THE RESEARCH PROCESS
Objectives for research

- **Confirm landscape**: identify key perceptions and attitudes about the global development sector, its funding and its outcomes

- **Test narratives**: determine optimal narrative for the sector by testing different themes, tones and types of supporting content

- **Evaluate messages**: understand which resonate with key audiences and identify those with the most potential for use across the sector

- **Identify optimal language, terminology and images**: understand what tones, words, images and terms are most compelling
Reviewed 25 separate research projects from the last 10 years

Both foundation and non-foundation projects

Used to inform research design and stimulus for testing

Aim was to learn what can be done to change perceptions – rather than just verifying existing insights
The Research Approach

Content Evaluation & Development
Investigate existing data and resources to understand current and past sector positioning & messaging. Use the knowledge to hypothesis and develop optimal content.

Traditional Focus Groups
Exploratory qualitative to test core concepts and stimuli reactions
(5 groups, 6-8 respondents per group)

Jury Groups
Test Partisan arguments in a head to head environment to identify winning cases
(4 groups, 8 partisans and 6-8 jurors per group)

Online Quantitative Narrative Test
Test content, tone and specific language to identify strongest overall narrative, messages and stimuli pairings.
(1200 online surveys per country in the US, UK, FR and DE)

The two types of groups were conducted in conjunction with each other in four countries US, UK, FR, DE
Thinking about the structure

Brainstorming and content workshop sessions were used to refine the content for testing so that in the quantitative stage we had 4 Narrative constructs to test and 16 Messages.

Message Version A

Women and Girls (Value Variation)
Women and girls everywhere deserve an equal chance to thrive. We must correct the imbalance that is holding them back and let them take control of their own destinies.

Message Version B

Women and Girls (Return on Investment)
Investing in women and girls is very effective. Empower them and their whole family benefits. Their nations also gain by their contribution to society. For every year girls attend school beyond nine years old, an entire country’s wages rise by 20%.
The qualitative phase

The qualitative research dug deep into underlying motivations and attitudes towards international development/aid. We also evaluated responses to specific ideas and visuals to identify what resonates.

**OUTCOMES:** Refine individual arguments and identify any new themes for inclusion, then determine which themes offer most potential to build narratives on for quant testing.
The quantitative phase

The quantitative research was used to validate findings about attitudes, knowledge and audience priorities from the qualitative research. In addition, it will identify the narrative and messaging architecture that most mobilizes the base, tips the swings in favor and quiets the Skeptics.

OUTCOMES: Develop a playbook for use by the Foundation and their partners that identifies an ideal narrative, key messages, and optimal tones, language, and proof points.
QUALITATIVE FINDINGS – A SUMMARY
Qual Confirmed Existing Insights

There is broad agreement for the **moral** case for development

Huge **skepticism** exists around the effectiveness of this work

There is an overall sense that "**nothing has changed**" in 30 years

Public **knowledge** and **understanding** of these issues is poor
The level of **anger** and **frustration** is higher than anticipated

There is a certain level of fear around **immigration** in Europe

**Education**, not health, was the most commonly cited priority

Some illustrations of **progress** “go too far”

Supporters are ill equipped to give any examples of **success**
Qual Showed Swings are in Play

Pros
“I just believe it’s the right thing to do.”
-- UK

Swings
“If there really was some benefit I’d be absolutely happy.”
-- France

Skeptics
“It’s not working. That’s enough of an argument.”
-- Germany

Goal of the quantitative phase to verify and size these audience segments
How do we develop **effective rebuttals** to corruption myths

How do we make a **better case for progress** with different audiences

Can a narrative work with **different audiences** in different countries

How do we best **arm and motivate** our base
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS
Methodology

- **Timing:** May 14-29, 2014
- **Methodology:** Penn Schoen Berland conducted an online quantitative survey
- **Audiences:** Engaged Public in the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Germany
- Three segments were targeted: Pro, Swing and Skeptic
- **Note:** Results are supplemented with anecdotal findings from open end questions and the 9 focus groups in the same countries.
- **Note:** unless otherwise indicated all numbers shown are percentages.
- **Note:** N-sizes below 50 should be considered directional
- Sample sizes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-size</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE at 90% Confidence Level</td>
<td>±2.0%</td>
<td>±1.7%</td>
<td>±2.3%</td>
<td>±4.1%</td>
<td>±3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience Size

Base is adult population in each country. Engaged audience is defined as people who have some knowledge about global development and pay attention to information about the subject.
Audience Size – within the Engaged

Proportion of the Public that qualify as Engaged in each country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Engaged - Pro</th>
<th>Engaged - Swing</th>
<th>Engaged - Skeptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

US: 26%
UK: 32%
France: 30%
Germany: 33%

Base is ENGAGED Public in each country. Engaged Public is defined as people who have some knowledge about global development and pay attention to information about the subject.
## Audience Definitions

### PRO:
- **Engaged Public**
- **Very Positive attitude** toward development across a series of 5 perception questions
- **Have taken an action** in the last year requiring either commitment of personal time or money
- **Composition of Engaged Audience:**
  - 47% US respondents
  - 41% UK respondents
  - 32% FR respondents
  - 42% DE respondents

### SWING:
- **Engaged Public**
- **Neutral to positive attitude** toward development across a series of 5 perception questions
- **At least willing to consider** taking action (e.g. reading an article at a minimum)
- **Composition of Engaged Audience:**
  - 39% US respondents
  - 47% UK respondents
  - 50% FR respondents
  - 47% DE respondents

### SKEPTICS:
- **Engaged or Slightly Less Engaged Public**
- **Neutral to negative attitude** toward development across a series of 5 perception questions
- **At least willing to consider** taking action (e.g. reading an article at a minimum)
- **Composition of Engaged Audience:**
  - 14% US respondents
  - 12% UK respondents
  - 18% FR respondents
  - 11% DE respondents

Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland
We have a moral obligation to help the world’s poorest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most agree that we have a moral obligation to help the world’s poorest people

Agreement is lowest among Skeptics at 73% overall
By contrast 77% of Pros strongly agree there is a moral obligation to help
Agreement is consistent across geographies, with Germans most likely to strongly agree (59%) and French least likely to strongly agree at 47%

“As a developed nation we have a moral responsibility to bring any people across the world to a decent level of education and health, and it is a shame and a disgrace that all people do not have these opportunities.” - (Supporter, London Jury Group)

“That it is everyone’s moral obligation to help in humanitarian causes and thrive to help those in urgent needs to make them better persons and contributors to their society.” - (Pro, US Online Survey)

“Also, don’t tell me I’ve a moral responsibility...I DON’T...charity starts at home and we’ve plenty of things to support right here.” - (Skeptic, US Online Survey)
Many feel foreign aid is a waste

62% of Skeptics believe aid is a big waste
US & France are the most negative countries at 48% agreement
In the US, 23% strongly agree foreign aid is a big waste
While overall agreement that aid is a waste is lowest among Pros, 21% strongly agree it is a problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foreign aid is a big waste**

- **Strongly agree**
- **Somewhat agree**

Even among those who believe there is a moral obligation to help the poorest there is still a strong belief that foreign aid is a big waste

Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland

QBL4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the idea that foreign aid is a big waste. [Top 2 Box (Strongly agree + Somewhat agree)]
Deep skepticism that individuals or their governments can make a difference

Skeptics feel strongly they cannot make a difference personally, but are more accepting of potential government impact.

Even among the Pro, close to half doubt their ability to personally make a difference.

US respondents are the most positive, while the French are the least positive.

**Personal impact on reducing poverty in poor countries**

- **Can’t make a difference**
- **Neutral**
- **Can make a difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can’t make a difference</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can make a difference</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government impact on reducing poverty in poor countries**

- **Can’t make a difference**
- **Neutral**
- **Can make a difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can’t make a difference</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can make a difference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intention to donate is very low outside the Pro audience

76% of Swings fall into the middle ground, neither very likely nor definitively unlikely to donate
53% of Skeptics say they are not at all likely to donate

“‘It makes me determined to increase my income so I can increase my personal donations.’” - (Pro, US Online Survey)

“I need reassurance that if I donate the money will not go into corruption.” - (Swing, UK Online Survey)

“I feel sorry for those in extreme poverty. My first thought is how I could help. Donations to charities that help the poor develop food and other resources receive my money.” - (Pro, US Online Survey)

“I feel I want to help...mainly by looking at ways to donate.” - (Swing, UK Online Survey)

QBSR5. Thinking about charitable giving to help in developing countries, please indicate how likely you would be to donate to a charity or non-profit organization (i.e. NGO) that works on international development programs, where a score of 0 means you are ‘Not at all likely to donate to an NGO’, and a score of 10 means you are ‘Very likely to donate to an NGO’. Where would you place yourself on this scale? [% Top 3 (10 – Very Likely + 9 + 8)/ % Bottom 3 Box(2+1+0- Not at all likely)]

Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland
Support for Government aid is strong with Pro, but weak among Swing and Skeptics

77% of Pros believe their government should give generously
Swings and Skeptics are more neutral, though 27% of Skeptics are opposed to government aid
Belief the government should give aid generously is strongest in Germany (48%) and weakest in France (32%)

My government should give aid generously

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should not give aid</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should give aid generously</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“It makes me feel that the US does not do enough to help these people get to a point of where they can help themselves.” - (Swing, US Online Survey)

“I would rather individuals donate via charity rather than depend on our government to donate the money.” - (Skeptic, US Online Survey)

The [UK] government should continue their aid in countries that need it but not India or China where their government has the ability to look after their own people. - (Swing, UK Online Survey)

“My responses reflect my belief that the government is an inefficient middle man in foreign aid. I would rather contribute directly to reputable, transparent private companies.” - (Swing, US Online Survey)
Supporting Global Development is the preferred term

The exception is Germany, where the preferred term is Supporting Overseas Development (Overseas avg. score=58%)

What would you call programs designed to expand health, education and economic opportunities for the world’s poorest people

- What are we doing?
  - Supporting
  - Helping
  - Developing
  - Donating
  - Sharing
  - Giving
  - Partnering
  - Assisting
  - Wasting

- Where?
  - Global
  - Foreign
  - International
  - Overseas

- What is it called?
  - Development
  - Philanthropy
  - Charity
  - Assistance
  - Partnerships
  - Humanitarianism

Shown-average score for each word (pre/post)

- Pro Top Scoring Word
- Swing Top Scoring Word
- Skeptic Top Scoring Word

Terminology test. Click on the box and select your preferred word from the drop down list. You may adjust your phrase as needed until you are satisfied. [Asked before and after exposure to the narratives, Shown-average of pre and post narrative score]
REACTIONS TO NARRATIVES
NARRATIVE & MESSAGING INDEX SCORE METHODOLOGY

Respondents saw one narrative and 8 messages. For each, a number of metrics were captured. Five metrics comprise the index score, while the sixth captures attitudes about specific wording in the messages.

Notes:
- We use Net Convincing because it captures both the upside of convincing (which is valuable for leveraging areas where we have current credibility), as well as the downside (which indicates areas where we have credibility weakness).
- We used top box scores for the other four metrics because they are the most important for behavior.
- Messages are also evaluated on:
  - Breakthrough: Their ability to stick in peoples’ minds
  - Education: Their ability to clearly convey information
  - Blowback: Potential negative perceptions
  - Right/Wrong: Whether respondents buy into the content or not

CONVINCING: Measure the effectiveness of the message on shifting the target audience’s current perceptions
Metric C: How convincing do you find the content of this statement?

PERCEPTION: Measure affinity and emotional response to each message
Metric A: Would you say you like this statement very much, somewhat, not very much, or not at all?
Metric B (messages only): Which of the following words or phrases do you think apply to this statement? Please select all that apply.

CALL TO ACTION: Measure how much the message can move the target audience to take action
Metric D: How much more or less likely would you be to support government funding for global development programs based on this statement?
Metric E: How much more or less likely would you be to donate to a charity or non-profit that works on global development programs based on this statement?
Metric F: How much more or less likely would you be to take action in support of global development programs (e.g. talk to friends and family either in person or online, send a letter to an elected official, or volunteer time to participate in an event)?

The index score is used to stack rank messages within each audience and across audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Convincing</th>
<th>Call to Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index Score</td>
<td>% Very much</td>
<td>Very + Somewhat</td>
<td>Not Very + Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the index score breakdown for the statement: **Women and girls everywhere deserve an equal chance to thrive. We must correct the imbalance that is holding them back and let them take control of their own destinies.**

EVALUATION OF SPECIFIC WORDS AND PHRASES (not included in the index score): Identifies words and phrases with messages that resonate most strongly with key audiences. The output shows the frequency that a word/phrase was selected. Color and size move proportionally from bright red for smallest % to light blue for largest % per scale above.

Metric F: Now we would like you to review the statement again and select the specific phrase or words in the statement that are MOST COMPELLING to you. Note that you may select between 1 and 30 words. (10 words for the messages)
The world’s poorest people lack opportunity but they don’t lack pride. They want to be able to provide for their families and live with dignity. What they crave more than anything else is to be self-sufficient and determine their own future. Aid in the modern era is about giving people a hand up not a hand out.

The world’s poorest people face challenges we can barely imagine. Yet so many refuse to give up. Their determination to create a better life for their children makes real change possible. They are not lacking in human potential, just an environment in which to survive and thrive.

Support today focuses on unlocking that potential. Basic healthcare frees people from poor health. People take advantage of education and training to flourish in their own communities. For example, farmers learn the skills they need to earn a living from their land. Projects that invest in people and deliver good health give people the kick start they need to become permanently independent.

When this type of support is available to entrepreneurial and motivated people, the potential is massive. Take a farmer like Odetta in Rwanda, who was living on less than $1 a day. Now she employs eight of her neighbors thanks to a farming skills program.

Migration declines when people have opportunity at home. They invest in their own communities. A growing number of countries who used to receive Aid now no longer need it. We must continue to work towards a future where every nation can be self-sufficient.

Support those striving to help themselves.
Partnership Narrative

Development is not about blindly giving. Change happens when we work with poor countries in a partnership. When we share the same goals and responsibility for achieving them. When we share knowledge, expertise and demand accountability. Sharing works because solutions get amplified when they get passed on. It’s not about one side shouldering the burden, it’s about a relationship that pays back both ways.

Organizations on the ground are more engaged than ever. Governments in poor countries are dedicating more of their budget to health, education and agriculture. Their desire to improve conditions in their own countries is also evident in the rise of projects they are co-funding with us. They also now contribute their own medical discoveries, innovations and exports to the shared wealth of nations.

Some of the biggest achievements of the last 30 years would not have been possible without these shared efforts:
The percentage of people living on just $1.25 a day has been cut in half since 1990. That’s 700 million less people living in extreme poverty – twice the population of the entire United States
Farmers like Joyce in Tanzania are now earning enough to send their children to high school thanks to a partnership that has made better seeds available to struggling farming families
There have been dramatic improvements in global health: smallpox beaten, polio on the way out, AIDS a survivable disease.
If child deaths had stayed the same since 1990, 17 million children would have died last year. Together, we’ve managed to reduce that to 6.6 million.

All this has been achieved not by handouts but by partnership - between people and countries. When poor countries improve, we benefit too. We are reaping the economic benefits of more trade partners and the security benefits of more stable countries.

We need to share, not just give.
Progress Narrative

Progress in the world comes from the persistence of individuals. People who believe that doing something is better than nothing. Ending global poverty is a difficult task, but step by step we are gaining ground. Nothing important has ever been achieved without perseverance. With determination and collective effort on both sides, the evidence is mounting that we’re making progress.

Look at the positive changes in the world in the last 50 years. Medical and technological breakthroughs provide tools we didn’t have before. Many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America have left mass poverty behind for good. We’ve beaten smallpox. AIDS is now survivable for most who have it. We know that for every year that girls attend school beyond nine years old, an entire country’s wages rise by 20%.

None of this happened overnight and none of it came easy. Creating a network of local health workers takes time. So does vaccinating a population or sharing new farming techniques. When we attack the foundations of poverty, you create change that can last forever.

Success breeds success. In the poorest countries, parents who lived hand to mouth are seeing their kids off to school and a brighter future. And the benefits spread outwards. The community with a reliable income can invest in a school or a medical center. At the largest end of the scale, countries like Botswana, Morocco, Brazil, Mexico used to receive Aid and no longer need it.

We’ve come too far to quit.

Keep up the momentum, push for a better world.
Morality Narrative

People cannot help where they are born. It is hard to imagine what life could have been like if we were born somewhere else. Many of the things we take for granted, like access to clean water or the most basic healthcare, remain desperately out of reach for so many. A life in the United States is worth no more than a life overseas. We can’t look away and ignore the suffering of those less fortunate than us - wherever they happen to live.

It’s a moral outrage that a child under 5 who lives in Africa is 8 times more likely to die than in Europe. It’s an injustice that the 85 richest people in the world own the same wealth as the poorest 3.5 billion. It’s unthinkable that we might stop helping the world’s poorest people when nearly 7 million helpless children die every year. They are dying from preventable diseases for which we have easy access to vaccines. They are also dying from everyday illnesses like diarrhea.

It’s our duty to support each other. If we turned a blind eye to people in need what would that say about us? Helping others is what makes us better people. It’s the foundation for any good society. Don’t ignore suffering, help those in need now.
Autonomy and Partnership narratives are strongest across segments and countries

The Morality narrative performs well with Pros but does not succeed with Skeptics.
Progress is the weakest narrative among Pros & Swing as well as in three out of four countries- the UK, France and Germany.

**NARRATIVE INDEX SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td>300-319</td>
<td>160-193</td>
<td>84-127</td>
<td>254-266</td>
<td>212-253</td>
<td>172-194</td>
<td>189-224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTONOMY**
- Mean: 319
- Range: 319-224

**MORALITY**
- Mean: 313
- Range: 313-217

**PARTNERSHIP**
- Mean: 312
- Range: 312-217

**PROGRESS**
- Mean: 300
- Range: 300-189

**Strongest Tagline**

- **Helping others to help themselves**
- **Where you are born shouldn’t determine when you’ll die**
- **One human race, with a future that’s better together**
- **Persistence leads to progress**

Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland
REACTIONS TO MESSAGES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>WOMEN &amp; GIRLS (VALUE VARIATION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>WOMEN &amp; GIRLS (RETURN ON INVESTMENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>CORRUPTION (TRANSPARENCY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>SELF-INTEREST (ECONOMIC &amp; SECURITY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>SELF-INTEREST (AS STATUS) – US ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>HUMAN POTENTIAL (BARRIERS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>HUMAN POTENTIAL (IMBALANCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>CONVERGENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>CONVERGENCE (LOOKING BACK WITH ALTERNATIVE TIME-BOUND MESSAGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>ODA (EFFECTIVENESS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>CONTINUE V. STOP (AS LOSS AVERSION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>CONTINUE V. STOP (PERSEVERANCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Reference to Smart Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>MORAL SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Message Key**

**Rank by Pro Index Score**

**Message Text**

- **Top Scoring Message**
  - CORRUPTION (AGGRESSIVE)
  - LEVELS OF CORRUPTION ARE MASSIVELY EXAGGERATED. IT IS THE PRICE WE MUST PAY FOR DOING THIS WORK, BUT THE LEVELS OF MONEY LOST ARE TINY COMPARED TO WHAT ACTUALLY REACHES THOSE IN NEED.

- **Second Scoring Message**
  - CONTINUE V. STOP (AS LOSS AVERSION)
  - WE HAVE CUT CHILD DEATHS ALMOST IN HALF, BEATEN SMALLPOX AND MADE AIDS A SURVIVABLE DISEASE. BUT WITHDRAW OUR SUPPORT AND THINGS GO BACKWARDS. AIDS WILL BE AN EPIDEMIC ONCE AGAIN. MORE CHILDREN WILL DIE NEEDLESSLY. TO STOP NOW WOULD BE TO loose ALL THAT WE HAVE WORKED SO HARD TO GAIN.

- **Bottom Scoring Message**
  - CONVERGENCE
  - WE HAVE NOW A PROVEN ROADMAP FOR THE INTERVENTIONS THAT WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE PREVENTABLE CHILD DEATHS UNIVERSALLY RARE BY 2030. THE KNOWLEDGE IS IN PLACE. NOW WE NEED A GLOBAL EFFORT TO SCALE UP WHAT WE KNOW WORKS.

**Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland**

Message test. See NARRATIVE & MESSAGING INDEX SCORE METHODOLOGY for Index score components.
Women & Girls (1A) performs very well across audiences, while Corruption (2B) does very poorly.

Convergence (5B) performs well among Swing and respondents in the US & UK.

### MESSAGE INDEX SCORE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message Category</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN &amp; GIRLS (VALUE VARIATION)</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN POTENTIAL (IMBALANCE)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE V. STOP (AS LOSS AVERSION)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN &amp; GIRLS (RETURN ON INVESTMENT)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVERGENCE</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE V. STOP (PERSEVERANCE)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVERGENCE (LOOKING BACK WITH ALTERNATIVE TIME-BOUND MESSAGE)</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRUPTION (TRANSPARENCY)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN POTENTIAL (BARRIERS)</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT WITH STIPULATIONS</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-INTEREST (ECONOMIC &amp; SECURITY)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA (ABRUPTION FROM PAST WITH REFERENCE TO SMART AID)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-INTEREST (AS STATUS) – US ONLY</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-INTEREST (IMMIGRATION) – UK, FR, DE ONLY</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA (EFFECTIVENESS)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRUPTION (AGGRESSIVE)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Scoring Message | Second Scoring Message | Bottom Scoring Message

Message test. See NARRATIVE & MESSAGING INDEX SCORE METHODOLOGY for Index score components.

Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland.
Women & Girls (Value) is strongest across almost all measures for Swings

Swing recognize Convergence (Looking back) as educational (i.e. informative and easy to understand)

Women & Girls (ROI) has the highest breakthrough potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWING: TOP MESSAGE DETAILS</th>
<th>INDEX SCORE</th>
<th>Index Score Components</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>57-193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN &amp; GIRLS (VALUE VARIATION)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>57 74 22 19 21</td>
<td>53 77 48 2 15 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN &amp; GIRLS (RETURN ON INVESTMENT)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>43 64 19 17 17</td>
<td>57 78 27 3 19 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVERGENCE (LOOKING BACK WITH ALTERNATIVE TIME-BOUND MESSAGE)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>43 64 19 17 17</td>
<td>54 80 31 5 18 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN POTENTIAL (IMBALANCE)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>40 70 17 15 17</td>
<td>48 76 38 2 15 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>44 60 20 18 17</td>
<td>53 70 39 3 23 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT WITH STIPULATIONS</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>42 63 17 17 16</td>
<td>47 73 37 3 20 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE V. STOP (AS LOSS AVERSION)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>37 64 18 17 17</td>
<td>56 79 31 4 23 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE V. STOP (PERSEVERANCE)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>39 64 18 15 17</td>
<td>50 74 36 2 19 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TopScoring Message
Message test. See NARRATIVE & MESSAGING INDEX SCORE METHODOLOGY for Index score components

Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland
LANGUAGE
Now we would like you to review the statement again and select the specific phrase or words in the statement that are MOST COMPELLING to you. Note that you may select between 1 and 30 words. (10 words for the messages)

The world’s poorest people lack opportunity but they don’t lack pride. They want to be able to provide for their families and live with dignity. What they crave more than anything else is to be self-sufficient and determine their own future. Aid in the modern era is about giving people a hand up not a hand out. The world’s poorest people face challenges we can barely imagine. Yet so many refuse to give up. Their determination to create a better life for their children makes real change possible. They are not lacking in human potential, just an environment in which to survive and thrive. Support today focuses on unlocking that potential. Basic healthcare frees people from poor health. People take advantage of education and training to flourish in their own communities. For example, farmers learn the skills they need to earn a living from their land. Projects that invest in people and deliver good health give people the kick start they need to become permanently independent. When this type of support is available to entrepreneurial and motivated people, the potential is massive. Take a farmer like Odetta in Rwanda, who was living on less than $1 a day. Now she employs eight of her neighbors thanks to a farming skills program. Migration declines when people have opportunity at home. They invest in their own communities. A growing number of countries who used to receive Aid now no longer need it. We must continue to work towards a future where every nation can be self-sufficient. Support those striving to help themselves.
### PARTNERSHIP: Narrative highlighting- US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development is not about blindly giving. Change happens when we work with poor countries in a partnership.</strong> When we share the same goals and responsibility for achieving them. When we share knowledge, expertise and demand accountability.</td>
<td><strong>Development is not about blindly giving. Change happens when we work with poor countries in a partnership.</strong> When we share the same goals and responsibility for achieving them. When we share knowledge, expertise and demand accountability.</td>
<td><strong>Development is not about blindly giving. Change happens when we work with poor countries in a partnership.</strong> When we share the same goals and responsibility for achieving them. When we share knowledge, expertise and demand accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting wealth because solutions get amplified when they get passed on.</td>
<td>Not about one side shouldering the burden, it’s about a relationship that pays back both ways.</td>
<td>Not about one side shouldering the burden, it’s about a relationship that pays back both ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The percentage of people living on just $1.25 a day has been cut in half since 1990. That’s 700 million less people living in extreme poverty. Twice the population of the entire United States. Farmers like Joyce in Tanzania are now earning enough to send their children to high school thanks to a partnership that has made better seeds available to struggling farming families. There have been dramatic improvements in global health: smallpox beaten, polio on the way out, AIDS a survivable disease. A child deaths that stayed the same since 1990, 17 million children would have died last year. Together, we’ve managed to reduce that to 6.6 million. We’ve been achieved not by handouts but by partnership - between people and countries. When poor countries improve, we benefit too. We are reaping the economic benefits of more trade partners and the security benefits of more stable countries. We need to share, not just give.</td>
<td>The percentage of people living on just $1.25 a day has been cut in half since 1990. That’s 700 million less people living in extreme poverty. Twice the population of the entire United States. Farmers like Joyce in Tanzania are now earning enough to send their children to high school thanks to a partnership that has made better seeds available to struggling farming families. There have been dramatic improvements in global health: smallpox beaten, polio on the way out, AIDS a survivable disease. A child deaths that stayed the same since 1990, 17 million children would have died last year. Together, we’ve managed to reduce that to 6.6 million. We’ve been achieved not by handouts but by partnership - between people and countries. When poor countries improve, we benefit too. We are reaping the economic benefits of more trade partners and the security benefits of more stable countries. We need to share, not just give.</td>
<td>The percentage of people living on just $1.25 a day has been cut in half since 1990. That’s 700 million less people living in extreme poverty. Twice the population of the entire United States. Farmers like Joyce in Tanzania are now earning enough to send their children to high school thanks to a partnership that has made better seeds available to struggling farming families. There have been dramatic improvements in global health: smallpox beaten, polio on the way out, AIDS a survivable disease. A child deaths that stayed the same since 1990, 17 million children would have died last year. Together, we’ve managed to reduce that to 6.6 million. We’ve been achieved not by handouts but by partnership - between people and countries. When poor countries improve, we benefit too. We are reaping the economic benefits of more trade partners and the security benefits of more stable countries. We need to share, not just give.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Progress: Narrative Highlighting - US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Skeptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress in the world comes from the persistence of individuals.</strong> People who believe that doing something is better than nothing. Ending global poverty is a difficult task, but step by step we are gaining ground. Ending poverty has been achieved without perseverance, determination, collective effort on both sides, and evidence mounting. We're making progress.</td>
<td><strong>Progress in the world comes from the persistence of individuals.</strong> People who believe that doing something is better than nothing. Ending global poverty is a difficult task, but step by step we are gaining ground. Ending poverty has been achieved without perseverance, determination, collective effort on both sides, and evidence mounting. We're making progress.</td>
<td><strong>Progress in the world comes from the persistence of individuals.</strong> People who believe that doing something is better than nothing. Ending global poverty is a difficult task, but step by step we are gaining ground. Ending poverty has been achieved without perseverance, determination, collective effort on both sides, and evidence mounting. We're making progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America have left mass poverty behind for good. We've beaten smallpox. AIDS is now survivable for most who have it. We know that for every year that girls attend school beyond nine years old, an entire country's wages rise by 20%. None of this happened overnight and none of it came easy. Creating a network of local health workers takes time. So does vaccinating a population or sharing new farming techniques.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ending poverty has been achieved without perseverance, determination, collective effort on both sides, and evidence mounting.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ending poverty has been achieved without perseverance, determination, collective effort on both sides, and evidence mounting.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the poorest countries, parents who lived hand to mouth are seeing their kids off to school and a brighter future. The benefits spread outwards.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Success breeds success.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Success breeds success.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The narrative project: Research conducted by Penn Schoen Berland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we would like you to review the statement again and select the specific phrase or words in the statement that are MOST COMPELLING to you. Note that you may select between 1 and 30 words. (10 words for the messages)
People cannot help where they are born. It is hard to imagine what life could have been like if we were born somewhere else. Many of the things we take for granted, like access to clean water or the most basic healthcare, remain desperately out of reach for so many. A life in the United States is worth no more than a life overseas. We can't look away and ignore the suffering of those less fortunate than us - wherever they happen to live. It's a moral outrage that a child under 5 who lives in Africa is 8 times more likely to die than in Europe. It's an injustice that the 85 richest people in the world own the same wealth as the poorest 3.5 billion. It's unthinkable that we might stop helping the world's poorest people when nearly 7 million helpless children die every year. They are dying from preventable diseases for which we have easy access to vaccines. They are also dying from everyday illnesses like diarrhea. It's our duty to support each other. If we turned a blind eye to people in need what would that say about us? Helping others is what makes us better people. It's the foundation for any good society. Don't ignore suffering, help those in need now.

People cannot help where they are born. It is hard to imagine what life could have been like if we were born somewhere else. Many of the things we take for granted, like access to clean water or the most basic healthcare, remain desperately out of reach for so many. A life in the United States is worth no more than a life overseas. We can't look away and ignore the suffering of those less fortunate than us - wherever they happen to live. It's a moral outrage that a child under 5 who lives in Africa is 8 times more likely to die than in Europe. It's an injustice that the 85 richest people in the world own the same wealth as the poorest 3.5 billion. It's unthinkable that we might stop helping the world's poorest people when nearly 7 million helpless children die every year. They are dying from preventable diseases for which we have easy access to vaccines. They are also dying from everyday illnesses like diarrhea. It's our duty to support each other. If we turned a blind eye to people in need what would that say about us? Helping others is what makes us better people. It's the foundation for any good society. Don't ignore suffering, help those in need now.
ATTACK & REBUTTAL
Even though Bottomless Pit is the most damaging attack, it fails to stand up against an effective rebuttal.

The rebuttal succeeds in convincing most Pros, many Swings and a moderate proportion of Skeptics to support global development programs. At the end of the day, most are aligned with supporters of global development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack:</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Convincing/Not Convincing</th>
<th>Support/Oppose Gov’t Funding</th>
<th>Likely/Unlikely to Donate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s a hopeless and bottomless pit. Year after year, money pours into places in need but things never get any better. In the last 50 years almost one trillion dollars in aid has gone to Africa and yet still all we see is the same images of suffering. Corruption means hardly any money reaches people in need anyway.</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>73/27</td>
<td>48/21</td>
<td>48/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>77/24</td>
<td>30/28</td>
<td>29/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>88/12</td>
<td>11/45</td>
<td>10/43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebuttal:</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Convincing/Not Convincing</th>
<th>Support/Oppose Gov’t Funding</th>
<th>Likely/Unlikely to Donate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the number of children dying from preventable causes has declined from 17 million in 1990 to nearly 7 million in 2013, how can anyone say that it isn’t working? If you only see suffering, you’re missing the bigger picture. We have cut extreme poverty in half across the globe. AIDS is no longer a death sentence. We have defeated smallpox. Many countries who received Aid no longer need it. There is still much to do, but what we have achieved should fill us with hope.</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>96/4</td>
<td>82/2</td>
<td>82/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>88/12</td>
<td>62/6</td>
<td>57/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>77/23</td>
<td>36/13</td>
<td>28/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QAR1/4. How convincing do you find the content of this statement? [% Top 2 (Very convincing + Somewhat convincing) - % Bottom 2 Box (Not very convincing + Not at all convincing)]

QAR2/S. How much more or less likely would you be to support government funding for global development programs based on this statement? [% Top 2 (Much more likely + Somewhat more likely) / % Bottom 2 Box (Somewhat less likely + Much less likely)]

QAR3/6. How much more or less likely would you be to donate to a charity or non-profit that works on global development programs based on this statement? [% Top 2 (Much more likely + Somewhat more likely) / % Bottom 2 Box (Somewhat less likely + Much less likely)]

QAR7. Who do you agree with more?
Held Back by Handouts attack has little impact on perceptions

Even Skeptics do not see it as a particularly convincing argument, though their opposition remains moderate

Rebuttal is seen as convincing and engenders increased support and interest in donating across audiences

Majority end aligned with supporters

**Held Back by Handouts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Convincing/Not Convincing</th>
<th>Support/Oppose Gov’t Funding</th>
<th>Likely/Unlikely to Donate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>49/17</td>
<td>50/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>54/46</td>
<td>31/21</td>
<td>30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>65/36</td>
<td>17/30</td>
<td>14/28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attack:**
Giving money to poor countries creates a state of dependency that keeps people poor. In trying to help, we do more harm than good. More than a quarter of countries in sub-Saharan Africa are poorer now than they were in 1960. What does that say about aid and development? The fact is, it’s not our job to solve the world’s problems and nor can we. Poor countries have to do it for themselves.

**Pro** 52/48 49/17 50/17

**Swing** 54/46 31/21 30/19

**Skeptic** 65/36 17/30 14/28

**Rebuttal:**
The collective focus is now on Aid that educates. Infant mortality has been reduced by teaching mothers how to care for newborns and training locals to become health workers in remote regions. We are helping countries feed themselves by equipping farmers with the skills they need to maximize their crops. More women and girls are empowered than ever before and are playing an active role in societies. For example, for every year girls attend school beyond nine years old, an entire country’s wages rise by 20%. By investing in people and their ability to drive their nation’s progress, the focus is on long-lasting change.

**Pro** 96/4 84/2 82/2

**Swing** 91/9 65/4 59/5

**Skeptic** 82/19 38/10 34/10

QAR8/11. How convincing do you find the content of this statement? [% Top 2 (Very convincing + Somewhat convincing) - % Bottom 2 Box (Not very convincing + Not at all convincing)]

QAR9/12. How much more or less likely would you be to support government funding for global development programs based on this statement? [% Top 2 (Much more likely + Somewhat more likely) / % Bottom 2 Box (Somewhat less likely + Much less likely)]

QAR10/13. How much more or less likely would you be to donate to a charity or non-profit that works on global development programs based on this statement? [% Top 2 (Much more likely + Somewhat more likely) / % Bottom 2 Box (Somewhat less likely + Much less likely)]

QAR14. Who do you agree with more?
Swings and Skeptics find the Problems at Home attack more compelling than Pros

However, 59% of Pros do find it convincing and a comparable proportion oppose gov’t funding and are unlikely to donate in this context.

Rebuttal is more convincing and motivating than the attack and most end aligned with supporters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems at Home</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Convincing/Not Convincing</th>
<th>Support/Oppose Gov’t Funding</th>
<th>Likely/Unlikely to Donate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attack:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve got too many problems of our own to sort out before we try to fix other people’s. We’ve got poverty and ill health here too. Our economy has barely recovered from the credit crunch. Money sent abroad is money not spent at home. You’ve got to look after your own before you are in a position to help others.</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>59/41</td>
<td>53/17</td>
<td>53/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>67/32</td>
<td>36/19</td>
<td>33/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>83/17</td>
<td>24/28</td>
<td>18/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rebuttal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping at home and abroad are not mutually exclusive. Transform their future and we transform our own. Our economy is boosted when developing countries become trade partners. Our security grows as nations become stable. Migration pressures ease when people have more opportunity at home. Meanwhile, the amount spent on aid achieves disproportionately large impact. When we are talking about extreme poverty, we are talking about people struggling to survive on $1.25 a day. When people have so little, help can be transformative. Most people think it’s more, but our spend on overseas aid is less than 1% of our federal budget. Is this really the budget we are prepared to chop when it does so much good?</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>93/7</td>
<td>79/3</td>
<td>79/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>85/15</td>
<td>58/6</td>
<td>54/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>67/34</td>
<td>32/16</td>
<td>25/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT ON PERCEPTIONS
Views on moral obligation remain high post messaging

Agree we have a moral obligation to help the world’s poorest people
Top 2 shown (Strongly agree + Somewhat agree)

PRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SWING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SKEPTIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑ Indicates a statistically significant change from pre to post at the 90% confidence interval

# QBL3 /QPS5 /QPST5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the idea that we have a moral obligation to help expand health, education and economic opportunities for the world’s poorest people.
Agreement that foreign aid is a “big waste” remains relatively stable post messaging

Perceptions improve marginally among Swings and Skeptics in the US and UK, and Skeptics in France.

Perceptions decline slightly among Pros and Swings in FR and DE and Pros in the US.

Foreign aid is a big waste
Top 2 shown (Strongly agree + Somewhat agree)

Q. QBL4 /QPS6 / QPST6. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the idea that foreign aid is a big waste.

Indicates a statistically significant change from pre to post at the 90% confidence interval.

Q#.
Perceptions that individuals can make a difference increases significantly across the Pro and Swing audiences

Personal impact on reducing poverty in poor countries
Showing Top 3 (10 – You can make a great deal of difference + 9 + 8)

- **PRO**
  - USA: 65, 66, 71
  - UK: 51, 50, 51
  - FR: 47, 47, 51
  - DE: Indicated a statistically significant change from pre to post at the 90% confidence interval

- **SWING**
  - USA: 7, 11, 18
  - UK: 5, 15, 14
  - FR: 19, 18, 13
  - DE: 1, 1, 1

- **SKEPTIC**
  - USA: 65, 66, 71
  - UK: 51, 58, 64
  - FR: 47, 47, 51
  - DE: 42

Indicates a statistically significant change from pre to post at the 90% confidence interval

# QBSR4 /QPS2 / QPST2. Thinking about you personally, how much of a difference do you think you can make to reducing poverty in poor countries? Please use the following scale where 0 means that you ‘can’t make any difference at all’ and 10 means that you ‘can make a great deal of difference’.
Perceptions that the gov’t can have an impact increase slightly following messaging, particularly among the Swing audience.

**Government impact on reducing poverty in poor countries**

Showing Top 3 (10 – You can make a great deal of difference + 9 + 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>SWING</th>
<th>SKEPTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>US</strong></td>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td><strong>FR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates a statistically significant change from pre to post at the 90% confidence interval.

Q#. QBSR3 / OPS1 / QPST1. Thinking about the COUNTRY Government, how much of a difference do you think it can make to reducing poverty in poor countries? Please use the following scale where 0 means that the COUNTRY Government ‘can’t make any difference at all’ and 10 means that it ‘can make a great deal of difference’.
Likelihood to donate to charity increases among Swing audience

Q#. QBSR5 /QPS3 /QPST3. Thinking about charitable giving to help in developing countries, please indicate how likely you would be to donate to a charity or non-profit organization (i.e. NGO) that works on international development programs, where a score of 0 means that you are 'Not at all likely to donate to an NGO', and a score of 10 means you are 'Very likely to donate to an NGO'.

Where would you place yourself on this scale?

Likelihood to donate to a charity or non-profit organization
Showing Top 3 (10 – Very likely to donate to an NGO + 9 + 8)

PRO
- US
- UK
- FR
- DE

SWING
- US
- UK
- FR
- DE

SKEPTIC
- US
- UK
- FR
- DE

Indicates a statistically significant change from pre to post at the 90% confidence interval

Q#. QBSR5 /QPS3 /QPST3. Thinking about charitable giving to help in developing countries, please indicate how likely you would be to donate to a charity or non-profit organization (i.e. NGO) that works on international development programs, where a score of 0 means that you are 'Not at all likely to donate to an NGO', and a score of 10 means you are 'Very likely to donate to an NGO'.

Where would you place yourself on this scale?
Support for gov’t aid increases strongly among Swing, lesser gains are seen among Pro audience.

My government should give aid generously
Showing Top 3 (10 – My government should give aid very generously + 9 + 8)

Q# QBSR6/QPS4 /QPST4. Thinking about overseas aid to poor countries - please indicate the extent to which you think that the COUNTRY Government should give overseas aid, where a score of 0 means that it ‘should not give aid at all’ and a score of 10 means that it ‘should give aid very generously’. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

[Graph showing support for overseas aid among different audiences and countries.]
Potential is top scoring image

Progress also performs very well and scores on par with Potential across most metrics. Hope is the least successful image across audiences.

### Table: Image Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Fits Complete</th>
<th>Much More Likely</th>
<th>Fits Complete</th>
<th>Much More Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q# IMAGE 5A. How well does this image fit with the detailed statement you read previously?  
Q# IMAGE 5B. How much more or less likely would you be to support global development programs based on the content of this image?