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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The arrival of the new 104th Congress, swept in by the November 1994 elections, has brought the subject of foreign aid into the spotlight. Both advocates and opponents of foreign aid have seemed to share the assumption that the public does not support foreign aid. To test this assumption and probe more deeply into public attitudes on the subject, the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) undertook an in-depth study that included:

- A nationwide poll of 801 randomly selected adult Americans, conducted January 12-15, 1995 (margin of error plus or minus 3.5 - 4.0%)

- A review of existing poll data since 1990

- Focus groups held in Portland, Oregon and Baltimore, Maryland

- Open-ended telephone interviews with 17 Americans from across the country

The study found that Americans overwhelmingly support the principle of giving some foreign aid, but their extreme overestimation of how much is actually spent on foreign aid has created a desire to reduce it. To the extent this misinformation is corrected, a strong majority favors maintaining or increasing spending, though there are a number of changes that Americans would like to see. These changes include greater emphasis on helping the needy rather than strategic allies; promoting self-reliance rather than relief; ensuring that aid goes to the needy rather than to corrupt governments; and placing a higher priority on whether recipient countries are democratic and have good human rights records.

More precisely, the study found:

1. An overwhelming majority of Americans embraces the principle that the US should give some aid to help people in foreign countries who are in genuine need.

2. A strong majority says the United States is spending too much on foreign aid. But this attitude is based on the assumption that the US is spending vastly more than it is in fact. Asked what an "appropriate" amount would be, the median level proposed is 5 times the present spending level.

3. When informed about the actual amount of spending on foreign aid, a strong majority favors either maintaining or increasing it.
4. The public wants to change the mix of priorities in foreign aid spending, putting less emphasis on securing US strategic allies and bases around the world and more emphasis on helping the poor and needy.

5. Support for spending on poor countries stems partly from a majority belief that the world is so interconnected that it is in the self-interest of the US to help poor countries develop their economies and limit their environmental pollution.

6. Strong support also comes from the attitude that the US has a moral obligation to help nations in need; an overwhelming majority rejects the idea that the US should only give when it promotes the US national interest.

7. A strong majority supports the principle of giving aid to help countries move toward democracy, including former socialist countries.

8. A majority is unhappy about the amount of aid that goes to countries that are not democratic or have poor human rights records.

9. A majority believes there is widespread waste and corruption in foreign aid programs. A strong majority would be willing to pay more in taxes if they believed that more aid would get to the people who really need it.

10. To promote self-reliance, a majority is willing to spend more on aid that emphasizes training and development, and is willing to give poor countries preferential trade treatment.
INTRODUCTION

With the arrival of the new Congress, swept in by the 1994 midterm elections, the subject of US foreign aid has suddenly received new attention. As battle has been joined between a Republican legislature and a Democratic administration, the assumption on both sides seems to be that the public is largely hostile to foreign aid. Editorials have asserted that foreign aid "is an attractive political target" (Washington Post, January 6) and "never very popular with Americans" (New York Times, January 2).

Evidence for this assumption has been limited to isolated poll questions that show negative feelings about foreign aid. In order to probe more deeply into how Americans feel about this issue, their assumptions, values and priorities, the Program on International Policy Attitudes undertook an in-depth study that included:

- A nationwide poll of 801 randomly selected adult Americans conducted January 12-15, 1995 (margin of error of plus or minus 3.5-4.0%)

- A review of existing poll data since 1990

- Focus groups held in Portland, Oregon and Baltimore, Maryland

- Open-ended telephone interviews with 17 Americans from across the country

Key findings of the study are:

1. An overwhelming majority of Americans embraces the principle that the US should give some aid to help people in foreign countries who are in genuine need.

   Eighty percent of those polled agreed that "the United States should be willing to share at least a small portion of its wealth with those in the world who are in great need." This attitude was shared by respondents in both parties—78% of Republicans agreed. Only 8% said they wanted to eliminate foreign aid entirely.

   Along the same lines, in a 1986 Belden and Russonello poll, 89% agreed that "Whenever people are hungry and poor, we ought to do what we can to help them." And in the same poll 78% agreed that "As a world leader, the US should set an example for other wealthy nations by helping poor nations."

   Most Americans are also not so discouraged by the enormity of the problems in developing countries. In a 1993 poll by Intercultural
Communication, Inc. (ICI), 56% disagreed with the statement, "Their problems are so overwhelming that anything the US does has no effect on improving conditions in developing countries."

When poll questions ask respondents to establish priorities, foreign aid is usually given a lower priority than domestic concerns. In the PIPA poll, 86% agreed that "Taking care of problems at home is more important than giving aid to foreign countries." Similarly, in the 1993 ICI poll, 91% agreed that "We need to solve our own poverty problems in the US before we turn attention to other countries," and in a 1992 Louis Harris poll, 66% agreed that "We should pay less attention to poor countries and concentrate on fighting poverty here at home."

But the responses to these questions are apparently an indication of how strongly respondents feel about the importance of addressing problems at home, not an indication that they want to withhold all foreign aid until all domestic problems are solved. Even when spending on foreign aid was directly juxtaposed with domestic spending in the PIPA poll, only 35% agreed that "Until we have resolved our problems at home, we should not give a penny of aid to other countries." And, apparently, most of these respondents were really not so unequivocal: when asked what percentage of the federal budget should go to foreign aid, just 7% said "none."

One reason Americans oppose the idea of stopping aid to other countries is that they view themselves as generous people, and they seem to derive a sense of fulfillment from being able to lend a helping hand. One woman from a Baltimore focus group expressed her feelings about the prospect of ending foreign aid. She said, "If [you] were to take that away, then what would you have to be proud of as an American?" And a Portland woman explained, "We have to have the feeling we are helping people."
Another reason why people reject the idea of eliminating foreign aid in favor of domestic programs is that they are not convinced that this would significantly contribute to solving problems at home. A Baltimore woman asked, "[E]ven if we cut off all the foreign aid today...what makes anybody think that it would go back into education, or libraries or universities?" Similarly, a man in the Baltimore focus group exclaimed,

I'm outraged by any politician who uses foreign aid as a scapegoat, as an easy solution. You know, "Cut foreign aid and we'll resolve all our problems domestically." That's just a bunch of nonsense.

Ultimately, several focus group members seemed to resolve their conflict between the desire to take care of the poor at home and to give foreign aid in the way a Baltimore man did, saying, "I think we're a wealthy enough country that we can do both."

The idea that foreign aid should be replaced by private giving is also rejected by the majority. Fifty-eight percent disagreed with the argument that "Helping people in foreign countries is not the proper role for the US government. This should be strictly a private matter, taken care of by individuals giving donations through private organizations." A woman from Troup, Texas said, "The Red Cross doesn't take in enough money to help other countries. It needs to be supplemented by government."

2. A strong majority says that the United States is spending too much on foreign aid. But this attitude is based on the assumption that the US is spending vastly more than it is in fact. Asked what an "appropriate" amount would be, the median level proposed is 5 times the present spending level.

Although only a few Americans want to eliminate foreign aid, the PIPA poll found that initially 75% felt that the US spends "too much" on it. A somewhat lower number -- 64% -- said they actually wanted to cut foreign aid spending. (Note: It is not unusual for people to respond differently to questions about whether they endorse a level of spending and questions that ask them to actively set a level of spending.)

Negativity toward the amount of foreign aid spending is echoed in other polls as well. In a February 1993 National Opinion Research Center poll, 70% agreed that "we are spending too much" on foreign aid. In the wake of the mid-term elections, a November 1994 Gallup poll found that 83% of respondents considered it acceptable "to reduce foreign aid... if government spending had to be cut in order to
balance the budget" and elsewhere in the poll, 71% favored "reducing foreign aid."

Estimates of Spending

But when the PIPA poll pursued this line of questioning further, it found that much of the negativity toward foreign aid spending seems to be based on the perception that the US spends vastly more than it really does. Respondents were asked to estimate how much of the federal budget goes to foreign aid. They were told that they could answer in fractions of a percent as well as whole percentage points, thus cueing respondents that the amount could be quite low. Nonetheless, the median estimate was 15% of the federal budget, fifteen times the actual amount of approximately 1%. The average estimate was even higher — 18%.

Even more extravagant estimates have been found in other polls. In an October 1993 Louis Harris poll, the average estimate was 33%, and in a November 1994 Harvard School of Public Health poll, 27% assumed that foreign aid was the largest item in the federal budget—larger than the defense budget or Social Security.

This misperception of how much federal spending goes to foreign aid cuts across all major political and demographic groups. In the PIPA poll, no group offered a median estimate less than 10% of the federal budget—still ten times the actual amount. But there were some differences: Democrats offered higher median estimates (18%) than Republicans (14%); younger respondents tended to give higher estimates (up to 20%) than older respondents; and respondents with less education offered higher estimates (24-25%) than those with college or post-graduate degrees (10-11%).

Focus group and interview participants likewise offered estimates of foreign aid spending many times the actual amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too Much</th>
<th>Too Little</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Few participants had a firm sense of how much is spent, but they all shared the same belief that foreign aid was a major budget item. "I think the numbers are kind of mind-boggling and out of reach," said a Portland participant.

**How Much is Appropriate?**

After giving their estimate of actual spending, respondents were asked what an "appropriate amount" would be to spend on foreign aid. The median response was 5% of the budget -- five times present spending levels. The average was 8%. Only 17% of all respondents said that the appropriate amount would be less than 1% of the budget.

To explore the range of what would be an acceptable level of spending, respondents were then asked "At what percentage would you feel that [foreign aid spending] is starting to be too much?" The median response was 13%. Only 10% of the sample thought 1% was too much.

Asked how much would start to be "too little," the median response was 3% -- still three times the present spending level. For Republicans, this number was 2%. Only 23% percent of all respondents cited a number below 1% as starting to be too little.

**Comparisons to Other Industrialized Countries**

A similar dynamic was uncovered when poll respondents were asked to think about how much development assistance the US
ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN AID AND
PERCEPTIONS OF ITS BUDGET SHARE

There were striking correlations between perceptions of foreign aid's share of the federal budget and attitudes toward foreign aid in general. Overall those who were more opposed to foreign aid tended to perceive the amount of foreign aid as higher. Of course, correlation does not demonstrate causation—it is difficult to say if the perception of a large budget share contributed to opposition to foreign aid, or if this perception was formed as a way to justify opposing foreign aid.

Among respondents who wanted to eliminate foreign aid entirely, the median estimate was that the US spends 23% of the budget on foreign aid. For those who felt the US spends "too much" on foreign aid the median estimate was 17%, while for who thought the amount spent on foreign aid was "about right" it was 11%. But even those who felt the US spends "too little" on foreign aid far overestimated its budget share—the median perception was 8%.

For respondents who agreed that "Until we have resolved our problems at home, we should not give a penny of aid to other countries" the median estimate was 21%; for those who disagreed it was 12%.

Among those who agreed that "the world economy is so interconnected" that foreign aid will eventually pay off, the median estimate was 13%, while among those who disagreed it was 17%. Similarly, for those who wanted to increase economic assistance to poor countries the median estimate was 14%, while for those who wanted to cut, the median was 18%. Among those who said US aid to South Korea had been a mistake, the median was 22%, while those who said it had not been a mistake, the median was 13%.

For those who agreed that "When we give countries foreign aid, we have a right to expect them to follow our lead and not do things like vote against us in the UN" the median estimate was 20%; for those who disagreed it was 12%. Respondents agreeing with this statement were asked a follow-up question: "Do you think foreign aid has been successful in this regard?" For those who said "no" the median estimate was 23%; for those who said "yes" it was 15%. 
gives as a percentage of its gross national product, as compared to other industrialized countries. Eighty-one percent incorrectly assumed that the US gives more. A Portland woman said in a focus group, the US gives "much too much more" in foreign aid compared to other countries. In fact, of the 21 industrialized donor countries of the OECD, the US ranks at the very bottom.

When asked in the poll how much the US "should" give as a percentage of GNP, 68% said the US should give the same as other industrialized countries, 13% said the US should give more and only 16% said it should give less. Thus, in this context, 81% seemed to think the US should be giving more than it is.

3. When informed about the actual amount of spending on foreign aid, a strong majority favors either maintaining or increasing it.

Early in the questionnaire, when respondents were asked how they would feel if the US would spend 1% of the federal budget on foreign aid, only 18% said that this would be "too much" -- down from the 75% who originally had said the US was spending too much. Thirty-three percent said this amount would be "too little" and 46% said it would be "about right." Thus, 79% were ready to support present spending levels or higher.

Late in the questionnaire, respondents were told how much the US spends on foreign aid as a percentage of the federal budget, how much the average taxpayer pays toward foreign aid, and to assume that any change they proposed would affect their own taxes accordingly. In this case, 35% said they wanted to cut foreign aid spending -- down from the 64% who originally wanted to cut

![Changes in Attitudes in Response to Information About Actual Amount of Foreign Aid](image-url)
spending, though higher than the 18% who said that 1% would be “too much.” Twenty-five percent wanted to increase spending and 37% wanted to keep it the same. Thus, 62% wanted to at least maintain present spending levels.

The foreign aid budget was then broken down into 10 different areas and, again, for each area respondents were told the total amount of spending, how much the average taxpayer pays, and to assume that any change they proposed would affect their own taxes accordingly. For 8 of the 10 areas, a strong majority ranging from 61% to 91% wanted to maintain or increase spending. In only two areas did a majority want to cut spending.

No other polls could be found in which respondents were presented with the correct information on spending.

When the figure of 1% of federal spending on foreign aid was introduced in the focus groups, it had an effect similar to that which occurred in the PIPA poll. Upon hearing the actual amount, in one focus group there was a loud gasp. Overall, there was some disbelief that it could be so low. Learning the actual spending number prompted the majority of participants to readjust their perspectives and view foreign aid spending more favorably. As a Baltimore man said, “Let’s put this in perspective, okay? This is peanuts! It’s nothing. In relation to the whole pie, it’s a small part.”

When respondents were told about how much the US spends relative to other industrialized countries, some respondents also shifted their positions. As one Baltimore woman said, “European countries provide more [foreign aid dollars] on a per capita basis. The amount that we give is pitiful!”

4. The public wants to change the mix of priorities in foreign aid spending, putting less emphasis on securing US strategic allies and bases around the world and more emphasis on helping the poor and needy.

Americans’ support for the traditional objective of using foreign aid to maintain US strategic allies and bases around the world has become quite soft. Only 45% agreed with the statement:

Giving foreign aid to countries who are strategically positioned in the world is a good idea because it ensures that they will stay friendly to us.

A slight majority of 51% disagreed.
On the other hand, a plurality of 48% agreed with the statement:

Now that the Cold War is over, it should no longer be necessary for the US to give money to other countries to make sure that they stay friendly to us or let us base US troops on their territory primarily to defend them.

Some Americans appear to reject the use of aid to gain influence because they see it as illegitimate. A woman from a Portland focus group expressed her discomfort with the practice of using aid to gain political influence. She said:

It seems to me that the [aid] money is going out there for political reasons and to control and to try to convert the world to our way. So, it's really a control mechanism, kind of like when your father gives you money to go to school on the condition that you study what he wants. I don't really like the whole "big daddy" approach. I don't think it's the United States' position or place in the world to be going out and trying to spread our agenda.

On the other hand, some Americans seem to see such efforts as legitimate but not effective. Fifty-two percent agreed with the statement, "When we give countries foreign aid, we have a right to expect them to follow our lead and not do things like vote against us in the UN." However, of those who agreed with this statement, only 32% (17% of the total sample) thought that foreign aid had been successful in eliciting this compliance.

These attitudes were reflected in the PIPA poll when respondents were asked their opinions of spending levels on different areas of the foreign aid budget. Areas that are associated with efforts to secure strategic allies or bolster the national security of the United States did not fare well. A majority wanted to cut aid to Israel and Egypt (56%) and military aid in general (52%). Support for Turkey and Greece was also fairly low, with 38% wanting to cut it.

Other polls have found similar attitudes. A 1990 Gallup poll found that 50% of respondents wanted aid to Israel decreased (25%) or stopped altogether (25%) and 47% felt that way about Egypt (23% wanted it decreased; 24% wanted it stopped). In a 1990 Newsweek poll, the pluralities wanting to spend less were, for Israel--43%, for Egypt--46%, for Turkey--52%, and for Greece--45%. In 1991, though, during the Gulf War, support for cutting aid to Israel dropped down to 7% (CBS/New York Times, January 24, 1991 -- 9 days after the first bombing of Baghdad) but already began to bounce back by September 1991 to 32% (ABC News).
Assuming that any change in spending would also increase or decrease your own taxes accordingly, I would like to know if you would favor increasing spending, cutting spending or keeping total spending about the same as now (on the following programs):
However, in the PIPA poll, all programs related to helping poor countries elicited strong majorities who wanted to either maintain or increase spending. Ninety-one percent wanted to maintain or increase spending on child survival programs, 90% for the Peace Corps, 87% for humanitarian relief, 79% for environmental aid to poor countries, 75% for assistance to help poor countries develop, and 74% for family planning for poor countries.

Consistent with this pattern, a 1991 Telephone Center poll found that 59% favored "shifting some of the money currently spent on foreign military aid to instead go toward foreign environmental aid."

This desire for a shift in priorities away from securing strategic allies and toward humanitarian and development aid may also be a trend, perhaps reflecting the end of the Cold War. In a question asked by Belden and Russonello in 1996, a plurality of 44% said that the most important countries to get US aid were those that were "important to US security." When this question was asked again in 1992, this number dropped by half to 21%. Instead, the new plurality of 44% said that the most important countries to get aid were "countries with the poorest economies."

5. Support for spending on poor countries stems partly from a belief that the world is so interconnected that it is in the self-interest of the US to help poor countries develop their economies and limit their environmental pollution.

A majority of Americans seems to feel that giving foreign aid is in the economic interest of the US. Sixty-three percent of respondents agreed that:

The world economy is so interconnected today that, in the long run, helping Third World countries to develop is in the economic interest of the US. Many of these countries will become trading partners that buy our exports, so in the long run, our aid will pay off economically.
If you had to choose which countries should get US aid, which of these would you select as the most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries with the poorest economies:</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>44%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries needed by the US as trade partners:</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries important to US security:</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>44%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the Baltimore focus group, one man said:

We are an interdependent, global planet. It's in our interest to see that countries develop because we can sell our products over there and that creates jobs for our people, raises our wages, and so on.

According to a 1993 ICI study, this perception of the US as economically interdependent with the Third World is quite strong. Eighty-three percent felt that Third World economies have some or a great deal of effect on the US economy. Most respondents thought that improvements in Third World economies would have a positive effect on US business opportunities (80%), on jobs in the US (66%) and on the US economy as a whole (72%).

Consistent with this perception of interdependence, large

The world economy is so interconnected today that, in the long run, helping Third World countries to develop is in the economic interest of the US. Many of these countries will become trading partners that buy our exports, so eventually our aid will pay off economically.
majors see efforts to help the Third World develop as good for the
global economy, including the American economy. In the 1993 ICI
study, 77% agreed that "helping the Third World to develop will pay
great and lasting dividends to us all," while 84% thought that such
help would have a great or some positive effect on "improving world
prosperity." In a 1992 Belden and Russonello study, 51% thought
that a good reason "why we should invest in foreign aid programs"
was that "helping other countries become more economically stable
will mean more trade and prosperity for the US," while 35% thought
this reason was "OK," and only 13% felt it was "not good." An August
1990 poll by Princeton Survey Research Associates found that 75%
favored "aid that encourages foreign countries to buy US products."

Environmental Aid

The perception of interdependence also leads many Americans
to view environmental aid as serving American interests. The PIAPA
poll found strong support for environmental aid to poor countries --
79% wanted to increase spending or keep it the same -- and in the
1992 Belden and Russonello study, a large majority (70%) thought
that a good reason for foreign aid is that "We can help save the
global environment by helping governments to stop destroying rain
forests, [and] retool polluting industries."

Comments made by focus group participants illustrate the self-
interested nature of support for environmental aid. Here is what a
Baltimore woman had to say:

What's happening with the pollution of the seas and oceans
and air and rain forests has global impact. Everyone on this
planet is going to be affected one way or another. We're all
interdependent.

A Portland woman linked her concern about her children's and
grandchildren's future with what happens environmentally in other
countries:

Something that's important to me and my son is the
environment -- what we're going to be living in in fifty or a
hundred years -- whether or not my grandchildren will be
walking around with oxygen masks.

The importance that Americans place on addressing global
environmental challenges is evident in a 1994 Belden and
Russonello poll, which asked respondents to rate the seriousness of
international problems on a 1-to-10 scale. "Threats to the global
environment" were rated at 6.9--the same as "the threat of civil wars
and international regional conflicts" and just below "the spread of
nuclear weapons" (7.1). It was also rated the same as the domestic economy and higher than immigration and race relations.

Limiting Population Growth

Americans' support for spending on family planning to limit population growth may also be related to the public's perception of global interconnectedness. Seventy-four percent of PIPA respondents wanted to increase or maintain spending on family planning for poor countries. A 1992 Gallup poll found that 54% favored "an increase in US economic aid and technical assistance to help developing countries slow their population growth."

Insights from the focus groups suggest that some Americans link overpopulation with environmental problems. Commenting on the amount of money spent on population control, a Portland woman said, "That's not enough and that's the crux of the whole problem! The world is finite. The poor in Brazil are burning forests so they can support their families, which is destroying our air. It's an enormous problem."

6. Strong support also comes from the attitude that the US has a moral obligation to help nations in need; an overwhelming majority rejects the idea that the US should only give aid when it promotes the US national interest.

Most Americans feel that moral reasons for giving aid are strong enough in and of themselves. Sixty-seven percent agree that "As one of the world's rich nations, the United States has a moral responsibility toward poor nations to help them develop economically and improve their people's lives." A 1994 Belden and Russonello poll found that 62% of respondents agreed that "each of us has a personal responsibility to help improve the lives of those in developing countries."

An overwhelming majority rejects the idea that the US should only give aid when it serves the national interest. Seventy-seven percent disagreed with the statement that:

We should only make commitments to send aid to parts of the world where we have security interests. These include the former Soviet republics and Eastern Europe where we want to prevent the reemergence of the Russian empire, and the Middle East where we want to ensure access to oil. We should not send aid to other parts of the world, such as Africa, Asia, or Latin America because we do not really have vital security interests there.
In addition, 76% agreed that "We should send aid to starving people irrespective of whether it will promote the national interest."

Explaining why giving foreign aid to poor and needy countries was important, many focus group and interview participants simply said "it's the right thing to do." A Minneapolis woman said that "alleviating suffering in the world is the most important thing a country can do, domestically or internationally."

Participants also stressed that the moral imperative to give aid should override narrow self-interest. A Baltimore man explained why it was right for the US to help the starving people of Somalia, saying:

The US has no strategic interests in Somalia -- it does not affect our borders, economy or our defense. Yet it is a place that we should be providing food because there are people who are starving.

Another Baltimore man concurred:

I guess I disagree with the proposition that foreign aid must be directly related to strategic interests. In a sense, it goes back to what Barry Goldwater said about foreign aid: "Foreign aid is bribery." I guess I'd like to think not -- that as a citizen in a community of nations, there are objectives that may or may not be linked to American strategic interests, [like] feeding the starving.

It seems that when Americans respond to suffering they are not greatly influenced by national boundaries. In the PIPA poll, when half the sample was asked how much it troubled them when they hear about hungry children inside the US, on a scale of 1 to 10, the average answer was 8.6. When the other half-sample was asked
about hungry children outside the US, the average answer was only slightly lower—7.2. In the 1994 Belden and Russonello poll, respondents were asked to rate the seriousness of various issues also on a scale of 1 to 10. "Disease and hunger in other countries" was rated 7.7 -- higher than a number of domestic concerns including cost of health care (7.6), our education system (7.4), poverty (7.2), the economy (6.9), immigration (6.9) and race relations (6.6).

7. A strong majority supports the principle of giving aid to help countries move toward democracy, including former socialist countries.

Apparently, most Americans support the idea that US foreign aid should help promote democracy. Apparently, this is motivated by long term self-interest as well as the American values of democracy and human rights. Sixty-seven percent agreed that: "Foreign aid to newly democratic countries is a good investment for America. Democracies are more stable, have better human rights, and are more likely to be friends with the US."

Seventy-two percent supported maintaining (52%) or increasing (20%) aid to "countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe making the transition from socialism to capitalism and democracy." Similarly, for aid to Russia alone, a February 1994 Time/CNN poll found 64% support for keeping present aid levels (55%) or increasing aid (9%).

In the PIPA poll, when respondents were asked to choose between two statements about aid to Russia, 59% preferred this argument in favor of aid:

*Foreign aid to newly democratic countries is a good investment for America. Democracies are more stable, have better human rights, and are more likely to be friends with the US. Foreign aid improves these new democracies' chances of success.*
After spending trillions of dollars defending against the Soviet threat, it would be foolish to not help the Russians make the transition to democracy and capitalism. If they go back to totalitarianism we will be really sorry we did not try harder to help.

Thirty-six percent preferred the opposing argument:

After having threatened the rest of the world for several decades the Russians do not deserve our help. Besides, if we help them get back on their feet they might turn around and threaten us again.

A Baltimore man explained why he viewed aid to Eastern Europe as important, saying:

Here we are, the inheritors of a whole new group of nations that have joined the western free democracies, and what are we doing to strengthen those democracies? We're giving them a handout of practically nothing! If they fail, they go right back to the totalitarian world.

Apparently support for aid to former socialist countries is not, however, very robust, as it appears to be quite sensitive to the rationales offered. Rationales that emphasized direct aid to Russia did quite well. A March 1993 Gallup poll found 79% in favor of "increasing financial aid to Russia...to provide food and other humanitarian aid." Modest majorities also supported increasing aid "to clean up the environment" (55%) and to "help Russia avoid a possible civil war" (52%).

However, when the effort to help Russia was portrayed as an active effort to change its form of government or its economy, support was weak. A CBS News poll in January 1994 found only 38% support for "giving economic aid...in order to help Russia reform its economy." Two CBS polls in October 1993 both asked whether the US should give aid "in order to help promote democracy in Russia," and found 42% and 38% support. A March 1993 Time/CNN poll found only 38% support for "substantially increasing...aid...in order to encourage [Russia] to adopt a democratic government and a market economy." Respondents may have been reacting negatively to the idea that aid was being used to impose a change in Russia.

When a Harris poll asked in October 1993, "Do you think the US government, along with other countries, should be willing to help Russia with financial aid to try to keep democracy alive in Russia, or not?" 61% said that it should. Unlike the questions discussed in the previous paragraph, democracy in Russia was described as already

"Here we are, the inheritors of a whole new group of nations that have joined the western free democracies, and what are we doing to strengthen those democracies? We're giving them a handout of practically nothing!"

A Baltimore man
in place. Also the effort to "keep it alive" was portrayed as a multilateral effort rather than a US effort, which may have mitigated the possible feeling that the US might otherwise be overreaching in its effort to convert Russia to democracy and capitalism.

Consistent with the previously discussed ambivalence toward using foreign aid for strategic ends, in the PIPA poll, an argument in favor of aid to former Soviet republics based on traditional geopolitics was not found very convincing. Only 48% agreed that "Giving aid to countries that used to be part of the Soviet Union or under its influence reduces the chances that they will once again be dominated by Russia" (while, as mentioned, 67% favored aid to newly democratic countries when it was framed in terms of supporting democracy).

Support for aid to former socialist countries may also be tempered by the fact that their needs are not as dire as those of the developing countries. When a 1993 IC1 poll asked, "Which countries, if any, do you feel it is most important for the US to give economic assistance to," Asia, Africa and Latin America received a plurality of 41%, while the ex-Soviet Union and Eastern Europe received 23% and 17%, respectively.

8. The majority is unhappy about the amount of aid that goes to countries that are not democratic or have poor human rights records.

Most Americans feel that, in general, US foreign aid policy has not been discriminating enough. Eighty percent agreed that "too much US foreign aid goes to governments that are not very democratic and have poor human rights records. This is not consistent with American principles."
Focus group participants emphasized the importance of giving foreign aid to democracies over non-democracies and totalitarian regimes. An exchange between two Baltimore men makes this point:

Man 1: I would say it is in America's strategic interest to support pro-Western democracies where free enterprise and democratic values will be enhanced, as opposed to totalitarian regimes that still outnumber the democracies on this planet.

Man 2: By and large, I agree. I think that democracies should be favored over non-democracies. I guess that would be, for me, the critical thing. As to the nature of the economy, whether it's pro-Western, that would not be terribly important to me. But a democratically elected government would be critical.

These and other comments expressed in the focus groups illustrate the importance that Americans place on giving foreign assistance to countries that strive for the same values that undergird our own democracy. As already seen, it is this attitude that drives much of the support for aid to former socialist countries.

The public also seems to have a long-standing concern that foreign aid may help enable non-democratic governments oppress their populations. In a 1982 Gallup poll, 65% agreed that "military aid lets dictatorships use military power against their own people."

9. The majority believes there is widespread waste and corruption in foreign aid programs. A strong majority would be willing to pay more in taxes if they believed that more aid would get to the people who really need it.

Most Americans are frustrated with the performance of foreign aid programs. Eighty-three percent agreed that "There is so much waste and corruption in the process of giving foreign aid that very little actually reaches the people who really need it." A 1992 Belden and Russonello poll found that 50% of respondents had "little confidence that [money for assistance the US sends overseas] reaches the needy people in other countries" -- only 9% had a "great deal of confidence" that money was going to the needy.

This perception of foreign aid programs being riddled with waste and corruption seems to stem from a number of sources. One source is the belief that US foreign aid programs are run by large, wasteful government bureaucracies. A 1986 Belden and Russonello poll found 85% agreed (51% strongly) that "a large part of aid is wasted by the US bureaucracy." But this perception of
If I knew that most foreign aid was going to the poor people who really need it rather than to wasteful bureaucracies and corrupt governments, I would be willing to pay more in taxes for foreign aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A overwhelming majority also believes that foreign aid spending is distorted by the disproportionate influence of some recipient nations. A 1990 Gallup poll found that only 8% believe "foreign aid is determined by the need of the receiving nation," while 85% believe it is determined by a nation's "political influence in Congress."

Recipient foreign governments are also seen as highly wasteful and corrupt. This is amplified by the erroneous perception that most aid is given in the form of cash transfers to governments that can easily be embezzled by corrupt governments. "Their bureaucrats are more corrupt than ours are!" exclaimed one Portland woman. "Do not hand that money over to that government over there and say, 'Do as you want with it,' because it really gets filtered down," said a Baltimore man. A woman added, "If we're going to give to another country in dollars and cents, how much does that top man [over there] take, and then the next man, and then the next one, you know?" A 1986 Belden and Russonello poll found that 88% agreed (63% strongly) that "aid is frequently misused by foreign governments."

These perceptions of waste and corruption may be placing a major damper on support for foreign aid spending. Fifty-eight percent of PIPA survey respondents concurred that "if I knew that most foreign aid was going to the poor people who really need it rather than to wasteful bureaucracies and corrupt governments, I would be willing to pay more in taxes for foreign aid."

Views expressed in the focus groups and interviews suggest that most Americans would have greater confidence in foreign aid programs that deal directly with the poor and needy in foreign countries, and that bypass foreign governments. The fewer middle-
men involved, the less perceived corruption. "[Right now], there are too many middlemen who we have to pay in order for us to distribute [aid]," commented a Baltimore woman.

10. To promote self-reliance, the majority is willing to spend more on aid that emphasizes training and development, and is willing to give poor countries preferential trade treatment.

Americans are concerned that foreign aid may engender dependency. In the focus groups some participants compared it to welfare. In a 1993 ICI poll, 83% agreed that "many aid programs are bad because they make countries dependent on us."

At the same time, Americans put such a high value on self-reliance that they are willing to pay more in taxes in support of foreign aid programs that are designed to foster it. Sixty-five percent supported the statement:

I prefer to give a hand up rather than a handout. Simply giving money and goods to poor countries can make them dependent. Whenever possible, I prefer to give them training and access to credit and other resources so that they can become self-reliant, and I would be willing to pay more in taxes to that end.

Focus group and interview participants likewise stressed the goal of self-sufficiency when giving foreign aid. Several participants mentioned the old adage, "Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day. Teach him to fish and he will eat for a lifetime."

Participants also expressed a preference for training and development over humanitarian relief. "Humanitarian aid is kind of a

![Bar Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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crisis situation," said a Portland woman. "But development [aid] builds the country so that people can do better for themselves...you really see the long-term results." She concluded, "You can give them food, but that doesn't mean they will have food two years later."

In the PIPA poll, an overwhelming majority saw promoting development as a way of avoiding the need for humanitarian relief. Eighty-six percent agreed that:

Americans are a generous people, so it is natural for them to provide relief when people are suffering from a disaster such as a famine. But the really intelligent thing to do is to help poor countries develop so that their economies are strong enough to cope with [disasters].

Efforts to promote self-reliance through improved food production were favorably viewed in the 1993 ICI poll. Sixty-eight percent felt that aid intended to improve Third World countries’ "ability to produce their own food supply" had been effective. Support was also sustained when it was pitted against economic self-interest. Asked if we should "help farmers in other countries to learn to grow their own food, even if they buy less from the US," 87% agreed that we should.

Consistent with this emphasis on making developing countries more self-reliant (and with the popular notion of "trade not aid"), in the PIPA poll 69% favored transferring trade quotas from wealthier countries to developing countries so that they can sell more of their products in the US. Support was sustained even when it was pointed out that taking these quotas away from wealthier countries could be politically sensitive.

However, when it was proposed that the US could simply allow in more goods from developing countries and respondents were reminded that this might threaten American jobs, only 43% thought this was a good idea, while 49% thought it was a bad idea.

Though concern about jobs seems to be a hot button for many Americans, this attitude does not generalize to all aspects of the potential for competition with developing countries. It does not seem that most Americans inherently oppose helping developing countries for fear that they will ultimately become competitors. In the ICI poll, 67% disagreed with the idea that it was "against our interests to help developing countries because they will compete with us economically and politically." And in the PIPA poll respondents were asked:

In the years after the Korean War, the US gave billions of dollars in aid to South Korea. Some people feel that this is a good example of how we contributed to developing a country
that is now an ally and a trading partner. Others feel that this aid helped South Korea take away our markets by selling low cost goods and therefore was a mistake. Do you think it was a mistake to have given aid to South Korea?

Only 33% said that it was a mistake and 60% said it was not.

Also, it seems that Americans see that a failure to allow trade may increase the demand for foreign aid. Before the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), a September 1993 NBC/Wall Street Journal poll found that 54% thought it likely that, if NAFTA was not passed, "we would have to give more foreign aid and loans to Mexico in order to support their economy," while only 38% disagreed.

The majority’s embrace of the principle of self-reliance appears to provide a backbone of support for development aid. As long as the consequences of successful Third World development do not include the direct loss of American jobs, a strong majority is willing to endorse aid that succeeds in promoting the self-reliance of new, and sometimes challenging, partners.

CONCLUSION

The key conclusion of this study is that Americans overwhelmingly support the principle of giving some foreign aid, but their extreme overestimation of how much is actually spent on foreign aid has created a desire to reduce it. To the extent this misinformation is corrected, a strong majority favors maintaining or increasing spending, though there are a number of changes Americans would like to see, such as a greater emphasis on:

- helping the needy rather than strategic allies
- promoting self-reliance rather than relief
- ensuring that aid goes to the needy rather than to corrupt governments
- limiting aid to countries that are democratic and have good human rights records

The extraordinary magnitude of the public misperception and the dramatic effects that came from receiving correct information point to two questions: Why is there such a misperception about the actual level of spending? and What is the range of possible support for foreign aid?
Sources of Misperception

The public overestimates by fifteen-fold the magnitude of US assistance to other countries. How could such a startling misperception have taken root? Though it is not possible to offer a conclusive answer, a number of possible contributing factors include:

- **Explicit and Implicit Misrepresentation by Public Figures** Public figures have made statements that explicitly or implicitly misrepresent the actual level of foreign aid spending. In November 1994, Senator Jesse Helms stated that "The foreign aid program has spent an estimated $2 trillion of the American taxpayers' money"—a figure far in excess of actual spending even going back to the end of World War II. In a more implicit way, Senator Mitch McConnell's widely published remark that "most poor countries are still poor" after decades of US aid, implied a much more ambitious program than really exists—one aimed at reversing the condition of "most poor countries."

- **Disproportionate Public Attention** When focus group members were asked how their overestimates might have formed, several voiced the feeling that the large amount of public attention and debate given to foreign aid spending meant that it had to be a large budget item. For example, when asked to explain his own misperception, a Baltimore man shrugged, "[Foreign aid] has become this overblown thing like welfare and other things that people complain about."

- **Confusion with Defense Spending** It is possible that much of the spending that Americans attribute to foreign aid is actually spending that occurs within the defense budget. Some members of focus groups, upon hearing that as a percentage of GNP other countries give more development aid than the US, reacted by pointing to the large investment the US has made in militarily defending other countries.

- **Historical Precedent** After World War II, the US engaged in a very large and pioneering effort to help rebuild Europe and Japan. At its peak, the US was spending 3% of its GNP on foreign aid. This image of the US as such a benefactor was firmly lodged in the collective memory. A popular comedy film was even made on the premise that a country might declare war on the US so as to surrender and then get large scale foreign aid. This image of the US is so firmly planted that it may still affect American assumptions, though actual US spending is now only a small fraction of what it was at its peak.
Range of Possible Support

Perhaps what is most striking about the results of the study is that Americans assume that the US is spending an extraordinary amount on foreign aid (15% of the federal budget would be more than $230 billion) and, though they think this imagined amount is too much, they are still rather sanguine—there has never been a significant mass effort to change it. Apparently, Americans assume that a program even larger than the Marshall Plan has been in place for several decades now and has been applied to the whole world. Though they want to cut back this imagined program, they appear to be willing to support a program substantially in excess of the actual present level of spending.

What is particularly striking is that Americans have assumed that they have been supporting an enormous aid program and have only been mildly uncomfortable with the fact that it has not produced the level of results that such a large-scale program should. Americans like to see results and they are drawn to the idea of participating in the solution of large-scale problems—thus the widespread support for rebuilding Europe and Japan. This raises the question of how much support there might be for a multilateral program that did hold out the promise of greater results.

In the PIPA poll, we asked the following question:

Imagine that the UN called a conference of leading scientists and experts to develop a plan and determine how much it would cost the developed countries, working together with the poor countries, to virtually eliminate hunger in the world in 5 years. If you were confident that this plan probably could work and that people in other countries, as well as the US, would pay their fair share, would you personally be willing to pay [$50 or $100] each year for the next five years to virtually eliminate hunger?

Of the half sample that was asked about paying $50 for five years, 78% said they would be willing, while of the half sample that was asked about paying $100, 75% said they would be willing. (Note: This question was asked before respondents were told the actual amount of foreign aid spending, and thus presumably would be on top of the already large amount they assumed was going to foreign aid.) In the focus groups, respondents thought it was self-evidently clear that, of course, they would pay such an amount if it would produce such a result.

If the federal government were to increase taxes across the board as part of a program in which the median American taxpayer's taxes would increase $100, this would generate an additional $60
billion per year. Even without assuming that the other industrialized countries would carry their share (though this would be important to Americans), according to various development experts, 60 billion dollars per year for five years could drastically reduce, if not virtually eliminate, hunger in the world (except, of course, for situations where political factors would prevent the provision of aid). UN studies done for the Agenda 21 program concluded that a program costing $25 billion a year until the end of the decade, with just $2 billion per year slated to come from the US, would control all major childhood diseases, cut child malnutrition by half, provide universal safe water and sanitation, and also provide universal family planning and basic education.

In short, either the amount of the federal budget Americans say they think would be an appropriate amount to go to foreign aid (5% or $77 billion), or the amount they say they are willing to increase spending in support of a program they assume would be effective ($60 billion), would make such an extraordinary and visible impact on the developing world that this would likely reinforce support for such efforts.

This is not to suggest that any effort to increase foreign aid spending would not encounter political resistance. Even if the misinformation about the level of foreign aid spending was cleared up, in the context of federal budgets with large deficits, Americans would be forced to face difficult tradeoffs. What is clear, though, is that given the values they hold, Americans are inclined to spend more than they are presently spending to help those in foreign countries who are in great need, and the level of investment they say they are willing to make would likely produce the kind of result they would like to see.
APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIATIONS

AGE

Overall, younger people seemed to be more supportive of foreign aid than older people. Rating their feelings about foreign aid on a scale of 1-to-10 (with 10 being very positive) those 18 to 29 had an average score of 4.7 while those over 65 were 3.9. While for the oldest respondents the median response was that 4% would be an appropriate percentage of the federal budget for foreign aid, for the youngest it was 9%.

The youngest group was also more willing to spend than the older group on some specific parts of the foreign aid budget. Eighty percent of respondents between 18 to 29 wanted to maintain or increase aid to countries in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, compared to 64% of those over 65. Seventy-one percent of the youngest group agreed that "Foreign aid to newly democratic countries is a good investment," compared to 58% of the oldest group. For family planning aid, 84% of the youngest group wanted to increase or maintain spending, as compared to 70% of the oldest. And for environmental aid, 91% of those 18 to 29 wanted to maintain or increase it, while 67% of those over 65 took that position. Intermediate age groups fell in between the youngest and oldest groups.

The age groups did not differ on parts of the foreign aid budget which deal with humanitarian, development, or security concerns. These concerns have a longer background in the public's awareness, while issues that have come to the foreground more recently, such as aid to newly democratic countries, family planning and environmental aid, show more of an "age gap."

Those 18 to 29 were also the most responsive to new proposals. Eighty percent of them favored the idea of shifting some trade quotas from richer to poorer countries as a form of assistance, as compared to 64% of those over 65. Eighty-four percent of the youngest group, compared to 53% of the oldest, said they would be willing to pay $100 per year for five years in support of a UN plan to eliminate world hunger (even though the younger people as a group are less well off than their seniors).

PARTY AFFILIATION

Overall, the similarities between Democrats and Republicans were much more striking than their differences. While there were some differences in predictable directions, on only two questions did the majority of Democrats or Republicans differ significantly from the majority position of the total sample.

--While a plurality of 49% of the total sample (and 51% of Republicans) disagreed with the statement that "Giving aid to countries that used to be part of the Soviet Union or under its influence helps reduce the chances that they will once again be dominated by Russia," a minority of 39% of Democrats disagreed, while 56% agreed.

--While 58% of the total sample (and 70% of Democrats) agreed that "If I knew most foreign aid was going to poor people instead of wasteful bureaucracies and corrupt governments, I would be willing to spend more in taxes for foreign aid," only 50% of Republicans agreed.

Contrary to prevailing stereotypes, Republicans appeared somewhat more doubtful about using foreign aid for strategic purposes than did Democrats. On spending for aid to Eastern Europe and countries of the former Soviet Union, there were slightly more Republicans willing to cut (30%) than there were Democrats (22%). Forty-two percent of
Republicans were ready to cut aid to Turkey and Greece, as compared to 28% of Democrats. Also fewer Republicans (45%) than Democrats (51%) agreed with the proposition that "Giving foreign aid to countries who are strategically positioned in the world is a good idea because it ensures that they will stay friendly to us."

GENDER

Based on their initial perception of foreign aid spending, both men and women wanted to cut foreign aid dramatically, but they had differing perceptions of its existing level. Women estimated foreign aid at 20% of the budget and felt that 6% would be an appropriate amount. Men estimated it at 12% of the budget and felt that 4% would be an appropriate amount. When informed of the actual level, more men wanted to cut foreign aid (42%) than did women (30%).

On virtually all other questions there were no marked differences between men and women. The only exceptions were that a bare majority of men (51%) did agree that it was a good idea to give aid "to countries who are strategically positioned," while only 40% of women agreed. Women agreed (52%) less strongly than men (66%) with the statement that "After spending trillions [on defense], it would be foolish not to help the Russians make the transition to democracy."

INCOME GROUPS

Income was negatively correlated with perceptions of the amount of foreign aid spending and the amount considered appropriate. For those with incomes below $15,000 the median estimate of foreign aid was 22% of the budget and the median attitude was that 11% would be an appropriate amount. For those with incomes above $100,000 the median estimate was 6% of the budget and 2% was the median appropriate amount. When informed of the real level, only those with incomes above $100,000 deviated markedly from the norm; 44% wanted to cut, compared to 36% for the total sample.

Though those with lower incomes gave a higher percentage for the "appropriate" percentage to go to foreign aid, they were also more ready to speak of eliminating foreign aid. Fifty-seven percent of those under $15,000 agreed with the statement "Until we have resolved our problems at home, we should not give a penny of aid to other countries," but only 8% of those above $100,000 agreed, with intermediate groups falling in between (total sample: 35%).

EDUCATION

Those with less education were more extreme in their overestimation of the percentage of the budget devoted to foreign aid--those who had not graduated from high school made a median estimate of 25%. Those with advanced degrees made lower estimates--a median of 10%--but were still far above the correct amount of 1%. Intermediate groups fell in between these estimates.

Educational level showed no effect on respondents' views about what percentages of the budget were appropriate, too much or too little for foreign aid.

Education appeared to play a role in views on aid to Russia. While 59% of the total sample agreed with the statement that "After spending trillions [on defense], it would be foolish not to help the Russians make the transition to democracy," this view was shared by 80% of those with advanced degrees but only 33% of those with some high school. However, there was no significant difference by education when the sample was asked specifically about spending levels for aid to the ex-Communist countries.
RACE

While African-Americans diverged from the views of the overall sample only infrequently, they seemed to support foreign aid slightly more strongly than whites.

When informed that foreign aid is about 1% of the federal budget, 37% of whites but only 19% of African-Americans wanted to cut it.

The argument that "aid to newly democratic countries is a good investment for America" won 66% agreement from whites, but 78% agreement from African-Americans. But on the other hand the statement that "After spending trillions [on defense], it would be foolish not to help the Russians make the transition to democracy" was endorsed by 61% of whites, but only 40% of African-Americans agreed.

The size of the sample does not permit a meaningful profile of the view of Hispanic and Asian minorities.
APPENDIX B
HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED

To prepare this study, PIPA conducted a nationwide poll, focus groups, interviews, and a review of previous polls on foreign aid conducted by other organizations.

THE POLL

The poll was conducted on January 12-15, 1995, with a sample of 801 American adults. Respondents were interviewed by telephone by Communications Center, Inc., (CCI) in Washington, DC, on a CATI system using a survey designed by PIPA. Each interview lasted an average of twenty minutes. Respondents were chosen from all households in the continental United States by a random digit dialing sample generated by the Genesys System and provided by Marketing Systems Group. Interviewers observed gender quotas.

Questions that were asked of the entire sample have a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5%. Some questions were asked of three-quarters of the sample and have a margin of error of 4%. The poll also included questions that were only asked when respondents answered a particular way to a previous question; consequently, the number of respondents varied on these questions.

The order and placement of some questions were varied to reduce any biases that might derive from question order or from respondents falling into patterns of responses.

FOCUS GROUPS

PIPA used focus groups to help craft questions for the poll so that they reflected how people talk and think about foreign aid. Focus groups provide citizens with the opportunity to think about various issues and topics over the course of a discussion, to talk about their views and feelings in their own words, and to describe the underlying assumptions behind their views.

PIPA conducted two focus groups -- one in Baltimore, Maryland and the other in Portland, Oregon. Both groups were held on the evening of December 22, 1994. Each discussion lasted about two hours and a total of twenty-four citizens participated.

Citizens were recruited by PIPA from a sample of random households in the Baltimore and Portland areas provided by Metromail in Lincoln, Nebraska. A strong effort was made by PIPA to recruit a mix of citizens to ensure that a range of perspectives and views were heard. The demographic makeup of each group was designed to roughly mirror society in general. Thus, there was a mix of men and women; white, black or other minorities; income levels; ages; education levels; and employment status.

INTERVIEWS

Telephone interviews were conducted by PIPA staff members both before and after the poll. In the before interviews, respondents were administered a draft of the questionnaire and then asked to elaborate on their answers in greater depth. This supplied qualitative data, and helped to refine individual questions and test early drafts of the poll. Those citizens interviewed were selected randomly from households around the country pulled from the sample provided by Metromail. The after interviews were held with individuals who actually participated in the PIPA poll to probe deeper into their responses to specific questions. Respondents were chosen based on how they answered specific poll questions that were of interest to PIPA. A total of seventeen interviews were conducted between January 3-26, 1995. Interviews lasted between fifteen and forty-five minutes.
REVIEW OF POLLS BY OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

A comprehensive review of publicly released polls on foreign aid-related issues was conducted, going back to 1990. The primary source was the Public Opinion Location Library (POLL) database of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut.
APPENDIX C
MAJOR STUDIES CITED

Americans and Foreign Aid in the Nineties -- A Survey on Foreign Economic Assistance (Cited as Beldon & Russonello, 1992)

Conducted for the Rockefeller Foundation by Beldon and Russonello. Interviews were conducted December 4 through December 8, 1992 by telephone. Sample size is 906 adults.

The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (Cited as Gallup, 1990)

Conducted for The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations by the Gallup Organization. In-home personal interviews were conducted October 23, through November 15, 1990. Sample size is 1,662 adults.


Conducted for the Pew Charitable Trusts' Global Stewardship Initiative by Beldon & Russonello, R/S/M, and Mellman Lazarus Lake. Interviews were conducted February 3 through February 15, 1994 by telephone. Sample size is 2,080 American voters.

A New Climate for Foreign Aid? (Cited as ICI, 1993)

Conducted for US Agency for International Development Bureau of Food and Humanitarian Assistance Office of Program Planning and Evaluation by Gerald Hursh-Cesar, Intercultural Communication, Inc. Interviews were conducted March 9 through March 21, 1993 by telephone. Sample size is 1,201 adults.

UNICEF Opinion Poll (Cited as Louis Harris, 1992)

Conducted for the United States Committee for UNICEF by the Louis Harris Organization. Interviews were conducted in December 1992 by telephone. Sample size is 2,001 adults.

What Americans Think: Views on Development and US-Third World Relations (Cited as Beldon & Russonello, 1986)

Conducted for InterAction and the Overseas Development Council by Beldon & Russonello. Interviews were conducted April 7 through May 6, 1986 by telephone. The sample was split into two replicates, each containing the same number of interviews. Sample size is 2,427 adults.
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U.S. PUBLIC ATTITUDES ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN BOSNIA
(May 4, 1994)

U.S. PUBLIC ATTITUDES ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN HAITI
(August 22, 1994)
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