**Annex 1.2 Additional Information on Survey Data Employed**

**The GDN-15.** The “Strengthening Institutions to Improve Public Expenditure Accountability” project aimed to strengthen the capacity of the 15 participating policy research organizations to monitor and analyze public expenditure choices, processes, and impacts and to engage constructively with policy officials to recommend improvements. The four and a half-year project, launched in 2008, had as its ultimate goal more capable, accountable, and responsive governments in the countries where the project operated. Populations in the countries where participating organizations were located were anticipated to benefit tangibly in the mid-term from improved government performance. The project management team consisted of representatives from the Global Development Network (GDN), the lead organization; the Results for Development Institute (R4D), the technical partner; and NORC at the University of Chicago, the monitoring and evaluation contractor.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The evaluation program collected data on management practices at baseline (2009 survey), in monitoring surveys in 2010 and 2011, and during a final survey for evaluation purposes in 2013.[[2]](#footnote-2) Overall, the surveys give us a picture of staffing composition and levels and a window on turnover and training, communications planning and practices, quality control, funding sources and composition, among other practices. The data I present in later chapters are generally from the 2011 survey; for some important questions that were not repeated in 2011, I show data from the 2009/2010 surveys.

**The TTI-48.** The Think Tank Initiative is a large-scale support-and-technical assistance project for an impressive number of think tanks (48 in 2013) administered by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and funded by a group of foundations and national aid agencies. Participating think tanks were selected, beginning in 2008, in regional cohorts from West Africa, East Africa, Latin America, and South Asia. The project has funding to continue through 2017.

TTI has three objectives whose summary statements indicate the program’s approach:

1. Select a group of promising independent policy research organizations and assist them in assessing critical areas of strength and weakness and identifying opportunities for improved organizational performance.
2. Provide a combination of general support funding and access to training and technical assistance to permit organizations to achieve improvements in research quality, organizational performance, and policy linkages.
3. Capture and share project learning about strategies for supporting and managing policy research organizations, in order to influence the future activities of the funding partners, participating think tanks, and other development actors. (Young, Huack, and Engel, 2013).

TTI conducted baseline surveys in 2008 and 2009 (think tanks were admitted to the program in two waves) and an annual monitoring survey from 2010 through 2013. Most data used here are from the 2011 survey to maximize comparability with the GDN data. Certain important questions – about quality control practices and comprehensive staffing information, for example – were only asked at baseline and therefore are shown for the earlier years. Generally, the survey year for data items is indicated in the tables. Where only one dataset is presented (GDN or TTI) there is only one year in parentheses. When data from both GDN and TTI are presented, the year for GDN is noted first, followed by the year for TTI.

The TTI data are for the 48 think tanks still participating in 2013 (listed at the end of this Annex), a few initial participants having left the program in earlier years. In some instances not all 48 responded to all questions. Because four think tanks participated in both the GDN and TTI programs, the maximum sample size in any table is 59 think tanks (15 + 48 – 4). When data are presented for the GDN and TTI programs separately, the four think tanks common to both programs are included in both tabulations. In tabulations for all think tanks combined, they are included only once (among the GDN think tanks).

Many of the questions used by TTI were the same as those in the parallel GDN-15 survey, although some additional areas are covered, e.g., strategy development in the TTI survey. Where possible, responses from the two surveys are combined to provide a larger sample size. When questions differ between the GDN and TTI surveys or are missing in one of them, data from only one or the other are used.

In all tabulations, “Stage 1” think tanks are defined as those with fewer than 10 full-time researchers. Where there are significant differences between Stage 1 and later-stage think tanks in staffing patterns and other areas, data for the Stage 1 group are presented separately from data for the larger organizations (a grouping that combines Stage 2 and Stage 3 institutions).

Neither the GDN-15 nor the TTI-48 is in any way a representative sample of think tanks, as they were selected from among think tanks that applied to participate in the program in response to widely disseminated proposal calls. Important characteristics of the two samples are shown in Table A.1.1.2, size (as indicated by the number of full-time staff), work mix of research and advocacy, and age in 2009.

The size distribution of think tanks in the two groups differs considerably, with half of the GDN-15 think tanks having fewer than 15 staff, compared with only 10 percent of the TTI-48 group. At the other end of the spectrum, 20 percent of the GDN-15 think tanks has over 50 staff members, compared with fully one-third of the TTI-48 group. Hence, the combined sample affords a higher share of observations among larger organizations, usefully augmenting the representation of small organizations.

The research-advocacy work mix distribution indicates that 41 percent of the combined sample reports doing 75 percent research and 25 percent advocacy, which is the most common split. The second most common split (containing 34 percent of the sample) is 60 percent research to 40 percent advocacy. While the two think tank groups are broadly similar, there is one startling difference: TTI-48 has 31 percent with a 90-10 percent research-advocacy split in contrast to only 13 percent for GDN 15. This may seem a startling difference, but it should be interpreted in combination with the fact that 53 percent of the GDN are in the next most research-concentrated category (75-25 percent research-advocacy spilt), vs. only 33 percent for TTI-48.

Lastly, the age distribution of the combined sample is quite broad, with 44 percent relatively new (10 years old or less) and 34 percent very well established (17 years or older)—offering a good range of maturity. It often takes a think tank a decade to really establish itself as an important player in the policy arena, particularly in well-developed markets. If the think tank focuses on an area not well covered by existing think tanks that is also of significant policy attention, less time may be needed. The TTI-48 is slightly more concentrated in the oldest group (33 percent vs. 27 percent for the GDN-15).

**The CEE-6.** I supplement the information from the previous two surveys in a few places where useful information is not available for them with data from this third data set, representing six think tanks in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) (Struyk 2006). The general criteria for inclusion of a think tank in the sample used here were that it had a minimum of 10 full-time researchers and had to be operating at about this level for the past five years (i.e., sufficient time to adequately address the personnel questions faced by an organization of this size).[[3]](#footnote-3) The six think tanks included in the sample come from two groups. Three are organizations with which I had long-standing working relations and I understood to have a particular interest in management questions. The other three were among those interviewed in 1997 for a prior study of think tanks in the region (Struyk 1999). They were invited to participate based on information obtained in 1997 and on recommendations from the first three think tanks selected. The data on these six think tanks are for about the year 2000, when these organizations were mostly 5-10 years old and led by their first president (generally a person who had previously worked as a researcher in a soviet-style research institute). They were all Stage 2 think tanks. Information gathered includes staff practices and related data on turnover and the ways in which they developed their agendas, as discussed further in Chapter 2 where the information is first used. Again the sample is non-representative.

**Table A.1.2.1. Selected Characteristics at Baseline of Think Tanks Participating in the GDN and TTI Programs**

Percent distributions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **GDN-15** | **TTI-48** | **Combinedb** |
| **Size by Full-Time Employees (2008-2009)** |  |  |  |
| 1-15 | 53 | 10 | 20 |
| 16-30 | 13 | 33 | 29 |
| 31-50 | 13 | 23 | 19 |
| 51-100 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| 101 and up | 0 | 8 | 7 |
| **Work Mix (2011)** |  |  |  |
| 25% research - 75% advocacy | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 40% research – 60% advocacy | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 60% research - 40% advocacy | 33 | 33 | 34 |
| 75% research - 25% advocacy | 53 | 33 | 41 |
| 90% research - 10% advocacy | 13 | 31 | 24 |
| **Organization age (2008-2009)a** |  |  |  |
| 1-10 Years | 33 | 46 | 44 |
| 11-16 Years | 40 | 21 | 22 |
| 17 Years and Older | 27 | 33 | 34 |

1. Age in 2009
2. Some values in this column may appear not to be the mean of the values in the previous two columns. Recall that the four organizations that participated in both projects are included for both programs but only once in the combined column.

**Table A.1.2.2. GDN-15 Think Tanks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Organization Name | Abbreviation | Country |
| Advanced Social Technologies | AST | Armenia |
| Center for Economics and Development Studies, Faculty of Economics, Padjadjaran University | CEDS | Indonesia |
| Center for Research and Communication | CRC | Philippines |
| Research Center of the University of the Pacific | CIUP | Peru |
| Center for the Implementation of Public Policies Promoting Equity and Growth | CIPPEC | Argentina |
| Graduate School of Public Administration and Public Policy, Tecnológico de Monterrey | EGAP | Mexico |
| Fundación para el Desarrollo de Guatemala | FUNDESA\* | Guatemala |
| Centre for Budget and Policy Studies | CBPS | India |
| Policy Research and Development | PRAD | Nepal |
| Unnayan Shamannay | US | Bangladesh |
| Integrated Social Development Centre | ISODEC | Ghana |
| Institute of Economic Affairs | IEA\* | Kenya |
| Economic Policy Research Centre | EPRC\* | Uganda |
| Economic and Social Research Foundation | ESRF\* | Tanzania |
| Center for the Study of the Economies of Africa | CSEA | Nigeria |

\*Also in the TTI program.

**Table A.1.2.3. List of TTI-48 Think Tanks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Abbreviation** | **Country** |
| **Latin America** |  |  |
| [Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/ASIES) | ASIES | Guatemale |
| [Centro de Análisis y Difusión de la Economía Paraguaya](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CADEP) | CADEP | Paraguay |
| [Centro Ecuatoriano de Derecho Ambiental](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CEDA) | CEDA | Ecuador |
| [Foro Social de Deuda Externa y Desarrollo de Honduras](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/FOSDEH) | FOSDEH | Honduras |
| [Fundación ARU](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/ARU) | ARU | Bolivia |
| [Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/FUNDAUNGO) | FUNDAUNGA | El Salvador |
| [Fundación para el Avance de las Reformas y las Oportunidades](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/Grupo-FARO) | Grupo FARO | Ecuador |
| [Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Económico y Social / Departamento de Estudios Económicos y Sociales](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/FUSADES) | FUSADES | El Salvador |
| Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo | GRADE | Peru |
| [Instituto de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/INESAD) | INESAD | Bolivia |
| [Instituto de Estudios Peruanos](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IEP) | IRP | Peru |
| Instituto Desarrollo | ID | Paraguay |
| **Sub-Saharan Africa** |  |  |
| [Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/ACODE) | ACODE | Uganda |
| [African Heritage Institution](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/AfriHeritage) | AfriHeritage | Nigeria |
| [Center for the Study of the Economies of Africa](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CSEA) | CESA | Nigeria |
| [Centre d’études, de documentation et de recherches économiques et sociales](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CEDRES) | CEDRES | Burkina Faso |
| [Centre for Population and Environmental Development](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CPED) | CREP | Nigeria |
| [Consortium pour la recherche économique et sociale](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CRES) | CRES | Senegal |
| [Economic and Social Research Foundation](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/ESRF) | ESRF | Tanzania |
| [Economic Policy Research Centre](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/EPRC) | EPRC | Uganda |
| [Ethiopian Development Research Institute](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/EDRI) | EDRI | Ethiopia |
| [Ethiopian Economic Association / Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/EEA-EEPRI) | EEA | Ethiopia |
| [Initiative prospective agricole et rurale](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IPAR) | IPAR | Senegal |
| [Institut de recherche empirique en économie politique](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IERPE) | IERPE | Benin |
| [Institute of Economic Affairs](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IEA-Kenya) | IEA-Kenya | Kenya |
| Institute of Economic Affairs – Ghana | IEA-Ghana | Ghana |
| [Institute of Policy Analysis and Research – Rwanda](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IPAR-Rwanda) | IPAR-Rwanda | Rwanda |
| [Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/ISSER) | ISSER | Ghana |
| [Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/KIPPRA) | KIPPRA | Kenya |
| [Makerere Institute of Social Research](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/MISR) | MISR | Uganda |
| [Research on Poverty Alleviation](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/REPOA) | REPOA | Tanzania |
| [Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Research Organization](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/STIPRO) | STIPRO | Tanzania |
| **South Asia** |  |  |
| [Center for Study of Science, Technology and Policy](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CSTEP) | CSTEP | India |
| [Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CBGA) | CBGA | India |
| [Centre for Policy Dialogue](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CPD) | CBD | Bangladesh |
| Centre for Policy Research | CPR | India |
| [Centre for Poverty Analysis](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CEPA) | CEPA | Sri Lanka |
| [Centre for the Study of Developing Societies](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/CSDS) | CSDS | India |
| [Indian Institute of Dalit Studies](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IIDS) | IIDS | India |
| [Institute for Social and Environmental Transition – Nepal](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/ISET-N) | ISET-N | Nepal |
| Institute of Economic Growth | IEG | India |
| [Institute of Governance Studies](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IGS) | IGS | Bangladesh |
| [Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IPS) | IPS | Sri Lanka |
| [Institute of Rural Management Anand](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/IRMA) | IRMA | India |
| [National Council of Applied Economic Research](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/NCAER) | NCAER | India |
| [Public Affairs Centre](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/PAC) | PAC | India |
| [Social Policy and Development Centre](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/SPDC) | SPDC | Pakistan |
| [Sustainable Development Policy Institute](http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/think-tanks/SDPI) | SDPI | Pakistan |

1. Mid-Term evaluation results are in Struyk and Haddaway (2012). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Additional surveys were done of policy communities in each country to measure policy impacts, and research reports were reviewed by external experienced social scientists to rate research quality changes. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Interviews on personnel practices were conducted with two smaller think tanks in the region, and the results confirmed that these practices were quite unstructured at that time. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)