



## **Overview: The Role of Information Policy in Resolving Global Challenges**

**SHARON WEINER**

Libraries  
Purdue University

### **Executive Summary**

Governments in many countries recognize the importance of knowledge-based societies whose citizens are adaptable and have the means to engage in continuous learning. Information societies can address global challenges far more readily than those that do not adopt its characteristics of ICTs (information and communication technologies) and connectivity; usable content; infrastructure and deliverability; and human intellectual capability.

Information policy emerged as a result of the unprecedented access to information that the Internet afforded. It encompasses the laws, regulations, doctrinal positions, and other societal decisions related to the creation, processing, flows, access, and use of information. It can include many issues, such as ICTs; information access, retrieval, and use; data protection; privacy; secrecy, security, veracity, and transparency of government records; freedom of information legislation; information management; copyright; intellectual property; and e-government. Because it evolved from issues encountered by many different sectors, it is complex and multi-dimensional, involving the fields of technology, communications, law, government, medicine, education, business, and economics. Information policies can facilitate access to and use of information or they can restrict it.

Access to information is not ubiquitous and access alone does not ensure that people can effectively find and use information. The concepts of “digital divide” and “information poverty” persist. Policies, laws, and regulation related to information vary considerably from one nation to other, and even within nations. Policies may be inconsistent; over-regulated; or completely lacking. Policies generally develop as needed, or as problems arise, rather than in a coordinated, cohesive manner with all major stakeholders participating in the decision-making.

The development of effective and sustainable solutions to global problems optimally occurs in collaboration with stakeholder communities and societies. All involved need to have the ability to access and know how to find and use the best information available. Inequity in access to information and inadequate training in how to use information both in the United States and worldwide hampers the collective problem-solving that could lead to dynamic, innovative

**PURDUE**  
UNIVERSITY

**Global Policy Research Institute**

1341 Northwestern Avenue

West Lafayette, IN 47906

Phone: (765) 496-6788

Fax: (765) 463-1837

[www.purdue.edu/globalpolicy](http://www.purdue.edu/globalpolicy)

results. Is information policy an effective means to ensure that communities have the knowledge to engage in solutions to global problems? Would a focus on the development of information policy result in the ability to solve persistent problems such as poverty and hunger, universal education, gender equality, health, environmental sustainability, and economic growth and development, and society and leadership? Viable alternatives include a focus on a specific aspect of information policy (infrastructure, information resources, or information literacy); targeting the global challenge to be addressed with supportive information policy; and a consideration of both the country's economy and type of government.

This brief is a broad overview and is the first in a series. Future briefs will address the role of specific aspects of information policy in addressing individual global challenges.

## Overview: The Role of Information Policy in Resolving Global Challenges

“How well an individual, an organization, and an entire society can harness, access, share, and make use of available information will ultimately decide their ability to generate economic growth and to enhance the quality of life for all.”

*Gwang-Jo Kim  
Director of UNESCO Bangkok [1]*

This policy brief provides an overview of the problem of the role of information policy in resolving global challenges. Information policy encompasses the laws, regulations, doctrinal positions, and other societal decision-making related to the creation, processing, flows, access, and use of information [2]. It covers a variety of issues that can include information and communication technologies (ICT); information access, retrieval, management, and use; information resources; data protection and privacy; transparency of government information; copyright; and intellectual property [3]. These issues can be grouped into three categories:

1. Information Infrastructure (the technologies that allow for access to information).
2. Information Resources (the knowledge content; its accessibility through open access; and its legal and ethical use).

3. Information Literacy (the skills and competencies of individuals to effectively and efficiently find, use, manage, and communicate information for specific purposes).

The question is whether policy setting in these areas can facilitate the development of solutions to global challenges.

## The Global Challenges

The United Nations identified the following as the most pressing global challenges that need to be resolved in its Millennium Development Goals [4]:

- End poverty and hunger
- Universal education
- Gender equality
- Child and maternal health
- Combat HIV/AIDS
- Environmental sustainability
- Global partnership

The strategies identified to reduce poverty to achieve the Millennium Development Goals were: rural and urban productivity; health; education; gender equality; water and sanitation; environmental sustainability; science, technology, and innovation; and transparent, decentralized governance [5]. These are similar to the challenges identified by the Global Policy Research Institute (GPRI) at Purdue University:

- Agriculture: crop development, food security, safety
- Environment: climate change, sustainability, water, air, and arable land
- Energy Systems: alternative sources, delivery, efficiencies
- Economy: global commerce, development
- Health: health care engineering, disease, drug research
- Security Defense: space, cybertechnology (<http://www.purdue.edu/globalpolicy>)

The development, implementation, and long-term success of effective and sustainable solutions to global problems optimally occur in collaboration with stakeholder communities and societies [5,6,7,8,46]. Local needs and local problems may differ greatly from one community to another. Communities can participate in developing

solutions to issues by helping to determine what information needs to be gathered, helping to gather and assess the needed information, providing the community's perspectives, and collaborating on formulating recommendations and decisions. All involved need to have the ability to access and use the best information available.

## Information Policy

Information can be viewed as a national resource that substantially benefits a country in its social and economic growth [1,9]. It is necessary for science and industry; for education and leisure; and for democracy and an open society. The concept of the information, or knowledge, society is replacing the long-standing paradigm of the industrial society as essential for the social, cultural, and economic development of nations and communities, institutions and individuals [2,9,10]. Information societies can address global challenges far more readily than those that do not adopt the characteristics of ICTs and connectivity; relevant information resources; infrastructure and deliverability; and human intellectual capability. Many world leaders believe that the formulation of national information policy has strategic importance [2]. Citizens in an information- or knowledge-based society have the means to engage in continuous learning which contributes to global competitiveness.

There are advantages and disadvantages to information policy as a means to address global challenges. These are some of the positive aspects of information policy:

- Information policy can provide a consistent, coordinated, long-term strategic approach to issues of technological access by all; creation and support for freely available information resources; and training in how to effectively find, use, and communicate information.
- Information policy can be developed through a consensus process by involving all stakeholders, which will increase the likelihood of implementation and sustainability.
- Established goals for information policy can include realistic financial strategies.
- Information policy can include processes for accountability to ensure that goals are met.

These are some of the negative aspects of information policy:

- Information policy is not usually an end in itself but supports other initiatives.
- Government assistance can motivate success, but can hamper private investment or healthy competitiveness. Lending and subsidies can create dependencies on government funding and expectations of continued funding.
- There is the potential for corruption. Official corruption is more difficult when there is little or no engagement between the government and industry. There are conflicts of interest when governments are closely connected with IT companies.
- Some governments do not favor unrestricted global information access and dissemination.
- Governments can use information policy for political ends, such as hindering communication and discussion of administrative actions, protecting private interests, and increasing public fear.
- Partisanship can influence public opinion and acceptance of information policy.
- Changes in high-ranking government personnel can dramatically change information policies [1,8,9,11,50].

Policies, laws, standards, and regulations related to information vary considerably from one nation to another, and within nations. Inconsistency in policies, over-regulation, and lack of policy exist because they develop independently from one another and as needed or as problems arise, rather than in a coordinated, cohesive manner with all major stakeholders participating in the decision-making [12,13].

## Infrastructure

Investments in ICT have a favorable impact on economies and human development [7,12,15,16, 17,48]. In fact, the growth effect of broadband is significant and stronger in developing countries than in those that are developed [14]. Nations that have networked information capabilities have a foundation for new economic development opportunities; the sharing of scientific, technical, and business knowledge; and collaborations. The World Bank found that every 10 percentage point increase in broadband penetration in low- and

middle-income countries accelerated economic growth by 1.38 percentage points [18]. There are demonstrated relationships between information creation, processing, flows, access, and use and social and economic development. These include correlations between progress in development and progress in ICTs; and estimations of the causal effect of ICTs on economic and social performance. However, there are disparities in developed and developing countries. The International Telecommunication Union reported that 70% of the population in developed countries had access to the Internet in 2011, compared with 24% of the population in developing countries [19]. Thirty-four percent of people over age 15 from remote areas in Australia did not use the Internet in 2008–09, compared with 23% of people in Australia’s major cities [18]. Experts in the use of ICTs in development consider progress to have been generally slow, insufficient, and without planning.

The World Summit on the Information Society, UNESCO’s Information for All program, and other prominent organizations have raised awareness about the digital divide within and between nations. There are differences in countries that have high-, middle-, and low-income economies; rural and urban communities; and within all countries between affluent people and those in relative poverty. In many countries, women have less access to ICT and less skill in using technologies than men [1,21,22,48]. Inequity in access to information and insufficient training in how to use information hampers the collective problem solving that could lead to dynamic, innovative results.

Many education systems do not have policies relating to using information that ensure that educators are well prepared for teaching to the needs and challenges of the 21st century. There are insufficient monitoring systems in place to give decision-makers evidence of the positive or negative impacts of ICT in education [10].

## Information Resources

UNESCO developed strategies for countries on developing open access policy. Jānis Kārklīns, Assistant Director-General for UNESCO’s Communication and Information, stated that open access “leads to opportunities for equitable economic and social development, intercultural

dialogue, and has the potential to spark innovation” [23]. Openly accessible information and formal training throughout the educational system in finding and using information provides the maximum potential for effective community-based solutions to global issues.

There is a need for many additional online resources and accurate data. Population data are not collected systematically or consistently in every country [24]. During the recent global financial crisis, the need for financial data resources that are timely, internally consistent, and comparable across countries for monitoring financial stability became apparent [25]. The International Monetary Fund and the Financial Stability Board developed recommendations for strengthening existing data. There are restrictions on who can access information in some locations and sectors [50]. Those who speak English have access to more information in most fields of knowledge [12]. People who have greater access to education, including languages, and more economic resources to access information can use English language resources and also have access to regional resources available in their first language. Access to global information is restricted if English is not a common language in a community, and this limits a country’s international competitiveness [21,26].

Other communities have disadvantages in access to information resources. Societies that rely greatly or exclusively on oral communication, have high levels of illiteracy, or do not have the financial means to pay for online access to resources do not have the advantage of that source of knowledge [1,9,26].

## Information Literacy

The cost to distribute information is relatively low once an ICT infrastructure is in place. But access to information alone does not ensure that people can effectively find and use information [8,21,22,27,51]. There is mounting evidence from employers that people entering and in the workforce lack information literacy (IL) competencies, while employers emphasize that it is required for workplace effectiveness and continuous learning [28].



Opinions on who should be responsible for information literacy vary. These differences may prevent the formation of policies related to information literacy or result in contradictions in a national or international context.

UNESCO funded a project to compile overviews of the state of IL around the world in 2007 [29] and a framework for international IL indicators in 2008 [21]. Understanding and acceptance of IL at the policy level varies greatly. In Australia, there is an understanding and support for IL and its role in lifelong learning across a wide range of organizations and sectors, but predominantly in postsecondary education through core student learning outcomes. The Bologna process included IL and Belgian student teachers are required to take a course in information retrieval. There is financial, institutional, and state support in France where a 1996 law helped in integrating IL in curricula. The Nordic countries collaborate through the NordINFOLIT network established in 2001 to encourage development, find common solutions, and document projects in IL. Denmark and Norway are beginning to introduce IL in educational institutions. Finland integrated IL in its Finnish Virtual University. A Swedish law required that higher education develop IL capabilities. In Francophone Africa, ICT and digitization is not well developed, so IL training covers the use of print resources. Most of the IL activity in Latin America occurs in postsecondary institutions, though it is not usually part of the curriculum. There is little IL activity in schools and none in public libraries or the private sector [29].

## Existing Approaches to Information Policy

There have been numerous approaches to information policy since the concept originated in the 1970s. The examples that follow illustrate approaches to policies from governments and NGOs (non-governmental organizations), from democratic and non-democratic countries, and from countries that vary in gross national income. The current approaches represent a range of government involvement and participation from the private sector. There has been a stronger focus on ICT, but the examples also describe policy related to information resources and information literacy, which tend to be more recent than ICT.

NGOs have a long history of involvement in developing recommendations related to information policy. UNESCO has as its primary purpose to maintain, increase, and disseminate knowledge [30]. Some of its objectives related to global challenges are to: attain quality education for all and lifelong learning; mobilize science knowledge and policy for sustainable development; address social and ethical challenges; and build inclusive knowledge societies [31]. In 1974, the General Conference of UNESCO recommended that member states either create or improve national information systems through governmental advisory and coordinating bodies [32]. UNESCO promotes universal access to information through online multilingualism and open access to information [23]. The World Bank suggested objectives for its assistance strategy in 1996 that harnessed information and technology for poverty reduction and economic development. Those included:

- Widespread, equitable access to communication and information services through national information infrastructure and integration into international networks;
- Information policies and systems that improved the function and competitiveness of key economic sectors;
- New ways to use information technology to help solve the problems of education, health, poverty alleviation, rural development, and the environment [33].

More recently, the 2003 *Prague Declaration* represented 23 countries and stated that IL plays a leading role in reducing inequities through information use in multicultural and multilingual contexts [34]. The *Declaration* recommended that governments develop programs to promote IL to close the digital divide through an information literate citizenry, an effective civil society, and a competitive workforce. The 2005 *Alexandria Proclamation*, representing 17 countries, declared IL to be a basic human right and the foundation for achieving the Millennium Declaration and World Summit on the Information Society goals [35]. UNESCO's Information for All program held regional meetings in 2008-09 for "Training the Trainer in Information Literacy," sponsoring 11 workshops attended by 761 participants from 99 countries [36]. UNESCO sponsored an international conference on Media and Information

Literacy (MIL) for Knowledge Societies held in Moscow in 2012. The conference issued the Moscow Declaration which proposed the integration of MIL in policy; the reform of educational systems to include MIL; inclusion of MIL assessment in education, lifelong and workplace learning, and teacher training; and prioritization and investment in capacity-building for MIL [37]. The 2003 and 2005 World Summit on the Information Society declared that the ability for all to access and contribute information, ideas, and knowledge is essential for an information society [38]. Some consider information as a basic necessity and fundamental right of citizens, rather than focusing only on its economic potential [39,40].

In the U.S., there is no central body of law or agency that coordinates information policy, so different organizations and agencies create policies that can be incompatible, redundant, or conflicting. America's 2010 National Broadband Plan proposes recommendations rather than policies [41]. Private companies are developing most of the infrastructure. Differences in legislation across states and between government agencies complicate the process. There is a growing body of policy documents and recommendations from outside of the government related to information and other literacies. The American Library Association issued a foundational work in 1989 that described the importance of information literacy to all sectors of society [42]. President Obama issued a proclamation in 2009 that declared October as National Information Literacy Awareness Month, drawing attention to the need for an informed citizenry and the need to know how to use information effectively [43]. To date, governors in 20 states and the mayor of 1 city have subsequently issued similar proclamations. Many educational accrediting organizations include IL as a standard [44].

The European Commission is responsible for EU information policy, which is viewed as proactive, contributing to strategic goals, and an important part of the European economy [3]. The 1994 Bangemann report outlined measures to consider for an information and communication infrastructure that would promote a global information society. It recommended an emphasis on education and training [45]. The European Network on Information Literacy was established in

2001 to determine the extent to which information literacy is a national policy issue in European countries; and to identify policies that relate to the integration of information literacy into university curricula [24].

Finland transformed into a knowledge economy during the 1990s driven by the ICT sector. It has one of the most open economies and is a leading knowledge-based economy. This took place because of a strong educational system and institutions for the formation of national consensus. Programs in economic policy management and national strategy issues for leaders helped to conceptualize and implement change. The Prime Minister chaired an Information Society Council that included key representatives of public administration, private sector enterprises, interest groups, and organizations [51].

The U.K. incorporated information functions into units in its Cabinet Office. The merged National Archives and Office of Public Sector Information provide leadership for information policy for the government and the public sector. Other departments address developing citizens' skills; promoting media literacy; and libraries, museums, and broadcasting [49].

Australia's government focused on infrastructure by making major investments and developing strong information policies for its National Broadband Network. The Network will connect all Australian households and businesses to a high-speed broadband network by 2015. It will sell services to private communications providers to fund the investment [20].

Kenya does not have a national information policy, though the government considers it important to have access to information and to expertise for problem-solving and economic development. Factors that hinder a national information policy are: lack of recognition of the relevance of information in development; insufficient financial resources; lack of people trained to apply for donor funds or develop policy; misappropriation of funds; insufficient libraries and databases of industrial, scientific and statistical information; poor understanding of user needs; and changes of personnel in policymaking positions [52].

Information policies are developing in countries in the Asia-Pacific region [1]. The Philippines developed national ICT strategies for improving the quality of life through the creation of a more digitally inclusive society and use of ICT in governance. Laws related to ICTs benefit marginalized groups and promote political reform. These were part of broader development plans but are generally uncoordinated, unsustainable, and short-term. Roles, responsibilities, and programs overlap. Nevertheless, there has been progress in supporting legislation, infrastructure, institutions, human capital, and public-private partnerships to promote the ICT industry [51].

### Viable Alternatives for Solving/Mitigating/Or Adapting to the Issue

The success of the various approaches to information policy in resolving global challenges has been mixed. Most countries do not have a coordinated, well-planned strategy involving multiple stakeholders, prioritization, and sufficient funding to address ICT, creation of relevant information resources, or training in the use of technologies and resources (i.e., information literacy). As a result, local communities cannot fully participate in developing and implementing solutions to their societal problems. The following are viable alternatives for the role of information policy in resolving global challenges:

- **The aspect of information policy considered.** Policymakers would focus on a specific aspect of information policy: infrastructure, information resources, or information literacy.
- **The global challenge to be addressed.** Policymakers would focus on the global challenges and plan information policies to best address the challenges.
- **Economy and type of government.** Aspects of information policy to be developed and implemented would differ based on their classification in a matrix of economy and type of government. The World Bank ranks economies as low, middle, or high income determined by the gross national income per capita (see Appendix 1). The “Democracy Index” of the Economist Intelligence Unit (see Appendix 2) organizes countries by type of government. In 2011, almost half of the world’s population lived in a type of

democracy (11% in a full democracy) and 1/3 lived in an authoritarian state. **High-income economies tend to have full democracies** and low-income economies tend to have authoritarian or hybrid regimes (see Appendix 3). **None of the low-income economies have full democracies and only 2.5% of the authoritarian regimes have high-income economies.** Therefore, the type of government is an important factor to consider in determining if countries will have the economic means to support information policies with appropriate infrastructure, information resources, and training.

### Positive and Negative Consequences of Each Alternative

#### *Specific Aspect of Information Policy*

The positive consequences of a focus on a **specific aspect of information policy** are that the policy that is most needed, easiest to develop and implement, best aligned with priorities, or not adequately addressed by the private sector would be emphasized and implemented. Resources would be targeted to discreet, achievable goals. There would be less likelihood of redundancy and gaps in policy would be addressed. The particular information policy may influence improvement in multiple global challenges [7,26]. One group in the World Bank is focusing solely on ICT for development in its plan for 2012-15 [46]. Information resources and IL are at an earlier stage in the policy development process than ICT, requiring further data gathering [27]. This customization based on characteristics of individual countries is preferable to a common policy applied to all situations [48].

The negative consequences of a focus on **specific aspects of information policy** are that differing, and possibly irreconcilable, perspectives would make it difficult to coordinate policy across multiple sectors [47]. Policy that is easiest to implement, ICT, would be favored over the creation of needed information resources and education in how to find and use information [21,22,27]. Policies might be reactive rather than proactive [13]. Those who have greater power could impose an emphasis on aspects of policy that are politically advantageous to them [51]. Policy

developed in isolation might have no effect on global challenges.

### ***The Global Challenge***

The positive consequences of an information policy focus on **the global challenge to be addressed** are that information policy would holistically address infrastructure as well as information resources and training specifically to resolve a global challenge [50]. Limited resources would be targeted realistically to that primary goal. Global challenges would be addressed with customized local solutions and linked to solutions from other sectors [8].

The negative consequences of an information policy focus on **the global challenge to be addressed** are that the effectiveness of the policies would be dependent on the financial and educational resources available to implement the policies. The implementation of ICT policy without consideration of the information resources needed or IL in the community would decrease the likelihood of successful implementation and use [8].

### ***Economy and Type of Government***

The positive consequences of an information policy focus **based on economy and type of government** is that policies would take into consideration the monetary resources of a country and be financially realistic [12]. Governments that favor widespread and open access to information could address societal problems with more widely available and consistently accessible information [1]. Better coordination would reduce or prevent duplication of effort among the many stakeholders.

The negative consequences of an information policy focus **based on economy and type of government** are that policies for low-income economies would be very limited based on financial resources available. These countries are the ones that have the greatest need for the resolution of global challenges [17]. In countries with authoritarian governments, control of policymaking may be held by people who are motivated by self-interest, rather than the good of the citizenry. Policies may restrict access to and use of information, and thus be counterproductive

to the tenets of a knowledge society [11]. Lastly, information may be used for criminal ends.

### **Conclusion**

This policy brief focused on the question of the role of information policy in resolving global challenges. Three viable alternatives considered important influential factors: specific aspects of information policy, the individual global challenges to be addressed, and the economy and type of government of countries.

### **References**

1. Karan K. 2011. Information policies in Asia: Development of indicators. Bangkok, Thailand: UNESCO Bangkok.  
<http://www.unescobkk.org/news/article/information-policies-in-asia-development-of-indicators/>
2. Braman S. 2006. *Change of state: Information, policy, and power*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
3. Rabina D, Johnston S. 2010. Recent trends in EU information policy: Toward greater transparency in the information society. *Advances in Librarianship* 32:181-97.
4. United Nations. Millennium Development Goals.  
<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml>
5. UN Millennium Project. 2005. *Investing in development: A practical plan to achieve the Millennium Development Goals*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.  
<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/reports/full-report.htm>
6. United Nations General Assembly. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. Keeping the promise: United to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Oct. 19, 2010. A/RES/65/1.  
[http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/outcome\\_documentN1051260.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/outcome_documentN1051260.pdf)
7. James J. 2005. The global digital divide in the Internet: Developed countries constructs and Third World realities. *Journal of Information Science* 31(2):114-123.
8. Munyua H, Adera E, Jensen M. 2009. Emerging ICTs and their potential in revitalizing small-scale agriculture in Africa. *Agricultural Information Worldwide* 2(1):3-9.



9. Arnold A. 2004. Developing a national information policy—considerations for developing countries. *International Information & Library Review* 36:199-207.
10. Anderson RE, Plomp T. 2009. Introduction. In: Plomp T, Anderson RE, Law N, Quale A, eds. Cross-national information and communication technology: Policies and practices in education. 2nd ed. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, p. 3-17.
11. Åström J, Karlsson M, Linde J, Pirranejad A. 2012. Understanding the rise of e-participation in non-democracies: Domestic and international factors. *Government Information Quarterly* 29:142-50.
12. Jakopin NM, Klein A. 2011. Determinants of broadband Internet access take-up: country level drivers. *info* 13(5):29-47.
13. Ma F, Jiang T, Fu Z, Zhao H. 2012. A study on the structure of the Chinese information policy domain framework. *Journal of Information Science* 38(1) 52-63.
14. Qiang CZ. 2010. Broadband infrastructure investment in stimulus packages: Relevance for developing countries. *info* 12(2):41-56.
15. Fornefeld M, Delaunay G, Elixmann D. 2008. The impact of broadband on growth and productivity: A study on behalf of the European Commission. Dusseldorf: MICUS Management Consulting GMBH.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/benchmarking/broadband\\_impact\\_2008.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/benchmarking/broadband_impact_2008.pdf)
16. Katz R. 2012. The impact of broadband on the economy: Research to date and policy issues. Geneva: International Telecommunications Union.  
[http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/treg/broadband/ITU-BB-Reports\\_Impact-of-Broadband-on-the-Economy.pdf](http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/treg/broadband/ITU-BB-Reports_Impact-of-Broadband-on-the-Economy.pdf)
17. Cortes EA, Navarro JA. 2011. Do ICT influence economic growth and human development in European Union Countries? *International Advances in Economic Research* 17:28-44.
18. Rab A. 2009. Information society policies. Annual world report, 2009. UNESCO Information for All Programme.  
[http://portal.unesco.org/pv\\_obj\\_cache/pv\\_obj\\_id\\_7774ED2218FE3D744E13D402CEE010E77B20A00/filename/ifap\\_world\\_report\\_2009.pdf](http://portal.unesco.org/pv_obj_cache/pv_obj_id_7774ED2218FE3D744E13D402CEE010E77B20A00/filename/ifap_world_report_2009.pdf)
19. Measuring the Information Society 2012: Executive summary. Geneva: International Telecommunication Union.  
<http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/publications/idi/material/2012/MIS2012-ExecSum-E.pdf>
20. Dias MP. 2012. Australia's project for universal broadband access: From policy to social potential. *First Monday* 17(9-3).  
<http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4114/3299>
21. Catts R, Lau J. 2008. *Towards information literacy indicators*. Paris: UNESCO.  
<http://www.ifla.org/en/publications/towards-information-literacy-indicators>
22. Epstein D, Nisbet EC, Gillespie T. 2011. Who's responsible for the digital divide? Public perceptions and policy implications. *Information Society* 27:92-104.
23. Swan A. 2012. Policy guidelines for the development and promotion of open access. UNESCO.  
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002158/215863e.pdf>
24. The Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics: Better data for better results—an action plan for improving development statistics. Presented to the Second International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results Marrakech, Morocco, February 4-5, 2004. Roundtable sponsored by the Multilateral Development Banks (African Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank) in collaboration with the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.  
<http://www.mfdr.org/documents/MarrakechActionPlanforStatistics.pdf>
25. Adelheid B. 2010. Finding new data. *Finance & Development* 47(3):52-53.  
<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2010/09/burgi.htm>
26. Hudson H. 2011. Digital diversity: broadband and indigenous populations in Alaska. *Journal of Information Policy* 1:378-93.
27. Basili C. 2011. A framework for analyzing and comparing information literacy policies in European countries. *Library Trends* 60(2):395-418.

28. Weiner S. 2011. Information literacy and the workforce: A review. *Education Libraries* 34(2):7-14.  
<http://units.sla.org/division/ded/educationlibraries/34-2.pdf>
29. Lau J. 2007. Information literacy: An international state-of-the-art report. 2<sup>nd</sup> draft. Veracruz, Mexico: IFLA.  
[http://www.jesuslau.com/docs/publicaciones/doc2/UNESCO\\_state\\_of\\_the\\_art.pdf](http://www.jesuslau.com/docs/publicaciones/doc2/UNESCO_state_of_the_art.pdf)
30. UNESCO Constitution. 1946.  
[http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=15244&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15244&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
31. Meeting global challenges. UNESCO.  
<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/partners-donors/partnering-with-unesco/>
32. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, National Information Systems (NATIS). 1974. Objectives for National and International Action: Intergovernmental Conference on the Planning of National Documentation, Library and Archives Infrastructures. Report COM-74/NATIS/3, July 1974.  
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000097/009793eb.pdf>
33. Talero E, Gaudette P. 1996. Harnessing information for development: A proposal for a World Bank group strategy. [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1999/08/15/000009265\\_3961219093624/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1999/08/15/000009265_3961219093624/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf)
34. Thompson S. 2003. Information literacy meeting of experts, Prague, the Czech Republic, September 20–23, 2003: Report of a meeting.  
<https://docs.google.com/fileview?id=0B3SNEP9j56rIMjM4OGJiNWItM2E4Ni00Yjc0LWJjYTctZDMxZTViOGYyMDAy&hl=en>
35. Garner SD. 2006. High-level colloquium on information literacy and lifelong learning, Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Alexandria, Egypt, November 6–9, 2005: Report of a meeting.  
<http://ifla.queenslibrary.org/III/wsIs/High-Level-Colloquium.pdf>
36. Boekhorst AK, Horton Jr. FW. 2009. Training-the-trainers in information literacy (TTT) workshops project, final report to UNESCO. *International Information and Library Review* 41(4):224-30.
37. The Moscow Declaration on Media and Information Literacy. UNESCO Information for All Programme, IFLA. June 28, 2012.  
[http://ifapcom.ru/files/News/Images/2012/mil/Moscow\\_Declaration\\_on\\_MIL\\_eng.pdf](http://ifapcom.ru/files/News/Images/2012/mil/Moscow_Declaration_on_MIL_eng.pdf)
38. Declaration of principles: Building the Information Society: A global challenge in the new millennium. World Summit on the Information Society, Geneva 2003-Tunis 2005. WSIS-03/GENEVA/DOC/4-E.  
<http://www.itu.int/wsIs/docs/geneva/official/dop.html>
39. Tăbușcă S. The Internet access as a fundamental right.  
<ftp://all.repec.org/opt/ReDIF/RePEc/rau/jisomg/WI10/JISOM-WI10-A21.pdf>
40. Duff AS. 2012. The Rawls-Tawney Theorem and the digital divide in the postindustrial society. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62(3):604-12.
41. National Broadband Plan: Connecting America. Washington, DC: Federal Communications Commission.  
<http://www.broadband.gov/plan/>
42. ACRL. 1989. Presidential Committee on Information Literacy: Final report.  
<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential.cfm>
43. Obama B. 2009. National Information Literacy Awareness Month.  
[http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Presidential-Proclamation-National-Information-Literacy-Awareness-Month/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Presidential-Proclamation-National-Information-Literacy-Awareness-Month/)
44. Saunders L. 2007. Regional accreditation organizations' treatment of information literacy: Definitions, collaboration, and assessment. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 33(3):317–326.
45. Bangemann Report: Europe and the Global Information Society. 1994.  
<http://www.cyber-rights.org/documents/bangemann.htm>
46. ICT for greater development impact: World Bank Group strategy for information and communication technology 2012-2015.  
[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINFORMATIONANDCOMMUNICATIONANDTECHNOLOGIES/Resources/WBG\\_ICT\\_Strategy-2012.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINFORMATIONANDCOMMUNICATIONANDTECHNOLOGIES/Resources/WBG_ICT_Strategy-2012.pdf)

47. Baer WS. 1997. Will the global information infrastructure need transnational (or any) governance? In: National information infrastructure initiatives: Vision and policy design. Ed. by Kahin B, Wilson III E, ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, p. 532-52.
48. Suriya M. 1998. The impact of informatisation on economic and human development: A cross-country analysis. *Asian Libraries* 7(7):152-70.
49. Owen BB, Cooke L, Matthews G. 2012. Information policymaking in the United Kingdom: The role of the information professional. *Journal of Information Policy* 2:51-78.  
<http://jip.vmlhost.psu.edu/ojs/index.php/jip/article/view/82/49>
50. Florini A, Saleem S. 2011. Information disclosure in global energy governance. *Global Policy* 2:144-54.
51. Hanna NK, Knight PT. 2012. Comparative experience and lessons in e-transformation. In: *National strategies to harness information technology: Seeking transformation in Singapore, Finland, the Philippines, and South Africa*. Hanna NK, Knight PT, ed. New York: Springer. p. 195-231.
52. Ayoo P, Otiye J. 2002. Factors hampering the formulation of a national information policy in Kenya. *Library Review* 51(7):350-7.

## Appendix 1. WORLD BANK COUNTRY CLASSIFICATION

<http://www.oecd.org/site/iops/documents/35876528.pdf>

### Low-income economies (61)

Afghanistan Guinea-Bissau Pakistan  
 Angola Haiti Papua New Guinea  
 Bangladesh India Rwanda  
 Benin Kenya Sao Tome and Principe  
 Bhutan Korea, Dem Rep. Senegal  
 Burkina Faso Kyrgyz Republic Sierra Leone  
 Burundi Lao PDR Solomon Islands  
 Cambodia Lesotho Somalia  
 Cameroon Liberia Sudan  
 Central African Republic Madagascar Tajikistan  
 Chad Malawi Tanzania  
 Comoros Mali Timor-Leste  
 Congo, Dem. Rep Mauritania Togo  
 Congo, Rep. Moldova Uganda  
 Cote d'Ivoire Mongolia Uzbekistan  
 Equatorial Guinea Mozambique Vietnam  
 Eritrea Myanmar Yemen, Rep.  
 Ethiopia Nepal Zambia  
 Gambia, The Nicaragua Zimbabwe  
 Ghana Niger  
 Guinea Nigeria

### Middle-income economies (93)

Albania Georgia Philippines  
 Algeria Guatemala Romania  
 Armenia Guyana Russian Federation  
 Azerbaijan Honduras Samoa  
 Belarus Indonesia Serbia and Montenegro  
 Bolivia Iran, Islamic Rep. South Africa  
 Bosnia and Herzegovina Iraq Sri Lanka  
 Brazil Jamaica Suriname  
 Bulgaria Jordan Swaziland  
 Cape Verde Kazakhstan Syrian Arab Republic  
 China Kiribati Thailand  
 Colombia Macedonia, FYR Tonga  
 Cuba Maldives Tunisia  
 Djibouti Marshall Islands Turkey  
 Dominican Republic Micronesia, Fed. Sts.  
 Turkmenistan  
 Ecuador Morocco Ukraine  
 Egypt, Arab Rep. Namibia Vanuatu  
 El Salvador Paraguay West Bank and Gaza  
 Fiji Peru  
 American Samoa Grenada Panama  
 Antigua and Barbuda Hungary Poland  
 Argentina Latvia Saudi Arabia  
 Barbados Lebanon Seychelles  
 Belize Libya Slovak Republic

Botswana Lithuania St. Kitts and Nevis  
 Chile Malaysia St. Lucia  
 Costa Rica Mauritius St. Vincent and the  
 Grenadines  
 Croatia Mayotte Trinidad and Tobago  
 Czech Republic Mexico Uruguay  
 Dominica Northern Mariana Islands Venezuela, RB  
 Estonia Oman  
 Gabon Palau

### High-income economies (54)

Andorra Germany Netherlands  
 Aruba Greece Netherlands Antilles  
 Australia Greenland New Caledonia  
 Austria Guam New Zealand  
 Bahamas, The Hong Kong, China Norway  
 Bahrain Iceland Portugal  
 Belgium Ireland Puerto Rico  
 Bermuda Isle of Man Qatar  
 Brunei Israel San Marino  
 Canada Italy Singapore  
 Cayman Islands Japan Slovenia  
 Channel Islands Korea, Rep. Spain  
 Cyprus Kuwait Sweden  
 Denmark Liechtenstein Switzerland  
 Faeroe Islands Luxembourg United Arab Emirates  
 Finland Macao, China United Kingdom  
 France Malta United States  
 French Polynesia Monaco Virgin Islands (U.S.)

## Appendix 2. 2011 DEMOCRACY INDEX CATEGORIZATION OF COUNTRIES.

[http://www.eiu.com/Handlers/WhitepaperHandler.aspx?fi=Democracy\\_Index\\_Final\\_Dec\\_2011.pdf&moe=wp&campaignid=DemocracyIndex2011](http://www.eiu.com/Handlers/WhitepaperHandler.aspx?fi=Democracy_Index_Final_Dec_2011.pdf&moe=wp&campaignid=DemocracyIndex2011)

### Full Democracies.

Australia  
 Canada  
 Denmark  
 Finland  
 Iceland  
 Luxembourg  
 Netherlands  
 New Zealand  
 Norway  
 Sweden  
 Switzerland



**Democracies under Stress.**

Austria  
 Belgium  
 Costa Rica  
 Czech Republic  
 Germany  
 Ireland  
 Japan  
 Malta  
 Mauritius  
 South Korea  
 Spain  
 United Kingdom  
 United States  
 Uruguay

**Flawed Democracies.**

Argentina  
 Benin  
 Botswana  
 Brazil  
 Bulgaria  
 Cape Verde  
 Chile  
 Columbia  
 Croatia  
 Cyprus  
 Dominican Republic  
 El Salvador  
 Estonia  
 France  
 Ghana  
 Greece  
 Guyana  
 Hungary  
 India  
 Indonesia  
 Israel  
 Italy  
 Jamaica  
 Latvia  
 Lesotho  
 Lithuania  
 Macedonia  
 Malaysia  
 Mali  
 Mexico  
 Moldavia  
 Mongolia  
 Montenegro  
 Namibia  
 Panama  
 Papua New Guinea

Paraguay  
 Peru  
 Philippines  
 Poland  
 Portugal  
 Romania  
 Serbia  
 Slovakia  
 Slovenia  
 South Africa  
 Sri Lanka  
 Suriname  
 Taiwan  
 Thailand  
 Timor-Leste  
 Trinidad and Tobago  
 Zambia

**Hybrid Regimes.**

Albania  
 Armenia  
 Bangladesh  
 Bhutan  
 Bolivia  
 Bosnia and Herzegovina  
 Burundi  
 Cambodia  
 Ecuador  
 Egypt  
 Georgia  
 Guatemala  
 Haiti  
 Honduras  
 Hong Kong  
 Iraq  
 Kenya  
 Kyrgyz Republic  
 Lebanon  
 Liberia  
 Malawi  
 Mauritania  
 Mozambique  
 Nepal  
 Nicaragua  
 Niger  
 Pakistan  
 Palestine  
 Senegal  
 Sierra Leone  
 Singapore  
 Tanzania  
 Tunisia  
 Turkey

Uganda  
Ukraine  
Venezuela

**Authoritarian Regimes.**

Afghanistan  
Algeria  
Angola  
Azerbaijan  
Bahrain  
Belarus  
Burkina Faso  
Cameroon  
Central African Republic  
Chad  
China  
Comoros  
Congo (Brazzaville)  
Cote d'Ivoire  
Democratic Republic of Congo  
Djibouti  
Equatorial Guinea  
Eritrea  
Ethiopia  
Fiji  
Gabon  
Gambia  
Guinea  
Guinea-Bissau  
Iran  
Jordan  
Kazakhstan  
Kenya  
Kuwait  
Laos  
Libya  
Madagascar  
Morocco  
Myanmar  
Nigeria  
North Korea  
Oman  
Qatar  
Rwanda  
Russia  
Saudi Arabia  
Sudan  
Swaziland  
Syria  
Tajikistan  
Togo  
Turkmenistan

United Arab Emirates  
Uzbekistan  
Vietnam  
Yemen  
Zimbabwe

**Appendix 3. CROSS TABULATION WITH DEMOCRACY INDEX AND WORLD BANK COUNTRY CLASSIFICATION.**

	<b>Full Democracy</b>	<b>Flawed Democracy</b>	<b>Hybrid Regimes</b>	<b>Authoritarian Regimes</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Low-income economy</b>	0% (n=0)	6.1% (n=10)	11.7% (n=19)	17.2% (n=28)	35% (n=57)
<b>Middle-income economy</b>	2.5% (n=4)	20.9% (n=34)	9.2% (n=15)	11.7% (n=19)	44.2% (n=72)
<b>High-income economy</b>	12.9% (n=21)	4.3% (n=7)	1.2% (n=2)	2.5% (n=4)	20.9% (n=34)
<b>Total</b>	15.3% (n=25)	31.3% (n=51)	22.1% (n=36)	31.3% (n=51)	100% (n=163)

p = .000