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PREAMBLE

Over the last fifteen years, governance has become an increasingly visible and central component of development strategy. Public financial management, civil service reform, freedom of information, asset disclosure, rule of law, stolen asset recovery, and anti-corruption are just a few of the initiatives which have blossomed to improve governance around the world.

**Governance and Anti-Corruption Diagnostics**

This guide focuses on one of the more granular approaches to governance improvement, the governance and anti-corruption diagnostic. Governance and anti-corruption diagnostics are used as an initial strategy to identify the nature of governance problems, to target the key sources or institutions associated with these problems, and to establish a baseline and indicators which can be used to make reforms and to measure progress over time. Increasingly, these diagnostics are becoming sectoral in nature, meaning they are customized to assess governance and anti-corruption in a targeted sector. If conducted properly, the diagnostic process informs and catalyzes stakeholders to demand reform. If repeated periodically, these diagnostics can become useful tools to monitor governance and anti-corruption over time.

More specifically, governance and anti-corruption diagnostics:

- Unbundle corruption by type – administrative, capture of the state, bidding, theft of goods and public resources, purchase of licenses and regulations;
- Identify both weak institutions (which are in need of reform) and strong institutions (which provide examples of good governance);
- Assess the cost of each type of corruption on different groups of stakeholders;
- Provide insight into the relationship between corruption, service quality and access, and trust in public institutions;
- Identify key determinants of good governance; and
- Serve as a strong foundation for policy recommendations and reform.

Today, multilateral and bilateral institutions, host country governments and NGOs are extensively involved in the conduct of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics. The diagnostics which have been conducted have focused on governance in the transport, public works, health, education, judiciary, water, and other sectors/areas.

Management of these diagnostics comes in many forms – reflecting the growing and evolving nature of governance as a field of development. The diagnostic manager can be a sectoral or governance expert, a trained statistician or demographer, a civil servant of an Anti-Corruption Authority, a staff member or consultant tasked with project management of multiple economic and political development projects, or a staff member of an NGO hired to conduct a diagnostic. In sum, governance and anti-corruption diagnostics can be managed by individuals with substantial relevant experience or quite limited exposure to both governance and diagnostic activity. Given that governance activity is still in its early stages, variety in terms of management capacity is likely to continue to be the norm.
Acknowledging this reality, the governance field now finds itself with a new set of capacity building needs. Diagnostic managers with limited experience need guidance and tools to ensure quality results. Individuals working for donor organizations, as well as public officials in-country, need support to understand how diagnostics should be conducted, how to monitor implementation, and how to ensure the results are useful and credible.

**Who is this guide for?**

This guide has been developed as a resource for those managers or evaluators of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics who are not statisticians, demographers, or experts in survey implementation. In particular, the guide is designed for staff with donor organizations, host country governments, NGOs, and local statistical firms who lack experience and education associated with the conduct of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics and with survey implementation, in general. Survey implementation is important because it rests at the center of conducting the governance and anti-corruption diagnostic.

The guide is written for a “lay audience” meaning it assumes little, if any, understanding of statistics or survey implementation. While many detailed textbooks exist related to survey design and implementation, this document is designed for the non-expert. Thus, technical terms are defined and the use of technical jargon is minimized to avoid confusion. Nevertheless, survey implementation, which plays a central role in the conduct of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics is, by definition, technical. This guide aims to address these technicalities in a straightforward and user-friendly manner.

**What is the purpose of this guide?**

This guide aims to ensure quality management and results of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics by providing useful and practical approaches to monitoring, as well as customizable field-based tools, to support a survey monitoring process. In addition, numerous standardized documents (including questionnaires, sampling methodologies and others) are provided to support questionnaire design and management of the diagnostic. The guidance, tools, and standard documentation aim to ensure quality and to identify areas of weakness for capacity building.

In the short-term, our objective is to enhance data quality and capacity building associated with implementation of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics. In the long run, our hope is that this guide will be one of many steps to develop a more standard approach for governance and anti-corruption diagnostic implementation.

**What is the experiential basis for this guide?**

The guide is based on monitoring associated with the conduct of several governance and anti-corruption diagnostics implemented in African countries including Mauritania, Tanzania, Senegal, and Cote d’Ivoire. The standard documents referenced in this document are associated with diagnostics which were conducted in Peru, Honduras, Colombia, Madagascar, Mozambique and other countries. Our approach to monitoring reflects the practical realities of
conducting governance and anti-corruption diagnostics, including operating under a modest and limited budget.

Why is monitoring important for governance and anti-corruption diagnostics?

Governance and anti-corruption diagnostics involve a major upfront investment of time and resources – mainly associated with the design of instruments and the procurement of a firm to conduct survey implementation. Monitoring is an important means of protecting this upfront investment, and ensuring that the returns will be valuable for the host country, the World Bank, and the development community at large.

Hence, we view monitoring as a critical part of managing a governance and anti-corruption diagnostic. Without it, a diagnostic can encounter serious problems related to: (i) poor data quality; (ii) missed opportunities for capacity building related to survey implementation and/or governance; and (iii) project delays and funding shortfalls. Any governance diagnostic associated with poor quality subjects itself to questions of credibility, potentially undermining the entire governance initiative.

In spite of these risks, monitoring is often overlooked or undervalued. For this reason, we believe that innovation and resource optimization is essential for improving monitoring of governance diagnostics.

Conclusion

This guide reflects much of what has been learned from conducting governance and anti-corruption diagnostics. We have developed this guide to share our knowledge and experience with others in the field and, in particular, those who are new to the conduct of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics. We would like to thank all persons and experts involved in the development of the guide for their valuable contribution. And we would like to thank those committed field workers and national experts encountered during several of the World Bank’s assessment missions.
I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Background

In concert with the World Bank’s expanding governance and anti-corruption agenda, governance and anti-corruption diagnostics have been developed as a means of establishing a foundation for reform and, in particular, sectoral reform. These diagnostics are designed to generate specific, actionable indicators which are needed to implement a public reform initiative. While these diagnostics have much in common with other types of diagnostic efforts implemented by the World Bank, they have their own unique approach and structure.

Governance and anti-corruption diagnostics target both users and providers of public services. They involve multiple respondent groups – households, enterprises, public officials and, at times, NGOs and media. They are based upon quantitative data and analysis resulting from surveys of users (households and/or enterprises) and providers (public officials). In addition, they may include qualitative elements, such as data collected through focus groups or consultations.

The linkage between users and providers is a critical component of this approach. Governance and anti-corruption diagnostics capture data related to experiences of households and enterprises which use government goods and services. This data may include experiences associated with visiting a local health facility, obtaining a driver’s license, or securing regulatory or procurement information from the government. The diagnostics also capture information from service providers, mainly public officials. The collected data provides keen insight into the policy and operational constraints of governmental entities which supervise and provide services to the public.

For a given country, the results of a governance and anti-corruption diagnostic identify public institutions most in need of reform, the type of reforms needed, and a sense of the obstacles and opportunities which may affect reform. The implementation of the diagnostic also provides an opportunity to build local capacity related to governance knowledge and reform.

In a broader sense, the implementation of governance and anti-corruption diagnostics creates opportunities for: (i) improving governance and anti-corruption data and knowledge; (ii) supporting broad-based capacity building of governance, anti-corruption, and survey expertise; and (iii) targeted sectoral governance and anti-corruption reform.

Purpose

This guide aims to provide practical, hands-on guidance related to management and quality control associated with governance and anti-corruption survey implementation. The focus is on surveys because survey data rests at the heart of these diagnostics. In addition, the emphasis is on implementation because the management challenges associated with the conduct of the governance surveys in the field are underappreciated and, yet, can have a significant effect on the results.
The guide aims to be useful to World Bank staff and consultants, staff of donor organizations and governmental and NGO staff tasked with managing a governance or anti-corruption survey. As has been discussed, many of these individuals are not statisticians and are new to survey implementation and management. The guidance is based upon a solid theoretical framework associated with survey design and implementation; however it is oriented toward practical risk management and capacity building associated with implementation of governance and anti-corruption surveys. The document also aims to provide useful quality control guidance to field-based statistical firms which execute these diagnostics, and to local statistical agencies which routinely implement countrywide surveys, but may have limited experience with governance and anti-corruption diagnostics. These agencies are in a position to consider incorporating governance and anti-corruption surveys or modules into their broader survey efforts.

In sum, this document aims to:

(i) Provide practical guidance for managing governance and anti-corruption survey implementation, with particular emphasis on fieldwork,
(ii) Improve quality control for governance and anti-corruption surveys by enhancing data quality and analysis,
(iii) Provide tools, knowledge, and model documentation to enhance management capacity associated with governance and anti-corruption survey implementation,
(iv) Support effective governance and anti-corruption survey design through the provision of model questionnaires; and
(v) Identify areas of opportunity for local capacity development.

Structure of the Guide

This guide is organized in the following six sections:

Section I – Background and Purpose
Section II – General Principles and Definitions
Section III – Approach to Monitoring
Section IV – Quality Assessment Tools
Section V – Standard Governance and Anti-Corruption Questionnaires and Procedures
Section VI – Other Standard Governance and Anti-Corruption Survey and Diagnostic Documents
Section VII – Guidance for Data Analysis
Section VIII – Conclusion

Section II is designed to provide a governance and anti-corruption diagnostic manager with an understanding of the essential concepts related to implementation of survey fieldwork. Section III provides specific guidance related to monitoring of survey implementation in the field, supported by Section IV, which provides sample tools to support a monitoring and quality assessment in the field. Section V provides a set of standard questionnaires and procedures that are recommended for governance and anti-corruption survey design, while Section VI provides a reference for other standard documentation which supports diagnostic management. Finally, Section VII provides guidance for analyzing governance data, followed by concluding remarks in Section VIII.
II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND DEFINITIONS

This section contains: (i) a brief description of a survey; (ii) simplified definitions of major concepts associated with conducting a survey; and (ii) a summary of the main sources of errors. In addition, recommended references are presented at bottom of the section.

2.1 Definition, Characteristics, Phases of a Survey

What is a survey?

A survey can be defined as the method of gathering information (data) from a small number of individuals (called a sample), in order to learn characteristics about a larger population (called target population)\(^1\). Examples of well-known surveys at the international level are: the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), the Living Standards Measurement Study Surveys (SLMS), and the Multi-Indicators Clusters Surveys (MICS).

A survey is not the only source of statistical data. There are two other major sources of statistical data, namely censuses and administrative statistics. A census is an exhaustive data collection exercise covering the entire target population. (Examples of a census are: a demographic census, a census of voters, and an agriculture census.) Administrative statistics may also be referred to as routine statistics. They are based on administrative registers, such as vital statistics and customer statistics. However, when conducted scientifically and properly, surveys offer the advantage of generating a high quality of data at a relatively low cost and in a timely manner.

Confidentiality

Surveys results are always presented in terms of summaries or aggregates tables. No individual data is published. Throughout the world, individual data are confidential and protected by law.

Main Phases of a Survey

In general, a scientific survey seeking reliable findings is conducted in four phases: (i) a preparatory phase; (ii) data collection; (iii) data processing; and (iv) data analysis. Briefly, these survey phases can be described as follows:

(i) Preparatory phase. In the first phase, a number of activities are carried out to prepare for the data collection and processing exercises. These major preparatory activities are: sampling, development of technical documents (including questionnaires), training of supervisors and enumerators, and execution of a pilot test.

---

(ii) **Data collection.** In the second phase, information (data) is collected from the *eligible respondents* using appropriate *instruments* (mainly questionnaires) and, often, within a *fixed interval of time*.

(iii) **Data processing.** Data collected from the field is *verified* (for completeness and coherence of questionnaires), *coded* (coding the non-pre-coded part of questionnaires), and *captured* (entered using a data entry program). Resulting data files are subsequently *cleaned* and *weighted*.

(iv) **Data analysis.** In the fourth and last phase, tables of results are produced and indicators are computed, analyzed and noted. A report is produced which describes the applied methodology and presents the main results of the survey.

2.2 **Critical Steps and Major Concepts**

**Step 1: Defining the Target Population**

Generally, governance surveys cover several of the following target populations: households, public officials, business enterprises and, at times, non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The media may be included in a governance and anti-corruption study, but rarely is the media subject to a formal survey. (More commonly, media participate in focus groups or consultations.)

Some governance and anti-corruption diagnostics combine quantitative and qualitative techniques to capture data from these different target populations. In these cases, *surveys* are used for populations which can be evaluated using quantitative statistical methods, and *focus groups* are used for more qualitative assessments which may involve a small group of NGOs, media actors, or targeted business enterprises in a given sector. The objectives, context, and budget of a given diagnostic will determine the target population of the diagnostic and the overall methodological approach.

To conduct a survey, it is necessary to identify the *survey coverage*.

- **Survey Coverage.** The survey coverage defines the target population of the survey. For example, the target population could be households, transport sector enterprises, or public officials. Each unit of the target population (a household, an enterprise, a public official) is called a *Statistical Unit* (SU). The target population is defined prior to the survey implementation, often by the Terms of References (TOR) of the study.

**Step 2: Identifying the Subpopulations of Importance**

Once target populations are clearly defined, the next step is to define the survey domain and to ensure representativeness accordingly.

- **Survey domain:** The survey domain is a subpopulation of the target population for which *separate results* are required. For example, sponsors of a survey may want to view the data based on area of residence (urban-rural), administrative subdivisions (governorate,
region), gender (male-female), or age groups. Factors like budget constraints, quality of the sampling frame and the scope of the study play critical roles in determining the survey domain.

For many governance and anti-corruption surveys, the survey domains have tended to be regions (the first country administrative subdivision) and the area of residence (urban – rural).

Step 3: Sampling

The next step is to choose a small number of units (a sample) from each target population for interviews. A representative sample must be drawn from a viable sampling frame, utilizing scientific probability sampling methods.

- **Sampling Frame:** A sampling frame is an inventory or a list of all statistical units of the target population. The most common sampling frame of a household-based survey is the list of Enumeration Areas (EA) drawn from a recent population census. In a two stage sampling of a household survey, the Enumeration Areas comprise the statistical unit in the first stage, and the households are the statistical unit in the second stage.

- **Enumeration Area:** An enumeration area is a small geographical area of a known population size (population and/or the number of households). Enumeration Area populations can range from 100 to 300 households on average. In addition to a known estimated size, Enumeration Areas should have clear maps with identified boundaries. The maps should be available and accessible. The maps are often developed and maintained by the national statistical agency in a country.

Once a sampling frame is secured, the quality of the sampling frame must be evaluated for its currency (if the data is up-to-date), its completeness, and its accessibility. If the sampling frame is out of date, incomplete, or unavailable, the survey team should identify and evaluate other methods for developing a sample. With most governance and anti-corruption surveys, samples are selected using probability sampling methods and, thus, non-probability sampling methods (such as quota sampling) are not discussed in this section.

- **Probability Sampling:** With probability sampling, samples are selected randomly and each statistical unit has a known and non-zero probability of selection. In other words, all units of the target population have a chance to be selected in the sample. This chance of selection is called the probability of selection. There are several probability sampling methods, ranging from simple random sampling to multistage random sampling with stratification.

For a governance and anti-corruption household survey, the most typical sampling method is two stage probability sampling. In the first stage, Enumeration Areas are selected with probability proportional to the size, meaning by the size of the number of individuals, households or, alternatively, by the size of the population in the Enumeration Area. In the second stage, a number of households (referred to as a Cluster) are selected from each selected Enumeration Area. Clusters are usually selected using equal probability systematic sampling.
Determining the sample size is another critical element of sampling. The sample size is often determined at the beginning of a survey. In fact, Terms of Reference associated with securing a statistical firm to conduct a governance diagnostic will often include specific sample sizes, as they impact directly the cost of implementation. Regardless, the size of the sample associated with a survey affects its representativeness, and it should be determined with this in mind.

- **Sample size**: The sample size determination is based on a technical determination of the minimum number of valid observations required for each target population in order to ensure that the results are representative for the survey domains. In practice, budget constraints play a critical role in the sample size determination.

Once the selection method and sample size are determined, selection of the sample must be conducted carefully. Due to its technical nature, it is recommended that the local national statistical agency draw the sample. However, given the importance of the sampling in terms of the survey data quality and its representativeness, it is highly recommended that a statistician specialized in sampling be a part of the assessment team to evaluate the quality of the sampling frame and to verify the applied sampling methods. Such verification is an essential part of the assessment exercise, and should not be considered optional.

### 2.3 Sources of errors

There are two distinct sources of errors in a survey: **sampling errors** and **non-sampling errors**. This guide focuses primarily on non-sampling errors, rather than on sampling errors – which is a more technical issue.

- **Sampling errors**: Sampling errors are related to the sampling methods used and the quality of the sampling frame. Usually, in probability sampling surveys, sampling errors are estimated and published with results.

- **Non-sampling errors**: There approximately ten types of non sampling errors that may create bias of the survey results: (i) sampling operations (ex. errors in sample selection); (ii) non-interviews; (iii) adequacy of respondents; (iv) understanding of the concepts; (v) lack of knowledge; (vi) concealment of the truth; (vii) loaded questions; (viii) processing errors; (ix) conceptual problems; and (x) interview errors. The activities related to non-sampling errors constitute the subject of the following sections.

---

2 About 14 working days of statistician expert time is required to conduct this task.
III. APPROACH TO MONITORING

This section presents a number of tested approaches and guidance to monitor the implementation of a governance and anti-corruption survey. The monitoring approach described below concentrates on the evaluation of processes and documents to determine if standard procedures are followed and if diagnostic documents and data comply with industry standards. In particular, the evaluation assesses: (i) survey documents; (ii) preparatory phase activities; (iii) data collection; and (iv) data processing exercises.

3.1 Review of the Survey Documents

An essential component of monitoring is ensuring that the implementation team has developed proper documentation to support the survey effort. There are three primary types of survey documents which should be reviewed during the monitoring process: (i) administrative documents; (ii) metadata; and (iii) outputs documents. A brief discussion of each is below.

**Administrative Documents**

Each survey is accompanied by a set of administrative documents which officially authorize surveyors and enumerators to collect data from defined eligible respondents. The requirements for these administrative documents differ from country to country. In addition, the scope of the survey impacts which types of administrative documents are needed. In general, field workers need a minimum of the following: (i) a valid ID card and (ii) a formal authorization to collect data (such as an order of mission and/or a recommendation letter). Administrative documents must be determined by the institution in charge of the survey implementation.

Administrative documents must be secured by the implementation team prior to data collection. Most often, the documents must be secured from the government. Officials at the national statistical agency are a useful source of guidance for determining the type of authorizations needed to conduct a survey, as well as the appropriate authorizing entity in the government. A proper monitoring exercise ensures that all field workers are provided necessary administrative documents, and that the documents are used during the implementation of the survey in the field.

**Meta data**

Meta data comprise some of the most critical and technical documents and resources required for survey implementation. The metadata include documents such as questionnaires and manuals, as well as other resources such as data entry programs and tabulation plans. A standard list of metadata necessary for a governance survey implementation is presented in Annex 1, Table 3.1.

While all metadata are necessary, some are essential for the proper implementation of any survey. The most critical metadata for governance and anti-corruption surveys are: (i) sampling methodology; (ii) questionnaires; and (iii) the manual of instructions for enumerators and surveyors.
For each document or resource, the monitoring approach involves three steps as follows.

- **Step 1: Verification of the availability of the document.** For each document, a determination should be made that the document exists, regardless of the document content. This process involves gathering evidence that the document was drafted and used in the survey implementation (refer to the list of documents in Table 3.1, column 1).

- **Step 2: Assess the contents of the document.** Each document should be evaluated, without focusing on quality. In this evaluation, one would compare the contents of the document with standard contents to ensure all relevant sections or elements are included. See the list of contents provided in Table 3.1, column 2.

- **Step 3: Analyze the contents of the document.** The contents should be analyzed to determine if they meet document requirements. Some guidance for analyzing the quality of the contents is presented in Table 3.1, column 3.

**Output Documents**

Output documents can be defined as all survey outputs (or deliverables), which would include reports (i.e. pilot report, and final report of the diagnostic) and data files produced from the data collection. Table 3.2 presents the standard list of outputs expected from a governance survey. The same monitoring approach described above for metadata should be applied for output documents which are listed in Annex 2, Table 3.2.

**3.2 Evaluation of the Implementation of the Preparatory Activities**

During the preparatory phase a number of activities are carried out to ensure proper implementation of data collection and data processing. The major preparatory activities are: sampling, development of technical documents, selection and training of staff, and the pilot test. These preparatory activities should not be seen as optional, as they constitute an integral part of the survey implementation. Preparatory activities are necessary for the quality and the overall success of the survey.

For each preparatory activity, the assessment is conducted in two steps.

- In the first step, it is necessary to verify if the specific preparatory activity was conducted or not. In a second step, one must evaluate how far rules and norms were respected when the activity was implemented. For example, one preparatory activity is the pilot test. The first step of this assessment involves gathering evidence that the pilot test was actually conducted. Supporting evidence would include completed questionnaires and/or data files.

- In the second step of the assessment, one has to verify if the key elements of the methodology were tested. Because the aim of the pilot is to test the entire survey methodology, the assessment must verify that all aspects of the methodology were tested, including the field organization, adequacy of technical documents (essentially
questionnaires, manuals and maps), the performance of the field workers and data entry personnel, the data processing organization, and the data entry programs.

Table 3.3, column 1 in Annex 3 presents the list of the major preparatory activities. For each listed activity, key evidence to confirm that the activity occurred is listed in column 2, while column 3 presents ways to assess how far norms and standards were respected when the activity was conducted.

3.3 Field Monitoring of the Data Collection

The data collection constitutes the critical phase where most of the non-sampling errors can be committed. During this phase, errors may be committed by field staff (enumerators and supervisors) or by the respondent being interviewed.

Mistakes made by enumerators can be numerous and tend to represent the majority of the non-sampling errors. If not well-trained, enumerators can commit errors in any of the stages of data collection – including the use of maps, selection of the eligible and correct respondents, wording of questions, recording of responses, and the handling of questionnaires. In addition, errors can also result from miscommunication between a supervisor and an enumerator. If enumerators are not continuously managed, they may commit a number of systematic errors that must be corrected during the data processing. In addition, a poorly-qualified supervisor may give incorrect guidance to enumerators, damaging the quality of the data.

The respondents’ attitude is also a common and non-negligible source of errors. In fact, it is not unusual for a respondent to declare false information, either because he/she has misunderstood the question or he/she is not interested in cooperating with the survey team. In this last case, respondents may deliberately declare ambiguous answers, wrong information or simply refuse to be interviewed.

*Onsite monitoring is critical for the assessment of data collection.* An assessment of data collection after the data collection process is completed is hard and often inefficient. The monitoring should be conducted while the data collection exercise is going on, preferably during the first weeks of the exercise. In general, the assessment of the data collection covers: (i) the availability and adequacy of materials, (ii) interview implementation, and (iii) the handling and quality control associated with questionnaire management.

The assessment of the data collection requires specific tools to facilitate monitoring. Examples of monitoring tools are those developed for the 2009 Tanzanian governance and anti-corruption survey presented in Annexes 4, 5 and 6. With few adjustments, these tools can be adapted almost for any governance and anti-corruption survey. The tools are presented and discussed in Section IV.

3.4 Monitoring Data Processing

Data processing is subject to various types of errors which may jeopardize the survey results. For that reason, monitoring of data processing is a critical part of quality assurance. For most governance surveys, where data is collected using paper versions of questionnaires (as opposed
to using laptops), data processing involves three consecutive and complementary activities: office editing, data entry, and file cleaning.

During the office editing, all completed questionnaires must be systematically verified and coded. In verification, the aim is to check the completeness of questionnaires and consistency of information. In coding, the exercise consists of assigning appropriate codes to open-ended questions. Though office editing and data entry may be conducted at the same time, all questionnaires must be verified and coded before the data is entered.

The assessment focuses on the implementation of the data processing, rather than the survey data quality. (The evaluation of data quality is a technical matter; better to be entrusted to a survey statistician. It should be mentioned that a review of the sampling and data quality will require about two weeks of time of an expert statistician.)

The assessment of the office editing can only be conducted on-site. It consists of selecting randomly a number of already verified, coded and entered questionnaires. The number of questionnaire to be selected depends on the available time, the number of monitors, and the access to completed questionnaires. We recommend at least examining 30 completed questionnaires per target population. For each selected questionnaire, the monitor must verify if:

(i) The questionnaire was verified, meaning that all questions have been answered properly, that filters have been respected fully, and the appropriate corrections have been written clearly on the questionnaire. Agents conducting a verification usually use pens of color different than the color used by enumerators, so it should be easy to determine that the questionnaire was verified.

(ii) The questionnaire was coded, meaning that the responses on a questionnaire must be entered as number. Entering text responses is to be avoided as far as possible. Hence, the main task of coding is to transfer the text answers to valid codes. The monitor should submit all of the not coded questions to the core survey team and ask for an explanation.

(iii) The information in the questionnaire was correctly and entirely entered, meaning that the monitor should compare the entered data with the data in the actual questionnaire.

In addition, the monitor should assess factors like venue, organization and file cleaning. Specifically, the monitor should assess the adequacy of the venue (in terms of offices, spaces, shelves for questionnaires, regular electricity, and so on), the level of organization of the data entry operation (number of data entry operators, number of computers, used data entry programs, working hours, quality controls, backups, and other operational factors) and the processing of the file cleaning.
IV. QUALITY ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Assessing quality of governance survey implementation is a detailed and time-consuming process. It requires a hands-on presence and oversight in the field during survey implementation. It also requires tools which support the monitoring and evaluation of quality.

This section discusses tools that have been designed to perform a quality assessment of a governance diagnostic survey. Ideally, the budget for a governance diagnostic should include funding for field-based monitoring. However, governance diagnostic efforts are often conducted with constrained budgets. In these cases, some monitoring can be performed from a distance, particularly by requiring the implementation team to submit timely documentation and data via e-mail. The tools below provide a range of options for monitoring and assessment, depending on availability of funds.

Two Types of Tools: Document Checklist and Fieldwork Evaluation Forms

Two types of tools have been developed to support the quality assessment. The first type involves a checklist. In this case, we are referring to a checklist of documents that is provided to the survey implementation team as part of a request for standard documentation associated with the survey. While the checklist is part of a quality evaluation, it also provides guidance related to the type of documents which should be developed in the course of planning for and conducting the survey. The checklist is comprised of critical documentation which is standard for governance and anti-corruption surveys.

The second type of tool is a set of evaluation forms which are used solely by the evaluator to provide a systematic assessment of the quality of certain aspects of the implementation of the survey in the field. These forms assess an array of elements of the survey implementation which can affect quality including:

- The completeness of a questionnaire;
- The degree to which the questionnaire is filled out properly;
- The qualifications of the enumerators;
- The documentation provided to enumerators;
- The experience of enumerators during the conduct of the survey;
- Procedures and actual experience associated with management of the questionnaires; and
- Observations of interviews.

Evaluation forms are particularly effective in determining which aspects of the fieldwork are conducted in accordance with quality standards, and which reflect inherent weaknesses in the survey implementation.

Document Checklist

A document checklist, as indicated in Annex 4, provides a complete and thorough listing of all documents generated during the survey planning and implementation process. A number of these documents – such as the sampling methodology and questionnaires – are critical to the
quality of the implementation. A lack of these critical documents, or an indication that they are of poor quality, can affect the overall quality of the survey implementation and jeopardize the credibility of a governance and anti-corruption survey results.

A document checklist can be used for capacity building, management and planning, and evaluation purposes. In terms of capacity building, the checklist provides the local survey implementation team (which could include local statistical firms, research centers, NGOs, national statistical agencies, and governmental officials) a list of documents to be developed and utilized in the survey implementation process. While many individuals on the survey team may be familiar with these documents, individuals with less experience in survey implementation will find the document checklist useful guidance for generating appropriate documentation. In addition, the checklist creates an opportunity for the diagnostic manager to discuss the objective and quality of each document with the local survey manager.

The checklist also supports proper management of the survey. A diagnostic manager can ensure that the documents on the checklist are incorporated into the project work plan as deliverables, with deadlines for each document. In fact, the checklist can be used to frame the work plan and, thus, it becomes a useful planning document for the survey team, as well as a management tool for the diagnostic manager.

Last, but not least, the document checklist can be used by the evaluator to determine if the survey implementation is being conducted in accordance with appropriate standards and practices. For example, it is a standard practice for a written sampling methodology to be produced before, not after, the implementation of the survey. This is because the sampling methodology defines the approach for selecting the sample, and this method should be fully agreed to prior to implementation. Should implementation begin without having a thorough written sampling methodology, the survey is subject to increased risk which could impact the quality of the results.

While many governance and anti-corruption diagnostics may not produce every document on the checklist, certain documents are essential and non-negotiable. *These essential documents should be generated for every governance survey. They include: sampling methodology, work plan, questionnaires, manual of instructions for surveyors and enumerators, and codes list.*

Procedurally, the diagnostic manager should provide the document checklist to the survey implementation team leader at the beginning of the implementation effort, indicating that the checklist includes all relevant documents to be produced in the survey. The diagnostic manager may also indicate high priority documents which are essential to the survey effort. As implementation begins, the diagnostic manager should ask for a copy of all documents on the checklist, or those of highest priority, whichever is practicable. A team following standard practices will have no problem providing a copy of the documents it has developed, and it can usually do so within a few days. The submission can be made digitally. A team with less capacity may find it difficult to provide even the most essential documents, and this should be a red flag to the diagnostic manager. The ease and straightforwardness of document submission, as well as the thoroughness of the documents themselves, is an indicator of the level of organization and management of the survey, and a sign of overall quality of the implementation effort.
**Fieldwork Evaluation Forms**

Fieldwork evaluation tools are useful for understanding what is happening on the ground during data collection. For example, while the actual data collection process should follow the written methodology, evaluators will find that this is not always the case. The best way to monitor and understand the challenges, opportunities, and actual quality of the survey implementation is by being on the ground with the survey team to evaluate the performance of the work.

Three fieldwork evaluation tools have been developed to conduct an evaluation of the survey implementation in the field:

- **Form A: Questionnaire Completeness Evaluation Form.** This form is tailored to mirror the questionnaire instrument. Because there are separate questionnaire instruments for each target population (such as households, enterprises, and public officials), the forms which evaluate the completeness of these questionnaires must be customized to be consistent with each questionnaire. As a result, Form A will be tailored to the number of target populations. For example, if a diagnostic involves 3 surveys (household, enterprise and public officials), there will be 3 versions of Form A: one to evaluate the household survey, another to assess the enterprise survey, and a third to analyze the public officials survey.

- **Form B: Field Enumeration Evaluation Form.** This form evaluates the conduct, performance and quality of the enumerator. There is only one version of this form, and it is used to evaluate enumerators of all types of surveys. (See Annex 6.)

- **Form C: Data Collection Observation Checklist.** This form requires a modest level of customization for each type of survey. (See Annex 7.)

Below is a description of these three fieldwork evaluation tools. Samples of the tools are attached in Annex 5, 6, and 7. Utilization of these forms will require tailoring of the forms to the context of the targeted survey. This will involve restructuring Form A to mirror the questions on the questionnaires used in a given survey; and making minor, cosmetic revisions to Form B and Form C to reflect the context of the survey.

**Form A: Questionnaire Completeness Evaluation Form**

Form A, as shown in the sample in Annex 5, is intended to assess the completeness of the questionnaire, as well as if questions were answered correctly, incorrectly, or not at all.

The evaluation data generated by this form is useful because it sheds light upon the quality of the completed questionnaires. The evaluation data indicates if all desired information is being captured on the questionnaires or the extent to which there are omissions or holes in the data (i.e. significant numbers of “non-response”). The evaluation also provides insight into whether

---

3 The samples were developed for an evaluation of a governance and anti-corruption survey in Tanzania in 2009. While these tools reflect the context and content of the Tanzania survey, they provide a useful example of how these tools can be used to evaluate fieldwork quality of any governance and/or anti-corruption survey effort.
the enumerator is administering the instrument properly including, for example, the appropriate recordation of responses and ensuring that skip rules are respected.

Form A is *not* intended to collect data as part of the data collection process. It is not intended to serve as a substitute or complement to the data collection process nor is it designed to evaluate the survey data quality. It captures data used solely to evaluate the completeness of the questionnaire as part of a monitoring or assessment process.

The evaluation of questionnaire completeness takes time. The evaluation itself must be conducted on a sample of completed questionnaires. We recommend selecting completed questionnaires from at least 3 different data collection sites (including urban and rural). In addition, the more surveys that can be assessed, the more data available to determine the quality of the actual survey implementation.\(^4\)

An evaluation of the questionnaires requires: (i) the completed questionnaire instrument; and (ii) a customized Form A (tailed to the questionnaire used for the survey). Securing the completed questionnaires should conform to privacy, storage and data entry procedures established by the fieldwork team. A separate Form A digital file should be created for each questionnaire review. In other words, if the evaluator reviews 20 completed questionnaires, there should be 20 Form A Excel files at the end of the evaluation process, each representing a review of one questionnaire.

To review an individual completed questionnaire, the evaluator assesses each question to determine if it is answered properly. Codes are provided in the instructions and on Form A to guide the evaluator in the review and coding process. In general, the evaluator will code questions as follows:

- **Acceptable Answer – 1:** This code indicates the recorded answer is one of the choices provided to the respondent, and that it was recorded properly.

- **Answered not Properly – 2:** This code indicates that the question was answered, but the answer is not an appropriate response. An example of a response in this category would be an answer not on the list of options provided to the respondent.

- **Not Answered – 3:** This code indicates that the answer was left black. Note: a “9”- usually used as a code for the refuse to respond” is not a blank response. A “9-refuse to respond” is an acceptable answer, meaning that the respondent did not respond to the question, and the enumerator coded the response as 9. In this circumstance, the enumerator has done his/her job properly. This evaluation is targeted to find quality problems. With Form A, the assessment focuses on whether the enumerator is capturing data from the interview properly. If the respondent does not reply, a 9 is a proper code for that question.

We would like to make a final comment about coding utilizing Form A. The initial section of Form A (which indicates the geographic region and ward) utilizes the same codes as those

\(^4\) In the Tanzania survey, we evaluated approximately 53 questionnaires selected randomly.
developed by the fieldwork team. Routinely, enumerators are provided a list of codes for each of the country subdivision units (i.e. region, ward, etc.) and the enumeration area (if applicable).

**Form B: Field Enumeration Evaluation Form**

Form B, as shown in the sample in Annex 6, supports an assessment of the qualifications, conduct, and experiences of the field enumerators. The evaluation questions are standard questions which assess the quality of enumerators, the degree to which they have been properly trained and the extent to which procedures are being followed in the field. This information is valuable because it provides insight into how the survey is being implemented at the local level, areas of weakness and strength in the fieldwork, and the overall quality of enumerators selected to perform interviews.

Form B provides a structured evaluation of the field enumerators including:

- The level of education and occupation of the enumerator;
- His/her local language ability (in their assigned area);
- The extent to which the enumerator is provided proper documentation for conducting the interviews in the field (including codes, maps, manuals of instruction);
- The degree to which procedures are being followed, utilizing appropriate documentation;
- The enumerator’s perception of the attitudes of the respondents;
- Procedures for storing completed questionnaires, and for communication with the supervisor;
- The number of interviews to be conducted in a given area;
- The number of completed, damaged, or lost completed questionnaires in a given area;
- The number of interviews remaining.

In implementing the field enumerator assessment, as many enumerators as possible should be evaluated. Ideally, these evaluations should occur in the field, in the course of data collection. On-site evaluations generate useful data about how the survey is actually being conducted, problem areas which may affect overall data quality, and a sense of respondent reaction to the questionnaire.

In reality, the number of enumerators evaluated depends upon time and budget. As far as possible, all enumerators operating in the visited sites for monitoring purposes should be evaluated.

Utilization of Form B for other survey evaluations will require very little customization. At most, the form will require cosmetic format changes.

**Form C: Data Collection Observation Checklist**

Form C, as shown in the sample in Annex 7, is a tool which captures the observations and perceptions of the evaluator for each survey implementation. These observations are valuable because they reflect the overall views of the evaluator after he/she has monitored fieldwork for

---

5 Three data collection site were selected for evaluating enumerators in the 2009 Tanzanian survey assessment.
each survey in multiple locations. Data collected with this form should reveal strengths and weaknesses of a given survey such as:

- If enumerators conducting this survey were provided and utilized proper documentation, maps, codes, and manual of instructions;
- If the selection of respondents was conducted properly;
- If respondents cooperated in the interviews;
- The language in which the interview was conducted;
- If the objective of the survey was explained;
- If the questionnaire was filled in systematically;
- If the enumerators utilized the language on the questionnaires for questions or if they reworded the questions on an ad-hoc basis;
- If the enumerators inferred responses;
- The nature of the enumerator’s behavior before, during, and after the interview;
- The overall attitude of respondents; and
- General comments of the evaluator.

Form C is a useful means of capturing specific information reflecting inherent weaknesses or challenges of a particular survey. For example, if public officials are generally reluctant to answer questions, this observation will be captured on Form C, ensuring that the overall evaluation reflects this inherent weakness of the survey implementation.

The Form C evaluation can also prepare the diagnostic manager for a high non-response rate of a given survey. To the extent the evaluation is conducted in the midst of a survey, this information can be used to improve the management and responsiveness of the remaining interviews.

Like Form B, Form C requires very little customization and is easily adapted to a household, public officials, or enterprise survey. One Form C should be generated for each survey of a diagnostic. For example, if a diagnostic involves household, enterprise, and public officials surveys, three separate Form Cs will be developed, one for each survey type. The end result would be three separate Excel files. Annex 7 includes three sample Form C documents.
V. STANDARD GOVERNANCE QUESTIONNAIRES AND PROCEDURES

Governance and anti-corruption diagnostics have been conducted throughout South and Central America, Africa, and the Caribbean. Due to the broad nature of governance, these diagnostics vary in focus, reflecting country priorities. The diagnostics may be general in nature, may target a specific sector (such as transport or health), or may emphasize a relevant theme (such as victimization).

Examples of the range of governance diagnostics are plentiful. For example, the diagnostics in Mauritania and Senegal focused on the transport and public works sectors and, consequently, included an emphasis on procurement. Alternatively, in Cote d’Ivoire, a post-conflict country, the diagnostic focused on the health and educations sectors, as these were considered of highest governance priority within the context of this fragile state. Governance and anti-corruption questionnaires reflect these inherent variations in focus, mirroring country priorities and opportunities for reform. In spite of these differences in emphasis, there is enormous continuity in the design of governance and anti-corruption instruments, and it is that continuity that this section will explore.

The design of questionnaires for new diagnostics should leverage the investment which has been made in governance and anti-corruption instrument design. After ten years of designing and conducting governance and anti-corruption diagnostics, it is unnecessary to develop new instruments from scratch. In fact, this would be a costly and inefficient use of resources. Furthermore, it is often unfeasible given the budget and timeframe for a governance diagnostic. Questionnaire design is a technical and precise area of expertise. It should not be approached cavalierly, or conducted by individuals who do not have expertise in questionnaire design, as this can have an adverse effect of the quality of results. For these reasons, every effort should be made to leverage existing knowledge, expertise, and tools in questionnaire design.

Numerous governance questionnaires have been developed over the past ten years. These instruments embody substantial design effort and, thus, serve as a valuable source of questions and sections for future governance and anti-corruption questionnaires.

Sample Governance Questionnaires

This section provides information about models of governance and anti-corruption questionnaires that practitioners may utilize for designing instruments for a new diagnostic. The questionnaires listed below were the result of extensive instrument design. Substantial effort was made to phrase questions in a manner which would capture accurate data and, also, ensure a high response rate.

In utilizing the instruments below, every effort should be made to respect the language and structure of the instruments, recognizing that questions have been designed specifically to maximize the usefulness of the results, including to support cross country comparisons. In addition, identical questions are often asked of multiple respondent groups. This allows for cross instrument data analysis, including comparisons of user and provider experiences and perceptions. In these cases, consistency in language and design should be respected to optimize data quality and analytical results.
Below is information related to available model governance and anti-corruption questionnaires developed by the World Bank. The questionnaires referenced below were selected as models based on their high quality; availability in multiple languages; applicability to multiple respondent groups including households, enterprises, and public officials; and focus on different sectors or themes. They are available in a range of languages, depending on the type of diagnostic.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TYPE OF QUESTIONNAIRE</strong></th>
<th><strong>AVAILABLE IN THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGES</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire - General</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>General governance and anti-corruption questionnaire. Administered in Honduras, Colombia, &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Questionnaire - General</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>General governance and anti-corruption questionnaire. Administered in Honduras, Colombia, &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire - General</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>General governance and anti-corruption questionnaire. Administered in Honduras, Colombia, &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire - Sectoral</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Administered in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Questionnaire - Sectoral</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Administered in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire - Sectoral</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Administered in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire – Basic Public Services (Health and Education emphasis)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a conflict-affected country, focusing on basic public services, especially health and education. Administered in Cote d'Ivoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire – Basic Public Services (Health and Education emphasis)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a conflict-affected country, focusing on basic public services, especially health and education. Administered in Cote d'Ivoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire – focus on crime victimization</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>General questionnaire tailored to emphasize crime victimization. Administered in Madagascar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire – focus on crime victimization</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>General questionnaire tailored to emphasize crime victimization. Administered in Madagascar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Questionnaire – focus on the Health Sector</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Questionnaire tailored specifically to the health sector. Administered to employees of facility in Yemen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 These languages include English, French, Arabic, Spanish, and Kurdish. The actual questionnaire instruments are available via e-mail request by contacting Francesca Recanatini (frecanatini@worldbank.org) or Grace Morgan (gmorgan2@worldbank.org) in PREM-Public Sector.
The Language of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire must utilize the official language of the country and any other language that is predominantly spoken and understood throughout the country. For example, in Mauritania, Arabic is the primary official language, but segments of the population do not speak Arabic and, instead, speak French (along with local languages). Consequently, the questionnaire for the Mauritania diagnostic was developed in two languages: Arabic and French.

Many countries have dozens of spoken languages. However, it is not practical from a financial perspective to develop questionnaires in dozens of languages. A determination of the appropriate language for the questionnaire should take into consideration the official language of the country, other languages which are spoken throughout the country by individuals who are unlikely to understand the official language, and the project budget. For most governance diagnostics, questionnaires are developed in one or two languages. The translation is often performed by statistical survey experts who understand technical survey language and design, who have a native understanding of the languages involved in the translation, and who understand the nuances of language use in the target country.

Language of the Interviews

There will be situations when a respondent does not speak the language of the questionnaire. To address these situations, it is important that enumerator selection take into account local language ability. The pool of enumerators should include language ability which covers all local languages which will be needed to conduct the interviews. Project management and planning should consider those parts of the country that may require enumerators with specific local language ability, and the enumerators should be assigned accordingly. Enumerator training should also provide clear instructions about conducting an interview when an oral translation of each question is required. In these circumstances, the enumerator should use a consistent verbal translation of each question.

Testing the Questionnaires in a Pilot Survey

Conducting a pilot of a small sample of respondents is a standard practice of survey implementation. A pilot survey provides an opportunity to test the questionnaire, and to determine if there are problems with phrasing, translation, or structure of the instrument. In addition, the pilot can help identify problems which cause non-responses. The pilot test also sheds light on the effectiveness of established procedures, as well as the performance of individual enumerators in the conduct of interviews.

The pilot survey generates substantial information which can be used to improve the implementation of the actual survey. Upon completion of the pilot, it is common for the survey team to revise certain questions to improve response and effectiveness of the survey. In
addition, the survey manager often finalizes a survey team after the pilot, retaining enumerators who have performed well in the pilot, and releasing those that did not perform up to standard. Lastly, procedural changes may also occur after the pilot. In sum, the pilot is an important opportunity for testing and improving the effectiveness of the questionnaire, as well as fieldwork procedures and personnel.

**Authorization of the Final Questionnaire**

All governance and anti-corruption diagnostics involve a detailed process of questionnaire development. This process includes determining an appropriate questionnaire template as a basis for the questionnaire, adding or removing questions based on the focus of the given diagnostic, and refining questions to be effective within the local context of the country. This process is time-consuming and often involves multiple reviews of the questionnaire instruments. Because of the detailed and fluid nature of this revision process, it is important to create structure and formality around the finalization of the questionnaires. If a non-final version of the questionnaire is used for the data collection, the results of the diagnostic can be compromised. Hence we recommend that diagnostic managers indicate that questionnaires may not be used in a data collection until the manager has sent the local survey firm formal written authorization indicating that questionnaires are ready for the pilot and, subsequently, the data collection. This formality minimizes miscommunication and error which can result in the use of an incorrect version of a questionnaire during data collection. This is a costly mistake to make, and should be avoided.

There are two critical points for authorizing a final version of the questionnaires. The first is before the commencement of the pilot. The questionnaires used in the pilot should be in final form for the pilot. They should be completely translated into all languages used for the diagnostic. They should be formatted to ensure efficiency and ease of interviewing and recording. They should include all questions and sections which will be included in the final questionnaire used in the actual survey implementation.

The second authorization is before the actual data collection. After the pilot, it is common for the questionnaires to be revised and reformatted. These revisions result in a final version of the questionnaire for the actual data collection. The revised questionnaires need to be reviewed to ensure consistency across instruments and to avoid inadvertent omissions of questions or sections.

It should be underscored that questionnaire revision is a tedious undertaking. It is quite possible that even a detail-oriented and precise editor will miss a critical revision. For this reason, it is important to have numerous individuals review the final instruments before actual survey implementation. In addition, it is essential that the survey sponsor review and authorize the final questionnaires before fieldwork begins.
VI. OTHER STANDARD SURVEY AND DIAGNOSTIC DOCUMENTS

Sharing model documents with a survey or diagnostic team is a simple, but effective, way to improve the likelihood of quality results. It is also a useful means of supporting capacity building. Standard documentation – such as a project work plan, a sampling methodology, or an executive summary for a final diagnostic report – provide the survey team in the field, as well as the diagnostic manager, with a clear idea of the type of documents to be generated in the course of conducting governance and anti-corruption surveys. For a seasoned firm which has extensive statistical experience conducting surveys, these model documents will likely reinforce existing knowledge and procedures. However, for firms or staff with more marginal capacity, the simple act of sending an e-mail with an attachment of multiple standard documents can be an important way to convey an appropriate standard for the conduct of the surveys.

Model documents provide a concrete example of expected deliverables, and create an opportunity to discuss the objective and contents of each document with the survey team. From a management point of view, model documents create visible and practical guidance, in particular with firms of lesser capacity. Should a survey team develop documents of unacceptable quality, the diagnostic manager can refer to elements of the model document to guide the document revision.

The table below reflects the types of standard governance and anti-corruption diagnostic documentation which is available, a list of languages in which the documents are available, and comments which reflect the focus and original source of each document. A complete listing of all diagnostic documents which are available to support governance diagnostics and surveys is available in Annex 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DIAGNOSTIC DOCUMENT</th>
<th>AVAILABLE LANGUAGES</th>
<th>IN THE FOLLOWING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Action Plan</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Kurdish, Spanish</td>
<td>Government Action Plan for reform. This document was developed for Honduras after completion of the Diagnostic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish, Portuguese, Spanish</td>
<td>Indices of public sector performance, developed by WBI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work plan</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish, Spanish</td>
<td>A project work plan developed for Cote d'Ivoire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Methodology – General</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Kurdish, Portuguese</td>
<td>Methodology for a general diagnostic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Methodology – General (including a focus on crime victimization)</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>Methodology for a general diagnostic with a focus on crime victimization. Developed for a diagnostic in Madagascar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Methodology - Sectoral</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Spanish</td>
<td>Methodology for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Developed for diagnostics in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Kurdish, Spanish</td>
<td>Terms of reference. Developed for Cote d'Ivoire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The documents are available via e-mail request by contacting Francesca Recanatini (frecanatini@worldbank.org) or Grace Morgan (gmorgan2@worldbank.org) in PREM-Public Sector.

7 The documents are available via e-mail request by contacting Francesca Recanatini (frecanatini@worldbank.org) or Grace Morgan (gmorgan2@worldbank.org) in PREM-Public Sector.
The analysis of governance and anti-corruption data is framed by the design of the questionnaire and the actual data collected. Furthermore, because each survey instrument is customized to the needs and priorities of the target country, data analysis tends to reflect the individual context of a given country.

Nevertheless, there are standard sections included in most governance and anti-corruption surveys, and experience provides us with guidance as to how to analyze the data collected in these sections. In addition, some diagnostics involve focus groups, consultations, or other non-quantitative forms of data collection. The findings from these qualitative forms of data collection often inform the data analysis process, and can be highly useful for refining data analysis and framing recommendations.

In general data analysis aims to:

(i) Unbundle corruption by type – administrative, capture of the state, bidding, theft of goods and public resources, purchase of licenses and regulations;
(ii) Identify both weak institutions (which are in need of reform) and strong institutions (which provide examples of good governance);
(iii) Assess the cost of each type of corruption on different groups of stakeholders;
(iv) Identify key determinants of good governance; and
(v) Develop policy recommendations.

With these objectives in mind, below is a list of recommended areas of focus for the analysis of governance and anti-corruption data. In selected cases, analytical examples from the 2001 Peruvian Governance and Anti-Corruption Diagnostic are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF FOCUS FOR DATA ANALYSIS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between corruption, and poverty and inequality</td>
<td>In examining this relationship in Peru, evidence indicates that poor users (smaller firms) are disproportionally penalized by paying bribes that represent a greater share of their income (their gross monthly revenues). In addition, paying a bribe does not necessarily translate into better quality of service received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The type of corruption</td>
<td>It is crucial to unbundle corruption, since it can take many different forms, from administrative corruption, to State Capture, to corruption related to procurement and purchasing of positions in the public administration. Each form of corruption is associated with a different institutional weakness and calls for a targeted policy solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation and prioritization of improvements to public administration</td>
<td>The data should be analyzed to determine if improvements are needed with public administration systems such as recruiting, merit-based promotion, insulation of the civil service from political changes, and a civil service code of ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of transparency and accountability</td>
<td>High levels of transparency and accountability, reflected by institutionalized approaches to using civil society to monitor government, are necessary to reduce corruption. Better monitoring and accountability can be achieved by facilitating open access to information unless there is a compelling reason for it to remain secret. Positive signs of accountability involve a proactive approach by government to invite oversight by civil society and the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent to which there is collective action and civil society inclusion

Related to the previous point, successful anti-corruption strategies are the product of collective and integrated efforts, which comprise all the branches of the government, the private sector (local and international) and civil society.

The most corrupted state agencies

Data collected -- from households, enterprises, and public officials -- related to the honesty of institutions provides useful insight into which agencies are perceived to be most problematic in terms of corruption.

State institutions with good governance and which are highly regarded

Data collected -- from households, enterprises, and public officials -- related to the honesty of institutions provides useful insight into which agencies are perceived to be highly regarded. In addition, the quality of services data sheds light on public institutions with good governance.

Various dimensions of governance and quality of service delivery across regions

Analyzing quality of service data by region may reveal regional weaknesses. This information is useful for prioritizing reforms.

The cost of corruption on businesses

The cost of bribery to enterprises -- how much they are willing to pay in bribes -- is an indicator of how costly corruption is financially for businesses, but it is also indicative of the macro-economic fiscal losses to the Treasury if a more transparent system were to exist.

The nature of bribes paid to government by enterprises

Bribery data can be analyzed to determine the reason why enterprises pay bribes. For example, are most bribes designed to facilitate judicial procedures, obtain licenses, guarantee contracts or obtain public services? Bribery data can be analyzed to target key institutions and activities involved in corruption.

The key private actors involved in corruption -- foreign investors and/or domestic firms

Is the preponderance of the bribery from foreign investors or domestic firms? This information is useful for determining the key actors involved in corruption. Identifying the key actors involved in corrupt behavior is critical information for developing a reform strategy.

The existence and effects of corruption and poor governance in judicial institutions

In the Peruvian governance diagnostic, users and enterprises overwhelmingly reported that the judicial system was unfair and ineffective due to high costs, the lack of credibility and professionalism of judges, and the timing and complexity of legislation. As a result, both individuals and firms preferred to use alternative mechanisms for conflict resolution. In addition, in the same diagnostic, about 90 percent of enterprises and users of public services indicated that judicial power is not independent from the government or political groups. Enterprise managers also reported that bribes are used predominantly to facilitate judicial proceedings.

Institutions which are responsible for corruption and poor governance in procurement

It is important to determine if the responsibility for poor governance in procurement rests with public institutions, private firms, or both. Often times, the responsibility for poor governance in procurement rests with both. In the Peruvian diagnostic, more than half of all enterprises always paid bribes to secure public procurement contracts. The percentage was higher for foreign enterprises. Enterprises reported, on average, that 17 percent of the value of the contract is paid as a bribe.

Evidence of State Capture

Some key institutions outside of the public sector may fuel poor governance by exercising undue influence over the state. These groups -- which include large financial and economic actors, like...
cartels – can wield enormous influence in shaping laws, policies and regulations. It is useful to contrast perceptions about these influential actors with other private actors such as associations of professionals and trade unions. Some diagnostics have revealed that cartels are perceived to have substantially higher levels of influence on the state than associations and trade unions.

| Linkages between bribes and political funding | Does the data indicate that enterprises make political contributions to influence the political process? If so, are larger or smaller sized firms more willing to make these contributions? A related area of analysis is the perception of firms about the extent to which bribe revenues are used to finance political campaigns, suggesting the existence of a tight, non-transparent link between government officials, political parties, and the private sector. |
| Evidence of illicit payments to secure public administration positions | It is important to understand if payments are made to secure positions in the public administration and, if so, if this practice is more predominant amongst higher level or lower jobs, or both. |
| The cost of corruption on individuals, and identify effects on inequality | Bribery is a significant and regressive ‘tax’ on public service users. It is common for individual users to report major bribes extorted from institutions in charge of driving licenses and passports, construction permits, taxes, school enrollment, or other public goods and services. Furthermore, poorer households tend to be disproportionately affected by corruption. |
| Comparison of bribery expenses to critical business expenses | In the Peru diagnostic, enterprises indicated that they spend more on bribes than on security, and this bribery ‘tax’ is regressive. For smaller enterprises the bribery tax is particularly onerous: it accounts for 8.9 percent of firm revenues, whereas large firms pay less than 2.5 percent. |
| The relationship between bribery and service delivery quality | It is important to understand user perceptions of service quality by institution (which institutions were perceived to have strong or poor service quality), and to compare this data to bribery data. In the Peru diagnostic, bribery payments did not appear to translate into higher quality of public services for users and firms. |
| The relationship between governance and access to public services | Evidence of bureaucratic inefficiencies and the requirement to bribe to receive services can be discouraging to users. If inefficiencies are too great, some users may choose not to seek a public service. Furthermore, access to public services is often more difficult for poor users. There is evidence which indicates that poor citizens do not seek medical care at times, even when they need it. |
| The extent to which there are regional variations on the quality of public service delivery | Service quality may vary from one region to another. In addition, it is important to determine if service quality is better for certain public services rather than others. For example, in the Peru diagnostic, the quality of public services appeared on average to be higher in the Selva region and Lima than in the rest of the country, and significantly greater in the case of offices handling driving licenses, judicial documents, basic health services and schools. |
| Governance and corruption in the Health and Education Services. Health and education are basic public services which impact the lives of most citizens around the world | These services often represent the primary means by which citizens are served by government. Consequently, data should be analyzed to determine the cost, quality, and access to health and education services. |
| The relationship between corruption and Local Governments | Determining the institutional actors associated with corruption is a critical part of the data analysis. Some anti-corruption diagnostics document the extent and the seriousness of the corruption problem within municipal agencies. Analysis suggests that along several |
In addition, Annex 9 includes a set of graphs which provide sample charts and diagrams which can be developed to depict the data results. Selective results from the 2001 Peruvian Governance and Anti-Corruption Diagnostic are used to provide examples where appropriate.
VIII. CONCLUSION

Over the last 15 years, governance and anti-corruption activity has blossomed throughout the development field. It has become increasingly integrated into development strategies in a range of countries from fragile and conflict-affected states to low- and middle-income countries. Governance has become an integral part of most donor lending and investment. In addition, efforts to improve governance and combat corruption are evident in virtually every sector including health care, education, justice, transport, and water. Finally, while experts continue to debate the exact relationship between governance and growth, most now agree that the relationship between these two factors is significant. It appears that improving governance and fighting corruption are permanent additions to the field of international development.

As governance and anti-corruption efforts deepen and expand, assessment mechanisms and implementation systems will also strengthen. We anticipate that governance and anti-corruption diagnostics will be a part of this evolution, and we hope this guide is a small step toward ongoing development of this field.
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### Table 3.1: Essential documents for governance survey implementation – main contents and elements for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Main Contents</th>
<th>Elements for Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project work plan and schedule</td>
<td>Date, duration, venue and expected results for:</td>
<td>Should contain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)- Preparatory activities</td>
<td>(a): staffs selection, training, pilot test, publicity ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)- Field operations</td>
<td>(b): preparation, interviews, questionnaire retrieval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)- Data processing</td>
<td>(c): coding, verification, and data entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)- Data dissemination</td>
<td>(d): Main outputs like reports, row data files, cleaned and weighted data files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation related to Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01- Sampling methodology</td>
<td>(a)- Target populations</td>
<td>Two weeks time for a statistician expert are required to evaluate the sampling plan and the survey data quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)- Statistical units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)- Sampling frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)- Sampling methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)- Samples sizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)- Weights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02- Data collection methodology</td>
<td>(a)- Eligible respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)- Method of interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)- Fields workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)- Quality controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)- Guarantees for responses confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)- Questionnaires retrieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a): Ex. Head of household, Enterprise Manager, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b): Ex: direct interview, interview by phone, by mail...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c): Profile and numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d): Systematic check of all or some of competed questionnaires, verification selection of the right samples units, field monitoring missions,...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e): Legal mention on questionnaire (law), in manuals and during trainings, storage of documents, fate of completed questionnaires ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f): Date, duration, venue and organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03- Data processing methodology</td>
<td>(a)- Data entry program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)- Verification and coding methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)- Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a): Statistical software like SPSS, STATA, SAS, CsPro, etc.(but not Excel or lotus), tested programs, variables dictionary, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) &amp; (c): date, duration, methods, staffs, venue and organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questionnaire

*Standard questionnaires are available at the World Bank (PREM-Public Sector) for all types of governance and anti-corruption surveys target populations. Standard versions must be adapted to the particular survey context.*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)- Front page</td>
<td>(a): Country name, survey item, logos / names of involved institutions, mention of individual data confidentiality ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)- Location identification</td>
<td>(b): Country administrative unite, EA and SU number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)- Date of interview</td>
<td>(c): Essential for the control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)- Questions</td>
<td>(d): Presented section by section, numbered, precoded, questions clearly probed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)- Traceability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required versions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)- Pilot test version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)- Final version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)- Translated versions; when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1: Essential documents for governance and anti-corruption survey implementation – main contents and elements for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Main Contents</th>
<th>Elements for Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enumerators’ Manual of Instructions | (a) - Introduction  
(b) - Definition of Concepts  
(c) - Enumerator’s tasks and responsibilities  
(d) - Recommended attitude  
(e) - Methods of interview  
(f) - Completion of questionnaire  
(g) - List of documents and equipments |  | (a): Description of the survey context and objectives;  
(b): Definition of main concepts used in the survey such as resident, household, unemployed...  
(c): household listing, identification of the right SU (ex. household), interviews, questionnaires retrieval...  
(d): Behaviors before, during and after the interview (does and doesn’t)  
(e): Often during direct interview with the eligible respondent  
(f): Explained for each single question and presented section by section, question by question following the same order as in the questionnaire. |
| Codes Lists                  | (a) - Administrative subdivisions codes  
(b) - Variables codes | (a): Ex. Regions, Counties, Wards...  
(b): For not already pre-coded variables in the questionnaire |
| Supervisors’ Manual of Instructions | (a) - Introduction  
(b) - Supervisor’s tasks and responsibilities  
(d) - Recommended attitude  
(e) - Techniques of controls | (a): The objectives of the survey and field operations organization  
(b): Introducing enumerators to local authorities, indentifying the EA boundaries, establishment of enumerators work plans and itineraries, techniques of controls, questionnaires retrieval... |
| Verification and Coding Manual of Instructions | (a) - Introduction  
(b) - Tasks and responsibilities  
(c) - Presentation of questionnaire  
(d) - Methods of verification  
(e) - Methods of coding | (a): Description of the survey context and objectives;  
(b): Verification and coding  
(c): General presentation of questionnaire  
(d): Explain in details how to verify the completeness of questionnaire and coherence of responses  
(e): List of all non pre-coded variables in the questionnaires and the assigned codes or how to code. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Main Contents</th>
<th>Elements for Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Data Entry Manual of Instructions | (a) Introduction  
(b) Tasks and responsibilities  
(c) Presentation of questionnaire  
(d) Methods of entering data | (a) Description of the survey context and objectives;  
(b) Data entry  
(c) General presentation of questionnaire  
(d) Explain in details how to enter data from questionnaire; section by section, question by question. |
| **Required versions:**  
(i) Pilot test version  
(ii) Final version  
(iii) Translated versions; when necessary. |  
(a) Technical documents that recall the movement of completed questionnaires during the field operations (from enumerators to supervisors and from supervisors to archives) and the data processing (from the archives to verification/coding to data entry and back to archives). Forms must be signed by all intervening staffs.  
(b) In case of a two sampling stages using EA at the 1st stage and household at the 2nd stage, the form is essential to list all household in the EA (name of the head of household and assign a number to each household). The list serves as the sampling frame for the 2nd sampling stage. |
| Technical Forms | The most essential are:  
(a) Materials Transmission Control Forms  
(b) Households Listing Form |  
(a) In most of times, the assigned areas are the EAs. The maps should be useful, with clear boundaries and main infrastructures recognizable in the field.  
(b) Other maps, such as maps of cities and certain rural administrative unites are often required to facilitate the field operations and the assessment exercise. |
| **Required versions:**  
(i) Pilot test version  
(ii) Final version  
(iii) Translated versions; when necessary. | |
| Maps | (a) Assigned area maps  
(b) Other maps |  
(a) Statistical software  
(b) Type of variables, modalities of answers for all questions  
(c) List of tables, canvas of tables, indicators ... |
| **Required maps:**  
(i) Copies for the training  
(ii) Pilot test zones  
(iii) All covered EAs (1st degree sample) | |
| Data Entry Program | (a) Tested Programs  
(b) Dictionary of variables  
(c) Tabulation plans | |
| **Required versions:**  
(i) Pilot test version  
(ii) Final version | |
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Table 3.2: Governance and anti-corruption survey outputs (or deliverables) – main contents and elements for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Main Contents</th>
<th>Elements for analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Pilot test evaluation report</td>
<td>(a)- Chronogram of activities (b)- Sampling (c)- Data collection (d)- Data processing (e)- Evaluation (f)- Methodology amendments</td>
<td>(a):- Date, duration and venue (b):- Selected zones, method of selection, sample sizes... (c):- Involved staff, eligible respondents, field organization, dates, no. of completed questionnaires (d):- Programs, date, venue and organization (f):- Evaluation of field workers performance, average number of questionnaire per day per enumerator, per data entry operator, number of refusals, number of damaged and lost completed questionnaires, remarks on questionnaires, remarks on manuals, remarks on the data entry programs...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes presented as a part of the survey final report instead of separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(01) Sampling</td>
<td>(a)- Sampling frame evaluation (b)- Final samples sizes (c)- Difficulties (d)- Weights</td>
<td>Evidences that an appropriate training was organized: (b):- Covered items, field training, languages... (c):- Manuals, questionnaires, technical forms and maps (e):- Number of attendants and of recruited, daily presence lists...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) Training</td>
<td>(a)- Venue date and duration (b)- Program (c)- Training documents (d)- Trainers (e)- Trainees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) Data collection and processing</td>
<td>The corrected version after the pilot test.</td>
<td>(a)- Organization (b)- Measures to guarantee confidentiality (c)- Archiving (a):- Place of storage, logistics (shelves ...) (b):- Fate of completed questionnaires at the end of the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04) Storage of completed questionnaires</td>
<td>(a)- Organization (b)- Measures to guarantee confidentiality (c)- Archiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(05) Dissemination Strategy</td>
<td>(a)- Dissemination plan (b)- Vectors (c)- Beneficiaries</td>
<td>(a):- Dates, venues (b):- Prints, CDs, Web, seminars... (c):- Publics, restricted diffusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Reports</td>
<td>(a)- Methodology, (b)- Main results (c)- Metadata</td>
<td>(a):- Main elements of revised methodology after the pilot test, (b):- As compared to TOR (c):- Mainly questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3: Main Preparatory Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Required information for assessment</th>
<th>Elements of assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>(a)- Profile of applicants</td>
<td>(a)-: age, education, profession, language...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)- Selection procedures</td>
<td>(b)-: public announcement, from rosters... -compare (i)- initial required number of staffs with (ii)- Number of applications and (iii)- Final selected number -mode of selection: tests, CVs, -when, where and how tests were conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING</td>
<td>(a)- Evidences proving that the training was actually conducted</td>
<td>Evidence such as: - reports, - lists of presence - programs - completed questionnaire during the training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)- Date and duration</td>
<td>(b)- Adequate training will require on the average 5 to 7 working days for enumerators, and additional 2 days for controllers and one day for supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)- Venue</td>
<td>(c)- Place, convenience of classrooms....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)- Content of training</td>
<td>(d)- in general : (i)- context and aim of the survey, (ii)- definition of concept; (iii)- completion of questionnaires, (iii) completion of technical forms and (iv)- field applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)-Trainers</td>
<td>(e)- It’s highly recommended that the survey core team is the one who train the field and data entry staffs. In case of need, at least the core team must train the supervisors after what the supervisors train both enumerators and controllers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)-Training supports</td>
<td>(f)-Distributed during the training (Manuals of instructions, examples of questionnaires, technical forms, maps..)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)-Assiduity</td>
<td>(g)-All staffs must benefit from the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)-Attendance</td>
<td>(h)-Daily lists of presence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLING</td>
<td>(a)-Defined target populations (b)-Sampling frame (c)-Sampling methods</td>
<td>Two weeks time for a statistician expert are required to evaluate the sampling plan and the survey data quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILOT TEST</td>
<td>(a)- Organization</td>
<td>(a)-: field operations organization , date, duration and venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)- Covered sample</td>
<td>(b)-: Selected zones, method of selection, eligible respondents,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)- Completed questionnaires</td>
<td>(c)- number of completed questionnaires per target population..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)- The data file</td>
<td>(d)-: data entry programs and cleaned data files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)- evaluation report</td>
<td>(f)- : evaluation of the whole methodology: field workers performance, remarks on questionnaires, remarks on manuals, remarks on the data entry programs...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Document Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technical note on Sampling (Sampling methodology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Note on the Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Note on storage of completed questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Households questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Households questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Households questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Households questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Households questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Households questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public Officials questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Public Officials questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public Officials questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Public Officials questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Public Officials questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public Officials questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Business Enterprises questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Business Enterprises questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Business Enterprises questionnaire _ Language 1 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Business Enterprises questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Business Enterprises questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Business Enterprises questionnaire _ Language 2 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Enumerators' Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Enumerators' Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Enumerators' Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Enumerators' Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Enumerators' Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Enumerators' Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Supervisors' Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Supervisors' Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Supervisors' Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Supervisors' Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Training version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Supervisors' Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Supervisors' Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 34-39 | Verification Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Training version  
       | Verification Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Verification Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Final version  
       | Verification Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Training version  
       | Verification Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Verification Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Final version  |
| 40-45 | Coding Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Training version  
       | Coding Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Coding Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Final version  
       | Coding Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Training version  
       | Coding Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Coding Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Final version  |
| 46-51 | Data Entry Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Training version  
       | Data Entry Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Data Entry Manual of Instructions _ Language 1 _ Final version  
       | Data Entry Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Training version  
       | Data Entry Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Data Entry Manual of Instructions _ Language 2 _ Final version  |
| 52-59 | Codes Lists _ Language 1 _ Training version  
       | Codes Lists _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Codes Lists _ Language 1 _ Final version  
       | Codes Lists _ Language 2 _ Training version  
       | Codes Lists _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Codes Lists _ Language 2 _ Final version  |
| 60-65 | Materials Transmission Control Form _ Language 1 _ Training version  
       | Materials Transmission Control Form _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Materials Transmission Control Form _ Language 1 _ Final version  
       | Materials Transmission Control Form _ Language 2 _ Training version  
       | Materials Transmission Control Form _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Materials Transmission Control Form _ Language 2 _ Final version  |
| 66-68 | Ward Maps _ Copies for Training  
       | Ward Maps _ Pilot Test Zones  
       | Materials Transmission Control Form  |
| 69-71 | Households Listing Form _ Language 1 _ Training version  
       | Households Listing Form _ Language 1 _ Pilot Test version  
       | Households Listing Form _ Language 1 _ Final version  |
Households Listing Form _Language 2_ Training version
Households Listing Form _ Language 2 _ Pilot Test version
Households Listing Form _ Language 2 _ Final version

Pilot Test Report of Exploitation _ Language 1
Pilot Test Report of Exploitation _ Language 2

Data Entry Program _ Pilot Test Version
Data Entry Program _ Final Version

Data Files _ Pilot Test

Tabulation Plans _ Pilot Test Version
Tabulation Plans _ Final Version

List of Indicators to be computed _ Pilot Test Version
List of Indicators to be computed _ Final Version

Note on the Dissemination Strategy
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Diagnostic Document</th>
<th>Available in the Following Languages</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire - General</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>General governance and anti-corruption questionnaire used in Honduras, Colombia, &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Questionnaire - General</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>General governance and anti-corruption questionnaire used in Honduras, Colombia, &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire - General</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>General governance and anti-corruption questionnaire used in Honduras, Colombia, &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire - Sectoral</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Used in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Questionnaire - Sectoral</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Used in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire - Sectoral</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Used in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire – Basic Public Services (Health and Education emphasis)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a post-conflict country, focusing on basic public services, especially health and education. Used in Cote d’Ivoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire – Basic Public Services (Health and Education emphasis)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Questionnaire customized for a post-conflict country, focusing on basic public services, especially health and education. Used in Cote d’Ivoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Questionnaire – focus on crime victimization</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>General questionnaire tailored to emphasize crime victimization. Used in Madagascar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials Questionnaire – focus on crime victimization.</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>General questionnaire tailored to emphasize crime victimization. Used in Madagascar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Questionnaire – focus on the Health Sector</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Questionnaire tailored specifically to the health sector. Used in Yemen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach questionnaire – focus on the Health Sector.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Questionnaire tailored specifically to the health sector. Used in Yemen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF DIAGNOSTIC DOCUMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>AVAILABLE IN THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>COMMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Action Plan</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Kurdish, Spanish</td>
<td>Government Action Plan for reform. This document was developed for Honduras after completion of the Diagnostic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish, Portuguese, Spanish</td>
<td>Indices of public sector performance, developed by WBI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work plan</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish, Spanish</td>
<td>A project work plan developed for Cote d'Ivoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Methodology – General</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Kurdish, Portuguese</td>
<td>Methodology for a general diagnostic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Methodology – general (and with a focus on crime victimization)</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Kurdish</td>
<td>Methodology for a general diagnostic with a focus on crime victimization. Developed for a diagnostic in Madagascar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Methodology - Sectoral</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Spanish</td>
<td>Methodology for a sectoral diagnostic targeting the transport &amp; public works sector. Developed for diagnostics in Mauritania and Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Kurdish, Spanish</td>
<td>Terms of reference. Developed for Cote d'Ivoire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>