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Abstract
Jordan Travis Radke
Promoting the Human Development Model: Transforming Research into a Promotional Tool
(Under the direction of Ted Mouw)

Diffusion scholars have established that supranational organizations play a key role in disseminating international development norms, yet leave unexamined how they promote such norms. In a case study of the United Nation Development Programme, I coded 40 organizational documents to analyze the UNDP’s discourse and practices around the promotion of the “human development” (HD) model. I found that the UNDP’s primary promotional strategy is to support HD research worldwide, resulting in hundreds of “reports;” the process and products of this research are intended to diffuse the model and consequently supplant the reigning model of economic development. In short, the UNDP not only uses research as a tool to investigate, but as one to promote a cultural, normative argument about the appropriate goals of international development. This case study contributes to theories of diffusion by deepening understanding of promotional strategies, suggesting that one such strategy is the use of promotional research.
To Keith, who keeps me grounded.
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It is true that sometimes the change in the fashions of thinking about development appears like a comedy of errors, a lurching of one fad to another, a wild goose chase. Economic growth, employment creation, jobs and justice, redistribution with growth, basic needs, bottom-up development, participatory development, sustainable development, market-friendly development, development as liberation, as liberalization, as freedom, human development, thus goes the carousel of the slogans.


Over the past century, theories of development have flashed across public consciousness, the popularity of each theory waning along with the creation of a new and improved replacement. Each of these abstract cultural models redefines the appropriate ends and means of “development,” articulating diverse and often conflicting understandings of what constitutes a “developed” nation. For economic growth, a nation’s goal is to increase economic activity and incomes. For basic needs, a nation should expand access to goods and services to deprived groups. For human capital formation, a nation should increase the productivity of its citizens. These models provide nations with stylized development formulas – address this issue, combat this problem of “underdevelopment,” and you will develop. As the criteria of development shifts, so too do ideas of who is most developed; new models construct and deconstruct categories of developed and undeveloped nations.

How do these theories of development come into being? Why do some theories increase in popularity while others fade from the story – and who is behind it all? Among scholars of diffusion – those who study the flow of ideas and practices (for example, behaviors, strategies, beliefs, technologies, policies) across a social system – those who adopt a “world culture” approach suggest that these models of development are created at the
global level and then adopted by nation-states (Meyer et al. 1997). International bodies—such as the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, United Nations, and various international associations and NGOs—have facilitated the creation of a culture that exists at a global, rather than a national, level; these organizations effectively serve as a factory that manufactures globally-defined national goals and the means to achieve those goals (Dobbin et al. 2007: 451; Meyer et al. 1997: 163). After these models are constructed by these “expert epistemic communities and international organizations,” they weave their way into the public imagination, achieving acceptance as a shared construct and gaining power as a global norm (Dobbin et al. 2007: 449; Meyer et al. 1997).

Because there is no single world power to impose one model of development over another, several variants of current models can co-exist with one another and with stubborn remnants of previously influential models (Meyer et al. 1997). “Neoliberalization” exists alongside “sustainable” development, “human” development beside “economic growth,” and vestiges of “basic needs” and “redistribution with growth” continue to survive. These competing conceptual models are aligned with and advocated by the international organizations that created them (Meyer et al. 1997; Boli and Thomas 1997). According to diffusion theorists, these international organizations are often “active champions of central elements of world culture” and “devoted to specific bodies of knowledge and their dissemination” (Meyer et al. 1997: 165-166). In a sense, theories of development vie for existence and authority through their respective institutional proponents.

In the face of competition between diverse global models of development, how do

---

1 Of course, the way nations “adopt” these models differs markedly. Adoption can take place solely on the discursive level, meaning that nations adopt the model without changing underlying practices to align with the model. In the diffusion literature, this separation between the formal acceptance of the model but disregard for accompanying functional changes and outcomes is known as “decoupling” (Meyer et al. 1997).
international organizations strategically promote their models? What methods do global institutional actors employ to facilitate their model’s diffusion and encourage the adoption of their framework over another? While diffusion theory suggests that these models are created and advocated by these global institutions, diffusion scholars have focused their work on understanding the pattern of acceptance – where and why available models are adopted – rather than promotion (Everett 1995). Strang and Soule (1998) note within their review of diffusion studies that much of the research is “adopter-centric” and suggest that those “who construct and disseminate new practices deserve renewed attention” (286). In other words, diffusion studies focus on mechanisms of diffusion and patterns of adoption, but leave the strategies and mechanisms of promotion largely unexamined.

Twenty years ago, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) constructed a model of “human” development with the explicit purpose of replacing income-centered models of economic development. The organization sponsors an extensive research program to achieve this goal, raising and spreading awareness of their model through 712 (to date) global, regional, and national “Human Development Reports” in which the human development approach is applied to the findings of targeted research on a specific theme. The relatively recent creation of this model provides an ideal case through which to explore organizational strategies of promotion, as one can study promotion-in-progress. Through an institutional case study of the UNDP, I show that that one organizational strategy to promote models is to harness the power of research to spread and legitimate ideas.
BACKGROUND: The Emergence of a “Human” Development Model

Beginnings

When Bill Draper became administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1986, he expanded the UNDP’s mission to advocate certain conceptions of development (Murphy 2006). Up to that point, the UNDP had a strong cultural norm of impartiality, making the institution hesitant to advance an agenda or set thematic goals (Murphy 2006). Draper aimed to give the UNDP greater focus, and in the late 1980s looked to outside sources “to get some intellectual support for what we were doing” (Draper in Murphy 2006). For this purpose, in 1988 he approached Mahbub ul Huq, Pakistan's former Planning and Finance Minister, whose intelligence had “deeply impressed” Draper during a visit to Pakistan in the 1980s (Murphy 2006; 153). As Murphy writes,

Draper wanted ul Haq to join the UNDP and he was willing to let the economist decide not only what his job would be, but also on the terms under which he would serve. Ul Haq wanted to write a report, a kind of 'state of the human condition,' and he wanted complete editorial independence - complete intellectual freedom (242).

Thus the global Human Development Report (gHDR) was born, and articulated within it was the newly constructed notion of “human” development (HD) and guidelines for how to measure it. Ul Haq gathered a small report team of “leading development thinkers” to define this concept of human development, and to decide how to assess nations' fulfillment of it (UNDP 2010: 15).

---

2 In some accounts, ul Haq approached Draper (134:38).

3 The initial report team consisted of 5 core consultants: Meghad Desai, Gustav Ranis, Amartya Sen, Frances Stewart, and Paul Streeten (81:1; 153:7).
The Theoretical Model: What is “Human” Development?

The UNDP's team of experts was able to funnel their new approach into a small blue insert in the first gHDR, a box labeled “Box 1.1: Human Development Defined.”

Human development is a process of enlarging people's choices. In principle these choices can be infinite and change over time. But at all levels of development, the three essential ones are for people to lead a long and healthy life, to acquire knowledge and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living … Human development has two sides: the formation of human capabilities - such as improved health, knowledge and skills - and the use people make of their acquired capabilities - for leisure, productive purposes or being active in cultural, social and political affairs … Development must, therefore, be more than just the expansion of income and wealth. Its focus must be people (UNDP 1990: 10).

This succinct definition hints at the core components of the human development approach: the goal of development is to expand people's choices, there is an open-ended list of the particular choices, and one must consider both human capabilities and the use people make of these capabilities.

This definition of development is grounded within the broader movement that conceives of the goals of international development as improved quality of life (QOL) rather than increased standards of living (Stiglitz et al 2010; Latouche 2010). An intellectual current since the 1970s, those that adopt the QOL perspective have sought to expand the measurement and concept of development beyond a focus on income and wealth (Desai 1991). Scholars using this framework have critiqued the widespread use of measures of income to capture a nation’s level of development because this implicitly elevates income from its instrumental role in improving the lives of people to the goal of development. To combat this perceived reductionism, proponents of QOL advocate the use of multiple indicators that incorporate several dimensions of human life and environment to measure...
development; in so doing, they hope to shift the ideal goals of development by re-conceptualizing development as a multidimensional phenomenon (Stiglitz et al. 2010). Human development is clearly informed by this approach.

More specifically, the original formulation of human development was heavily influenced by the Capability Approach (Jolly 2009: 83, 86). As articulated by economist Amartya Sen (and core consultant for the first HDR), this approach defines the goal of development as the expansion of freedom for humans to live the life they choose. For the Capability Approach, a person's advantage is gauged by the extent of their freedoms, including both the range of choices available to a person (their “capabilities”), and whether or not that person is capable of making those choices (their “functionings”) (Sen 1999). Sen speaks of these concepts in terms of vectors; the capability vector is the range of options available to a person, and the vector of functionings contains those life options which he or she has achieved. A person's capability set is thus the number of functionings available to a person – what s/he is actually able to be and do (Srinivasan 1994: 239). Sen argues that freedom is the end and means of development, as freedom leads to well-being (an end) and the fulfillment of freedoms is instrumental (the means) to attaining other freedoms (Sen 1999).

The language of the Capability Approach is embedded within the UNDP's description of human development as “both the process of widening people’s choice and the level of their achieved well being” (UNDP 1990: 10). Additionally, the open-ended nature of the capability vector is mirrored in the multi-dimensionality of human development. For example, the UNDP website declares,

Human development has always been flexible and 'open-ended' with respect to more specific definitions. There can be as many human development dimensions as there
are ways of enlarging people’s choices. The key or priority parameters of human development can evolve over time and vary both across and within countries (UNDP 2011).

Like the Capability Approach, the HD framework does not construct a closed list of ends of development beyond the expansion of the choice to achieve various ends.

The QOL and Capability Approach contributed three main ideas to the HD theoretical model. First, people, not income, are the ends of development. Secondly, expanding individual freedoms is the means to develop. Third, the list of these freedoms is open-ended and malleable.

**The Methodological Model: How is “Human” Development Assessed?**

In his writings, Sen provided no blueprint as to how to measure the extent of freedom for a given community, and the UNDP team was left to construct their own method to measure development as conceptualized as the expansion of choices. They employed a range of different types of measures within the gHDRs to do so, each type serving a particular purpose and meant to supplement one another (Jahan 2002; Fukuda-Parr et al. 2009: 185). These measures may be broadly categorized into two methodological approaches – a “dashboard” and “composite index” approach.

A dashboard approach presents broad sets of indicators to describe, through numbers, a certain domain of life (Stiglitz et al 2010). This approach consolidates information by gathering numbers into a smaller physical space (the statistical table or graph), but does not aggregate information into another number. Because the human development paradigm “claims that … the benefits [of various domains of life] are intrinsically different and each must be valued for its own sake,” the architects of the original gHDR believed the need for a single metric would be misplaced (Jolly 2009: 86). Using several indicators allows for
nuance and complexity, and was thus a good fit for human development's inclusive definition of the goals and obstacles of development. In the HDRs, large swaths of indicators are organized into statistical tables or graphs that highlight various aspects of human development, such as poverty, education, or infrastructure (Jahan 2002). Different reports explore “one or another new dimension, a new side, of the wealth of relationships and current policy choices that determine the degree to which every human being can enjoy a full life – for example, income inequality, poor governance, restrictive gender relations, and over- and under-consumption” (Murphy 2006: 247). These themed reports gather a wealth of information on the causes and consequences of a particular development challenge, using a plethora of different statistics to illustrate various aspects of the issue. The amount of information used to “measure” human development is thus extensive and seemingly limitless, given the expansive and open-ended nature of the human development concept.

In a composite index approach, information relevant to a multidimensional phenomenon is simplified into a single comprehensive or summary measure (Stiglitz et al 2010). Indicators of each component dimension are selected, standardized to the same metric, and aggregated into a single number. The central composite index within the gHDR is the Human Development Index (HDI), which merges indicators of knowledge, health, and income, which are argued to be “key” capabilities because they are “universally valued” and “basic to life” (Fukuda-Parr 2009: 97-98). Knowledge is calculated using mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling (based on current enrollment); a long and healthy life is equated with life expectancy at birth; and a decent standard of living is computed by gross national income (GNI) per capita (UNDP 2010: 15). Given that there is no “common

---

4 Until 2010, knowledge was calculated using adult literacy rates and gross enrollment ratios, and income was calculated using real GDP per capita ($PPP) (UNDP 2010: 15).
currency for measuring socioeconomic progress,” the three dimensions were standardized by setting maximum and minimum values and converting values to a point between 0 and 1 which could then be aggregated (ul Haq1998: 47). Regardless of the theme of the report, on each page nations are ranked by HDI and classified into “high,” “medium,” and “low” human development. While more composite indices have been developed to compliment the HDI as time has progressed, the HDI is undoubtedly the most central index to the reports and the only measure by which nations’ are ranked (Fukuda-Parr et al 2009: 185).
LITERATURE REVIEW:

The Academic Response to the Human Development Model

The UNDP’s human development model has inspired a substantial academic response, with researchers focusing on critiquing the validity of the model. Scholars have responded to human development, and the HDI in particular, as if the UNDP were engaged in a scientific project to accumulate knowledge about development. The topics these scholars have studied flow naturally from this presumption – to assess the construct validity of human development measures, the goodness-of-fit between the conceptual and methodological model, and generally how well the model reflects reality.

This literature has coalesced around three central issues. First, studies have addressed to what extent human development measures provide “new” information about development that is not captured by “old” measures. These scholars have generally argued that the HDI, specifically, offers nothing new to our understanding of development (McGillivray 1991; McGillivray and White 1993; Srinivasan 1994). Second, studies have assessed to what extent the HDI adequately represents the reality of the dimensions it intends to measure – knowledge, a long and healthy life, and standards of living. In this area, several technical critiques of the construction or underlying data of the HDI have been published (Trabold-Nubler 1991; Narayana 2009; McGillivray and White 1993; Sagar and Najam 1998; Despotis 2005; Srinivasan 1994). To cope with the alleged flaws of the index, many scholars present a modified human development index (Noorbakhsh 1998; Trabold-Nubler 1991; Morse 2003; Despotis 2005; Lind 1992). Third, studies have assessed to what extent the HDI can serve as
a proxy for human development dimensions beyond education, income, and health. Many scholars argue that the HDI does not meaningfully capture the reality of other dimensions and suggest the incorporation of more dimensions (Trabold-Nubler 1991; Gustav et al. 2006), including for example: inequality (Sagar and Najam 1998), sustainability (Neumayer 2001 and 2007); and environmental destruction (De la Vega and Urrutia 2001).

The biggest assumption of this literature, seen as so obvious that it is simply taken for granted, is that the UNDP's sole purpose in creating the human development model is to better understand development. For example, Sagar and Najam (1998) conclude their critical review of the HDI in writing, "Any attempt to understand the state of the world – which is what the HDI purports to do – is only as good as its ability to reflect the realities of the world. The acid test of the HDI lies in whether the image of the world it presents fits with what we actually see around us" (252). The final remark of Hopkin’s (1991) evaluation of the Human Development Reports also concludes, “…does the new UNDP report take us any further in our understanding of human development?” (1473). In this viewpoint, the UNDP has offered the model of human development as an alternative framework through which to understand the reality of development.

**Contribution of the World Culture Framework**

Although scholars thus far have studied human development as an academic project, in actuality human development is neither an explanatory nor a causal model, but a *cultural* model. The theory proposes new norms of development – new definitions, measures, understandings of what nations *should* do, and what *should* constitute different levels of development. World culture literature suggests that international organizations such as the UNDP are “carriers” of cultural models and consequently set global norms surrounding
issues such as human rights, development, education or environmental standards (Meyer et al. 1997; Suarez 2007). These models are normative and prescriptive, not meant simply to understand the world but rather to change it in a particular way.

Moreover, world culture literature suggests that international organizations are not simply disinterested suppliers of global norms, but rather strategic actors that are “centrally involved” in the “promotion of world-cultural principles” (Boli and Thomas 1997; Meyer et al. 1997). Empirical studies confirm the importance of international organizations in facilitating the diffusion of particular models, demonstrating for example the importance of the International Labor Organization (ILO) in setting welfare standards (Strang and Chang 1993); the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in spreading antidiscrimination policies in education (McNeely 1995); and the impact of international NGO density on “third world” education (Schafer 2007).

Thus far, scholars studying human development have focused on critiquing the model itself, divorcing the model from the motives and purpose of the organization that created it. From a world culture framework, this focus misses the interesting part of the story as it ignores the agenda of the organization behind the idea. This project seeks to address the misplaced focus of human development literature, reinserting agency into the analysis through studying the UNDP’s advocacy of the model.

While our incomplete understanding of the particular case of human development is worthy of study in its own right, it also provides insight into a larger process that is understudied in the diffusion literature generally – organizational promotion. The diffusion literature, within which world culture scholarship is one area, is research which seeks to understand the spread of practices or ideas. Within this literature, scholars tend to focus on
the results rather than the origins of the diffusion process, primarily studying the “adopters” of ideas rather than the creators or “innovators” of them. Although the stages of innovation and adoption are conceptually distinct in diffusion theory, in practice scholars tend to subsume innovation within early adoption (Barrett et al. 2010: 1183-1184). For example, in Wejnert’s (2002) review of diffusion scholarship that provides a "conceptual framework of variables influencing the diffusion of innovations," her discussion of characteristics of innovators reveals that by “innovator” she actually means those that are also early adopters (298). Yet innovators that are separate from early adopters, as is the case when international organizations promote world cultural models, do not appear in the review. Additionally, Wejnert (2002) does not discuss the influence of specific methods of promotion – strategies used to attempt to influence potential adopters to adopt a model. Wejnert’s review indicates the scarcity of literature surrounding both innovators as well as methods of promotion.

Much of the diffusion literature’s emphasis on the adoption, rather than promotion, of models is a consequence of the methods used to research diffusion. Diffusion studies most often gather data on where a model has spread and then attempt to retroactively explain the particular pattern of adoption (Everett 1995: 105). As Everett (1995) notes, “Such a rearward orientation to most diffusion studies helps lead them to concentration on successful innovations” (106). This focus on success leads to a lack of understanding of failed diffusion, as well as the full range of successful and unsuccessful attempts to promote a model. To overcome this bias, Everett (1995) recommends that “[a]lternative research approaches to after-the-fact data gathering about how an innovation has diffused should be explored” (106). A focus on those organizations which promote models can fill this gap in understanding, given that research which studies the origins of diffusion can study
promotional methods before they fail or succeed; this knowledge will then enable future researchers to connect these promotional strategies to both failed and successful diffusion, leading to a better understanding of what works and what doesn’t.

Thus far, few studies seek to understand mechanisms of promotion. However, there is a small body of work that looks at “change agents” or “diffusion professionals,” which Barrett et al. (2010) describe as those “with a professional interest in diffusing behaviors that they do not necessarily adopt themselves” (Everett 1995; Barrett et al. 2010: 1186). For example, Abrahamson and Fairchild (1999) look at how discourse from “management-knowledge entrepreneurs” promotes management techniques; Van den Bulte and Lilien (2001) show that the diffusion of the drug tetracycline was influenced heavily by marketing efforts; and Van Dyke et al. (2007) study the way that social movement organizations (SMOs) promotion of labor activism can “successfully generate protest activity among conscience constituents” (207).

While these studies provide initial insight into promotional processes, this type of analysis should be replicated within international organizations given the uniquely influential role of international organizations as constructors of world culture. As mentioned above, research has demonstrated the importance of international organizations in spreading cultural models, but this research does little to illuminate how these organizations do so. As Suarez (2007) summarizes, “Quantitative analysis suggest that these organizations influence the diffusion of many reforms, yet little qualitative evidence exists that the carriers of these models are more than passive vessels” (Suarez 66). In other words, although we know that international organizations influence diffusion, we don't yet know the mechanisms through which they influence.
I have found very few studies that provide insight into the strategies that international organizations specifically use to promote global models. In one of these studies, Barrett et al. (2010) study “export-only diffusion,” when the promoters of an adoption do not in fact adopt the model they promote. One finding of this study is that promotional strategies sponsored by wealthy nations through organizations such as the Population Council and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) – such as conferences, fellowships and funding – were positively correlated with poor nations' adoption of population-control policies during the Cold War (Barrett et al. 2010). In another study, Suarez (2007) researched an online forum provided by the INGO Human Rights Education Associates (HREA) and found that the forum provides a space for professionals to interact and in so doing contributes to the construction and diffusion of human rights education. These studies indicate that organizations specifically employ conferences, fellowships, funding, and online forums as methods to advocate their models. My study will contribute to and build upon this repertoire of promotional methods by expanding the number and type of cases studied.

In short, our understanding of how the UNDP advocates the human development model, as well as how international organizations promote models generally, is incomplete. Thus far, scholarly work on human development studies the abstract model but excludes from the analysis the organization that created and promotes it. Scholarly work that seeks to understand the construction of world culture and diffusion of global models posits that international organizations play a key role in this construction, yet research does not demonstrate the strategies organizations use to do so. The UNDP’s clear alignment with the human development model and explicit desire to promote this framework make it an ideal case to study the promotion of global models by international organizations. In conducting a
case study of the UNDP’s promotion of the human development model, I will contribute to both human development and diffusion literature.
METHODS

Case Selection and General Approach

I conducted an institutional case study of the UNDP from the creation of the human development model in 1990 to present. Case studies are well-suited for theory elaboration, and this project seeks to contribute to theories of diffusion by deepening understanding of strategies of promotion. Like many qualitative projects designed around a case, my work may be generalized to an analytic process rather than a population (Becker 1990). By this, I mean that the UNDP is not meant to be representative of, for example, development organizations or UN agencies or any other category of organizations in which it can be placed. Rather, these findings will provide insight into the process of organizational promotion; the strategies that the UNDP uses to do so are likely found in other organizations seeking to promote their models, regardless of whether or not they belong to the same category of organizations.

I found the UNDP to be an ideal case through which to study organizational strategies of promotion because of the organization’s direct and unambiguous alignment with the human development model. Not only did the UNDP create the model, but according to their Strategic Plan, their “the mission is to support countries to accelerate progress on human development” and the UNDP Evaluation office writes that their “unique contribution among international organizations [is] its promotion of human development in all its dimensions” (165:2; 91:81). In other words, the UNDP did not simply sponsor the conception of human development, but considers this particular understanding of development to be central to their
mission and purpose. The model’s relatively recent birth in 1990 is also well-suited to studying promotion given that promotion tends to occur in the time period after the construction of a model, making it more likely that I would be able to study promotion-in-progress.

**Data**

First, I gathered data on the actual model of human development through UNDP publications, including background information on the foundations, history, and structure of both the theory and measurement of human development. I then looked for institutional practices and infrastructure surrounding the model, discovering these practices to center on the support of a human development research program. Since 1990, the UNDP has supported the production of 712 Human Development Reports (HDRs), reports which summarize research into a specific national, regional, or global problem and then provide policy recommendations based on a human development framework. According to the UNDP Corporate Policy on national human development reports, former UNDP Administrator Mark Malloch Brown writes, “These reports must continue to spread alternative ideas on development …” (88:4). Additionally, the UNDP website concludes that the goal of these reports is to “[put] people back at the centre of the development process in terms of economic debate, policy and advocacy” (91:106). These reports thus seemed to be an outlet through which the UNDP promotes human development, and so I then focused on gathering discourse surrounding these reports specifically.

By using the UNDP website as a portal into UNDP publications, I gathered 40 documents through which to study the discourse surrounding the human development model and reports; these documents were each written by UNDP stuff or consultants to the Human
Development Reports. These texts coalesced into four categories: 1) UNDP Guidelines to report teams which give directions as to how to produce and write HDRs and what should be done with the completed report; 2) Empirical assessments of the “Impact” of HDRs and HD measures, including 409 cited examples of impact in 47 countries, six regions, and on a global level; 3) Texts written by the original architects of the HDRs about the intended purpose of the reports and perceived subjective impact; 4) UNDP-published articles and books about human development research.

With the help of the qualitative analysis program Atlas Ti, I coded all of these texts using an inductive analytic approach. By this, I mean I used an emergent coding scheme that became more refined as I sorted through the data. In coding, I looked for patterns in how the UNDP perceives the purpose and outcomes of the human development model and human development research. I coded both qualitatively, examining how the UNDP discusses human development research, as well as quantitatively, counting how many times the UNDP cites different types of “impacts” of the human development model and research. For this more quantitative analysis of “impact,” I coded only those sections which cited a specific, real-world example of the impact of either HDRs or human development measures (overwhelmingly of the HDI, the flagship measure of the human development model). I categorized these examples inductively, looking for common themes of the types of impact cited. After I finished this initial coding process, I then re-analyzed each example, re-coding those necessary to maintain a consistent coding process from those examples I encountered first in my research to last. This coding scheme is discussed more specifically later in this paper.

---

5 See Appendix One for a Summary of Source Documents.

6 This includes 294 cited examples of HDRs and 115 cited examples of HD measures (primarily the HDI).
When analyzing these coded documents, I kept in mind the following questions: *What was the UNDP’s purpose in creating the human development model and establishing the HDR program? How do HDRs help to diffuse and promote the model of human development, and to what extent is it the UNDP’s intention to use HDRs to do so? How does the UNDP assess and perceive the impact of the HDR program, and what does this tell us about their goals for the research and the model itself?* My analysis developed from patterns in qualitative and quantitative coding.
ANALYSIS

General Findings: Using Research as a Promotional Tool

The discourse surrounding the creation of human development – the purpose for creating the model, as well as its theoretical and methodological construction – demonstrates that the UNDP intended from the very beginning to provide a model of development that would compete with dominant ideas of development. The UNDP sought “their own” model of development, aimed to use this model to supplant notions of development they felt badly modeled what the development process should be, and strategically constructed the human development model to compete with other models.

From the discourse surrounding the human development report it is clear that research into human development is the UNDP's primary strategy through which to promote their model and so redefine development. The organization produces these reports through a decentralized, participatory process in order to get as many academics and development practitioners involved as possible, in effect creating HD experts and advocates. They then ask the creators of the reports to use the reports as a platform on which to raise awareness of the model and teach the human development perspective. The reports are supposed to be used as tools of persuasion – documents which employ the “creative use of statistics to reinforce an argument” – and convince practitioners and the public that the human

7 From this point forward, I will use Atlas Ti codes to cite referenced documents. In these codes, the first number is the Atlas Ti document code, which can be found for each document in the Summary of Source Documents in the appendix. The second number is the number of the coded quote within the referenced document. Using Atlas Ti codes makes the analysis more replicable and verifiable, given that others could locate the evidence from which the analysis is built.
development framework is superior to the economic development framework (153:38). To this end, reports should be written and tailored to a predetermined targeted group in a way that best makes a case for that group. Report teams are then encouraged to conduct communications and outreach campaigns and host events in order to advocate the report's message. In UNDP assessments of the “impact” of their Human Development Reports, the organization primarily seeks evidence for the outcomes of this diffusion and promotion – that the human development model has been adopted – rather than the impact of the information and data produced by the research process. This suggests that a goal of the UNDP for this research is in fact to promote the idea of human development.

**Model Creation: The Strategic Intentions of the UNDP**

From coding surrounding the formation of human development, it is clear that the architects of the model strategically constructed it to compete with and ultimately supplant the dominant model of economic development. These experts designed human development to act as a “counter-offensive against conventional economic growth models, national income accounting, and measuring the 'means' rather than the 'ends' of development” (153:6; 161:12). Accordingly, many of the tenets of human development are defined in contrast to other notions of development (147:6). This is evident in the first gHDR, in which the authors define human development directly through its differences from the approaches of economic growth, human capital formation, human resources development, human welfare, and basic needs (10:15). Human development was designed, specifically, as “an explicit challenge to the reigning paradigm of the late 1980s … commonly known as the Washington Consensus … symbolized then in the World Bank's *World Development Report's* practice of ranking countries by per capita income” (157:15). Human development discourse, in large part, is an
elaborate argument about the merits of human development over the flawed neoliberal approach to economic development (10:2; 152). According to its proponents, the merits of the HD approach are specifically its multidimensionality and its focus on actual human lives (152:13; 135:14).

The discussion surrounding the creation of the HDI is particularly illustrative of the competitive purpose of the model. Although the HDI has since become the most well-known feature of the human development model, the architects of human development were initially hesitant to create a composite measure. Sen, one of members of the original report team, said,

I did not, I must admit, initially see much merit in the HDI itself … I had expressed to Mahbub considerable skepticism about trying to focus on a crude index of this kind, attempting to catch in one single number the complex reality of human development … Why give prominence, it was natural to ask, to a crude summary index … (73: 3).

The original team felt that the concept of human development was too big to be whittled into a single number and didn't want to detract from its complexity. Jahan (2002) describes, however, the impetus behind the eventual decision to construct such a measure:

... the conviction was that GNP dominance could not be broken by a set of tables … a viable alternative that could challenge GNP would have to be a summary measure like the HDI. In fact, the HDI can be seen, in the words of Professor Sen, 'as a deliberately constructed crude measure, offered as a rival to the GNP, an overused and oversold index that Mahbub wanted to supplant.' (73:3).

The creation of the HDI was thus primarily strategic – to replace the GNP with a measure “which is not as blind to the social aspects of human lives” (ul Haq, quoted in 73:3; 134:16). While unable to fully capture the richness of human development, to the UNDP the HDI symbolizes the shift toward an expanded set of criteria used to compare nations' development (134:41,42). Those who constructed the HDI believed that changing the measure of
development performance was a key step in eventually changing the goals of development (161:4).

The HDI has been critiqued extensively since its creation, given the admitted disconnect between the expansiveness of the concept and the simplicity of the measure (134:16,43). Yet, the architects of human development argue that they struck a pragmatic balance between a “statistically pure” measure and one that is “effective both for advocacy and policy-making” (73:3). They argue that composite indices are simple and elegant advocacy tools that allow for quick cross-country comparability (160). In short, the motives of the creators of the HDI were not academic, to accurately statistically capture human development, but rather strategic, to create a symbol of a different conception of development that could compete with the GNP, the symbol of economic development.

**Model Diffusion: Using HDRs to Spread the Concept of Human Development**

From coding surrounding the production of human development reports, including official guidelines for how to do so, UNDP discourse suggests that the organization uses the process and products of research to diffuse the concept of human development. Specifically, the organization uses the process of research to diffuse the model by using decentralized research focusing on regional and national publications, and encouraging report teams to use “participatory” production. By democratizing report production, the UNDP widens the group of experts involved in research and consequently raises awareness of the concept among academics and development practitioners. The UNDP then uses the products of research to diffuse the idea of human development by encouraging report teams to raise awareness of the findings and substantive issues of their reports within the community. Research thus allows the UNDP to take their model public – it produces data and discourse about which to raise
awareness.

**The Original Plan: Global Human Development Reports**

The original research project of the UNDP was a *global* report which the UNDP has commissioned annually since the inaugural report in 1990. The themes of these reports fluctuate from year to year, each one considering a global *obstacle* to development, given that the HD approach is “committed to concentrating on what remains undone” (134:17). The reports measure UN nations' comparative progress toward combating a particular problem or, as Amartya Sen describes, “threats that endanger human well-being and freedom” (159). Report sub-titles (see table) illustrate this thematic focus.

**Table 1. Global HDR Sub-Titles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Concept and Measurement of human development</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Human rights and human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Global Dimensions of Human Development</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Deepening democracy in a fragmented world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>People's Participation</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals: A compact among nations to end human poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Gender and human development</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>International cooperation at a crossroads: Aid trade and security in an unequal world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Human Development to Eradicate Poverty</td>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>Fighting climate change: Human solidarity in a divided world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Consumption for Human Development</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Human mobility and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Globalization with a Human Face</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Pathways to Human Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Each report uses data to tell a story about that year’s theme and then provides policy recommendations based on the human development framework (153:38). The stable core of the reports includes only the HDI rankings and supplementary data on the HDI’s core dimensions; all else changes from year to year.

The methodology used to construct gHDRs – annually fluctuating dimensions and large groups of rotating experts – has effectively widened the group of researchers studying the world through a human development framework. As a UNDP historian notes, “This series of policy applications, this refraction of the core concept into an entire spectrum of relevant policy realms, has required the report's authors constantly to expand the range of experts involved in their production” (59:26). For example, the 2011 report cites the involvement of “some 500 researchers, civil society advocates, development practitioners and policy-makers from around the globe” (UNDP 2011). In addition, consistent with ul Haq’s original insistence of editorial independence, these reports have remained independent publications, a status guaranteed by a special resolution of the General Assembly (159:4). These nominally independent teams, however, are still strongly guided by UNDP instructions and institutions. Commissioning independent reports thus allows the UNDP to involve as many people as possible in the project (as opposed to simply using UNDP staff) but ultimately remain in control of the general direction and framework of the reports.

The democratization of research was an explicit choice of ul Haq, as he did not want to “monopolize human development but to ensure that others too 'owned the concept’” (153:14). Sen explains,

“Mahbub … told the world: 'Here we have a broad framework; if you want something to be included in the list, which may deserve a table in the Human Development Report … [or] be considered for inclusion in one of the indices … tell us what, and explain why it must figure in the accounting. We will listen’” (Sen, 135:13).
This is a recurrent theme in UNDP discourse – the desire to make human development a ground-up movement. The focus on making human development a “shared” concept in effect also helps to spread the concept. Allowing others to “own” or contribute to the framework effectively gives people a stake in the human development concept and heightens the chance that they will adopt the framework. The effect of this democratization and expansion of HD experts, according to a UNDP historian has maintained the “vitality of the larger human development research programme and of the concept itself” (247). Widening the circle of experts involved in global research helps to advance human development, as research requires adoption of the framework and thus produces investment in the idea.

**Regional and National Reports**

For the same reasons that ul Haq wanted to democratize the global report process – the idea that “some office at UNDP headquarters in New York could never be the final word on what should be 'included in the list' of human development concerns” – the UNDP began to support research which applied the human development perspective to the regional, national, and sub-national level (59:25). Since 1992, the UNDP has provided training, funding, and logistical support to independent groups of scholars around the world to produce these regional reports (rHDRs) and national reports (nHDRs). According to the UNDP website, “UNDP Country Offices core funds often provide most of the funding for the preparation of HDRs,” although report teams can seek funding from donors and other UNDP funds (UNDP 2011). While the global reports must achieve international applicability, the regional and national reports can explore “key issues that trigger or obstruct people's freedoms in a given state or region, identify local patterns of inequality and exclusion, and ultimately propose specific and concrete policy options based on this analysis (84:12, 91:81).
The reports are produced mostly by poor and formerly communist nations, and follow no consistent yearly publication pattern (59).

Although the reports are branded with a UN stamp that lends legitimacy and credibility to the report, these reports are “designed and executed by networks of local scholars” rather than UN staff (59:24). Again, the effect of this independence is to further diffuse the idea of human development. Like those who produce the global reports, regional and national report teams are expected to stay within the boundaries of the human development framework, even if allowed to choose the theme of the report. The UNDP’s “Corporate Policy on NHDRs,” prepared in 2000 by the National Human Development Report unit in the HDR Office (HDRO), makes it clear that regional and national teams are expected to thematically and methodologically model the approach of the global reports:

All of the critical dimensions of human development (longevity, knowledge, a decent standard of living, security and participation) as well as the flagship human development index (HDI) should be reflected. It is desirable, although not mandatory, for the NHDRs to address pertinent themes of the global HDR … They should combine techniques that have been tested through the global HDRs with approaches that are more closely attuned to local experience and expectations(88:17, 88:23)

In general, ideas flow from the global to the national & regional reports rather than vice versa (91:39, 87). This discourse indicates that regional and national reports are still intended to advance the human development approach, as found in the concepts and methodologies of the gHDRs and determined by those experts closer to UNDP headquarters (88:8, 145:6).

To ensure that the hundreds of n/rHDRs produced advance the same foundational concept, the human development research agenda has become increasingly bureaucratized and codified with institutions and guidelines created to “support” the n/rHDR teams (91:135). The UNDP created the Human Development Report Office (HDRO) to identify
and disseminate best practices, and added a National Human Development Report (NHDR) unit in 2001 (145:5). The HDRO has written sanctioned guidelines as to how to produce quality reports, including an official UNDP Corporate Policy on NHDRs (2000), an HDR “Toolkit” available online, and “thematic guidelines” for various topics (91:135; 165). The UNDP has created electronic networks, including HDR-Net in 1999 and HDR Stats-Net in 2003, as a means through which development practitioners may share experiences and best practices (91:135). The UNDP sponsors several training courses and forums, and distributes training material through the UNDP website (91:135; 157; 164: 9-10; 165). Additionally, the UNDP has added both incentives and checks to ensure quality work, including the nHDR excellence awards and a review process (91:135). Furthermore, the reports are monitored and reviewed by UNDP country offices (88:39). An extensive bureaucratic infrastructure has arisen around the human development project to ensure that all reports share certain characteristics to promote the same basic framework.

The production of regional and national reports has vastly expanded the reach of the human development project, including both the number of people involved as well as the number of available reports. To date, 712 total reports have been produced, including 21 global reports, 29 regional reports, and 662 national and sub-national reports (UNDP 2011). In 1998, an astounding 80 reports were produced in a single year. National and regional HDRs have been produced in Europe and the CIS (244), Africa (163), Latin America and the Caribbean (129), Asia and the Pacific (98), Arab States (56), Malta (categorized as “other”) (1), and as well as globally. In total, 143 countries have participated in the human development project.
“Participatory” Production

Not only does the UNDP diffuse the human development concept through dispersing report production geographically, but also through directing r/nHDR teams to involve as many people as possible in the production process. One of the UNDP's six “Corporate Principles” of HDRs is “Participatory and Inclusive Preparation” and instructions as to how to involve as many “partners” or “stakeholders” as possible are embedded within various guidelines (126:1; 140:1; 130:1). Examples of such stakeholders in the development process include researchers, experts, journalists, marginalized groups, and the government (129).

Guidelines suggest that the process of choosing a report theme should be participatory (140; 132:3), and that the report team should establish “inclusive partnership mechanisms” such as a policy steering committee, a content advisory committee, a reader's group, a focal point and follow-up group, consultations, and links with other institutional reports (163:3). Additionally, the report team should offer human development training to generally “deepen” participation (140:22).

The reason for such participation is often justified by the ideals of collaboration and consensus, such that the report process helps a country to “jointly articulate a common national vision for the future” or “bringing about a shared and invested vision” (145:31; 162:51). Alongside these proclamations, however, are indications of more pragmatic considerations – people are more likely to adopt or even advocate the human development framework if they were involved in report production. Consider, for example, the following quotes as examples of the way UNDP documents discuss the participatory report process:

Broad participation helps to ensure that relevant issues are addressed, and that there is greater national buy-in of the report’s analysis, findings and recommendations. It also helps in enlarging the number of advocates for the report who can carry key messages and recommendations to policy makers, the media and the public. Most importantly,
broad consultation and participation will help to translate the recommendations into action and support implementation of the response” (130:1, italics mine)

For HDR advocacy to succeed, the people responsible for considering, approving, funding and implementing improved human development policies must be on board from the beginning. Data and recommendations that come across a policy maker’s desk for the first time only after an HDR is published are much less likely to be considered, if even read (136:17, italics mine)

Inclusive consultation broadens analysis and consideration of policy options, and strengthens prospects for the implementation of recommendations (140:3).

In all of these excerpts, the UNDP explicitly acknowledges that a consequence of participatory production is to get people “on board” with the project or create “buy-in” to the HD framework.

Additionally, the UNDP aims to make these research projects self-sustaining such that others continue to do the work of diffusion for the organization. The UNDP calls this transfer or delegation of research as “capacity building.” This term is mentioned fairly often in UNDP documents, but explained vaguely as “Capacity is the ability of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner” (165:29). The capacity to which they refer, however, is specifically the capacity to continue researching and advocating human development. For example, the authors of Measuring Human Development conclude that “HDR teams can target a range of stakeholders for capacity development, helping them strengthen their skills in understanding and using human development data” (136:13). The author of the research paper Influence of Regional, National, and Subnational HDRs expands this capacity building to the political realm, writing that stakeholders involved in the preparation process can develop “skills key to formulating and implementing human development policies” (84:41).

The range of professionals invested in, contributing to, and ultimately promoting the
human development model has mushroomed over the past twenty years. The HDR Toolkit concludes that the HDRs help to advance the human development framework in part by requiring and growing a “robust community of human development professionals” and an HDRO research paper concludes that “the periodic production of HDRs has helped create a core group of human development experts” (145:3; 84:81). These experts and professionals may then generate human development discourse around development problems and solutions (143:3). Research thus creates human development advocates, who may then in turn help spread the human development framework.

*Using HDRs to Raise Awareness of Human Development: Directions from the UNDP*

Not only does the research process help diffuse the idea of human development, but the products of research – the HDRs – help to diffuse the idea as well. Once the reports are finished, the UNDP directs report teams to raise awareness of the findings and issues within the r/nHDR. This publicity and outreach takes the content of the reports public, beyond the realm of the experts and intellectuals involved in report production.

Once the final report is written and printed, the UNDP encourages report teams to raise awareness during four distinct phases – the Pre-Launch, Launch, Dissemination, and Post-Launch Outreach. Each of these phases are intended to extend the impact of the r/nHDRs “beyond policy makers, academics, journalists and NGOs to the public at large” (91:78). Before the official release of the report, report teams are directed to maximize future interest in the report by cultivating media interest to increase press coverage (137:9). In various guidelines, methods are suggested for how to maximize this interest. For example, report teams could hold trainings for journalists, given their role as “important stakeholders in guiding public debate and drawing attention to human development issues” (136:19).
These trainings are intended to ensure that media personnel understand the data and recommendations of the r/nHDR, but also the “larger scope” of human development initiatives (136:22). When the report is set to be released to the public, the UNDP recommends that report teams hold a high-profile event to mark the date. In several documents, the UNDP recommends that a famous person, such as a leading politician or even a sports hero, be asked to attend to generate more press coverage (88:26). For example, in an online discussion in response to a request from UNDP South Africa for dissemination and advocacy tips, a UNDP staff member from Albania suggests,

… recruiting an eminent person for the launch is desirable. If Nelson Mandela won't do it, why not approach, or send the report out to be read by, a few national sports heroes, or famous musicians, and see if any are moved to participate? Are Hugh Masakela or Miriam Makeba (sp?) in SA? International artists passing through on tour? (162:36)

Famous people should be used to promote the reports because they lend “a high profile to the report and the ideas associated with it, thus attracting more media attention and increasing the chances that the report will influence policy” (91:76). Report teams in both the pre-launch and launch phases should strategically attract attention to the report.

Once released to the public, the reports should be widely disseminated (88:26). To facilitate this distribution, the HDR Toolkit recommends that teams consider commercial publication and marketing to increase the availability of the reports and generate awareness beyond what the Toolkit terms “usual suspects” - development professionals already likely to be familiar with the HDRs and human development generally (144:51). Suggested techniques for commercial marketing include such strategies as brochures, direct mailings, advertising, journal reviews of the r/nHDR “preferably by eminent leaders or renowned experts,” and placement in print and online bookstores (144:52). Additionally, the HDR
Toolkit provides detailed instructions on how to ensure that the r/nHDR “pops up in a Web search related to a country, theme, and sub-theme(s)”(144:53).

Beyond distributing the physical report, teams are instructed to design outreach and communications strategies to cater the messages of the report to specific audiences and further spread the word (163). An HDRO staff member participating in a HDR-NET online discussion explains:

KEEP THE MESSAGES ALIVE ALL YEAR . . . What is needed is a strategy that is integral to UNDP's work, that uses the Report as an advocacy and communications tool year-round. The national HD networks are one important strategy for influencing debate, concepts, policies on an ongoing basis. Working with educators and students, with school curriculum is another. Placing stories and articles in the media that draw on NHDR's for solutions to current issues is another. Organizing fora for debate is another. At HDRO, we have several initiatives ... to support the HD "movement" to thrive and grow (144:53).

This ongoing outreach is central to the HDR approach, with “Sustained Follow-Up” comprising one of the six Corporate Principles of the NHDRs (144:3). In other words, report teams should use the reports to generate and detail development “messages,” but recognize that fewer people will read the actual report. Teams should extract the main messages from the report and advertise them. The most direct way to communicate these messages, according to the UNDP, is to publicize within the mainstream media, as “communicating directly with the general public can be a more effective way of promoting human development” than trying to reach them through the “elite groups” of academics or development practitioners (91:78; 88:36). Several UNDP guidelines provide directions on how to create such promotional materials for the media (144:47).

The UNDP Evaluation Report provides several exemplary cases of more creative outreach techniques, including Brazil's strategy of granting awards to journalists for quality
coverage and distributing pre-written articles (91:71, 73). Bolivia’s outreach strategy was mentioned in several UNDP reports as particularly effective; they consulted around 500 people in the production of the report, and then used “caravans, soaps, soap operas, radio and TV programmes, games and street performances ...” to publicize the report (91:72). They produced radio magazines which were aired by 278 radio stations, and as a consequence of this outreach “an impact study found six out of ten rural radio listeners had discussed the HDR findings with friends and families” (84:79). Spreading the messages of the reports, by whatever means necessary, is crucial to the HDR process.

In short, the UNDP instructs regional and country teams to raise awareness of human development concepts and data by actively seeking publicity and wide dissemination. HDRs provide concrete recommendations and findings about which to raise awareness. These guidelines indicate that the organization views their reports as vehicles to publicize the human development model.

*Model Promotion*

From coding of guidelines on how to write HDRs and what to do with the completed reports, UNDP discourse suggests that the organization also uses research to *promote* the idea. By promote, I mean to actively persuade practitioners and the public that the human development framework is the best way to conceive of and approach the development process. This is a step beyond raising awareness or neutrally offering the model as an alternative to economic development. UNDP Bolivia's strategy most succinctly demonstrates the goal of promotion: “The main objectives of our strategy were the following: 1. Promote different currents of opinion towards the human development paradigm. 2. Inform about the findings and central theories present in the NHDR. 3. Facilitate the process of awareness of
the importance to adopt human development concepts in public policy” (162:37). Tellingly, promotion is the first goal in this strategy of promotion, informing, and raising awareness.

This goal to use research as a promotional tool is evident in the UNDP guidelines' emphasis on the principle of “advocacy” within the r/nHDR process. In UNDP discourse, HDR data is seen as a resource upon which to draw to strengthen a particular message – most often, that an issue is a problem that needs to be addressed. The *Human Development Journey* online course, a course created to help development practitioners “understand the key concepts of all the Human Development approach” (165:38) defines this principle of advocacy as:

> the act of supporting or arguing in favour of a cause, policy or idea. It expresses the intent to influence public opinion and societal attitudes or to bring about changes in government, community or institutional policies.... It means putting a problem on the agenda, providing a solution to that problem and building support for acting on both the problem and the solution (165:6).

Advocacy refers to the intentional attempt to include new problems on the development agenda, to raise awareness of that issue and convince the appropriate people (through “targeting” specific audiences) that the issue is a problem worthy of a response (136:1). The UNDP encourages both advocacy surrounding specific issues, and advocacy surrounding the basic concept of human development – making “the development community aware of what Human Development is and how the Human Development approach can be used by all stakeholders” (165:10). Advocacy, then, is the process of using human development reports as persuasive communication, including such activities as the creation of websites, databases, human development networks, curricula, or other methods which allow teams to advocate certain messages using HDR data (136:1, 41).

To effectively advocate these messages, report teams should tailor the message
specifically to a target group. Teams should thus select a target audience before beginning the report process and then construct the reports in the way that is most persuasive, compelling and accessible to that particular audience (140). UNDP guidelines encourage teams to identify a target audience by asking themselves “Who can influence decisions in this area?,” given that “[any] advocacy document seeking to foster change must reach and influence those who have the power to bring about transformation” (140:32, 30). Suggested target audiences include donors, governments, service providers (such as utility providers or city council members), the press, or civil society (such as NGOs or academia) (137:19). Report teams should then cater all messages to that audience in order to “create materials that will provide that constituency with the most powerful advocacy tool” as possible (137:11, 162:46).

To ensure that the targeted audience and the public understand and accept the message of the r/nHDR, the UNDP underscores the importance of making the reports as intellectually accessible and as compelling as possible (80:20, 25). In a thematic guidance note, the authors note that, “Form and presentation, not just content, are an important part of how the message of the report will be received” (130:3). Presentation is so important that one of the six Corporate Principles of the nHDRs is “Flexibility and Creativity,” through which teams are encouraged, for example, to put a “human face” on their argument by using narratives, quotes, traditional wisdom, local stories, or future projections because these are the most appealing and compelling strategies (125:24; 136:37). The purpose of this emphasis on readability and attention-grabbing techniques is nicely summarized in “Advocating for Change with Human Development Data”: “Since communicating key messages persuasively is essential for advocacy, the careful presentation and positioning of data in the report is an
essential exercise” (136:26). HDR data should be used to convince, persuade, and support a central message.

Additionally, UNDP documents discuss the purpose of those communication and outreach strategies discussed earlier as methods to persuade – not just publicize. Tellingly, the principle of “Sustained Follow-Up” if often referred to as simply advocacy (137:21). Additionally, in the Toolkit’s discussion of using marketing techniques they note, “In the case of human development, what is being ‘marketed’ is often awareness, knowledge, and new forms of behavior” (144:9). Outreach campaigns are intended not only to expose people to human development, but convince them to adopt it.

In short, the purpose of HDR research is not merely to collect data on an issue of interest, but to collect data in order to better support advocacy of the “message” that a particular issue is a problem that needs to be addressed. In Measuring Human Development: A Primer, the authors write that the different stages of report preparation “represent just one part of a larger cycle of objective, empirical research to fuel public debate and policy reviews that supports the achievement of … the broader human development goals of a country or region” (136:73). Data collection in this sense is the means to an end – successfully convincing an audience that they should include a particular issue within their development goals.

Model Adoption: The UNDP's Language of “Impact”

UNDP discourse demonstrates that research facilitates the promotion of the human development model, and suggests that the organization recognizes and hopes to harness this power of research. To further explore to what extent promotion is a goal of the UNDP for their research program, rather than a byproduct or side effect, I analyzed discourse
surrounding the impact of the human development reports and HD measures (primarily the HDI), including both subjective perceptions and empirical examples gathered by the UNDP. Because organizations gauge the success of a program against their goals, the way the UNDP talks about the impact (the success) of the HDRs gives insight into what the organization ideally would like the reports to be and do (their goals).

From my codes surrounding “impacts,” I found that that when the UNDP evaluates the impact of their human development project, they primarily seek affirmation that the human development model has been adopted. This adoption is evidenced by the use of various components of the model: for example, definitions, labels, goals, or measures. In UNDP discourse, they seem to associate the “impact” of their HD research program with the extent to which their promotion of the model has been successful, demonstrated through evidence of its adoption. The UNDP’s goal of adoption further demonstrates that the UNDP is using the research process to promote their model – research as an intermediary means – and not just to track the achievement of human development in the world.

Perceived Impact

In codes surrounding the organization's subjective perceptions of impact – claims made without supporting evidence – the UNDP’s focus is on the how well the concept is spreading and to what extent it is being used. The organization perceives their success as related specifically to changing the way the concept of development is discussed and understood.

Most directly, the UNDP considers the reports as having been successful in inserting the broad rubric of human development into national discourse. The UNDP website claims that the HDRs have “introduced the human development concept into national policy
dialogues — not only through human development indicators and policy recommendations, but also through the country-led and country-owned process of consultation, research and report writing” (159:9). The organization views this introduction as having caused a broad redefinition of development itself. The “revolutionary” idea of human development, writes Ponzio in a chapter of Pioneering the Human Development Revolution, has “engendered major change in the understanding and statistical accounting of the process of development” (153.18). The 2010 gHDR, devoted to assessing the influence of the HDRs since 1990, provides clear insight into the organization's claim to redefining development, writing

Twenty years later the conceptual brilliance and continuing relevance of that original human development paradigm are indisputable. It is now almost universally accepted that a country’s success or an individual’s well-being cannot be evaluated by money alone (134:7).

The report authors go on to claim that the reports have “had a profound effect on the way policy-makers, public officials and the news media, as well as economists and other social scientists, view societal advancement” (134:13). In short, the UNDP believes they are shifting conceptions of international development toward the human development framework.

Additionally, the UNDP asserts that they have sparked a discursive “movement.” For example, ul Haq writes in Reflections on Human Development, “From a mere idea, human development is becoming an intellectual movement and a practical strategy” (161:43). In a related claim, the UNDP website asserts that the number of r/nHDRs written provides evidence that the messages and tools of human development “have been embraced by people around the world” (159:6). In this view, the organization has successfully inspired a ground-up movement.
Given that part of the HD model is the view that development goals are malleable and relative to each nation’s current condition and values, the UNDP also considers itself successful in making the development goal-setting process more democratic and participatory. Specifically, the organization views the reports as an outlet through which nations have been able to articulate their own specific development goals. The UNDP claims that the nHDRs “have helped to articulate people’s perceptions and priorities” and “contributed to stronger definitions of national priorities” (159:9; 138:16). The introductory text to the HDR-Net network concludes that HDRs “have inspired a global movement to articulate human development priorities in every region and to mobilize action for policy-making” (162:2). Not only have reports opened space to articulate these priorities, but also have “open[ed] space for democratic debate” to allow for discussion over disagreements in what those priorities should be (140:26). In other words, nHDRs have created a space in which nations can articulate their own priorities apart from or alongside the dominant priority of economic growth; this space enables a more malleable understanding of development that is consistent with the human development framework.

**Documented Impact**

In addition to these broad perceptions of impact, the UNDP has gathered specific cases to provide evidence of the impact of both HDRs and HD measures (particularly the HDI). By analyzing these examples of impact, I could indirectly study potentially unspoken or implicit organizational meanings of the term “impact.” To analyze the relative distribution of types of impact within this discourse, through coding I categorized different cases and then counted the occurrence of each type. This quantitative analysis corroborates the findings of my qualitative analysis of the UNDP’s subjective perceptions of impact. The UNDP’s
examples of impact primarily include cases that demonstrate that the idea of human development is gaining traction within academia, the media, and politics, and is becoming institutionalized within education and the government. Broadly, the UNDP gathers evidence of acceptance of the human development perspective, or that a HD dimension discussed in a report (its theme) has been incorporated as a problem within the development agenda. Thus, not only is promotion a consequence of human development research, but this promotion is also a goal of the UNDP.

**The UNDP's Evaluation of HDR Impact**

The figure below captures the coded distribution of 294 examples of HDR impact.

*Figure 1: Distribution of Coded Examples of HDR Impact*

These citations demonstrate that the human development framework is being discussed, researched, or taught; the term or HD dimensions are being incorporated into national strategies and applied to infrastructure; and the human development framework is affecting
development inputs – policies, programs, and funding. These examples evidence that human development is being adopted nominally, structurally, and functionally.

What is most notable about the following “impacts” is that the vast majority of cases demonstrate little beyond adoption of the framework. If the UNDP’s sole goal were to change development outcomes, few of the following cases would qualify. If the UNDP’s sole goal were to provide new facts and data to our understanding of development, few of the following cases would qualify. If the UNDP’s sole goal were to advance one particular development strategy, few of the following cases would qualify. Only if a goal of the UNDP is to generally promote the human development perspective would those cases in which the term “human development” was mentioned in a speech or taught in a classroom or added to the title of a government agency qualify as an “impact.” These examples evidence a shifting conceptualization of development rather than a particular outcome, enhanced understanding, or successful strategy. While the UNDP likely has multiple goals for their HDRs, this analysis suggests that promotion is a central goal of the project. The following sections will expand on and provide examples of each of the categories above, to illustrate to the reader the types of impacts cited.

Discursive Impacts (82 citations)

Many of the cited impacts within the UNDP's evaluation are discursive impacts that demonstrate the spread of human development ideas. For example, the UNDP claims that an nHDR “helped shaped the public debate” in Argentina (59:3), was used by political parties to prepare their election agenda in Mongolia (71:66), or “steered discussion in community fora” in Thailand (84:62). One UNDP report even cites as an impact of Bosnia & Herzegovina’s
nHDR on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁹ that MDG messages may be found on commercial products “such as bread packaging” (71:119).

Within these discursive impacts, two prominent sub-categories emerge – cases in which the report was cited or referenced or when the report garnered media attention. In the first category, reports are simply referred to by a prominent person or group, or referenced within a document. For example, an impact report includes as an example of the 2004 Afghanistan nHDR impact that President Hamid Karzai “referred to the report’s summary of social development indicators during a presentation to the European Parliament” (71:97). Another example within this category is that the president of Bolivia “praised the national report” (71:112). In the second category, cases of impact include broad media coverage. In a research paper written by a policy analyst in the HDRO, “prominent media coverage” is included as one of six main influences of the HDRs. Exemplary reports in this category generated more than 1,000 news reports (Turkey, 84:74), received “prominent” coverage from news outlets such as Al Jazeera, Le Monde, and the New York Times (Afghanistan, 84:75), and were both covered in 3 television commercials and written about by Thomas Friedman “no fewer than five times” (Arab States, 84:77). As another example, a UNDP Evaluation Office report demonstrates the extensiveness of the intellectual impact of nHDRs in Brazil by writing that an internet search “came up with hundreds of articles by academics and professionals citing 'human development index' and 'Brazil’”, and noting that seven articles had been printed in Brazil's top academic journals. (91:25). HDRs are considered tools to generate discussion about human development, and are considered successful when evidence demonstrates that they have done so.

---

⁹ The Millenium Development Goals are eight development benchmarks, adopted by world leaders at a United Nations conference held in 2000, to be reached by 2015.
Strategy/Agenda Setting (49 citations)

The UNDP Corporate Policy on NHDRs asserts that the reports “are effective tools for the formulation of national development strategies and specific action plans and programmes” (88:11). Accordingly, in the UNDP's assessment of HDR impacts, a frequently cited influence is the incorporation of human development terms into some sort of national strategy or plan. Most directly, the UNDP considers references to the term “human development” in official country plans as examples of influence. For example, in Venezuela, the “social balance” axis of the Economic and Social Plan is defined as “directed to reach and to deepen human development” (37:17). Additionally, India included a human development chapter in its Annual Economic Survey and Plan document (84:44), and Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan and Ukraine's Programme of the Activity of the Cabinet of Ministers each consider human development a “priority area” (71:88; 91:14).

Often, the UNDP claims that the HDRs have impacted various plans and strategies indirectly through the thematic issues and recommendations included in a specific HDR. In this category, nHDRs are successful in putting a new problem on the development agenda – evidence that the UNDP is reshaping the understanding of goals and obstacles to development. For example, UNDP credits their 2002 nHDR on AIDS for the reference to the disease in Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan (71:88). Additionally, Jordan's 2004 nHDR is credited for the emphasis within the country's development plan on reducing poverty and unemployment (71:49). The UNDP claims that recommendations from specific nHDRs were incorporated into Colombia's state development plans (71:31, 91:7), Pakistan's Medium-Term Development Framework (71:69), and Latvia's Declaration of Intended Initiatives (71:58). Often, UNDP's claim to influence is more nebulous, for instance as in cases that information from an nHDR “fed into” a national plan (Colombia 71:35) or was
“incorporated” into a strategy (Mongolia 71:65; 84:18). In a related category, some cases include claims that the report was used as a “basis” for a strategy (Bhutan 59:15; Afghanistan 84:45) or that the reports helped “shape” a strategy (Bolivia 71:24). Lastly, several examples assert that nHDRs have influenced several country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), which nations are required to prepare to be considered for debt relief from the World Bank and IMF (Bosnia and Herzegovina 71:26, 84:50; El Salvador 71:38, 84:50; Tanzania 91:15; Tajikstan 84:42).

Research (48 citations)

Several examples of impact relate specifically to how human development research, through the n/rHDRs, has built up the capacity of that nation to in turn produce more reports and conduct more research. These types of impacts break down into three general categories – *new research* is conducted or funded as a result of the r/nHDR, *innovation* of new research measures or concepts, and generally building that nation or region’s *capacity* to conduct human development research. For example, an impact of the 2005 El Salvador nHDR was that the European Commission financed the project “Human Development and Migration” to enhance analysis into migration issues and “improve the understanding of migration among researchers, academics and opinion leaders” (84:66). One of the impacts of the 2003 Colombian nHDR was an HDI corrected for violence – the creation of this innovative measure was seen as an impact in and of itself (84:31). In Slovakia, one impact of the nHDR was that the “[w]ork on the NHDR has also helped expand the scope of statistical surveys” (91:13). These impacts demonstrate that the UNDP is shaping the way research is conducted in various locales – that researchers are adopting the HD framework or more fully investigating HD issues. All of these cases provide evidence that the UNDP has impacted the
academic community's conceptualization of development.

*Educational Impacts (42 Citations)*

Many citations are simply programs and events that provide education on the human development perspective. Some of these educational programs are single events meant for the general public, while others include more specialized, longer-term academic courses or on-the-job training sessions. These programs use HDRs as “vehicle[s] to introduce human development” and are seen by the UNDP as “allowing the development of national expertise familiar with the approach, which facilitates the subsequent application of human development to policy analysis and policy making” (84:83). The UNDP describes this education as a way to prepare the public to “accept the issues raised by NHDRs”:

Given that the human development framework is not the dominant intellectual framework, getting people to accept the issues raised by NHDRs requires that they be familiar with the basic concepts of human development. Our studies show that NHDRs are more effective when society is more capable of understanding and debating basic human development-related ideas. Such capacity can be enhanced through education and information programmes targeted at different groups, including academics, policy makers, journalists, students and the general public (91:105).

From the UNDP’s perspective, educational programs lay the necessary groundwork to both generate experts and convert the public to the human development model. Within UNDP impact reports, those educational programs cited may be grouped into these three broad categories: Incorporation into Schools, Educational Events, and Training Programs (in order of number of citations).

*Incorporation into Schools.* The writers of the nHDR evaluation conclude, “Getting human development products into the educational system can be a very effective way of spreading human development ideas over the long term” (91:104). Many of these educational programs center on teaching the general human development framework. For example,
UNDP impact reports cite instances in which human development has the general basis of an entire degree (84:95). For example, according to the UNDP, Russia now offers four MBA programs in human development (59:7). In Latin America, a distance-learning Human Development Virtual School was created in 2001, in cooperation with four regional universities, which had trained 2500 people as of 2000 (84:91).

Often, the UNDP cites as evidence of influence that human development concepts have been incorporated into the curriculum at secondary schools and universities, as well as postgraduate and post-school training (91:5; 91:10). For example, human development courses are now taught at four universities in India (91:10), Yerevan University in Armenia (84:88, 91:2), Sophia University in Bulgaria (84:88, 91:5), universities in Kazakhstan (91:11), and Military academies in Argentina (84:93, 94). At the time of this writing, the UNDP website includes a list of 29 academic courses on human development offered around the world (164:7). The reports are also used as curricula in various settings – for example, in high schools in Armenia (76:76), Argentina (84:93), and Botswana (84:60), and in universities in the Arab States (84:86). In other cases, HDRs have been used, more broadly, as foundation for curriculum. For example, in Brazil “three out of seven exams measuring student performance in secondary school included questions on the HDI” (84:92; 91:25). In Chile, the nHDRs have been included as “one of the main bibliographical references in various academic curricula” (84:90). Or, the substantive topics of nHDRs have contributed to or inspired curriculum – on HIV/AIDS for primary school students in Mozambique (59:9) and on anti-corruption for university students in the Philippines (84:89, 90). This curriculum shows that HDR themes have been successful in establishing the importance of certain problems of development, such that they are worth of study.
Educational Events. Many educational programs are single events including workshops, summits, symposiums, or forums. For example, an impact of the 2004 report in India and West Bengal was a “follow-up workshop attended by over 80 state ministers, economists, local representatives and NGOs” (71:42). Additionally, a national summit after the 2004 Indonesian report, (71:46), “well-attended symposiums” on human development after the 2002 Mexican report (71:61), and a national conference on HIV/AIDS after the 2002 Ugandan report (71:86) were all classified as report impacts.

Training Programs. The UNDP also cites as impacts “training” courses offered outside of the academic setting. At the time of this writing, the UNDP website includes a list of 18 training courses on human development (164:8). For example, the National Defense College in Thailand now requires high-ranking officers to take a course on the Human Achievement Index (HAI), a measure included within Thailand's nHDR (71:83; 84:114). As another example, Uzbekistan has made strong efforts to “increase awareness and advocate the policy relevance of the human development paradigm” to undergraduate and postgraduate students, teachers, and state officials through “support to research and the development of pedagogies and curricula to teach human development, train lecturers and develop in-service training schemes” (84:87).

Infrastructure (24 citations)

If serious change begins with ideas, embedding the production of human development thinking in these many vehicles is likely to prove in the long run to have had the biggest impact of all.

– Khadija Haq and Richard Jolly, 2008

Many cited impacts consist of the addition of the term “Human Development” to organizations, agencies, or other types of infrastructure. For example, these cases include the
creation of a Human Development and Sustainable Income Generation Public Union and Human Development Center in Azerbaijan (71:110), a Human Development Research and Coordination Unit in a state of India (71:41), a Human Development Network in the Philippines which is “dedicated to build knowledge that will help strengthen institutional capacity in achieving human development outcomes” (84:81, 82), and a Ministry for Human Development in Bolivia (73:11). In other cases, the theme of a report is seen to prompt the creation of infrastructure. The UNDP credits nHDRs for sparking the creation of an Office for Public Safety in Kosovo after their 2004 report (71:54), a Task Force on Poverty Reduction and Employment Generation in Pakistan after their 2003 report (71:68), and both an “independent body” against non-transparency and corruption as well as good governance and sustainable development departments in Senegal (91:12). Lastly, the HDRs are seen to cause changes in infrastructure. For example, the UNDP report Ideas, Innovation, Impact mentions that the 2003 Azerbaijan nHDR caused the Ministry of Communication to reorganize as the Ministry of Communication and Technology (71:20). Notably, the UNDP does not mention the impacts of these organizations; the existence of this new infrastructure is deemed an impact in and of itself.

Policies (22 citations)

Twenty-two examples of HDR impact include policy changes in response to the report. Of these 22 citations, 11 include a reference to a specific policy; the remaining 11 citations are general assertions of policy influence. For example, a UNDP report includes that the Armenian nHDRs have contributed to the “incorporation of human development-related concepts and approaches in poverty reduction policies” (91:2) and Indian nHDRs have led to “the establishment of new government policies to address issues raised” (91:10).
In the analysis of the Impact of nHDRs in the RBEC Region (HDR-Net), the authors admit that while country offices say the nHDRs were used to propose policy recommendations and options, “few countries have successfully been able to provide specific recommendations” (162:22). Some impacts, however, are specific and refer to concrete policies that the UNDP attributes to their HDRs. For example, according to UNDP documents the University of Zimbabwe changed its catering policy to discourage the practice of exchanging sex for food (71:93) and El Salvador instituted fiscal reform to “stem tax invasion” (84:99).

Programs (20 citations)

This group of impacts includes programs or projects created (primarily by the government) in response to HDRs. Although some of these programs may have been enacted through policy, the legislation behind these programs is not mentioned in the citation. For example, in response to the 2003 Arab States rHDR, Bahrain upgraded the technology skills of primary school teachers (71:100). Bulgaria’s 2003 report “gave birth to an integrated area-based approach consisting of a set of partnership projects initiated by UNDP and supported by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and other donors” (91:5). As another example, Brazil’s Alvorada (Dawn) program grew out of the nHDRs, a program “to improve the living conditions of the neediest” that covered areas in Brazil with low HDIs (84:70).

Funding Changes (8 citations)

Budget or funding shifts attributed to HDRs make up the least cited category. For example, the UNDP reports that a response to Indonesia’s 2004 report was a boost in several district's health and education budgets (71:132), while in Zambia “[n]ational budget allocations directed towards human development priorities have grown, especially for basic education and primary health care” (91:16). Additionally within this category, three citations
claim that HDRs have mobilized funds for specific programs or events – Roma programmes (71:124) or a “youth knowledge-fair” in Turkey (84:74).

The UNDP's Evaluation of the Impact of HD Measures

Within the UNDP's documentation of the impact of HD measures more specifically – overwhelmingly referring to the HDI – the distribution of 115 coded cases fall into the following categories: (1) use of the HDI to determine which areas receive funding; (2) general adoption or use of HD measures, or (3) responses to the “scores” or rankings created by the HDI. In each of these categories, the UNDP's focus again is on the adoption of the HDI rather than the outcomes of using the HDI. While this does not demonstrate that the UNDP doesn't aim for the HDI to impact development outcomes, it does indicate that the use of the HDI qualifies as an impact regardless of whether or not this use results in changed outcomes. Using the HDI is an impact in and of itself.

This distinction is made clearer by using the analogue of the World Bank and the GDP. The following claims of impact would be akin to the World Bank claiming that they have made an impact because people use the GDP. This demonstrates only that those using the GDP accept it as a legitimate measure of development. Unless promoting the measure (and the perspective it represents) is the organization’s goal, claiming that the use of a measure is an impact makes little sense. If promotion were not a goal, the impact of a measure would likely be whether the use of a measure impacts outcomes – for example, if targeting areas using the GDP more efficiently alleviates poverty. The impacts below document the use of HD measures but not the outcomes of this use (for example, improved longevity, income, or health). Specifically, these citations demonstrate that the HDI is being adopted as a measure to determine where to funnel resources, determine who is more or less
Influencing Funding Patterns: To whom does funding go? (66 citations)

According to the UNDP citations, the HDI has been most influential in that nations and regions have begun to use the measure as a way to determine where to funnel resources and institute programs. UNDP reports emphasize that the HDI has changed who has received funding – not necessarily what has received funding. Many of these impacts are cases in which the HDI has been used as a tool to target the most underdeveloped regions in order to decide where to begin programs or focus government attention. For example, Peru now uses the HDI as “a base for selecting and channeling social assistance through State programmes (e.g. the projects Urban Work and JUNTOS)” (84:56). The HDI in Vietnam, according to the UNDP, has more generally “helped shift both government and donor attention towards some of the more impoverished and isolated provinces where assistance is badly needed” (37:18).

In another cases, the UNDP speaks more generally of the HDI influencing geographic resource allocation. For example, the HDI is used to determine resource allocation in Venezuela (37:17), Egypt (91:8; 71:36), Brazil (91:52, 73:12), and Pakistan (71:70); in Chile,
the HDI is one component of the “prioritization index” used by the Ministry of Planning to allocate funds (84:54).

**General Adoption and Use of the HDI (26 citations)**

The UNDP considers the formal adoption of the HDI by organizations or governments as an impact. For example, Venezuela uses the HDI to measure success of their Economic and Social Plan (37:17) and Vietnam uses the HDI as a general measure of “development progress”(37:16). In other cases, the impact of the HDI is described more ambiguously – as in the Philippines, where the HDI is “recognized as an official government statistic” (37:16), and in Brazil, where states have incorporated human development “indexes into their programmes and plans” (91:36. In a rare number of cases, the UNDP asserts that other measures within HDRs apart from the HDI have been used. For example, Tanzania uses poverty and environmental indicators from their 2002 nHDR within their “Poverty Monitoring System” (71:77). Or, Peru’s National Statistics Institute uses nHDR data (84:56). In some cases, the UNDP also claims that nations have included the HDI within national strategies and agendas. For example, Egypt’s five-year national plan (2002-2007) is using the HDI (37:24), and in Kuwait the HDI is used in “strategic planning” (54:55).

In other cases, the UNDP claims the HDI is influential if governments are simply calculating it for smaller areas within the nation. The request of the Egyptian government to measure the HDI down to the village level is considered an impact (37:10), as is the production of a state level HDI by the Venezuelan National Statistics Office (37:17) and the calculation of the HDI for provinces in Argentina (71:18). The UNDP considers the extended reach of the HDI through these “disaggregation exercises” as evidence of influence in itself, and also a “crucial” means through which to “generate interest in human development
Because the HDI incorporates measures of education and health, the rankings produced by the measure may be different than those calculated by the GDP. In impacts coded *Revealing Disparities*, the UNDP cites cases in which the calculation of the HDI has shed light on internal inequalities according to the new criteria. For example, in Vietnam regional calculation of the HDI “revealed sudden widening disparities,” while Argentina’s calculation of an extended HDI (which incorporated measures of infant mortality, unemployment and education quality) revealed “overlooked social and geographical differences” (37:18; 84:32). The NHDR Evaluation report credits disaggregation of the HDI as having “accomplished its job of raising awareness of inequality within the county” (91:97).

According to the UNDP, inequalities evidenced by the HDI have prompted a range of responses from nations – demands to reduce inequality, competition, and attempts to improve relative standing. For example, in Brazil regional disparities “have prompted civil society institutions to highlight the issue of inequality and demand measures to reduce it” (73:12). Additionally, according to the UNDP the HDI has “motivated desirable and healthy competition among countries to surpass neighbors or competitors in rankings,” and intra-country competition specifically within Egypt, Brazil, and India (73:17; 91:50). The writers of the *Influence and Impact of the NHDR System* claim that Brazilians “follow the changing HDI rankings of their country and its states and municipalities” with the same competitive spirit that they apply to soccer competitions (91:54). According to a UNDP historian, in India “when a [head of government] appears before parliament, he’s confronted with
questions such as ‘how many points you’ve slipped’ and ‘what you will do about it’ (59:16). On opposite ends of the spectrum, those with low rankings have in some cases used their low scores as evidence for why they deserve funding, and those high on the rankings are sometimes rewarded for this superior rank. For example, in Brazil parliamentarians from the poorest states “use the indexes to bring extra resources to the states and municipalities they represent,” while the Philippine government recognizes “the 10 best performing provinces in terms of human development” (91:24; 37:16).

In some cases, the nation’s response is to maximize or improve the absolute value or ranking of the HDI. For example, “the ultimate objective of [Venezuela’s] Economic and Social Plan is ‘to improve the Human Development Index for the population’ (37:17) and in Vietnam a ‘stated aim in the country’s official development strategy is ‘a substantial improvement in the country’s HDI’ (37:18). In Brazil – one of the most frequently cited countries in which the HDI has had a large impact – several states, including Bahia, Mias Gerias, Maranhao, and Ceara have set goals to raise their HDI or HDI ranking (84:72). For both Mias Gerias and Maranhao, these goals are specific; Mias Gerias would like to move from a score of .776 to .8, and Maranhao from .547 to .65 (84:72). In the state of Ceara, the goal is instead focused on rankings; Ceara's state ranking moved from 23rd in 1991 to 19th in 2000 and they would like to “further improve the state's position in HDI” (84:72).

**Intended Impact**

In both the subjective perceptions of impact and documented examples, the UNDP discusses the impact they think they have actually made. To strengthen the analysis, I also coded discussions of the types of impact the UNDP would ideally like to make. I did this because the organization’s evaluation of their impact is constrained by the reality that
development outcomes change very slowly (160:15,16; 158:20). The difficulty in gathering evidence of improved development outcomes is acknowledged by the authors of the “Analysis of the Impact of NHDRs in the RBEC Region,” who write, “While it has been possible to speak in general terms about how the NHDRs are received by governments, NGOs, research institutions, media, etc., their influence has either been short-lived or difficult to assess in terms of HD achievement and outcome” (162:21). Thus, one could argue that the UNDP is limited to gathering evidence of the acceptance of the human development model because these changes are more immediate and so available. The types of impacts the UNDP believe they have made thus may not be the same as those they ideally would like to make. However, coded discourse surrounding the UNDP’s intended impact for the HDR program indicate that the organization is not settling for evidence that their model has been adopted, but aiming for this adoption.

In UNDP guidelines that provide suggestions to HDR teams on how to monitor the impact of their reports, the majority of suggested indicators measure either discursive adoption or the application of the HD framework to development inputs (136:72; 144:59; 132:4). This suggests that the UNDP does not expect their reports to directly influence development outcomes. Rather, the organization's immediate goal is to impact the way the public and development professionals conceive of and approach international development. See table on following page for a summary of these lists of sample indicators.
Table 2. Suggested Indicators to Monitor HDR Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing Discourse</th>
<th>Application of HD Framework to Development Inputs</th>
<th>Changing Development Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the results of perception surveys over time</td>
<td>Shifts in resource allocations</td>
<td>The outcome of evaluation using the strategic results framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that tracks and reports on the outputs and outcomes of UNDP’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of HDR findings in parliamentary and other public debates</td>
<td>Establishment of new institutional bodies and/or</td>
<td>Changes in HDI, HPI, GDI, GEM or other composite human development indexes over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes in those that exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in human development courses or programmes</td>
<td>Emergence of new partnerships and/or enhancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of those that exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey or focus groups to determine exposure to or use of the HDR</td>
<td>Legislation proposed and/or adopted at any level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage over time, domestically and abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons visiting the HDR online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the HDR in MDG reports, common country assessments, the UNDP results oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual report, PRSPs, or comparable instruments at sub-national and regional levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As another example of this goal of adoption, Chile's system of measuring impacts is held up as an exemplar in the “Sustained Follow-Up” chapter of the HDR toolkit. Chile's system does not include a single category for outcomes; they gauge the impact of their reports through analyzing: distribution, launching, appropriation, institutionalization, and demand for new reports (144:63). That this system is held up as ideal also suggests that the UNDP expects to influence adoption but not outcomes.

Again, however, one could return to the argument that the UNDP would ideally like to impact outcomes but reduce their goals to more realistic expectations. In a sense, this is
true. The UNDP does hope to change “long-term development impacts,” but believes that they do so through changing the parameters of development discourse and thus redefining development. Within the HDR Toolkit, a box titled “How HDRs Make an Impact” illustrates this indirect impact on outcomes (144:8).

**Discursive Adoption Leading to “Real” Adoption**

What is not known never happened. What is not presented, can never be chosen. What is not discussed, will never be fully understood. What is assumed will never lead to change (144:10).

- Marisol Sanjines (UNDP Bolivia)

In the vision demonstrated in Box 6.1 (above), the discursive “output” of the HDRs is an intermediary step in the process of changing development outcomes. The UNDP hopes to
indirectly “fuel momentum” for “long-term development impacts” through increasing the likelihood of adoption of the human development framework. The UNDP sees real changes as flowing naturally from the discourse which they are actively engaged in changing. This discourse leads to changes in political behavior (“policy reforms” in Box 6.1), that then leads to a world more consistent with the goals of the human development model (“long-term development impacts” in Box 6.1). In other words, if the organization can prompt the discursive adoption of the human development, functional adoption (acting in accordance with the goals of the model) will result and cause real changes.

The organization contends that if they can redefine the way people conceive of development, people they change their practices to better align with this new definition. The founder of the HDRs, Mahbub ul Haq, believed strongly in the power of ideas to influence real change; in fact, he ended his book Reflections on Human Development with Barbara Ward's quote: “Ideas are the prime movers of history. Revolutions usually begin with ideas” (152:21). This outlook seems to have seeped into the HDR program generally. In UNDP documents discussing the purpose of HDRs, action is generally enacted through changes in discourse. For example, the purpose of the HDRs is to “generate debate and catalyze action for human development progress” (145:39). Or, in the UNDP website description of HDRs, “As advocacy tools designed to appeal to a wide audience, the reports can spur public debates and mobilize support for action and change” (159:9). Action comes after discourse and debate.

The UNDP also places a special emphasis on ensuring that this discourse winds up in the hands – or minds – of those with power over the development process. HDRs are intended, ultimately, to generate debate within the political arena, and “focus political
attention” on certain issues and influence policy discussion is a particular way (165:26).

“The most important objective of an HDR,” write the authors of *Measuring Human Development*, “is to influence and advocate policy so that deprivation is eliminated” (138:12). The *HDR Toolkit* refers to the HDRs as “prime vehicles for UNDP … to contribute to policy analysis and human development advocacy” (145:26). It is important to note that this is cultural advocacy rather than political lobbying – the UNDP is not advocating specific policies or strategies, but rather a new outlook on international development and its relevant vocabulary.

The UNDP also claims that, by providing an outlet for the nation to collectively articulate their development priorities, they will give people control over the development process. For example, the *Human Development Journey* course discusses research capacity development as ideally enabling countries to “own” their development and “lay[ing] the foundation for meaningful participation”:

National and regional ownership through a process that draws on national/regional actors and capabilities throughout the preparation, yielding a product firmly grounded in the country’s past and existing development plans. HDR preparation aims at developing national capacities so that a country and its people can take charge of their development and thereby ‘own’ it. (165:17)

…capacity development – in addition to its intrinsic value – helps lay the foundation for meaningful participation in national and local development processes and thereby increases the chances for more sustainable development results” (165:30).

Again, the UNDP intends for a discursive change (broadened participation in producing a report) to produce real changes (participatory development processes).

To the UNDP, practices change after changing conception through advocating the HD perspective. This is a very different approach to influencing change than if the UNDP had decided to promote practices from the beginning, without first aiming to influence discourse.
For example, the UNDP could directly fund initiatives in health or education. The UNDP could lobby governments for particular policy changes, or propose strategies to global agencies with power over the development process, such as the IMF or World Bank. The belief that conceptual adoption of human development, redefining development to incorporate more than the economic realm, will lead to behavioral adoption and ultimately real change is one specific strategy among many options. That the organization chose this strategy possibly suggests that the UNDP’s reason to promote the human development model is that they believe this promotion will influence development outcomes.
DISCUSSION

I initially found that the UNDP’s creation of human development was strategic, meant to compete with and crowd out other models of development. In analyzing the discourse surrounding human development research, the UNDP’s primary institutional activity devoted to the model, I discovered three main themes: 1) the process and products of human development research help to spread the idea of human development; 2) the UNDP intends for these reports to advocate the human development model; and 3) the UNDP aims for these reports to prompt adoption of the model, from which they assert real changes will emerge.

I found that the use of a highly decentralized, participatory research process was acknowledged by the UNDP as an effective means to raise awareness of the human development concept and get those involved in report production “on board” with the project. Once produced, these reports provide a concrete resource around which awareness-raising campaigns may be held. Additionally, the UNDP's emphasis on capacity building – that is, building local capacity to continue conducting human development research and advocacy – demonstrates the organization's aim to redirect local development research toward the human development framework and thus create a self-sustaining awareness campaign. By encouraging regional and national research projects, the UNDP has effectively created an arsenal of geographically dispersed intellectuals and practitioners invested in the human development model, such that the diffusion of the human development concept is maximized.

Furthermore, I found that the UNDP does not perceive these reports only as the end product of empirical research. Rather, the organization views their reports as a medium
through which to convince specific audiences of a specific message. The substantive data within the reports is understood as a resource to enforce an argument, rather than as an end result in and of itself. The advocacy phase of report production further demonstrates that the sole purpose of this research is not only to research, but also to use this research as an intermediate phase that is intended to be used for something – to promote the human development message.

After analyzing the way the UNDP discusses the purpose and production of the HDRs and directs the production process, I analyzed the way the UNDP perceives and assesses the impact of the completed reports to give insight into the UNDP’s goals. In discourse surrounding impact, I found that “impact” primarily meant the extent to which the framework of human development – the ideas embedded within the research of the reports – were being adopted nominally, discursively, structurally, and functionally. Perceptions of impact centered on the extent to which human development discourse had entered the political arena, changed understandings of international development, created an intellectual “movement,” and enabled nations to articulate their own goals. Impact assessments of the HDRs primarily gauge the extent to which the human development framework is used – discussed in the media, incorporated into national goals, researched, taught, and incorporated into infrastructure; and, less often, the extent to which the HD framework is applied to development inputs in policies, programs, and funding. Evaluations of the impact of the HDI – the symbol of the human development perspective – center on the extent to which the HDI is replacing the GDP as a measure to: determine where to funnel resources, determine who is more or less developed, and measure the “state” of development generally. These impacts provide evidence that the concepts and measures of the human development model have been
adopted – not necessarily whether the use of the framework has produced real changes in the state of development (for example, whether areas are healthier or more educated because of this new understanding of development). These evaluations of impact, in other words, assess whether or not the diffusion and promotion of the human development framework – byproducts of the act of research itself – has been successful. This is not the say that the UNDP does not hope to impact development outcomes – discourse suggests that they do – but they believe this impact will result from the adoption from the human development model. This analysis suggests that the UNDP's immediate goal for the HDRs is to promote the HD model, as evidenced from the way they discuss the intended impact of the reports as well as the type of cases of impact they gather.

These findings suggest that The UNDP has transformed research into a promotional tool. Admittedly, most research results in a “message” which researchers on some level would like others to understand and accept. Yet what differentiates this case is that the UNDP is neither seeking to falsify nor support an empirical argument or causal process, or to generate empirical evidence on a poorly understood phenomenon. They are gathering and consolidating data relevant to various dimensions of human development, but this is often secondary data and the goal of the reports is not only to provide information but rather to bring attention to the issue (131:2). The UNDP is seeking to redefine the dimensions and thus goals of development through promoting a new cultural model. Their argument is a normative and prescriptive one to which research is not a self-evident process, given that numbers cannot adequately arbitrate what the goals of development should be. This purpose – to advocate a cultural, normative argument – is not one for which research is expressly intended.
Rather, the organization appears to use research for its secondary effects. Research creates activities around which to mobilize people to become educated on the new perspective. Research creates artifacts to use to raise awareness – measures, numbers, documents, recommendations, concepts and terminology. And, research creates an end product through which numbers may be employed to illustrate and legitimize an argument. By generating or gathering data and labeling it “human development,” the UNDP uses the research process to re-align different types of data to the concept of development, redefining development through changing its measurement. The human development reports send the message that economic data alone can not capture or measure development, but rather that a wide range of data speaks to the re-defined concept of development. This data does not, and cannot, empirically “prove” the theory of human development – the merits of which must instead be made on theoretical and ethical grounds. The UNDP does not solely use research for its manifest function, to confirm a theoretical claim or empirically explore a phenomenon, but also its latent function, to create a process and products around which theories may be publicized and advocated.
CONCLUSION

The impetus for this research project was to investigate the question: In the face of competition between diverse global models of development, how do international organizations strategically promote the adoption of their particular models? This study found that one organizational strategy of promotion is to harness the power of research to spread and advocate ideas – even if those ideas comprise cultural rather than empirical models. In the case of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), research was found to provide an all-encompassing promotional strategy that created practices and artifacts through which the organization could encourage the adoption of the human development model.

Given the findings of this case study, one can hypothesize that other international organizations could also use research as a promotional tool for their cultural models. This hypothesis provides the foundation for a rich future research agenda, provoking a number of questions about the relationship between research activities and cultural promotion: To what extent do organizations recognize and take advantage of the diffusing potential of participatory research processes? Of the plethora of official reports released by various international agencies, how many of them employ data not only to prove a claim but to make a case? To what extent do other organizations construct measures to provide a numerical symbol of a perspective rather than a precise quantification of a construct? To what extent are organizations strategic in this use of research, or to what extent is promotion an unintended byproduct of research? And most generally – why research?
Broadly, this project sought to deepen understanding of promotional strategies, given that most research into the diffusion of cultural models focuses on the results rather than the origins of diffusion. Previous studies had found such promotional mechanisms as conferences, fellowships, funding, and forums; this project contributed to that theoretical repertoire the use of research, and specifically research which involves participatory production and the frequent publication of geographically dispersed reports. By better understanding possible promotional mechanisms, future research can then trace these mechanisms to both their successful and unsuccessful outcomes.

Going forward, the next step after this research project is thus to investigate to what extent a research program is successful in promoting cultural models. This study suggests that research is a successful method to bring a model to those with the power to enact it – in this case, to policy makers and development practitioners. But, does research organized around a particular cultural model actually cause others to adopt the model? If so, does research “cause” certain types of adoption? For example, UNDP discourse suggests that research is successful in promoting the formal adoption of artifacts, such as terms or measures, but is limited in its ability to induce direct changes in policies. This could indicate that research provokes decoupled responses – discursive adoption without accompanying functional changes. Or, it could merely indicate a time lag in which, as the UNDP hopes, this surface-level adoption of artifacts, terms, and institutional labels indicate a discursive shift that will eventually enable deeper changes in practices and then outcomes.

Other questions that could be explored to analyze the success of research in promoting models include: Is research more effective at promoting models than other forms of persuasion, given the authority and legitimacy of numbers and science? Is research more
effective at promoting models among those populations who most recognize the authority of research, such as scientists or academics? This particular study could not answer these questions about the real effects of this promotional research, given that the examples of impact were all gathered by the UNDP and were thus susceptible to exaggerated perceptions and claims of influence. To fully explore the real effects of promotional research, scholars will need access to data from outside the organizations they are studying. In short, this project lays the groundwork for future investigations into the effects of promotional research.

This study both elaborates diffusion theory by bolstering the currently thin literature on promotional mechanisms, and provides the foundation for a rich research agenda to further the understanding of the role that research plays in the construction of world culture.
## Appendix One: Summary of Source Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc #</th>
<th>Atlas Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ASA Reference Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td><strong>Impact Reports</strong>&lt;br&gt;Consolidated Reply: Application of the HDI</td>
<td>This is an NHDR Network Discussion, consolidated on April 1, 2003. Shombi Sharp, a person in the UNDP Russian Federation, sent out a &quot;query&quot; to the group to gather examples of where the HDI has become a &quot;living tool with systematic application,&quot; to prepare a presentation for an NHDR/MDG round-table. Apparently they received &quot;minimal responses to this query,&quot; and so they &quot;filtered through material that was available to us, and combined a few interesting country examples highlighting how the HDI has been used as a living tool as well as a target for human progress. The impact the HDI continues to have around the world is remarkable, whether it is used as a state tool for resource allocation or as an incentive for local government officials to compete with one another to achieve the highest provincial HDI. We are keen to document more examples ...&quot; All of the network contributors were UNDP staff.</td>
<td>&quot;Consolidated Reply: Application of the HDI.&quot; 2003. National Human Development Report Network Discussion. Retrieved April 20, 2010 (<a href="http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/networks/replies/140.pdf">http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/networks/replies/140.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Influence of Regional, National, and Sub-National HDRs</td>
<td>This paper is a part of the Human Development Research Paper (HDRP) Series - a &quot;medium for sharing recent research commissioned to inform the global Human Development Report ...&quot;. &quot;The authors include leading academic and practitioners from around the world, as well as UNDP researchers (abstract). Paola Pagliana is Policy Specialist at the Human Development Report Office. The sources for this article include: (1) &quot;Assessment of Development Results&quot; for several countries (Argentina, Afghanistan, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina, Guatemala, Chile, Peru, Republic of Philippines, Uzbekistan), and (2) Actual Human Development Reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Influence and Impact of the NHDR System</td>
<td>This was an evaluation of the UNDP's evaluation office, answering a request from the Human Development Report Office. It is the first &quot;systematic evaluation of the strategic relevance of the NHDRs&quot; (37). It looked at: production processes, dissemination processes, outputs and outcomes. Methodology: prep phase (desk reviews of NHDRs and relevant discussions in the HDR networks, analysis of NHDR evaluations conducted thus far, surveys of country offices and selected headquarters units), pilot phase (pilot countries selected based on prep work and headquarter consultation: Brazil and India), in-depth case studies in each region (country visits, field studies and desk research, meet with government, NGOs, civil society orgs, UNDP staff and country team that produced the NHDR.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Documents with Impact Sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>The United Nations Development Programme: A Better Way?</td>
<td>Written by the Historian of the UNDP who was hired by the past Administrator, Mark Malloch Brown, to write a history of the UNDP. From research conducted from June 2004-March 2006, including hundreds of interviews and archival work in more than two dozen countries, Craig &quot;traces the history of the UNDP's organizational structure and mission, its relationship to the multilateral financial institutions, and the development of its doctrines.&quot; All of the material used in the book came from UNDP sources, including a section devoted to documenting the impact of HDRs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines/Directions from the UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td>UNDP Corporate Policy on NHDRs</td>
<td>This document &quot;defines six broad principles that characterize excellence in these reports. These include national and regional ownership, a participatory and inclusive preparation process, independence of analysis, quality of analysis, flexibility and creativity in presentation, and sustained follow-up&quot; (71, pg 29). It &quot;drew on the experience of a task force of contributors from within and outside UNDP who had solid experience in producing HDRs&quot; (145, pg 15). The Corporate Policy was prepared by David Whaley for UNDP with comments from members of the NHDR Task Force and Global HDR-Net, and with assistance from Kamil Kamaluddeen (UNDP Nigeria), Richard Ponzio (HDRO), and Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh (NHDR Unit/HDRO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9-15</strong></td>
<td><strong>125-132</strong></td>
<td>Thematic Guidance Notes</td>
<td>&quot;intended to provide theoretical background and practical support for development practitioners to address certain themes within a human development framework&quot; (71, pg. 29). <a href="http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/support/thematic/">http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/support/thematic/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for Conflict Prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for Human Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines for Migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>136-138</td>
<td>Measuring Human Development: A Primer</td>
<td>This primer is a &quot;tool for all those working on sub-national, national and regional Human Development Reports (HDRs) ... It consists of guidelines and tools to support the production of quantitatively and qualitatively rigorous reports that support a process of evidence based policy making and advocacy&quot; (<a href="http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/support/primer/">http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/support/primer/</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Advocating for Change with Human Development Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>139-145</td>
<td>HDR Toolkit</td>
<td>a &quot;practical handbook offering clear suggestions for actions necessary to achieve the 6 principles [delineated in the Corporate Policy]. Through practical guidelines and over 80 illustrations of HDR team practices around the world, the toolkit offers support for achieving excellence in HDR processes, content and advocacy. This publication includes 30 Minimum Standards that should be met by all HDRs&quot; (71, pg. 29).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Chapter 1, National Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Chapter 2, Participatory and Inclusive Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Independence of Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Chapter/Section</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Chapter 4, Quality of Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Flexibility and Creativity in Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Sustained Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Human Development Report Knowledge Networks, HDR-Net</td>
<td>“The HDR-Net, established in 1999, continues to strengthen this movement by serving as dynamic springboards for professional knowledge sharing and learning on human development issues. The network has evolved into a community of over 1000 human development professionals from within UNDP, government, academia, research and NGO communities” (<a href="http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/networks/hdrnet/">http://hdr.undp.org/en/nhdr/networks/hdrnet/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>HDR Timeline: Key Steps in the Human Development Report Process</td>
<td>“A companion to the HDR Toolkit, providing recommendations for the sequencing of many different processes involved in producing and advocating HDRs” (157).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


|------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**UNDP Published Articles and Books about Human Development Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>Choices that shaped the HDRs</td>
<td>Written by Inge Kaul, UNDP veteran and initial collaborator for HDR, former HDR Office Director, and helped develop the HDI.</td>
<td>Kaul, Inge. 2009 [2002]. “Choices that shaped the Human Development Reports.” Pp. 85-91 in ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Using the HDI for policy analysis</td>
<td>Written by Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, former director of HDRO, and Kate Raworth and A.K. Shiva Kumar.</td>
<td>Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko, Kate Raworth, and AK Shiva Kumar. 2009 [2002]. &quot;Using the HDI for policy analysis.&quot; Pp. 177-187 in ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-36</td>
<td>Pioneering the Human Development Revolution: An Intellectual Biography of Mahbub ul Haq</td>
<td>Several of the contributors to this book are also the core consultants of the original HDRs - Gustav Ranis &amp; Frances Stewart. Also contributing: Khadija Haq (Mahbub's wife), President of the ul Haq Human Development Centre; Richard Jolly and Sakiko-Fukada-Parr, former leadership in HDRO; Richard Ponzio, former Policy Advisor in the HDRO. This document provides a history into the creation of both the human development concept, and specifically the HDRs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Reflections on Human Development</td>
<td>This was written by the original architect of human development and the founder of the HDRs.</td>
<td>Ul Haq, Mahbub. 1998. Reflections on Human Development. Oxford India Paperbacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Foreward</td>
<td>Written by Paul Streeten, core consultant for first HDRs who helped develop the HDI.</td>
<td>Streeten, Paul. 1998. “Foreward.” Pp. in ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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