


IEG

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION GROUP
WORLD BANK | IFC | MIGA



IEG's 2011 Client Surveys: Topline Report of Key Findings



For more information, contact:

Gwen Cottle

Associate Director

GlobeScan Incorporated

Tel: +1 416 969 3097

Gwen.Cottle@GlobeScan.com

Lionel Bellier

Research Analyst

GlobeScan Incorporated

Tel: +44 (0) 2 7960 5114

Lionel.Bellier@GlobeScan.com

www.GlobeScan.com

The survey questions and results reported herein are provided on a confidential basis to IEG. IEG is free to use the findings in whatever manner it chooses, including releasing them to the public or media.

GlobeScan Incorporated subscribes to the standards of the World Association of Opinion and Marketing Research Professionals (ESOMAR). ESOMAR sets minimum disclosure standards for studies that are released to the public or the media. The purpose is to maintain the integrity of market research by avoiding misleading interpretations. If you are considering the dissemination of the findings, please consult with us regarding the form and content of publication. ESOMAR standards require us to correct any misinterpretation.

Project: 2481, GlobeScan®

January, 2012



Table of Contents

Introduction and Methodology	4
Familiarity with IEG's Products in General	10
Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products	14
IEG's Independence	18
Impact of IEG	26
Familiarity and Satisfaction with IEG's Recent Products	34
Influence of IEG's Products	46
Use of IEG's Products	52
Quality and Use of IEG's Recommendations	60
Access to IEG's Products / IEG's Outreach and Dissemination Efforts	65



Introduction and Methodology

- This PowerPoint report represents the topline findings of the 2011 Client Surveys of the World Bank Group's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG).
- The findings detailed here are based on three surveys carried out among three different audiences: WBG Board members and advisors, WBG Staff, and External Stakeholders. Details of fieldwork dates, sample size, and methodology for each survey are included on the next slide.
- In addition to this topline report, deliverables will also include a full set of Excel data tables for each survey, and an Excel file with verbatims for all open-ended questions (please note this topline report only includes results for the closed-ended questions). An SPSS data file will be available upon request.
- The present report shows key global comparisons across the three groups but focuses more on results for the WBG Staff, as this was the audience on which IEG placed the most importance.
- Please note that all figures in the charts and tables in this report are expressed in percentages, unless otherwise stated. Totals may not always add to 100 because of rounding.
- "DK/NA" respondents were excluded from all calculations reported in the following report.
- A skip was applied in Q7 and Q9, i.e., respondents who did not answer these questions were redirected to Q15.

- **Fieldwork:**

Fieldwork was conducted online and simultaneously for the three audiences. It was carried out between November 29th and December 19th, 2011.

- **Structure of Questionnaire:**

The core questionnaire was identical for the three audiences, thus allowing for global comparisons. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. In the first section, respondents were asked general questions about their familiarity with IEG's products, IEG's independence, and IEG's impact. Respondents were screened out if they were not at all familiar with IEG's products.

In the second section, respondents could select up to ten of IEG's recent evaluation products and rate each of them on overall satisfaction. They were then asked to select only one product, and to rate it on different categories (influence, use, quality/use of recommendations). All rating questions were designed with a six-point scale and, most of the time, this presentation of findings shows the sum of percentages of positive responses (4+5+6).

In the third and last section, respondents were asked other general questions about their access to IEG's products and IEG's outreach.

- **Response Rates:**


Board: population of 215 Executive directors (EDs), Alternate EDs, and Advisors; 42 responses. Response rate of 19.5 percent. One respondent screened out following the familiarity question.

WBG Staff: population of 6,299 operational staff; 895 responses for all available HR grade levels. Response rate of 14.2 percent. 103 respondents screened out following the familiarity question.

External Stakeholders: population of 17,887; 755 responses across various categories of stakeholders. Response rate of 4.2 percent. 130 respondents screened out following the familiarity question.

Distribution of WBG Staff by HR Grade Level

Before and After Q2 Screenout, 2011




All margins of error shown in this report are calculated using the total WBG Staff as population (6,299) and the overall number of WBG Staff respondents who effectively answered a particular question as sample size (i.e. DK/NAs are excluded from calculations).

The overall margin of error for WBG Staff throughout the following report is comprised between ± 3.0 and ± 4.7 percent (depending on questions), using a 95 percent Confidence Level.

A Chi Square test was run for each question and established that significant differences exist statistically between HR Grades for most of the questions, but not for all of them throughout the survey. Questions where difference is significant among HR Grades groups are highlighted in pink in the Excel data tables.

Distribution of WBG Staff by Organization and Office Location


Before and After Q2 Screenout, 2011




External Stakeholders Self-Categorization

2011

Before Q2 Screenout (n=755)




After Q2 Screenout (n=625)




External Stakeholders

By Region, 2011

Before Q2 Screenout (n=755)



After Q2 Screenout (n=625)



Detailed Demographics

By Sample Group, Post Q2 Screenout,* 2011

WBG Staff— sample sizes per category

Total: $n=792$

World Bank: $n=446$

IFC: $n=337$

MIGA: $n=9$

*(MIGA not shown in the charts
because of very small sample size)*

HQ: $n=349$

FO: $n=443$

GE: $n=63$

GF: $n=256$

GG: $n=310$

GH: $n=139$

GI: $n=21$

GJ: $n=3$

*(GJ not represented in the charts
because of very small sample size)*

External— sample sizes per category

Total: $n=625$

International organization: $n=91$

Gov't donor organization: $n=30$

Academia/research: $n=184$

NGO: $n=88$

Private for profit: $n=107$

Government: $n=90$

News/media: $n=9$

*(category not represented in the
charts because of very small sample
size)*

Other: $n=26$

Africa: $n=128$

Western Europe: $n=97$

North America: $n=93$

South Asia: $n=93$

East Asia / Pacific: $n=69$

LatAm / Carribeans: $n=65$

Eastern Europe / Central Asia: $n=45$

MENA: $n=35$

Board— sample sizes per category

Total: $n=41$

Executive directors: $n=8$

Alternate executive directors: $n=2$

Advisors: $n=31$


*(In the final data tables, Executives
and Alternate executives were
combined together in one category.)*




Familiarity with IEG's Products in General

Familiarity with IEG's Products in General

By Sample Group, 2011




Reason for not being familiar



Respondents from the Board are the most familiar with IEG's products in general (79%), well ahead of the WBG Staff respondents (55%), and the External audience (49%).

Familiarity with IEG's Products in General—WBG Staff


By Organization, Office Location, and HR Grade Level, 2011



Within the WBG Staff, the higher the HR grade level, the more familiar respondents are with IEG's products. Also, HQ-based respondents are much more familiar with IEG's products than respondents from a field office.

Familiarity with IEG's Products in General— External

By Category of External Stakeholders, 2011




Q1. How familiar are you with IEG's evaluation products?



Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products in General

Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products—WBG Staff

By Type of Products, WBG Staff, 2011




Project level evaluations are the most frequently used products by WBG Staff (72%), followed by sector/thematic evaluations (57%), and country-level evaluations (52%).

Sample sizes between $n=705$ and $n=777$
MoE ranges from $\pm 3.3\%$ to 3.5%

Q4. How much do you use each of the following types of IEG's evaluation products?

Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products—WBG Staff

By Type of Products, Those Highly Familiar With IEG's Products,* 2011



The frequency of usage of these products is much higher for WBG Staff respondents who are highly familiar with IEG's products in general.

*Subsamples from Q1, between $n=185$ and $n=211$

Q4. How much do you use each of the following types of IEG's evaluation products?

Q1. How familiar are you with IEG's evaluation products?

Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products—WBG Staff

By HR Grade Level, Top 3,* 2011

	All WBG Staff MoE: ±3.3% to 3.5%	GE	GF	GG	GH	GI
Project level evaluations	72	60	72	75	75	57
Sector/thematic evaluations	57	45	53	55	69	71
Country level evaluations	52	41	52	51	58	58
Corporate level evaluations	38	32	32	37	47	71
Annual reports	37	42	40	34	31	42

Respondents with higher HR grade levels are more likely to use sector/thematic and corporate level evaluations than respondents from lower HR grades.

*(4+5+6) on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 means “not at all” and 6 means “a great deal”

Q4. How much do you use each of the following types of IEG's evaluation products?




IEG's Independence


IEG's Independence—Summary of Findings

- Board members rate IEG's overall independence very highly (95%), rating it well ahead of WBG Staff and External respondents on all attributes when looking at Top 3 proportions. IEG's perceived independence is rated similarly by WBG Staff and External respondents.
- Within the WBG Staff, field-office based respondents rate IEG's overall independence more highly than those who are HQ-based (90% vs 80%). Respondents with lower HR grade levels tend to rate IEG's overall independence more favourably than those with higher HR grades.
- The more satisfied Staff respondents are on average with IEG's products, the more highly they rate IEG's overall independence.
- Staff respondents who use annual reports tend to give higher ratings to IEG's perceived overall independence.

By Attribute of Independence, "Very High" and "High,"* by Sample Group, 2011



MoE for WBG Staff ranges from $\pm 3.4\%$ to 3.5%




* (5+6) on a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 means "very low" and 6 means "very high"

† Sample sizes for the "Overall independence" chart are the averages of sample sizes of the four attributes, and are reported as indicator only.

IEG's Independence

Overall Independence* by Level of Satisfaction with IEG's Products** WBG Staff vs External vs Board, 2011



MoE for all WBG Staff s: 3.4%

*Average of four independence attributes

**Subsample: those who are highly satisfied on average with the IEG's products they rated in Q8. Note that all sample sizes shown above are the averages of sample sizes of the four attributes, and are reported as indicators only.

Q3. How would you rate IEG's independence based on the following criteria?


Q8. For each of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.

IEG's Independence—WBG Staff

Overall Independence,* by Levels of Familiarity and Satisfaction with IEG's Products, 2011


Overall independence based on familiarity with IEG's products

■ 6-Very high ■ 5-High ■ 4-Moderately high



Overall independence based on satisfaction with IEG's rated products

■ 6-Very high ■ 5-High ■ 4-Moderately high



*Average of four independence attributes

Note that all sample sizes shown above are the averages of sample sizes of the four attributes, and are reported as indicators only.

MoE for all WBG Staff: ±3.4%


Q3. How would you rate IEG's independence based on the following criteria?

Q1. How familiar are you with IEG's evaluation products?

Q8. For **each** of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.

IEG's Independence—WBG Staff

Overall Independence,* by Organization, Office Location, and HR Grade Level, 2011




*Average of four independence attributes

†This sample size is the average of sample sizes of the four attributes, and is reported as an indicator only.

Q3. How would you rate IEG's independence based on the following criteria?

IEG's Independence—WBG Staff

Overall Independence,* by Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products,** 2011



*Average of four independence attributes

**Subsample: those who use IEG's products "a great deal" or "frequently" in Q4.


Note that all sample sizes shown above are the averages of sample sizes of the four attributes, and are reported as indicators only.

Q3. How would you rate IEG's independence based on the following criteria?

Q4. How much do you use each of the following types of IEG's evaluation products?

IEG's Independence—External

Overall Independence,* International Organization vs NGO vs Government, 2011



*Average of four independence attributes

†This sample size is the average of sample sizes of the four attributes, and is reported as an indicator only.

Q3. How would you rate IEG's independence based on the following criteria?




Impact of IEG

- Board members are more likely than External respondents or WBG Staff to consider IEG's impact on WBG's development effectiveness to be important (86%, vs 79% and 65%, respectively). In contrast, it is External respondents who have the highest opinion of IEG's impact on the broader development community (73%), ahead of Board and Staff respondents (68% and 53%, respectively).
- Within WBG Staff, respondents from field offices are more likely than respondents from HQ to consider IEG impactful. With regard to job grades, the more highly placed respondents are less likely than others to consider IEG's impact on WBG's development effectiveness as great.
- The perceived impact of IEG is correlated to the degree of satisfaction respondents report in IEG's products. The more satisfied respondents also consider IEG to be more impactful.
- Among External respondents, those with more familiarity with IEG's products in general consider them to be more impactful than those with little familiarity. External respondents highly familiar with IEG's products in general rate IEG's impact on WBG's development effectiveness much more highly than Staff respondents (85% vs 57%), and the same goes for IEG's impact on broader development community (80% vs 44%).

Impact of IEG on WBG's Effectiveness and Development Community

By Sample Group, 2011




MoE for WBG Staff ranges from $\pm 3.3\%$ to 3.4%

Q6. How would you rate IEG's impact on the following?

Impact of IEG on WBG Effectiveness and Development Community—WBG Staff

By HR Grade Level and by Office Location, 2011




MoE for all WBG Staff ranges from $\pm 3.3\%$ to 3.4%

Q6. How would you rate IEG's impact on the following?

Impact of IEG on Development Community— External

By Category of External Stakeholders, by Region, 2011




Q6. How would you rate IEG's impact on the following? b) Broader development community's effectiveness


Impact of IEG on WBG's Effectiveness and Development Community—WBG Staff

By Level of Satisfaction with IEG's Products, 2011

Impact on WBG's development effectiveness



Impact on broader development community



MoE for all WBG Staff ranges from $\pm 3.3\%$ to 3.4%


Q6. How would you rate IEG's impact on the following?

33 Q8. For **each** of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.


Impact of IEG on WBG's Effectiveness and Development Community—WBG Staff

By Frequency of Usage of IEG's Products,* 2011

Impact on WBG's development effectiveness



Impact on broader development community




*Subsample: those who use IEG's products "a great deal" or "frequently" in Q4.

Q6. How would you rate IEG's impact on the following?

34 Q4. How much do you use each of the following types of IEG's evaluation products?

Impact of IEG on WBG's Effectiveness and Development Community—External

By Level of Familiarity with IEG's Products, External vs WBG Staff, 2011



MoE for all WBG Staff ranges from ±3.3% to 3.4%

Q6. How would you rate IEG's impact on the following?


35 Q1. How familiar are you with IEG's evaluation products?



Familiarity and Satisfaction with IEG's Recent Products

Familiarity with IEG's Evaluation Products— WBG Staff


Products Respondents Are Most Familiar With, Total mentions, 2011



Satisfaction with IEG's Evaluation Products— WBG Staff

Best/Worse Rated Products, Satisfaction Means,* 2011

**Global mean
satisfaction**



*On a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 6 means “very satisfied.”


Familiarity with IEG's Evaluation Products— External

Products Respondents Are Most Familiar With, Total Mentions, 2011



Satisfaction with IEG's Evaluation Products— External

Best/Worse Rated Products, Satisfaction Means,* 2011



*On a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 6 means “very satisfied.”

Familiarity and Overall Satisfaction with IEG's Evaluation Products—Board

Products Respondents Are Most Familiar With (Total Mentions in %, $n=39$), and Satisfaction Means for Each of Them,* 2011




*On a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 6 means “very satisfied.”

Q7. IEG has recently completed the following evaluation products. Please let us know which of these you are familiar with. Select up to ten.

Q8. For **each** of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.

Familiarity with IEG's Recent Products


Products Respondents Are Most Familiar With—Recoded by Group of Products
WBG Staff vs External, Total Mentions, 2011



MoE for WBG Staff: $\pm 3.4\%$

Overall Satisfaction with Group of Products

Overall Satisfaction,* by Group of Products, WBG Staff vs External, 2011




*Based on the average rating of all products rated by each respondent within each group of products

Q8. For **each** of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.

Overall Satisfaction with IEG's Recent Products

Overall Satisfaction,* by Sample Group, 2011




External respondents are satisfied with the IEG products they rated (overall satisfaction mean of 5.03), slightly ahead of the Board members (4.95). The overall satisfaction mean of all the products each respondent rated among the WBG Staff is lower—4.49.

*Based on the average rating of all products rated by each respondent.

Q8. For **each** of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.

Overall Satisfaction with IEG's Recent Products— WBG Staff

Overall Satisfaction,* by HR Grade Level and Office Location, 2011




Field-office based respondents are more satisfied overall with IEG's products than HQ-based respondents (4.71 vs 4.24), while overall satisfaction means decrease as respondents' HR grade level gets higher.

*Based on the average rating of all products rated by each respondent

Q8. For **each** of the products listed below, please tell us how satisfied you were overall with the product.

Detailed Satisfaction with IEG's Evaluation Products—WBG Staff

By Attribute of Satisfaction, 2011




WBG Staff appear very well satisfied with the ease of understanding and usefulness of the executive summary (both 88%), very closely followed by the concise presentation of conclusions (87%), and the relevance to their work (86%). They are less satisfied with the process of engagement (75% for Top 3 but only 49% for Top 2).

Sample sizes between $n=600$ and $n=660$
MoE ranges from $\pm 3.6\%$ to 3.8%

Satisfaction with IEG's Evaluation Products

“Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied,”* Selected Attributes, by Sample Group, 2011



MoE ranges from $\pm 3.6\%$ to 3.7%

* $(5+6)$ on a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 6 means “very satisfied”


Q10. How satisfied were you with the following aspects of the evaluation product? b), h), k)



Influence of IEG's Evaluation Products


Influence of IEG's Evaluation Products

“A Great Deal” and “Very Much,”* by Sample Group, 2011



The overall influence of IEG's evaluation products is rated the highest by External respondents (90%), ahead of the Board members (85%). WBG Staff are lagging behind, as 70 percent of them think IEG products are influential.

Overall influence (average frequencies of the five attributes)†




* (5+6) on a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 means “not at all” and 6 means “a great deal”

**For External, the exact wording was “The WBG’s activities in a sector” and “The WBG’s work in a country.”

†Sample sizes for the “Overall influence” chart are the averages of sample sizes of the five attributes, and are reported as indicator only.

Influence of IEG's Evaluation Products—WBG Staff

By Attribute of Influence, WBG Staff, 2011




Sample sizes between $n=638$ and $n=663$
MoE ranges from $\pm 3.6\%$ to 3.7%

†Sample size for the "Overall influence" label is the average of sample sizes of the seven attributes, and is reported as an indicator only.

Q11. To what extent has this evaluation product improved your understanding of the following?

Influence of IEG's Evaluation Products—WBG Staff

Overall Influence,* by Organization, Office Location, and HR Grade Level, 2011



Field-office based respondents are likely to rate IEG products' overall influence more highly than HQ-based respondents (81% vs 59%), while ratings of overall influence decrease as respondents' HR grade level gets higher.

*Average of seven influence attributes

†This sample size is the average of sample sizes of the seven attributes, and is reported as an indicator only.


Influence of IEG's Evaluation Products

Overall Influence,* by Level of Familiarity with IEG's Products, WBG Staff vs External, 2011

Overall influence—WBG Staff

Overall influence—External

■ 6—A great deal ■ 5—Very much ■ 4—Some extent



MoE for all WBG Staff: ±3.6%

*Average of seven influence attributes for WBG Staff, and five for External

Note: all sample sizes in the charts above are the averages of sample sizes of the seven and five attributes, and are reported as indicators only.


Q11. To what extent has this evaluation product improved your understanding of the following?

Influence of IEG's Evaluation Products—External


International Organization vs NGO vs Government, Selected Attributes, 2011

WBG's activities in a sector

■ 6—A great deal ■ 5—Very much ■ 4—Some extent



WBG's work in a country






Use of IEG's Products

Use of IEG's Products—Summary of Findings

- Overall use of IEG's products is greater among Board members (87%) than among External (72%) and WBG Staff respondents (63%).
- Among WBG Staff, and following the pattern already seen for previous questions, respondents in field offices are more likely to use IEG products overall than HQ-based respondents (72% vs 53%), and the overall use is becoming less important as respondents' HR grade level gets higher.
- The three most frequent uses Staff respondents have for IEG's products are to comment on / make inputs to the work of others (59%), to make the case for a particular course of action, and to inform appraisal or supervision of projects (both 58%). The two least frequent uses they make of IEG's products is to modify on-going operations, and to design new lending operations (both 46%).
- The most frequent use of IEG's products among External respondents is to help them conduct research (85%). External respondents make little use of IEG's reports for journalism (just 48%).

Use of IEG's Products

Overall Use, by Sample Group, 2011




*For External, the “overall use” measure was not asked directly and figures are based on the average frequencies of five different uses. Comparison with the two other sample groups should therefore be made cautiously. Sample sizes range from $n=383$ to $n=490$.

Q12. To what extent did you use the selected IEG evaluation product for the following? a) Overall use

Use of IEG's Evaluations—Board


By Type of Use, 2011



Q12. To what extent did you use the selected IEG evaluation product for the following?

Use of IEG's Evaluations—WBG Staff

By Type of Use, 2011




Sample sizes between $n=533$ and $n=626$
MoE ranges from $\pm 3.7\%$ to 4.1%

Q12. To what extent did you use the selected IEG evaluation product for the following?

Use of IEG's Evaluations—WBG Staff


Overall Use, by HR Grade Level and Office Location, 2011



Q12. To what extent did you use the selected IEG evaluation product for the following? a) Overall use

Use of IEG's Evaluations—WBG Staff

Overall Use, by Level of Familiarity with IEG's Products and by Group of Products, 2011



MoE for all WBG Staff: ±3.7%

Q12. To what extent did you use the selected IEG evaluation product for the following? a) Overall use

Q1. How familiar are you with IEG's evaluation products?

60


Q9. Now, thinking of all the products you are familiar with, please select one evaluation product on which you would like to answer a number of more detailed questions.

Use of IEG's Evaluations—External

By Type of Uses, 2011

6—A great deal 5—Very much 4—Some extent 3 2 1—Not at all

**Top 3
(4+5+6)**






Quality Measures and Use of IEG's Recommendations

Quality Measures of IEG's Recommendations


Overall Quality, WBG Staff vs Board, 2011



Overall, Board members and WBG Staff respondents have very similar levels of satisfaction with the quality of IEG's recommendations (81% vs 80%), but the difference is more visible when looking only at those who are "very satisfied" and "satisfied" (73% vs 56%).

Quality Measures of IEG's Recommendations

WBG Staff, 2011




Looking at detailed measures, IEG's recommendations are mostly praised for their clarity (86%), followed by their degree of coherence (81%).

Sample sizes between $n=554$ and $n=657$
MoE ranges from $\pm 3.6\%$ to 4.0%

Quality Measures of IEG's Recommendations— WBG Staff


Overall Quality, by Organization, Office Location, and HR Grade Level, 2011



Among WBG Staff, respondents in country offices are more satisfied with IEG's overall quality of recommendations than HQ-based respondents (87% vs 70%), and the same is true for respondents with lower HR grade levels compared with those with higher grades.

Quality Measures of IEG's Recommendations— WBG Staff

Overall Quality, by Group of Products, 2011



MoE for all WBG Staff: $\pm 3.6\%$

Q13. How satisfied are you with the recommendations from the IEG evaluation product you selected above based on the following criteria? a) Overall quality




Access to IEG's Products / Ratings of IEG's Outreach

Access to IEG's Products / Ratings of IEG's Outreach—Summary of Findings

- The most common channels used to access IEG's products by WBG Staff respondents are email announcements (63%), followed by consultations during evaluations (37%). Email announcements are also the main access channel used by External respondents (71%), but IEG's website is another major channel for them, at 60 percent—much more frequently used than among the other two audiences. Board members' preferred access is through hard copies of the products (95%).
- IEG's overall outreach and dissemination efforts are rated most highly by Board members respondents (94%), closely by External respondents (93%). WBG Staff ratings are lagging, with 74 percent offering positive ratings, and just over a third (34%) who rate IEG's overall outreach as "effective" or "very effective."
- Among Staff respondents, field office-based staff rate IEG's overall outreach and dissemination efforts more highly than their HQ-based counterparts (78% vs 69%). The two most positively rated types of outreach by Staff respondents are email newsletters/announcements (78%) and IEG's website itself (76%). Ratings are less favourable when it comes to presence in the press (60%), or visibility in modern types of communication such as videos/podcasts or social media, rated as effective by just 52 and 39 percent, respectively.

Access to IEG's Products in General

Total Mentions, by Sample Group, 2011



MoE for WBG Staff: ±3.3%


Access to IEG's Products in General—WBG Staff

Total Mentions, by HR Grade Level and by Office Location, 2011

	All WBG Staff (n=761) MoE: ±3.3%	GE	GF	GG	GH	GI	HQ	FO
Email announcements	63	68	58	64	62	90	62	64
During evaluation consultation	37	18	28	38	57	57	42	33
IEG website	35	39	37	35	30	29	39	31
Hard copies of evaluation products	29	19	18	29	48	57	34	25
IEG events/presentations	18	8	15	20	23	24	29	9
Social media/network	3	3	4	2	3	5	2	3
Videos/interviews/podcasts	2	2	2	3	0	5	2	2

Access to IEG's Products in General—WBG Staff


Total Mentions, By Level of Familiarity with IEG's Products, 2011



MoE for all WBG Staff: ±3.3%

Q15. Now thinking of all the IEG evaluation products you are familiar with, please describe how you access these products?


Overall Outreach, by Sample Group, 2011



Q16. How would you rate IEG's outreach and dissemination efforts in the following areas? i) Overall

IEG's Outreach—WBG Staff

By Type of Outreach, WBG Staff, 2011




Sample sizes between $n=412$ and $n=636$
MoE ranges from $\pm 3.7\%$ to 4.7%

Q16. How would you rate IEG's outreach and dissemination efforts in the following areas?

IEG's Outreach—WBG Staff


Overall Outreach, by Organization, Office Location, and HR Grade Level, 2011



Q16i. How would you rate IEG's outreach and dissemination efforts in the following areas? i) Overall

IEG's Outreach—WBG Staff

By Type of Outreach, Those Highly Familiar with IEG's Products,* 2011



MoE for all WBG Staff ranges from $\pm 3.7\%$ to 4.7%

*Subsamples from Q1, between $n=103$ and $n=176$

Q16. How would you rate IEG's outreach and dissemination efforts in the following areas?

GlobeScan's mission is to be the world's centre of excellence for global public opinion, customer, and stakeholder research, and for evidence-based strategic counsel.

We deliver research-based insight to companies, governments, multilaterals, and NGOs in pursuit of a prosperous and sustainable world.

www.GlobeScan.com

London . San Francisco . Toronto