However, the incidence claiming the 1% is *not enough* is considerably greater than the incidence claiming the 1% is *too much*, **and between 1998 and 2000, the incidence in favour of spending more has risen.**

Current Expenditure on Overseas Aid (Q.8)		
	1998	2001
	%	%
Not enough	28	34
Right amount	43	40
Too much	17	13
Don't know	12	13
	100	100

* **Review of Community Attitude Surveys on Overseas Aid**, B. Elliott, Elliott & Shanahan Research, January 1997, section F3.

Overall, more people in the 2001 survey sample believe the current 1% is 'not enough' than was the case in the 1998 survey. Conversely less people in the 2001 survey believe that the 1% is 'too much' or the 'right amount'.

The following table provides an analysis over the two surveys of the various sub groups in relation to the 1% being 'too much or 'not enough'.

Current Expenditure on Overseas Aid

	Too much money		Not enough money	
	1998	2000	1998	2000
Total Sample	17%	13%	28%	34%
Approve of aid	8	6	33	38
Disapproved of aid	72	63	3	10
aged 18-24 years	9	6	36	37
aged 50 years and over	22	14	25	31
5 capital cities	14	10	33	37
non capital cities	21	19	21	28
WA	23	12.5	24	46
Tasmania*	23	25	24	28
Left school 16 years or less	21	18	10	26.5
Left school 17 years plus	25	6	34	44
H/H Income less than \$30,000	22	17	26	28
H/H Income \$50,000 plus	13	8	32	42
Australian Government aid effective	9	7	29	36
Australian Government aid not effective	30	26	31	29
NGOs aid effective	11	8	32	37
NGOs aid not effective	30	28	24	28
Prefer emergency aid	29	20	17	24.5
Prefer long term aid	9	5	38	41
Aid reason long term interest	18	16	11	25
Aid reason moral responsibility	24	7	35	43
Should spend more	3	2	64	69
Should spend less	75	79	8	6
Made personal contribution	9	8	36	45

* Caution: Small base N = 50

The above table indicates that beliefs about aid expenditure is clearly related to education, age, attitude to aid, type of aid preferred, motives for aid, income, and beliefs about effectiveness. Additionally, there is considerable variation by geographic location. In the figures which follow the sample sizes need to be considered.

Current Expenditure on Overseas Aid					
Geographic Differences					
Sample Size		Too much		Not enough	
		1998	2001	1998	2001
(1200)	Total Sample	17%	13%	28%	34%
200	Sydney	14	11.5	31	35
150	NSW ex city	23	15	20	29
200	Melbourne	14	7	36	45
100	Vic. ex city	18	16	27	29
100	Brisbane	9	13	42	29
100	Qld. ex city	18	26	18	29
100	Adelaide	12	5	26	40
50	SA ex city	26	10	18	30
100	Perth	21	11	30	32
50	WA ex city	30	16	19	14
50	Tasmania	23	25	15	28

Clearly there is less support for the 1% in the country and the smaller states. Whereas the greatest support for more expenditure was in Brisbane in 1998, in 2001 it is in Melbourne and Adelaide.

11.2 Opinion as to Government Spending More or Less on Aid

In question 9 of the Newspoll survey respondents were informed:

While 1% of total government expenditure goes to aid poor countries, by comparison the government spends 8% on defence, and 38% on social security such as pensions.

They were then asked:

Given that the government spends 1% on aid to poor countries should the government spend more on aid, the same as they do now, less on aid?

As with the previous question, and supporting most other surveys in the past, the most popular response was the status quo - 'same as now' (42%). Again, in 2001 there is an increased incidence in favour of spending 'more' (40%) and a decrease in spending 'less' (10%). The balance were 'unsure' (8.5%). Most significantly, whilst the incidence in favour of spending 'more' was 1¹/₂ times the incidence favouring spending 'less' in 1998 **in 2001 it is 4:1 in favour of spending 'more' rather than 'less'**.

Opinion Regarding Government Spending More or Less on Overseas Aid (Q.9)		
	1998	2001
	%	%
Spend lot more	13	16
Spend little more	23	24
Total more	36	40
Same as now	42	42
Spend little less	8	4
Spend lot less	7	6
Total less	15	10
	100	100

The following table highlights the major differences between the 1998 sub groups based upon mean scores (average) and extreme points – ‘lot more’/‘lot less’. A mean score of 3.3 applies to the total sample which can be interpreted as between ‘same as now’ (3) and ‘little more’ (4). Also, as could be expected, there is a close correlation between this question (9) and question (8).

Spend More/Less on Aid						
	Mean Score		Lot More		Lot Less	
	1998	2001	1998	2001	1998	2001
Total Sample	3.3	3.4	13%	16%	7%	6%
Don't spend enough now	4.2	4.2	37	40	1	1
Spend too much now	2.0	2.0	1	4	39	43
Brisbane	3.6	3.6	24	17	7	10
Adelaide	3.5	3.4	12	21	4	5
Personal contribution	3.6	3.7	18	24	4	3
Left school age 17 plus	3.6	3.7	19	21	8	4
Moral responsibility reason	3.5	3.7	17	24	4	3
Prefer long term aid	3.5	3.7	19	22	3	2
Prefer emergency aid	2.9	3.1	6	9	14	6
Australian Government aid effective	3.5	3.6	14	19	2	3
Australian government aid not effective	3.1	3.1	12	15	15	14
NGO aid effective	3.5	3.6	16	21	3	3
NGO aid not effective	2.9	2.9	7	11	17	18
Approve of overseas aid	3.5	3.7	16	19	1	1
Disapprove of overseas aid	1.9	2.0	1	2	45	45
Aged 18-24 years	3.7	3.6	23	17	4	5
Aged 50 years and over	3.0	3.3	9	15	10	7

12. Unaided Recall NGOs

At the conclusion of the Newspoll Omnibus survey interviews on overseas aid respondents were asked (Q.12):

Thinking about non-government agencies. Many non-government agencies are involved in providing aid to poorer countries. This aid can be for emergencies or long term development. Which non-government agencies who provide overseas aid can you think of? Which others?

As was the situation in 1998, in 2001 over 70% were able to nominate *unaided* at least one NGO agency involved in overseas aid. Whereas World Vision dominated top-of-mind awareness versus all other organisations in 1998, in 2001 the Red Cross has the highest level of unprompted recall. The following table presents the results in alphabetical order for first mentions and total mentions.

Overseas Aid Organisations - Spontaneous Awareness

Organisation	First Mention		Total Mentions	
	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %
Austcare	1	2	3	3
Australian Catholic Relief	>1	-	1	<1
Australian Red Cross	11	16	23	30
Australian Volunteers Abroad/AVA	1	-	2	1
Care Australia	6	9.5	10	15
Caritas	>1	1	1	2
Christian Children's Fund	2	2	7	5
Community Aid Abroad/CAA	5	4	8	8
Foster Parents Plan	1	<1	1	<1
Fred Hollows Foundation	1	1	3	3
Freedom From Hunger	1	<1	2	<1
International Women's Development Agency	-	-	-	<1
Medicines Sans Frontiers	-	<1	1	1
Plan International	>1	<1	>1	<1
Rotary	>1	<1	>1	<1
Salvation Army	4	3	10	13
Save the Children Australia	1	<1	3	2
St Vincent De Paul	>1	<1	2	2
UNICEF 7	0.5	12	11	
United Nations Association of Australia	>1	<1	1	2
World Vision	18	13	30	22
World Wide Fund for Nature	>1	-	>1	<1
YMCA/YWCA	>1	>1	>1	<1
Other	10	12	23	25
None/Don't Know	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above table can be summarised as follows:

NGOs with Highest Level of Unaided Recall

<u>Top Seven in Awareness</u>	<u>First Mention</u>		<u>Total Mentions</u>	
	1998 %	2001 %	1998 %	2001 %
Australian Red Cross	11	16	23	30
World Vision	18	13	30	22
Care Australia	6	9.5	10	15
Salvation Army	4	3	10	13
UNICEF 7	0.5	12	11	
Community Aid Abroad/CAA	5	4	8	8
Christian Children's Fund	2	2	7	5

It should be noted that the above figures are for unprompted recall of NGOs. No doubt actual prompted awareness for many (most) of the NGOs would be considerably higher. Accordingly, the above results reflect profile or salience rather than familiarity.

13. Personal Contribution of Time or Money for Foreign Aid

Question 11 in the Newspoll survey asked respondents: *And have you made personal contributions, that is, money, time or services, in the past 12 months, to an organisation that provides foreign aid?* **Fifty percent (50%) claimed to have done so in 2001 versus 47% in 1998.** The table which follows indicates the major differences which occurred on this variable in relation to demographic characteristics.

Percentage Made Personal Contribution 2000 – 2001 (Q.11)			
(Sample Average 50%)			
Highest Incidence		Lowest Incidence	
Amount spent not enough	68%	Disapprove of aid	24%
Perth	61%	Should spend less	29%
Should spend more	61%	Rest of South Australia	30%
Household income \$60,000 plus	60%	Spend too much now	31%
Melbourne	58%	Rest of Western Australia	36%
Preferred emphasis long term	58%	Brisbane	42%
Moral responsibility	57%	Adelaide	42%
White Collar	57%	Aged 25 – 34	42%
Left school 17 plus	57%	Amount spend now right amount	43%
		Household income less than \$30,000	43%
		Not in work force	43%
		NGOs aid not effective	44%

The correlation of demographic variables with support for aid as shown throughout the report also applies to donating to an NGO. The exception is age where the highest incidence of donors are the 35-49 years age group. The inverse correlation between support for aid and age shown in 1998 is beginning to be diminished as the population ages so that more of the over 50 age group are better educated. The reason young people are less likely to donate to an NGO may reflect life's circumstances (incomes, competing priorities).

The results indicate a correlation between support for aid and making a personal contribution. Thus those who believe it is effective or should be increased were more likely to have donated time or money to an overseas aid organisation.

<i>Percentage Made Personal Contributions</i>		
	1998	2001
Total Sample	47%	50%
Attitude to Aid		
Approve of aid	51	55
Disapprove of aid	22	24
Should spend more on aid	61	61
Should spend less on aid	27	29
Spend too much on aid	26	31
Not spend enough on aid	60	68
Prefer long term aid	53	58
Prefer emergency aid	39	44
Moral responsibility reason	56	57
Long term interest reason	37	44
Government aid effective	54	55
Government aid not effective	39	49
NGOs aid effective	55	56
NGOs aid not effective	33	44

14. Identifying Targets for Messages About Overseas Aid – Multivariate Analyses

14.1 Introduction

The analyses reported thus far refer to 'univariate' or 'bivariate' analyses whereby one question is analysed alone or by another question. It has been shown, for example, that there is a strong relationship between level of support for aid and support for increases or decreases in the level of overseas aid expenditure.

It is clear that the population is not homogeneous with respect to their support for aid or beliefs about overseas aid. Most importantly, the 85% support level in 2001 for overseas aid contains a range of people with differing opinions about the desired level of expenditure in aid, whether aid is for moral reasons or trade, and whether aid should be development or emergency aid.

This section of the report summarises the results of a number of multivariate analyses designed to tease out the inter-relationships within the data and enable segments to be identified.

14.2 The Methodology

Two basic segmentation procedures were carried out:

- natural groupings
- a priori analysis.

14.21 Natural Groupings

This process involves using a range of multivariate statistics and allowing the statistical analysis to decide what segments exist, how many and their characteristics.

In this procedure the *first* step is a 'factor analysis' of the key questions on aid. The open-ended questions were excluded because of the very wide range of responses. Demographics were also excluded in the factor analysis because they tend to swamp the data, ie age, for example, could be the main basis but we are primarily interested in attitudes to aid.

The *second* step involved a 'cluster analysis' using a hierarchical algorithm (Wards) for an initial partition and then using a k means algorithm for identifying segments. The 'don't know' responses are treated as missing values.

The output was *six segments* allowing for the 'don't knows'.

14.22 Apriori Segmentation

In this approach the survey respondents were classified using only three key variables:

- approval/disapproval of aid (A10).
- current expenditure too much/too little (A8).
- government should spend more/less (A9).

Given that questions A8 and A9 are two ways of measuring the same thing the basic analysis was to segment people in terms of two broad dimensions and produce a matrix containing four quadrants (*four segments*).

14.3 Analysis of the Six Natural Groupings Segments

14.31 Overall Description

The six clear segments which emerged in 1998 were reproduced again in 2001, however, their sizes changed somewhat, especially segments 3 and 5 which now represent a smaller proportion of the survey sample.

<u>Segment 1</u>	Status Quo is fine: Aid works without my help 1998: 19% 2001: 24.5%
<u>Segment 2</u>	Contributors: Never enough aid, it works and I can Help – NGO constituents. 1998: 24% 2001: 30%
<u>Segment 3</u>	Government should do it: Aid isn't effective but support increased aid, non contributors. 1998: 14% 2001: 5%
<u>Segment 4</u>	Indifferent: Less government aid more NGOs 1998: 13% 2001: 11.5%
<u>Segment 5</u>	Sceptics 1998: 11% 2001: 6.5%
<u>Segment 6</u>	Emergency only: More aid, especially emergency and it needs my help. 1998: 19% 2001: 22%

14.32 Detailed Description of Segments

Segment 1: The Government does it right

This segment believe aid is effective and the level of aid is about right. They are therefore on side with the status quo. This segment has grown from 19% in 1998 to 24.5% in 2001.

- Have not personally contributed (A11) and take the view that Government and non Government aid is fairly effective (A2).
- Female bias (60%) and tend to be younger (under 35 or 40).
- Put above average importance in the environment, human rights, ensuring world peace, reducing poverty.
- Tend to believe Australian Government gives the right amount of aid.
- Approve of overseas aid.

Segment 2: **Contributors**

This segment represents the heartland of overseas aid and because it works and there is never enough they contribute personally. This segment also has grown from 24% to 30%.

- The largest segment (30%)
- Virtually all have contributed (A11) and they tend to see it as a moral responsibility (A7) and believe the Australian Government doesn't do enough (A8, A9). **They are the strongest supporters of Australian aid (A10).**
- This segment is biased in favour of:
 - females
 - live in capital cities
 - white collar
 - upper income
- They have most concern about the environment, human rights peace and health as priorities and are almost completely in agreement on the need for long term aid (A5).

Segment 3: **Government Should do it**

This segment has declined from 14% to 5% and represent fickle support for aid because it is necessary but not effective.

- The smallest segment (5%)
- Don't see government or non-government aid as effective (A2) and don't believe the Government does enough and should do more (A8/A9).
- However don't contribute themselves to any real extent (A11).
- Male bias (58%), middle aged 35-54 (51%).

Segment 4: **Indifferent – Negative about Government Aid**

This segment fell slightly from 13% in 1998 to 11.5% in 2001. They are more negative about government aid than NGO aid and some contribute to NGOs.

- Not much concerned about world trade, human rights, peace and poverty or health issues (A1). Only concerns/triggers are *population growth* and the *environment*.
- Male bias (61%).
- Don't see the Government Aid as very effective (A2) but are more positive about non Government aid (A2).
- More likely to see the Government as giving too much aid and believe it should give less (A8, A9) and tend to disapprove of government aid a lot (A10).

- Some 35% claim to personally contribute.

Segment 5: Sceptics

This segment remains a small segment falling from 11% to 6.5%. They tend to be older but will support aid but are not convinced.

- Also a small segment (6.5%).
- Very sceptical about the importance of the environment and human rights but do respond to poverty and health issues (A1).
- Male bias strong (65%) and are the **oldest** segment (35% over 60 years).
- Tend to show a spectrum of views about Government aid and tend to see it as tending towards too much (A8) and show weak approval.
- Some 36% claim to have personally contributed probably in an emergency basis (A11) although they are split on this issue (A5) and 58% look to long term aid in (A5).

Segment 6: Emergency only

This is one of the larger segments and grew from 19% in 1998 to 22% in 2001. They are turned on by humanitarian aid.

- Strong supporters of emergency aid (A5) and very average in their attitudes to Australian aid.
- 70% have contributed in the last 12 months personally second only to segment 2.
- Average on most global issues except less concerned about peace and human rights and perhaps positive.
- Generally positive about the effectiveness of Australian Government and Non Government aid (A2) and tend to believe it should be increased (A8, A9) but not to the extent of segment 2.
- This segment has the strongest blue collar and lowest income bias.

14.4 Positioning the Six Segments

In the chart below each of the six segments have been placed in one of four quadrants based upon their attitudes to **effectiveness** of aid and **expenditure** on aid.

Six Segments

**Aid Not
Effective**

Too much Aid

Just Right

Not enough Aid

4 11.5%		3 5%	
5 6.5%	1 24.5%	6 22%	2 30%

**Aid
Effective**

In terms of targets for messages, segments 2 and 6 are most 'on-side' but segment six is more likely to respond to emergency aid. Segment 1 are content with the status quo and are supporters of Government aid but won't put up their hand for NGOs requests. Similarly, segment 3 are basically on side about Government aid but need more convincing about effectiveness. Segments 4 and 5 pose the biggest challenge and they are more likely to be males. Both of these segments are relatively small. Even so, a third of each of these two negative segments contributed personally in the last 12 months.

Segmentation Analysis						
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Status Quo	Contributors	Govt. Role	Indifferent	Sceptics	Emergency Only
	24.5%	30%	5%	11.5%	6.5%	22%
	<u>Percentages</u>					
Non-Government aid effective						
- very	28	39	-	13	26	36
- somewhat	57	47	38	37	36	42
- not enough	13	13	40	25	21	15
- not at all	2	1	22	26	17	7
Government aid effective						
- very	22	15	4	5	13	14
- somewhat	60	61	19	28	38	49
- not enough	12	19	53	31	27	28
- not at all	6	5	24	35	22	9
Government should spend						
- more	40	69	63	10	26	31
- same	50	29	34	47	51	63
- less	10	1	3	33	23	6
Priority						
Long term	39	13	7.5	46	52	89
Emergency	61	87	92.5	54	48	11
Expenditure on aid						
- too much	14.5	3	5	46	30	14
- right amount	37	30	41	45	50	56
- not enough	28	67	55	9	19	30
Approval of Aid						
Approve a lot	56	89	71.5	24	36	49
Approve a little	34	11	22	33	45	42
Disapprove a little	6	-	4.5	20	9	5
Disapprove a lot	5	<1	2	23	10	4

Segmentation Analysis						
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Status Quo	Contributors	Govt. Role	Indifferent	Sceptics	Emergency Only
	24.5%	30%	5%	11.5%	6.5%	22%
Contributor	-	97	26	28	37	72
Income						
20,000/less	20	13	15	18	33	20
70,000 plus	14	22	25	23	16.5	19
Age						
18-30	26	18	14	14	13	25
over 50	35	35	43	43	48	37
Sex						
Male	41	45	58	61	65	52
Female	59	55	42	39	35	48
Socio-Eco Status						
Blue Collar	62	39	41	51	56	58
White Collar	38	61	59	49	44	42
Left school after age 17	40	54	48	36	33	36
Marital status						
single	23.5	21	14	17.5	11	19
now married	42	53	60	60	61	56
Children in Household						
No	63	59	72	64	61	54
“Extremely” important						
Safeguarding environment	67	72	26	22	-	28
Opening up world trade	15	20	14	3	9	9
Slowing population	24	28	5	17	20	11
Promoting human rights	39	58	7	5	26	10
Ensuring peace	67	76	24	14	38	32
Reducing poverty	70	74	6	-	40	24
Improving health	66	70	12	7	44	31

14.5 Apriori Quadrant Analysis

The four segments derived in this analysis provide an alternative means for determining target segments. It should be noted in order to categorise every respondent those who indicated 'don't know' in question A8 or A9 were treated as 'right amount now' (A8) or 'same as they do now' (A9). For A10 (approve/disapprove) 'don't know' were treated as *not* 'strongly approve'.

The real strength of support for aid now emerges much more clearly and has grown between 1998 and 2001. Whilst 85% said they support aid over half (58%) in 2001 say they support it strongly. **Thus quadrants I and III are the real supporters of overseas aid and they have grown from a total of 52.5% in 1998 to 58% in 2001.**

- I **The Believers** strongly support aid and support a greater expenditure on aid: 1998: 21%; 2001: 25%.
- III **The Status Quoers** whilst strongly supporting aid believe the existing expenditures are sufficient. 1998: 31.5%; 2001: 33%.
- II **The Just on Side** are a tiny segment and, whilst most approve of aid, they only approve 'a little' yet they believe more should be spent on aid. 1998: 4%; 2001: 3%.
- IV **The Fickle Supporters** are the largest segment. Two out of every three in this segment support aid but only 'a little' (the rest don't support it but are only 'slightly' against it). On average they support the existing level of expenditure and in general are more likely to prefer 'less' than 'more' be spent. 1998: 43%; 2001: 39%.

These segments are summarised in the following diagrams.

**THE STRENGTH OF SUPPORT FOR AID
A10**

A Lot	<i>APPROVE</i>	A little or Less
Budget Not Enough Spend More	I “BELIEVERS” 1998: 21%; 2001: 25% A10 Approve a lot 100% A8 Not enough 100% A9 Lot more 53% Little more 47%	II “JUST ON SIDE” 1998: 4%; 2001: 3% A10 Approve a little 82% A8 Not enough 100% A9 Spend little more 83% Spend lot more 17%
Budget Too Much Spend Less	III “STATUS QUOERS” 1998: 31.5%; 2001: 33% A10 Approve a lot 100% A8 Budget right amount 82% A9 Spend same as now 69% Little more 21%	IV “FICKLE SUPPORT” 1998: 43%; 2001: 39% A10 Approve a little 71% A8 Budget right amount 57% Budget too much 36% Budget not enough 7% A9 Spend same as now 62% Spend little less 10% Spend lot less 18%

Apriori Segment Analysis

	I Believers (25%)	II Just on Side (3%)	III Status Quoers (33%)	IV Fickle Support (39%)
Total Sample				
Government aid effective		<u>Percentages</u>		
- very	15	21	21	9
- somewhat	55	46	59	42
- not enough	24	23	17	28
- not at all	6	10	4	22
NGOs aid effective				
- very	36	14	36	22
- somewhat	48	63	49	41
- not enough	13	17.5	13	22
- not at all	2.5	6	2	15.5
Government spend more/less on aid				
- more	100	100	29	11
- same	-	-	69	62
- less	-	-	2	27
Long term priority	21.5	36	34	51
Emergency aid priority	70	58	58	35
Expenditure on aid				
- too much	-	-	4.5	36
- right amount	-	-	82	57
- not enough	100	100	14	7
Approval of Aid				
- Approve a lot	100	-	100	-
- A little	-	82	-	71
Disapprove a little	-	15	-	14
- a lot	-	3	-	15.5

Apriori Segment Analysis

	I Believers	II Just on Side	III Status Quoers	IV Fickle Support
Total Sample	(25%)	(3%)	(33%)	(39%)
	Percentages			
Income 20,000/ less	26	21	27	42
Income 70,000 plus	34	28	30	17
Aged 18 - 30 years	16	30	26	17
Age over 50 years	36	29	31	45
Male	49	54	49	49
Female	51	46	50	51
Blue Collar	33	79	48	64
White Collar	67	21	52	36
Left school after 17 years of age	30	13	17.5	11
-				
single/never married	20	24	23	16
- now married	54	54	54	51
No children in household	61	51	60	61
“Extremely” important				
Safeguarding environment	55	59	50	41
Opening up world trade	15	7	12	11
Slowing population growth	21	19	21	16
Promoting human rights	46.5	18	34	20
Ensuring peace	65.5	55	52	41.5
Reducing poverty	63	49	46	38
Improving health	52	46	50	44

Appendix A: Statistical Significance

Statistical significance tests have not been calculated in the data supplied in the tables in the report nor with the computer tables supplied under separate cover to AusAID and ACFOA.

The following table is supplied to act as a guide in assessing the significance of differences in any percentages for sub samples versus the total sample (N = 1200). The figures refer to the 95% confidence level. In essence, the reader can use 'rules of thumb' in deciding if the differences which occur are due to chance sampling variation or appear to be statistically significant.

Minimum Deviation in Percentage from the Total Sample Percentage								
Total Sample Size 1200								
Confidence Level 95%								
		Sub-Sample Size						
Total Sample Percent	Sample	50	100	200	400	600	800	1000
10 or 90%		7	5	4	2	2	1	1
20 or 80%		10	7	5	3	2	2	1
30 or 70%		11	8	5	4	3	2	1
40 or 60%		12	9	6	4	3	2	1
50 or 50%		12	9	6	4	3	2	1

Thus, when interpreting results for say Tasmania, with a sample of N = 50, the percentage obtained has to be more than seven points different to be statistically different if the total sample percentage is 10% or 90%, eg percentage who say 'Should be an increase in aid budget' – Tasmania 5%, Total sample 10%. This difference is not great enough and is not statistically significant since it had to be $\pm 7\%$ (because mean percent is 10% (or 90%).

As the table above reveals the difference in percent between a sub sample result and the total sample has to be greatest when the total sample percentage is around 50% and when the sub sample size is small. Thus, if the total sample incidence is 50% and we compare a sub sample with N = 60 then the sub sample percentage has to be different from the total sample by more than 12% to be significant, say comparing non metro WA (N = 50) with total sample (N = 1200).

Prefer emergency aid: Total Sample 48%

Prefer emergency aid WA: ex-city 62%

This is significant. WA ex-city is significantly different because it is different by ± 12 from the total sample percentage. Thus the difference is real and not due to the small sample size.

As the table shows the percent difference required to be significant between the sub sample incidence (%) and total sample incidence gets smaller as:

- sub sample size increases and/or
- the total sample incidence is very low (10%) or very high (90%).

When the total sample incidence is around 50% the sub sample difference has to be considerably greater than when it is around 10%.

Once a sub sample becomes quite large (400+) then the difference in sub sample incidence (%) and total sample (%) is only of the order of $\pm 4\%$ or less.

Finally, the table above is provided as a broad guide and is not strictly accurate. It is based on a Chi-Square test.

Appendix B: Questionnaire.

SECTION A - ASK ALL RESPONDENTS

A1 Now some questions about a number of different issues facing the world today. For each of the following issues please tell me whether you think it is extremely important, very important, somewhat important or not really important? Firstly ...

READ OUT AND ROTATE A-G

	<u>EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>SOME- WHAT IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT REALLY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NONE/ DON'T KNOW</u>
A) SAFEGUARDING THE ENVIRONMENT.....	1	2	3	4	5
B) OPENING UP WORLD TRADE.....	1	2	3	4	5
C) SLOWING DOWN POPULATION GROWTH.....	1	2	3	4	5
D) PROMOTING HUMAN RIGHTS	1	2	3	4	5
E) ENSURING PEACE AROUND THE WORLD	1	2	3	4	5
F) REDUCING POVERTY	1	2	3	4	5
G) IMPROVING HEALTH.....	1	2	3	4	5

A2	Thinking now about the aid given by Australians to help relieve poverty in developing countries. Do you personally think the aid given by each of the following is effective or not effective? Firstly, aid given by?		THE AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT	NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS AND CHARITIES
		VERY EFFECTIVE	1	1
		SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	2	2
		NOT EFFECTIVE ENOUGH	3	3
	READ OUT AND ROTATE A-B			
	<u>IF EFFECTIVE</u> Is that very effective or somewhat effective?	NOT EFFECTIVE AT ALL	4	4
	<u>IF NOT EFFECTIVE</u> Is that not effective at all or not effective enough?	NEITHER / DON'T KNOW	5	5

A3 What do you think are the main reasons why Australia should have an overseas aid program? What else?
PROBE FULLY

A4 What do you think are the main reasons why Australia should **not** have an overseas aid program? What else?
PROBE FULLY

A5 Thinking about different types of aid or assistance. Poor and developing countries need assistance in **emergencies** such as famine, natural disasters and civil wars. They also need **long term development** assistance to achieve economic and social progress. If you had to choose between the two types of overseas aid, where should the emphasis be? Should it be on?
READ OUT 1-2

		<u>SR</u>		
EMERGENCY AID.....	1	*	A6	
OR, LONG TERM AID	2	*	*	
NEITHER/DON'T KNOW	3	#	A7	

ASK IF CHOSE TYPE IE CODE 1-2 IN A5. CODE 3 GO TO A7

A6 Why do you believe ... (TYPE IN A5) should be emphasised? What other reasons? **PROBE FULLY**

ASK ALL RESPONDENTS

A7 We are interested in your opinions as to why we give overseas aid. Two major reasons have been suggested. Which **one** of these do you think is the **more important** reason for overseas aid? **READ OUT AND ROTATE A-B**

IF LONG TERM INTEREST Is that a lot more important or a little more important than Australia's moral responsibility?

IF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY Is that a lot more important or a little more important than Australia's long term interest?

		<u>SR</u>	
A) IT IS IN AUSTRALIA'S LONG TERM INTEREST TO GIVE AID	A LOT MORE IMPORTANT		1
	A LITTLE MORE IMPORTANT		2
B) IT IS AUSTRALIA'S MORAL RESPONSIBILITY TO GIVE AID	A LOT MORE IMPORTANT		3
	A LITTLE MORE IMPORTANT		4
	NEITHER / DON'T KNOW		5

A8	Australia spends one percent of total government expenditure, the equivalent of the cost of one loaf of bread per week for every Australian, on overseas aid to assist poor countries around the world. Do you personally believe Australia spends ... (READ OUT AND ROTATE 1-3 AND 3-1 ONLY) assisting poor countries?	TOO MUCH MONEY.	1
		THE RIGHT AMOUNT	2
		NOT ENOUGH MONEY	3
		DON'T KNOW.....	4

A9	While one percent of total government expenditure goes to aid poor countries, by comparison the government spends 8 percent on defence and 38 percent on social security such as pensions. Given that the government spends one percent on aid to poor countries should the government spend ...? READ OUT A-C AND ROTATE A-C AND C-A ONLY	A) MORE ON AID A LOT MORE	1
		A LITTLE MORE....	2

		B) THE SAME AS THEY DO NOW	3

		C) LESS ON AID A LITTLE LESS	4
		A LOT LESS.....	5

		NONE/DON'T KNOW	6

IF MORE Is that a lot more or a little more?

IF LESS Is that a lot less or a little less?

A10	Overall, would you say that you approve or disapprove of Australia giving foreign aid to poor countries around the world?	APPROVE A LOT	1
		APPROVE A LITTLE...	2
		DISAPPROVE A LITTLE	3
	<u>IF APPROVE</u> Is that approve a lot or approve a little?	DISAPPROVE A LOT ..	4
	<u>IF DISAPPROVE</u> Is that disapprove a lot or disapprove a little?	NEITHER / DON'T KNOW	5

A11	And have you yourself made personal contributions, that is, money, time or services, in the past twelve months, to an organisation that provides foreign aid?	YES.....	1
		NO	2
		DON'T KNOW	3

A12 Thinking about **non-government agencies**. Many non-government agencies are involved in providing aid to poorer countries. This aid can be for emergencies or long term development. Which non-government agencies who provide overseas aid can you think of? Which others? **PROBE FULLY. RECORD FIRST AND OTHER MENTIONS SEPARATELY**

	<u>FIRST</u> <u>MENTION</u>	<u>OTHER</u> <u>MENTION</u>
	<u>SR</u>	<u>MR</u>
AUSTCARE	01	01
AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC RELIEF.....	02	02
AUSTRALIAN RED CROSS	03	03
AUSTRALIAN VOLUNTEERS ABROAD / AVA.....	04	04

CARE AUSTRALIA	05	05
CARITAS	06	06
CHRISTIAN CHILDREN'S FUND.....	07	07
COMMUNITY AID ABROAD / CAA	08	08

FAMILY PLANNING AUSTRALIA.....	09	09
FOSTER PARENTS PLAN	10	10
FRED HOLLOWS FOUNDATION.....	11	11
FREEDOM FROM HUNGER	12	12
INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DEVELOPMENT AGENCY	13	13

MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES.....	14	14
OVERSEAS SERVICE BUREAU / OSB	15	15
PLAN INTERNATIONAL	16	16
ROTARY	17	17

SALVATION ARMY.....	18	18
SAVE THE CHILDREN AUSTRALIA.....	19	19
ST VINCENT DE PAUL.....	20	20

UNICEF	21	21
UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA.....	22	22

WORLD VISION	23	23
WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE.....	24	24
YMCA	25	25
YWCA	26	26
OTHER	27	27
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____
.....	_____	_____
.....	_____	_____
NONE/DON'T KNOW	28	28