

IV. Questionnaires

Contents	Page
I. Overview of the Interview Process.....	1
II. Questionnaire for Country Authorities.....	2
III. Questionnaire for Academics/Think Tanks	3
IV. Questionnaire for International Organizations	4
V. Questionnaire for IMF Staff—Area departments	5
VI. Questionnaire for IMF Staff—Functional	6
VII. Questionnaire for Departments—Research Management: Organization, Selection, and Budgeting	7
VIII. Questionnaire for Former IMF Research Directors	9

I. OVERVIEW OF THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

This background document describes the process followed to organize the interviews conducted to gather information on the relevance, utilization, and technical quality of IMF research. In particular, it explains the selection of interviewees, presents the templates used to guide the interviews, and describes how these templates were developed and utilized. The evaluation team conducted more than 350 interviews of authorities, staff, and other stakeholders. Most interviews were semi-structured in that a predetermined questionnaire was used to guide the conversation, but was not rigidly followed. A few of the initial interviews were open and were used to develop the questionnaires.

Minutes for each interview were filed and the results tabulated along the main dimension of relevance, utilization, and quality used for the evaluation. This tabulation was used to quantify results, and allowed to triangulate against the results obtained from the survey and peer reviews.

Country authorities. As part of its assessment of relevance and utilization to country authorities, the evaluation interviewed more than 100 officials in 38 countries. Countries were selected to include a representative sample by income levels, i.e., advanced, emerging market, and ECF-eligible economies. The sample included: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan*, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Russia, Saudi Arabia*, Senegal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, the United States, Vietnam, and Zambia. A standardized questionnaire was used for interviews of country authorities, with questions targeting different dimensions of the evaluation, mainly on relevance and utilization of IMF research. The evaluation team sent copies of the questionnaires to the country authorities, and in most cases they arranged the individual interviewees.

IMF staff. As part of the assessment of relevance to and utilization to IMF staff, the evaluation interviewed about 100 economists, including where possible one or two economists who had worked in each country for which authorities were interviewed and others who were randomly selected across area and functional departments. Slightly different questionnaires were used in interviews with staff in area and functional departments, however, and views were sought on relevance, utilization, quality, and management. In addition, interviews were conducted with senior managers and budget managers. These questionnaires focused on management issues such as resource management and incentives.

Other stakeholders. The evaluation interviewed more than 150 external researchers, including from think tanks, other international organizations, and academics during field visits. Modified questionnaires were prepared for this purpose. Once again, the questionnaires contained questions on all dimensions of the evaluation but with some difference in focus.

*IEO staff met with Board members in their capacity as former country officials.

Current and Former Research Directors. The evaluation interviewed the current Director of Research and three former Directors of Research. A standardized questionnaire was used, focusing on the goals of research at the IMF, technical quality, and management.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COUNTRY AUTHORITIES

IMF's principal research outputs include: Selected issues papers (SIPs), working papers (WPs), external publications (including IMF Staff Papers) and analytical work embodied in the *World Economic Outlook (WEO)*, the *Global Financial Stability Report (GFSR)*, and *Regional Economic Outlook (REO)*.

RELEVANCE

1. Are you familiar with the research conducted at the IMF?
2. Is the analytical work associated with Article IV and IMF programs in tune with your country's needs and priorities?

UTILIZATION

3. Do you have easy access to IMF research?
4. What IMF research output do you use the most? Has this changed over time?
5. Are there areas where you believe that IMF research has had an impact on research or policy-making in your country? In general? Any specific IMF output?

QUALITY

6. What is the overall quality of IMF research? Has it improved over time? Does it reflect alternative perspectives or is it driven by pre-set policy prescriptions?
7. How does the quality of IMF research compare to research conducted by other international organizations, national agencies, and leading research universities?

MANAGEMENT

8. Is there a consultation process for the selection of topics of IMF research that focus on your country? Have you been involved in this process?
9. Has there been any coordination or collaboration between your country and the IMF in research?

LOOKING FORWARD

10. Do you have any suggestions that would improve the relevance, dissemination, utilization, and impact of IMF research?

III. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ACADEMICS/THINK TANKS

The IEO is grateful for your views on the questions below as part of its study on ***Research at the IMF***. As inputs into the evaluation of IMF research (1999–2008), the IEO is requesting the views of academics/think tanks concerning the relevance, utilization, quality, and other aspects of the IMF's principal research outputs. These outputs include:

- Selected issues papers (SIPs) and working papers (WPs);
- Occasional papers (OPs);
- External publications (including *IMF Staff Papers*); and
- Analytical work embodied in the *World Economic Outlook (WEO)*, the *Global Financial Stability Report (GFSR)*, and the *Regional Economic Outlook (REO)*.

RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION

1. Are you familiar with the research conducted at the IMF? How frequently do you refer to it? What outputs do you use the most?
2. What is the value-added of IMF research? In what areas has it made a contribution?
3. Are there important topics that have not been sufficiently covered by IMF research?
4. Do you have easy access to IMF research? Are you able to download the research outputs from the website? Do you have any specific recommendations to improve the dissemination of IMF research?

QUALITY

5. How do you rate the overall quality of IMF research? Has the quality of research changed over time?
6. How does the quality of IMF research compare to research conducted by other international organizations, national agencies, and leading research universities?
7. Do you think IMF research employs a range of methods, and more importantly, is it open to different ideas?

MANAGEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8. Is the mix of research topics covered by the IMF appropriate? That is, is there the right balance between different types of research, such as empirical versus theoretical, country-specific versus cross-country, and advanced and emerging market economy versus developing country?
9. Should the IMF engage in basic research that does not have immediate policy application?
10. Do you have any suggestions that would improve the relevance, utilization and impact of IMF research?

IV. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

As inputs into the evaluation of IMF research (1999–2008), the IEO is requesting the views of international organizations concerning the relevance, utilization, quality, and management of the IMF's research outputs. These outputs include:

- Selected issues papers (SIPs) and working papers (WPs);
- Occasional papers (OPs);
- External publications (including *IMF Staff Papers*)
- Analytical work embodied in the *World Economic Outlook (WEO)*, the *Global Financial Stability Report (GFSR)*, and *Regional Economic Outlook (REO)*.

RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION

1. Are you familiar with the research conducted at the IMF? How frequently do you refer to it? What outputs do you use the most?
2. In your view, how relevant is IMF research in informing its policy advice? What is the value-added of IMF research? In what areas has it made a contribution?

QUALITY

3. How does the quality of IMF research compare to research conducted by other international organizations, national agencies, and leading research universities?
4. Do you think that the quality of IMF research has improved over time? Worsened? Is it now more useful than in the past?
5. Do you think IMF research employs a range of methods? Is it open to different ideas? Do you believe that IMF research is biased in any way?

MANAGEMENT

6. Is the mix of research topics covered by the IMF appropriate? That is, is there the right balance between different types of research, such as empirical versus theoretical, country-specific versus cross-country, and advanced and emerging market economy versus developing country?
7. How could the IMF improve the dissemination of its research outputs?

V. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IMF STAFF—AREA DEPARTMENTS

The IEO is grateful for your views on the questions below as part of its study on *Research at the IMF* during 1999–2008. The IMF’s principal research outputs include: Selected issues papers (SIPs), working papers (WPs), external publications (including *IMF Staff Papers*) and analytical work embodied in the *World Economic Outlook (WEO)*, the *Global Financial Stability Report (GFSR)*, and the *Regional Economic Outlook (REO)*.

RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION

1. What IMF research, including research on macro-financial linkages, do you use in your own surveillance work, policy work, and/or research? In what way have you used it (e.g., reading, imitating analysis, as an example for the authorities)?
2. How well does the research carried out by the Research department meet the needs of your work? How about research work prepared by other functional departments? Or in area departments?
3. Is the coverage of topics adequate? Do they study the issues that are most relevant for your work? Do you believe country authorities are interested in this research?
4. Do you believe that IMF staff is encouraged to align the results of their research with IMF views? Do you know of any examples of IMF research whose results are contrary to IMF views?

MANAGEMENT

5. How are research priorities set in your department? And how do you think they should be set?
6. What do you think about the technical quality of SIPs? WPs? And do you think there is adequate review of WPs? SIPs?
7. In the annual review process, do you think that research is recognized and rewarded? Should it be?
8. Are there gaps in research that need to be addressed?

CONCLUSION

9. Do you have any suggestions that would improve the relevance, dissemination, utilization and impact of IMF research?

VI. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IMF STAFF—FUNCTIONAL

The IEO is grateful for your views on the questions below as part of its study on *Research at the IMF* during 1999–2008. The IMF’s principal research outputs include: Selected issues papers (SIPs), working papers (WPs), external publications (including *IMF Staff Papers*) and analytical work embodied in the *World Economic Outlook (WEO)*, the *Global Financial Stability Report (GFSR)*, and the *Regional Economic Outlook (REO)*.

RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION

1. What IMF research, do you use in your operational work, and/or research? In what way have you used it?
2. Do you engage in research related to macro-financial linkages? If so, please describe.
3. How well does the research carried out by the Research department meet the needs of your work? How about research work prepared by other functional departments? Or in area departments?
4. Do you believe that IMF staff is encouraged to align the results of their research with IMF views? Do you know of any examples of IMF research whose results are contrary to IMF views?

MANAGEMENT

5. How are research priorities set in your department? And how do you think they should be set?
6. What do you think about the technical quality of SIPs? WPs? And do you think there is adequate review of WPs? SIPs?
7. In the annual review process, do you think that research is recognized and rewarded? Should it be?
8. Are there gaps in research that need to be addressed?

CONCLUSION

9. Do you have any suggestions that would improve the relevance, dissemination, utilization and impact of IMF research?

VII. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEPARTMENTS— RESEARCH MANAGEMENT: ORGANIZATION, SELECTION, AND BUDGETING

CONTEXT

Summary of goals for IEO evaluation of Fund research: relevance and utilization; technical quality; and management of research; the period covered is 1999–2008.

The questions below are intended to look how research is managed in your department: how priorities are set, topics selected, resources are allocated and used, and how research is evaluated; in addition, some of the questions document follow-up to the recommendations of the Mishkin report; not all of the questions may be applicable to your department.

Research is defined broadly; it includes publications in academic journals, books and conference volumes, *IMF Staff Papers*, the analytical chapters of the *WEO*, *REOs*, and *GFSR*, selected issues papers, working papers, occasional papers, and policy discussion papers; in addition, functional departments undertake research in support of technical assistance and external training.

PLANNING

In general, is research in your department planned in a formal, proactive fashion or does it evolve more so in a reactive fashion with work demands over the course of the year? Specifically, how are research priorities set by your department? Are there written descriptions or guidelines for this?

Describe the process for deciding on what research is undertaken in your department and how it is prioritized, including discussions between and among the immediate office and divisions. Is Fund management and other departments involved in setting your research program, and, if so, are they involved in a formal, regular fashion or on an informal, ad hoc basis? Is there coordination across departments in deciding on research activities? If there is coordination, how so, and if not, why not? Does the Executive Board influence your research agenda? Are there written descriptions or guidelines?

Do you collaborate on research projects with the World Bank, other international organizations, or government departments? If so, when is this done?

INCENTIVES

In the forward-looking part of APRs are specific research activities identified for staff? Are staff members formally or notionally expected to devote a particular share of their time to research? Is all research demand-driven or is there some scope for supply-driven work? What incentives are provided to do research? Good marks in APRs? Is adequate time provided to staff to improve or update their knowledge and skills?

REVIEW

Describe how your department reviews and assesses internal research outputs, be it by guidance, comments, workshops, etc.

Describe how your department reviews and assesses research outputs from other departments, e.g., research papers, selected issues papers, the *GFSR*, the *WEO*, etc.

Describe any formal internal or external assessments of your department's research activities since 2000.

BUDGETING

In the preparation of your budget do you allocate specific amounts of resources to research? Is there monitoring of resource use during the year and ex post accounting for its use?

Do you use the TRS to plan and monitor staff time devoted to research? Do you use TIMS for travel related to research?

How much flexibility is there to change research activities during the course of the year? How quickly can resources be redirected to new research topics that become relevant during the year? Do you use regular staff and/or consultants in these circumstances?

MISCELLANEOUS

Does your staff make presentations on research to management and the Executive Board?

Does your department have a practice, formal or otherwise, of determining which staff is named as the contributors to research products?

Do you have enough flexibility in recruiting researchers; in particular, do you have enough flexibility to hire outside EP recruitment?

Are you able to staff and retain the research assistants/officers that you need for your work? If not, what are the constraints or impediments?

What are your department's practices with respect to outreach for your research, including departmental and Fund-wide efforts?