ZHENG Fang (MEY08112)

Figure2

Unemployment duration survey by the ACYF, 2005



Source: China Youth Employment Report, 2005

2.1.4 Rural youth in disadvantage

China has the dual urban-rural household registration system. Urban young people in this paper refers to the youth aged 15-29 with urban household registration and rural young people refers to the youth aged 15-29 with agriculture household registration. Recent years, the term "rural migrant workers" is used to refer to the people who come from agriculture areas to work temporarily, usually non-regularly in urban areas and do not have urban registration.

Compared with urban youth, the rural young people are in disadvantage in terms of education level and job opportunity. Figure 3 shows a comparison between the education level of youth in rural and urban area, from which it can be observed that in rural area, the majority of young people are under senior high school education while in the urban area the majority of youth are above senior high education. The percentage of college and university graduates and post-graduates account for 11% of rural youth, while the number in urban area is more than 38%.

According to *China labor statistical yearbook 2006*, the majority of employed young people in urban area are in the fields such as business service; production, transport sector, etc. The statistics are unavailable for the rural young labor. According to the survey by the ACYF, less than 1 % of rural youth remain in agriculture sector. The overwhelmingly majority are seeking jobs in non-agriculture sector. The occupational comparison is shown in the graph: rural young people are much more engaged in manual and technical jobs while urban youth takes more jobs in professional, managerial, administration, and clerical work. The differences in job opportunities contributed to disparity in wages and working conditions.

ZHENG Fang (MEY08112)

relatively low-status jobs including hotel housekeeping, office cleaning, waitressing and construction work, etc.

Figurel

The economic activity status of the young population by age and sex



Source: China Youth Employment Report, 2005

2.1.3 Long duration of unemployment

According to China Youth Employment Report which reports the situation in year 2005, about 72% of young people without job remain unemployed for more than one year. As shown in figure 2, only 3% of unemployed youth are able to find job within one month.

According to the survey, the median age for the young population to first enter the labor market is 20. About 80% of the young people first entered the labor market somewhere between 17 to 23 years old, 13% young before 16 years old, only 2% enter the labor market after the age of 26. For the people entered the labor market before 22 years old, about 15% of them started their labor force experience with a period of unemployment, while almost all the persons who entered the labor market for the first time after reaching age 22 started their labor force experience with being employed. So the fact is that the earlier the young people enter labor market, the easier it is for one to be jobless, and the longer the unemployment duration. It is thus vital to keep young people stay in school for long enough period of time to avoid an early entry to the labor market and long-period of unemployment.

Table 4 Perceptions of the participants and *T*-test/ANOVA & Scheffé for differences in their perceptions on effects of the placement practice on learning

		(%)	(%)	<u>(%)</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>(%)</u>			<i>u I</i>	(2-
1. I think the placement	ent practice is	1.9	18.4	16.8	52.7	10.2	3.51	.97	5.52	.0
learning.	Student	2.0	18.8	17.3	52.4	9.5	3.49	.97		•
	Teacher	0	0	0	63.6	36.4	4.36	.505		
	Level Subgroups								.92	
	Level A	2.5	7.5	32.5	42.5	15	3.60	.922		
	Level B	2.8	8.3	37.8	45.6	5.6	3.43	.833		
	Level C	1.2	9.9	38.4	39.5	11.0	3.49	.862	••	
10. Students have signi	ficantly improved	3.2	22.5	32.6	36.5	5.2	3.18	.95	31	
their learning achievem	ient. Student	3.3	22.3	32.3	36.9	5.1	3.18	.95		
	Ieacner	U	27.3	45.5	18.2	9.1	3.09	.944	10	
	Level Subgroups	5.0	16.2	475	21.2	10.0	2 15	002	.19	
	Level A	2.0	10.5	47.J 56 1	21.5	2 0	2 12	.702		
	Level D	2.5	11.7	50.1	20.1	2.0 17	2 72	824		
7 With the practice st	Indents understand	17	18 1	170	52.2	80	3 40	.024	2 4 5	,
and accept more the tea	ching content and	1.7	10.1	17.5	55.5	0.9	J.79	.95	2.75	ċ
methods of their teache	s Student	10	18.6	177	54.0	8.0	3 48	Q 4		,
incurous of their teache	Teacher	1.7	0	273	27.3	45.5	4 18	874		
	Level Subamuns	v	v	27.5	27.5	-J.J	4.10	.074	22	
	Level A	2.5	8.8	36.3	40.0	12.5	3.51	.914		
	Level B	2.2	8.3	38.3	45.6	5.6	3.44	.813		
	Level C	0.6	8.7	38.4	45.3	7.0	3.49	.776		
8. With the practice. low	w achievers	3.0	23.5	29.4	35.6	8.4	3.23	.9997	-3.24	.0
progress slowly becaus	e of absence of						-			(
high achieving peers to	learn from.									
2 Officiate	Student	2.9	22.6	29.6	36.3	8.6	3.25	.99		
	Teacher	9.1	63.6	18.2	9.1	0	2.27	.786		
	Level Subgroups								1.85	
	Level A	1.3	10.0	42.5	37.5	8.8	3.43	.839		
	Level B	2.8	7.2	50.0	35.6	4.4	3.32	.787		
	Level C	0.6	11.0	43.6	37.2	7.6	3.40	.807		
11. I think students' im	provement is due	2.4	17.1	6.9	52.1	21.6	3.73	1.06	.56	
to students' willingness	to learn; no									
correlation between the	: improvement and		15.5	.	<i>.</i>	21.2	2 72	1.00		
the practice.	Student	2.2	17.3	7.1	52.2	21.2	3.73	1.05		
	Ieacher	9.1	9.1	U	42.2	<i>3</i> 0.4	3.9	1.5	1 00	
	Level Subgroups	25	75	27 5	41.2	11 2	2 51	002	1.09	
	Level A	2.3	1.5	57.5 A1 7	41.3	11.5	2.21	.000		
	Level B	J.U 2 0	0.0	41./	30.3 30 4	4.4	3.41	.074		
12 I think students' im	nrovement is due	2.7	7.7		52.5	22.2	3 83	1 02	- 60	
to students' learning att	provenient is due	1.7	10.4	7.1	57.2	23.0	2.02	1.05	00	
and a substance in a structure of the	improvement and									
correlation between the	Student	1.5	16.2	4.2	54.4	23.7	3.83	1.02		
the practice.	JUNER		10.0	0	45.5	27.3	3.64	1 262		
the practice.	Teacher	9.1	18.2	-	-	-	-	1.302		
the practice.	Teacher Level Subgroups	9.1	18.2					1.302	1.56	
the practice.	Teacher Level Subgroups Level A	9.1 2.5	18.2	50.0	28.8	8.8	3.31	.866	1.56	
the practice.	Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B	9.1 2.5 2.8	18.2 10.0 13.9	50.0 48.3	28.8 27.8	8.8 7.2	3.31 3.23	.866 .877	1.56	
the practice.	Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2	50.0 48.3 52.9	28.8 27.8 25.0	8.8 7.2 7.0	3.31 3.23 <u>3.21</u>	.866 .877 .853	1.56	
2. Students feel less stre	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0	10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2	3.31 3.23 <u>3.21</u> 3.47	.866 .877 .853 1.02	1.56 <u>3.76</u>	
 Students feel less strisimilar English levels. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1	10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45	.866 .877 .853 1.02 1.03	1.56 3.76). (
 Students feel less stra similar English levels. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Essed in a class of Student Teacher	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09	.866 .877 .853 1.02 1.03 .539	1.56 3.76). (
2. Students feel less stro similar English levels.	Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09	.866 .877 .853 1.02 1.03 .539	1.56 3.76 3.27). (
2. Students feel less stra similar English levels.	Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24		1.56 3.76 3.27).) !. !.)
 2. Students feel less strissimilar English levels. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.0 18.8	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42		1.56 3.76 3.27). () ()
 2. Students feel less strisimilar English levels. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.0	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55		1.56 3.76 3.27). () () ()
 2. Students feel less strasmilar English levels. 4. With the practice, strasmilar the practice strasmilar the strategy of the strate	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more ot in level in the series	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91)) () ()
 Students feel less strasmilar English levels. With the practice, strasmity at the practice strasmity at the practice strasmity at the practice strasmity at the practice strasmity at the strasmit, strasmity at the strasmity at the strasmity at the stras	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Ecvel C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28	1.302 .866 .877 .853 1.02 1.03 .539 1.094 .865 .88 .95	1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91). () () ()
 Students feel less strasmilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their intervention of the strasmilar English in class. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.27		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91). () () ()
 Students feel less strasmilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their intervention of the strasmilar English in class. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91). () ()
 Students feel less strismilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their interendent of the strict of the strine strict of the strict of the strict of the strict of the str	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C Idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 0 3.8	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.2	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5	8.8 7.2 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.20		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68). () () ()
 Students feel less strasmilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their intervention of the strasmilar English in class. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level A Level C	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 0 3.8 3.9	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68) () ()
 Students feel less strain similar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their interned in their interned in their interned in class. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level A Level B	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 50.0 45.3	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 35.6	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68). () () ()
 Students feel less strasmilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their intervention in class. With the practice strasmilar english in class. 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level B Level B Level B	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 50.0 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 35.0	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68). () () ()
 2. Students feel less strasmilar English levels. 4. With the practice, stumotivated in their intervention of the strategy of the str	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C Level B Level C udents with good	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82). () () ()
 Students feel less strismilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their interendent of the string of	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents with good elevate their	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9	8.8 7.2 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82). () () ()
 Students feel less strismilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their interending in class. With the practice, stury or poor English start to interest in their English 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level A Level B Level C idents with good elevate their learning.	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9 28.1	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82). () () ()
 Students feel less strasmilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their interenglish in class. With the practice, stur or poor English start to interest in their English 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level A Level B Level C idents with good elevate their learning. Student Teacher	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1 0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9 28.1 18.2	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9 36.5 54.5	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8 4.9 0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13 3.12 3.36		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82). () ()
 2. Students feel less strasmilar English levels. 4. With the practice, strasmilar English levels. 6. With the practice, strasmotivated in their interest in their English start to interest in their English 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C idents with good elevate their learning. Student Teacher Level Subgroups	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1 0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9 28.1 18.2	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9 36.5 54.5	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8 4.9 0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13 3.12 3.36		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82 .33). () ()
 2. Students feel less strasmilar English levels. 4. With the practice, stumotivated in their interend in their interend in their interest in class. 6. With the practice, stur or poor English start to interest in their English 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C udents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C udents with good elevate their learning. Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level C udents with good elevate their	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1 0 3.8 3.9 0 3.1 0 3.8 3.9 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.2 8 3.9 3.0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.1 0 3.2 8 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.8 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9 28.1 18.2 22.5	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.3 45.0	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9 36.5 54.5 18.8	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8 4.9 0 10.0	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13 3.12 3.36 3.09		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82 .33	0. () (). ()
 Students feel less strismilar English levels. With the practice, stumotivated in their interendent for the practice, stumotivated in class. With the practice, sture or poor English start to interest in their English 	Teacher Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C essed in a class of Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C udents are more est in learning Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level A Level B Level C udents with good elevate their learning. Student Teacher Level Subgroups Level C udents with good elevate their learning.	9.1 2.5 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1 0 6.3 3.9 1.2 2.4 2.4 0 3.8 3.9 0.6 3.0 3.1 0 3.8 5.0	18.2 10.0 13.9 12.2 20.5 21.0 0 18.8 8.3 10.5 21.9 18.2 11.3 13.3 11.6 27.9 28.1 18.2 22.5 16.1	50.0 48.3 52.9 13.2 13.3 9.1 32.5 34.4 32.6 27.4 27.9 9.1 45.0 50.0 45.3 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4 27.4	28.8 27.8 25.0 53.1 52.7 72.7 30.0 48.3 43.6 42.3 42.3 45.5 32.5 28.9 36.6 36.9 36.5 54.5 18.8 26.7	8.8 7.2 7.0 10.2 10.0 18.2 12.5 5.0 12.2 6.0 5.5 27.3 7.5 3.9 5.8 4.8 4.9 0 10.0 2.8	3.31 3.23 3.21 3.47 3.45 4.09 3.24 3.42 3.55 3.28 3.27 3.82 3.29 3.16 3.35 3.13 3.12 3.36 3.09 3.06		1.56 3.76 3.27 1.91 .68 .82 .33	0.))))

•

 Table 4 (continued)

 ,

······	1-	2*	3 *	4 "	5 °	Mean	SD	t/F	Sig.
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	_(%)				(2-tailed)
3. With the practice, students are more		19.7	29.4	41.0	7.6	3.32	.95	1.13	.261
focused in class than before. Student	2.4	19.9	29.2	41.2	7.3	3.31	.95		
Teacher	· 0	9.1	36.4	36.4	18.2	3.64	.924		•
Level Subgroups								1.36	.267
LevelA	3.8	11.3	43.8	30.0	11.3	3.34	.954		
Level B	3.3	10.6	52.8	30.6	2.8	3.19	.790		
Level C	1.2	9.3	47.7	33.7	8.1	3.38	.812		
5. With the practice, students are more	2.8	27.2	30.2	34.6	5.2	3.12	.96	-1.06	.291
active and positive about their English									
learning. Student	2.9	26.5	30.5	35.0	5.1	3.13	.96		
Teacher	• 0	54.5	18.2	18.2	9.1	2.82	1.079		
Level Subgroups	·							1.54	.215
Level A	5.0	20.0	37.5	28.8	8.8	3.16	1.012		
Level B	4.4	16.7	54.4	21.1	3.3	3.02	.832		
Level C	0.6	14.5	52.9	27.9	4.1	3.20	.757	. –	
9. Students are more willing to respond	6.0	28.9	32.6	27.9	4.5	2.96	.995	47	.636
in class. Student	6.2	28.5	32.5	28.3	4.4	2.96	.997		
Teacher	· 0	45.5	36.4	9.1	9.1	2.82	.982		
Level Subgroups								3.36	.036*
Level A	5.0	25.0	38.8	23.8	7.5	3.04	.999		(.048*)
Level B	7.8	21.7	53.3	16.1	1.1	2.81	.838		(C>B)
Level C	5.8	14.0	57.0	17.4	5.8	3.03	.885		

Note: *P<.05, **P<.01;

^a 1="Disagree Very Much"; 2="Disagree"; 3="No Opinion"; 4="Agree"; 5="Agree Very Much".

in that "with the practice, low achievers progress slowly because of absence of high achieving peers to learn from" (Item 8). In fact, students at a low achieving class are deprived of the example and stimulation provided by high achievers (e.g. Good and Marshall, 1984; Persell, 1977). The student group was significantly more concerned about slow progress of the low achievers than did their teachers (p<.01), denoting another negative effect of the grouping practice which should have raised the teachers' attention to.

To examine if the placement practice influences learning motivation of the students, it is found that 62.7% of the students and 90.9% of the teachers agreed on that "students feel less stressed in a class of similar English levels" (Item 2), suggestive of a positive effect on lowering students' affective filter. Respective 41.7% and 48.3% of the whole respondents claimed that "with the practice, students with good or poor English start to elevate their interest in their English learning" (Item 6) and that "students are more motivated in their interest in learning English in class" (Item 4). Compared to Item 2 wining a mean of 3.47 (M=3.45 for students /M=4.09 for teachers, these two other motivational effects, though failing to sustain significant evidences, both still gained a mean of above 3 (see Table 4).

As for the issue of how the placement practice impacts students' attitude to learning, the result shows that less than fifty percent of the whole respondents (48.6%) endorsed that with the practice, students become "more focused in class than before" (Item 3, M=3.32). A smaller proportion of about two-fifths of the respondents reported that "with the practice, students are more active and positive about their English learning" (Item 5) with a mean of 3.12. These findings indicate a somewhat positive effect of the placement practice on students' attitude to learning. However, the item of "students are more willing to respond in class" (Item 9) received the least agreements

(4) and therefore an English placement practice will influence what learners learn; and

(5) An English placement practice will influence learning in terms of degree of learners' motivation/attitude to English learning and affective level.

Table 6

Washback effects of placement practice on English teaching and learning

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Effects on Learning	Effects on Learning
Learning outcomes	Learning outcomes
The placement practice benefits student's English learning outcomes/achievement albeit not significant.	No direct correlation between students' improvement and the practice.
The placement practice is helpful for students'	No significant improvement on English competence.
English learning.	Possible slow progress of the low achievers due to absence of high achieving peers to learn from.
Learning motivation/attitude and	
affective level	Learning motivation/attitude
Elevating students' positive attitude towards English earning	Student's remaining passive in classroom participation.
Increasing students' levels of focus in class.	
The placement practice lowers students' stress level, especially for low achievers.	
Students at Level C become more inclining to respond in class than those at Level B.	Effects on Teaching
(effect for some learners but not for others)	Influence attitude to teaching content, methods, assessment system and practice
Effects on Teaching	measure
Influence attitude to teaching content,	Students' relative less satisfactory attitude toward the
methods, assessment system and	placement tests used, the assessment tools and the
practice measure	scoring system in general.
Students' understanding and according mars the	Doubt about the fairness of achievement assessment as
teaching content and methods of their teachers.	a result of adoption of non-standardized assessment.
Students' and teachers' positive attitudes toward the	A possibly too positive teachers' attitude to the
teaching content and methods used.	ability-grouping in terms of the 3-level grouping and
Positive attitude towards a 3-level grouping.	placement tools for freshmen and sophomores.
Easy to enact interactive teaching-learning	
activities. (effect on teaching-learning process)	
Constant adjustments made to curricula/programs or	
the placement practice: (1) curricular	
decision-making of teaching content, changing from	
the individual to the collective; (2) the expansion of	
pracement application from Freshmen English to	
sophomore English. (enect on the program)	

And to be exact (6) An English placement practice will influence students' and

other company which is located in the countries that does not impose the tax. With relation to income distribution, the concern is about equality in revenue distribution. Usually poor households get the worst impact from the tax compared with rich households. The impact usually relates to financial problem. For example, with more money the higher income person is willing to pay more to get better goods and services compared with the lower income person. This obstacle will be one of main considerations to OECD member countries in deciding whether the implement environment taxes in their countries or not.⁵⁰

ź

(

1

i

1

1

1

1

1

In spite of the obstacles faced by OECD member countries, environment taxes also bring additional revenue to their GDP which is almost 2 per cent in average from 1996 to 2006.⁵¹ This additional revenue for respective countries can be seen in Figure 2 below.



Source: OECD.

As shown in figure 2, among the countries, Denmark has the highest additional revenue to GDP from environment related taxes and also this revenue gradually increased from 1996 to 2006.

One of the OECD member countries which are already implementing the tax is the United Kingdom (UK). The reason in choosing UK as an example in this paper is because revenue obtained from the tax increased by around 56 per cent between 1994 and 2003 and also its policy on environmental tax rates was reviewed each period. There are 8 (eight) environment taxes imposed in UK that has further been grouped into four main categories: energy product, pollution, resources, and transport. These taxes are duty on hydrocarbon oil, VAT on duty, fossil fuel levy, climate change levy, vehicle excise duty, air passenger duty, landfill tax, and aggregate levy. One of those categories is energy product which increased significantly by 53 per cent in period 1994 – 2003 from £17.8 billion in 1994 to £27.2 billion in 2002. ⁵² One of the policies on environment taxes that were reviewed each period is the policy related to fossil fuel levy (FFL) and Landfill tax.

Data from UK's HM Customs and Excise as cited by Lin and Francis⁵³ states that FFL is levied on electricity price which uses fossil fuel to encourage renewable energy sources for electricity. At first levied at period April 1990 – March 1991, FFL rate was 10.60%. This rate was reviewed every period. In period April 1991 – March 1993 rate was increased to 11.00%, however since April 1993 until March 2002 rate was reduced to 0.30%. Landfill tax which was introduced in 1996 is levied to waste that is disposed at a licensed landfill site. This tax is levied at two rates, lower rate and standard rate. Standard rate is reviewed each period; however the lower rate is fixed. At first the standard rate was introduced in year 1996, the tax rate was £7 per ton and then increased at least £3 gradually every period until it reached £35 per ton.

There are some studies on the effect of environmental tax to business activities in OECD member countries. The studies point out that environment related taxes give a positive effect to the companies besides its negative effect. Some of these studies are (1) a study in Ireland done by Clinch and Dunne⁵⁴ which states that environment related tax which relates to energy will help company change their behavior in using energy to be more efficient

⁵⁰ OECD, Environmentally Related Taxes in OECD Countries (OECD: France, 2001), 29.

⁵¹ OECD, Environmentally Related Taxes, Fees, and Charges, 2006, <u>http://www2.oecd.org/ecoinst/queries/index.htm</u> (accessed June 6, 2009). ⁵² Emily Lin and Perry Francis, "Industrial Analysis of Environmental Taxes", (Economic Trends no.609, August,

²² Emily Lin and Perry Francis, "Industrial Analysis of Environmental Taxes", (Economic Trends no.609, August, 2004), <u>http://www.statistics.gov.uk/articles/economics_treads/ET609lin.pdf</u> (accessed April 30, 2009).
⁵³ Ibid., p.57-59.

⁵⁴ J. Peter Clinch and Louise Dunne, "Environmental Tax Reform: An Assessment of Social Responses in Ireland", *Energy Policy*, no. 34 (2006): 959-959, http:// <u>www.elsevier.com/locate/enpol</u> (accessed June 29, 2009).

Pakistan the biggest reasons for this insularity to Global credit crisis are in fact borne from some structural inadequacies of microcredit sector.

One reason, shared by microcredit organizations in many developing countries, is the non-integration of the microcredit into the mainstream of global finances. UNDP estimates that, the 104 worldwide funds that invest in the microcredit institutions all over the world have assets of USD 6.5billion.¹⁷ Though this seems impressive, the microcredit capital forms only a periphery of the global capital flows.

The second reason is that Pakistan microcredit sector has remained relatively un-commercialized through the decade of 2000. The bulk of the funding has been siphoned from donor agencies through the PPAF. This has meant that the capital available has not been taken from competitive sources. Relatively cheap capital, consequently, should result in a lower rate of return on investment. This is indeed the case. Pakistan has one of the lowest returns on capital among the worldwide microcredit sector.



Source: Figure 7. Microfinance performance in Pakistan 1999-2005¹⁸

The third reason, which is an extension of the above issue, is that Pakistani microcredit sector ranks low on self-sufficiency. This means that the heavy reliance on donor capital has precluded attraction by not only global capital but also local capitol sources.



2004

Middle East & North Africa: 105%

South & East Asia: 109% Sub-Saharan

Africa: 101%

MENA



2003

Africa

40

20

2002

Pakstan

Year

EC4

2005

+ LAC

¹⁷ UNDP. (2009). Poverty Reduction Discussion Paper. PG/ 2009/ 001. www.undp.org/poverty

¹⁸ Burki, H. and Chen G.(2006) "Microfinance Performance in Pakistan 1999-2005". ShoreBank Intl. USAID. Microfinance Connect. www.pmn.org

accuracy and where appropriate, be made available to the operational service, however this is yet to be achieved in Kenya. For instance, Post clearance records, offence records and chemical analysis records are maintained in hard copy and are not entered in the system. This is because of lack of a centralized database. Offences raised used to be maintained in the respective offices until 2006 when the risk management unit started to maintain the national offences register and developed the template for forwarding the offences to the headquarters. However, chemical analysis records, IPR information and some importers and exporters' information is outside the system. This makes building of complete profiles very difficult. To solve this, all records should be entered into a centralized database so that complete profiles can be built.

3.4.4. Risk Analysis and Risk Treatment

In the case of **Japan**, there is the national and the regional Operation Analysis Staff (OAS). National OAS analyzes data and sets national criteria while regional OAS analyzes and sets regional criteria. Analysis is done manually.²⁴ The Operation Analysis Staff determine the likelihood and the magnitude of the risks using CIS data. The OAS will then prioritize unacceptable risks by giving them ratings. First, qualification of importers (risk assessment and grouping of importers) is done, and then comparison between the selectivity criteria and import declaration data articles follows. A selectivity criterion is then installed within NACCS. Due to the sensitivity of the information, the officers did not divulge in-depth details of how this analysis is done.



Source: Customs and Tariff Bureau, Japan

The risks are treated in three ways: cargo examination (red channel), document examination (yellow channel) and direct release (green channel). In the case of the **United States**, in order to analyze risks, Customs identifies the areas of Customs activity that represent risk (risk exposure) to Customs. The Focused Assessment (FA) team must

²⁴ The Tokyo Customs and Tariff Bureau explained that there is no automated software for risk analysis but the staffs have to do the analysis using ordinary computer programmes like MS-Access and MS-Excel.

ZHENG Fang (MEY08112)

relatively low-status jobs including hotel housekeeping, office cleaning, waitressing and construction work, etc.

Figure1

The economic activity status of the young population by age and sex



Source: China Youth Employment Report, 2005

2.1.3 Long duration of unemployment

According to China Youth Employment Report which reports the situation in year 2005, about 72% of young people without job remain unemployed for more than one year. As shown in figure 2, only 3% of unemployed youth are able to find job within one month.

According to the survey, the median age for the young population to first enter the labor market is 20. About 80% of the young people first entered the labor market somewhere between 17 to 23 years old, 13% young before 16 years old, only 2% enter the labor market after the age of 26. For the people entered the labor market before 22 years old, about 15% of them started their labor force experience with a period of unemployment, while almost all the persons who entered the labor market for the first time after reaching age 22 started their labor force experience with being employed. So the fact is that the earlier the young people enter labor market, the easier it is for one to be jobless, and the longer the unemployment duration. It is thus vital to keep young people stay in school for long enough period of time to avoid an early entry to the labor market and long-period of unemployment.

ISMAIL, Nor Hisham (MEY08115)

grade awarded and "Five-Star Rating Award" will be given to the schools based on the grade they achieved. The Ministry of Education Malaysia uses the evaluation results to scrutinize each of the items of evaluation for a comprehensive feedback to the schools. Appendix 6 describes the format of SKIPS rating system.

Analysis of the Two Systems

The first part of this chapter will discuss the similarities and differences, as well as the favorable and inhibiting features of the SKIPS Accreditation System as compared to the CIS accreditation system. This chapter then will attempt to analyze the implementation of the SKIPS Accreditation System in Malaysia by the management process analysis adopting the Phased Planning Method (Ph.P Method) developed by Professor Kaoru Okamoto of GRIPS (the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Japan). The method is a generally applicable as for management analysis process following the seven-step cycle as described in **Appendix 1**.

Similarities and Differences of the Accreditation Model Frameworks

The models used by CIS and SKIPS have six common stages which begin with school registration followed by accreditation briefing, school preparation, evaluation, award and the outcome of the accreditation, in which some criteria are similar and different from each other as explained in the table below;

Stages	Similarities	Differences			
Registration	All schools must be registered to be eligible for accreditation.	Fees are impose in CIS accreditation but SKIPS accreditation is free			
Accreditation briefing	Briefing and workshop held to explain everything about the accreditation process for school to prepare.	CIS briefing involve other school constituent groups i.e. parents body, students council and governing body but SKIPS only invited school representatives (2 to 3 people) to a series of seminars about SKIPS.			
School Preparation	Guidelines provided	CIS uses Self-Study instrument where schools prepare for self-evaluation for at least a period of 18 months before accreditation is granted but SKIPS only provide guidelines during the seminar for schools to prepare before the evaluation			

Table 1: The Similarities and Differences of CIS and SKIPS Model

ISMAIL, Nor Hisham (MEY08115)

No	Subthemes	CIS	SKIPS
1	Philosophy, objectives, mission and vision	0	0
2	Human Rights	Δ	×
3	Internationalism	0	Δ
4	Cultural diversity	Δ	×
5	Curriculum management	0	0
6	Life-long learning	Δ	×
7	Human resource development	0	0
8	Teaching and learning	0	0
9	Academic achievement and examinations	0	0
10	Leadership quality and professionalism	0	0
11	Financial management	0	0
12	Teaching and learning facilities	0	Ο
13	Cooperation within school constituent groups	0	×
14 ·	Students health management	0	0
15	Services (e.g. food, transport, cleaning etc)	0	0
16	Safety	0	0
17	Cleanliness	0	0
18	Resource centre (e.g. library, media)	0	\bigtriangleup
19	Buildings and school setting	0	0
20	Compliance to related legislations (e.g. Education Act)	\bigtriangleup	0
21	School Advertisement/promotion	×	0
22	Students' Discipline/Behavior	0	0
23	School niche area	×	0
24	Co-curriculum activities/achievement	0	0
Note	O same indicators evaluated		
	Δ partially evaluated		

Appendix 7: Comparison of the Subthemes of SKIPS and CIS instruments

× not evaluated

Appendix A: Figures



Note. Data source is FDI/TNC database (www.unctad.org/fdi_statistics) and UNCTAD estimates.

Source: UNCTAD (2009).

Figure 1 FDI Inflows, global and by group of economies, 1980-2008

Appendix A: Figures

Figure 1: The management structure of a national university before the implementation of incorporation



Council

Deliberates on important items

Source: MEXT

TRAN, Huong Ly (MEY08119)





MTG: medium-term goals MTP: medium-term plan Source: University of Hiroshima

Appendix: Figures



Figure-1. GDP real growth in Kazakhstan, %

Source: The National Bank of Kazakhstan



Figure-2. Inflation in Kazakhstan 2001-2008, %

Source: The National Bank of Kazakhstan

BEGUM, Monira (MEY08126)

Figure 3a

Government official's view (N=36)



Figure 3b

View of Elected representatives (N=90)



Figure 3c

View of Local Peoples (N=92)



BUTLER, Louise (MEY08128)

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1.

Language in Coalition Government statements on Whaling

Timing Person		Word's describing Words describin Government's response action		Description of Whaling	Events		
		Lan	guage		1		
2004 (January- March)	Environment Minister	Weak/vague "seek an end" "commitment to protect"	Strong/concrete "continue to fight" "fight"	"unacceptable level of crueity" "no humane method of whale killing" "protracted and painful deaths merely to be soldE on the commercial marketplace" "slaughterEunder the guise of so- called 'scientific whaling" "unnecessary and unjustifiable"	Review of modern whale killing methods published by coalition of 140 animal welfare agencies March 2004 Anniversary of end of commercial whaling in Australia		
2004 (April- June)	Environment Minister	"argues" "regrettably" "disappointing"		"commercial hunt in defiance of the moratorium"	Announcement of quota increase by Norway, Iceland to continue whating		
2004 (July- September)	Environment Minister	"encourage" "strongly criticizing" "expressing concern"	"pursue a permanent international ban"	"An affront to science" "commercial slaughter" "disastrous industry"	25th Anniversary of cessation of whaling in Australia Annual IWC meeting July 2004		
2004 (October-							
2005 (January- March)	Environment Minister, Foreign Minister	"whale killing methods should be given priority consideration"		"Whating practices are cruel, whates take a long time to die"	Kiribati joins the IWC		
2005 (April- June)	Environment Minister	"convey community concern" "disagree" "pursue" "seek a halt" "make representations" "seek an erd" "extremely disappointed" "promote conservation" "call for the removal of the loophole"	"fight" "pursue a permanent global ban"	"simply exploitationEdoes not belong in the 21st centuryEwhere most people would like to see whales conserved, not chopped up and put on dinner tables" "continued exploitation of the so-called scientific whaing loophole Eis an outrage" "continued exploitation"	Australia leads a delegation (demarche) representing 15 countries to raise concerns about Japan's proposal to increase its whale catch in Antarctic waters. WC meeting - majority voted against proposal that would have allowed the resumption of commercial whaling		
2005 (July- September)	Environment Minister	"disappointing" "extremely disappointed"	"condemn"	"slaughter" "not acceptable in any circumstances" "not necessary to slaughter whales to study them" "not necessary to kill whales in order to obtain information on their stocks and diet"	WC reports Iceland issue of three special permits for scientific research		
2005 (October- December)	Environment Minister	"continue strong diplomatic efforts" "call on Japan to abandon its program" "campaign to highlight the flaws"	"condemning"	*prolonged and cruel practices É cause unnecessary suffering* *undermines its scientific credibility*	IWC meeting Australia, Spain and 12 Latin American and Southern Hemisphere countries sign a declaration condemning scientific whaling Australian environment minister announces new non-lethal research methods		
2006 (January- March)	Environment Minister	"committed to ending" "opposed" "oppose" "formal diplomatic protest" "if I believed that legal action could put an end to scientific whaling, I would have taken that path"		"whaling under the guise of scientific research" "no justification" "no scientific basis for the slaughter of whales"	Australian research published as evidence that lethal research on whales is not needed		
2006 (April- June)	Environment Minister	*Concerned* "persuade" *Opposed* "through international diplomatic effort* "strengthen our resolve and vigor É more effort, more organization and more resources* *Commitment to permanent global whale protection* *pushing strongly* "working hardÈto pursue*	"condemning" "fight" "campaign against" "fighting very hard" "fight strongly"	"random slaughter of whales" "turning the IWC into forum that is simply a rubber stamp for whale harvesting"	Australia hosts IWC symposium WC meeting held to discuss Japan's proposed RMS Environment Minister lobbies for support before Annual IWC meeting Annual IWC meeting		
2006 (July-							
2006 (October-							
2007 (January-	ME HIGH STREET						
March) 2007 (April-							
June) 2007 (Julya	8.0. 197 - Sec. 1						
September)							

Source: Compiled from media releases issued by Coalition government ministers 2004-2007.

BAJNÓCZI Mihály Imre (MEY 08129)

Figure 3



Gross debt of central government*

Source: ÁKK

Figure 4



General government financial balances

Source: OECD (2009)