

# An Evaluation of the Impact and Effectiveness of the Knight International Press Fellowship Program

By

Lee B. Becker

Director

James M. Cox Jr.

Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research

Henry W. Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication

University of Georgia

Athens, GA 30602

September 10, 1999

This report was produced with the assistance of Wilson Lowrey, a doctoral student in the Cox Center and the Grady College.

The author also acknowledges the significant contributions of Dr. Melinda Hawley and Dr. Patricia Priest to the research project. The data included in this report could not have been gathered without them.

Cox Center Program Facilitators Dale Wechsler and Kristina White provided essential logistical support and other assistance to the project. Graduate research assistants Heather Hammatt, S.C. Shin and Jeffery Wilson also contributed to the project, as did numerous graduate and undergraduate research clerks in the Cox Center.

The author also acknowledges the assistance of the staff of the International Center for Journalists, of many center directors, translators, drivers, others who assisted with the project in the field, of all the persons who answered questions about the project, and of the 33 Knight International Press Fellows whose work is the subject of this report.

## Table of Contents

Conclusions	1
Findings in Brief	2
Evaluation Methods and Procedures	4
Overview	4
Finding the Informants	5
Field Procedures	7
Questions Asked	8
Outcomes of the Search	9
Results in Detail	12
What the Fellows Did	12
Impact Globally Measured	13
Why Impact was Not Greater	14
Evaluations of the Fellows	15
Specific Measures of Impact	16
Probe about Impact on Attitude and Behavior	16
A Probe about Impact on Careers	18
Probes about Impact on New Story Type and Quality	19
Probes about Institutional Impact	20
Responses to Questions about Themselves	23
Country-by-Country Comparisons	24
Indices of Effects	26
Czech Republic	28
Hungary	28
Poland	28
Romania	29
Slovakia	29
Moldova	29
Russia	30
Ukraine	30
Chile	30
Ecuador	31
Peru	31
Summing up the Country Comparisons	31
Impact of Characteristics of Recipients on Outcome	34
Impact of Characteristics of the Fellows on Outcome	38
Some Alternative Explanations of Factors Influencing Impact	40
Examples of Organizational Impact	42
Impact Through Center Programming	44
Impact Through Institution Building	46
Impact on University Curricula	48
Summary	51
Tables	1-4
Charts	1-91
First Questionnaire	
Second Questionnaire	

---

## Conclusions

- ✓ The evaluation study provides consistent and concrete evidence that the Knight International Press Fellowship Program, as operated from 1994 to 1998, was a resounding success.
  
- ✓ Those who had contacts with the Knight Fellows participated enthusiastically in the evaluation process.
  
- ✓ They reported that the Program had had impact on their attitudes about a variety of topics, including on career commitment, on their knowledge about journalism, and on how they do their jobs.
  
- ✓ They offered concrete examples of things they had done differently and things they had seen others do as a result of the work of the Knight Fellows.
  
- ✓ In several important instances, the Knight Fellows left behind stronger host institutions that continued to serve journalism after the Fellows had returned home.

---

### Findings in Brief

- ▶ The reports of the people who worked with the Knight Fellows indicate that the Fellows were extremely active in the field, working closely with those they met and most often following up initial contacts with other types of interactions.
- ▶ For the most part, those we interviewed participated in a program of the Knight Fellow by choice. Fewer than one in 10 did so only because their participation was required by a superior.
- ▶ Large percentages of the respondents indicated that a Knight Fellow had impact on their career goals and ambitions, on their understanding of the basics of journalism and on their understanding of audiences of the mass media.
- ▶ Many respondents said the Knight Fellow changed how they thought about news, their ideas on the possible roles of the press in a democratic society, and the actual ways they carry out their jobs.
- ▶ More than half of the respondents rejected the suggestion that the ideas offered by the Knight Fellow were not appropriate for the workplace, and more than six in 10 rejected the criticism that the ideas offered by the Knight Fellow were not practical.
- ▶ The vast majority of the recipients of the Knight Fellowship training efforts felt the Fellows were sensitive to their needs and open to their suggestions.
- ▶ The Knight Fellows had relatively more impact on the learning of specific skills and on some basic attitudes about journalism and relatively less impact on more fundamental attitudes, such as those about the role of journalism in a society, about the Knight Fellow's country of origin, or about the country where the Fellow worked.
- ▶ Overwhelmingly the respondents reported evidence of impact of the work of the Knight Fellows on the journalistic product in the host country.
- ▶ Half of those responding indicated that the Knight Program had impact on the functioning of democracy in their country.

- 
- ▶ Across measures of impact, some countries are more consistently above average performers (Hungary, Romania, Moldova, Ukraine, and Ecuador), some are more consistently below (Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia), some are average (Chile), and some presented a more mixed picture (Russia and Peru).
  - ▶ The number of different types of interaction between the Knight Fellow and the recipients of the training and the amount of time spent in training are positively related to the amount of impact of the Knight Program.
  - ▶ The differing characteristics of the Knight Fellows selected and sent abroad are not important determinants of the effectiveness of the Knight Program once other factors, such as the characteristics of the country and of the recipients of training, are taken into consideration.
  - ▶ The Knight International Press Fellowship Program has contributed to institution building in many of the countries studied. The result is that the impact of the Knight Program continues even after the Fellows have ended their assignments.

## Evaluation Methods and Procedures

### *Overview*

We decided to examine the impact of the Knight International Press Fellowship Program by looking at the following four different types of influence:

- First, the impact of the Program on the journalists and others in the country with whom the Knight Fellows came into contact. Included was an examination of
  - changes in attitudes,
  - changes in behaviors, and
  - changes in careers.
- Second, the impact on journalism in the countries visited by the Knight Fellows. This included
  - changes in the types of stories covered and
  - changes in the quality of the news.
- Third, the impact of the Knight Program on media and media-related institutions in the countries visited by the Knight Fellows. This included
  - improvements in the economic stability of the media and
  - improvements in the stability of other relevant institutions, such as those offering basicand continuing journalism education and training.
- Fourth, the impact on the countries themselves. Included were
  - improvements in the operation of democratic institutions,
  - improvements in individual liberties, and
  - improvements in the electoral process.

We decided to treat the individual contacts as informants of all four types of influence, that is, of influence on themselves, of influence on journalism as practiced in their countries, of impact on institutions in the countries served, and of impact on the country itself. Such a strategy has limitations. The contacts may be unaware of the impact of the experiences they had with the Knight Fellows on

themselves, on journalism in the host country, on institutions in the country served, and on the country itself. They certainly are less likely to know of impact on others than on themselves. And the impact they report is based only on their perceptions, not on more concrete evidence of impact. At the same time, many of these contacts are seasoned observers of their environment, having worked as journalists for many years. And the topics at hand are certainly ones of interest to them. In addition, reports from these individuals of no impact would be informative in and of itself—even if other evidence of impact existed. In other words, the Program should have impact on the perceptions of the individuals served as well as on actual practice, for perceptions are almost certainly linked to practice at some point.

To obtain reports of impact from those with whom the Knight Fellow worked, we attempted to find as many of those contacts as possible and to conduct interviews with them.

### ***Finding the Informants***

Eighty-four Knight Fellows completed 89 different Knight Fellowships in the 1994 to 1998 period covered by this evaluation. The assignments covered the globe, from the Pacific region of Russia to Chile, from the Pacific Island nations to South Africa, and from Albania to the Baltic states.

Knight Fellow activities were concentrated most heavily in Central and Eastern Europe. Nine Fellows completed assignments in Slovakia, and eight served in the Czech Republic and Romania. Six were in Hungary. In part, this emphasis on Central and Eastern Europe is a reflection of the close link of the Knight International Press Fellowship Program to the operations of the Independent Journalism Centers, associated with the Independent Journalism Foundation of New York and located in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia.

The states of the former Soviet Union also have hosted large numbers of Knight Fellows. Six Knight Fellows served in Russia during the 1994 to 1998 period, four worked in Ukraine, and two were in Moldova.

A third area of geographic concentration of the Knight Fellow assignments from 1994 to the end of 1998 was Latin America and the Caribbean. Three Fellows worked in Ecuador and Peru, and two were in Chile and Columbia.

Outside these regions, there has been little concentration of Fellowship activity. Fellows have worked all over Africa, but only two countries, South Africa and Kenya, received more than one Fellow in the 1994 to 1998 period. South Africa was the host to eight Fellows, and Kenya hosted two.

The distances between countries served presented a challenge for evaluation. To trace the steps of each of the Knight Fellows would have been impossible in the time available. Sampling from the assignments of the Fellows was a necessity.

For this reason, we selected the three geographic regions where most Knight activity was concentrated: Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet states, and Latin America. In each of these regions, we initially selected all of the countries where at least two Knight Fellows had worked. In Central and Eastern Europe, this meant: Albania, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia. Among the former Soviet states, we selected initially Belarus, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine. In Latin America we selected initially Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. We eliminated two of these countries, Albania and Colombia, from the final list because of the political instability they were experiencing when we began the study and the resultant anticipated problems of travel and access to the persons we needed to interview. We also eliminated Belarus on the advice of the International Center for Journalists staff, which indicated that Fellow activity in that country was minimal.

This left us with 11 countries, eight in Europe and three in South America. The European countries were the Czech Republic, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, and Ukraine. (Russia, of course, is not entirely in Europe, and Knight assignments covered the entire country, as did the evaluation.) The South American countries were Chile, Ecuador and Peru.

Table 1 summarizes the data that resulted in the selection of the 11 countries. Shown are the number of Fellows who visited each country covered by the Knight International Press Fellowship Program during the 1994-98 period. Several Fellows visited more than one country, and, where that information is known, it is shown in the Table. (Fellows who visited a country for fewer than two weeks are not represented in the table.) A total of 33 Fellows visited the 11 countries included in the evaluation project.

Our goal was to find as many people as possible who worked with the Knight Fellows in these 11 countries and to interview them.

Fellows, upon return from their assignments, are expected to file a final report with the ICFJ. All but one of the 33 Fellows who worked in the 11 selected countries filed such a report. Some of the Fellows provided an actual list of contacts. Others imbedded references to people with whom the Fellows worked into the text of the report. We created a database based on these lists and textual references. We also conducted lengthy, telephone interviews with the 33 Knight Fellows during the Autumn of 1998 and into the winter and Spring of 1999 and asked each Fellow to supplement the information in the reports.

From the lists provided by the Fellows, a close reading of the texts of the reports themselves, and the interviews from the Fellows, we generated 603 names with at least a city locator. In some cases, the city was all we could generate. In other cases, we had complete names, addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses. Such complete information, however, was the exception. Most common was a name, a city, and at least a partial name of the organization for which they worked. During the telephone interview, each Fellow was asked to identify three individuals on whom they had the most impact. These individuals were flagged in the data base as individuals we should make a particular effort to locate.

### ***Field Procedures***

Each of the Fellows was hosted by one or more organizations in the country of their assignment. Many Fellows listed individuals in these organizations as contacts, and often these individuals were designated as people the Fellows believed they had influenced. For this reason, and because we recognized the need for logistical support, we began our fieldwork by attempting to contact the host organizations and the individuals in them. We shared our list of names with the hosts and asked for assistance in trying to locate the individuals on the lists. We also asked for help in finding other people with whom the Knight Fellows had contact.

In the second week of December of 1998, we pilot tested these procedures in Ecuador. Our goal was to see if we would be able to locate and interview the individuals on our list and how many we could reasonably expect to interview in a week, with two people in the field working. The procedures worked. We completed 29 interviews, 23 of them in the Capital city of Quito and six in the northern Andean city of Ibarra. Nineteen of these interviews were with people on the list, and 10 were with people identified on site as a result of the initial contacts.

With this information in hand, we set as our goal the completion of 30 interviews in each of our 11 countries and allocated a week for the visit to each country. Table 2 summarizes the data gathering procedures and schedule.

### ***Questions Asked***

We developed two separate interview schedules. The first was to be completed by the contact on his or her own, generally with me or one of my assistants in close proximity. The second was to be administered by me or one of my assistants. The first questionnaire contained two clusters of items designed to measure the perceived impact of the interaction with the Knight Fellow. These covered attitudinal change, learning, and behavioral change. These two clusters were separated by a battery of items designed to learn about any possible reasons why change was not likely and another set of items designed to evaluate the interaction with the Fellow. In addition, the instrument contained measures of the amount of time spent with the Fellow, the type of training experience, and background characteristics of the person completing the instrument.

The second instrument—to be administered by myself or a colleague—included a variety of questions designed to obtain both discrete indications of impact and examples of that impact. The persons we interviewed were asked if the Knight Program had had impact both on the person being interviewed and on others. In addition, the persons interviewed were asked to assess the impact of the Program on the practice of journalism in the country, on other institutions in the country, and on the country itself. The pattern of questioning was fixed, so respondents knew they were going to be asked to indicate if change had taken place first and then asked to give concrete examples of that change. This tactic was employed to encourage respondents to think concretely about Program impact rather than give general answers unlinked to recollections of actual change.

The first questionnaire was translated into Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, Slovakian and Ukrainian by native speakers in the U.S. and then retranslated to English by a second translator. Changes necessitated by discrepancies were made. Once we arrived in a country, we checked the questionnaire again with a local translator and made any needed changes.

The second questionnaire was administered through a local translator. First I or my colleague asked each question in English. The translator repeated each question in the local language and translated the answer to English. Only when the contact expressed a preference for English were both questionnaires completed in that language.

The first interview formed the basis for an assessment of Knight Program impact. The second was considered supplementary. We conducted the second interview in every case possible, but we tried particularly hard to complete it with those individuals who had the most exposure to the Knight Fellow. This group included those the Knight Fellows themselves had singled out as individuals on whom they had had the most impact.

When we interviewed staff members in the host organizations, we asked for specific examples of the impact of the Fellows on those organizations. This included course offerings or other evidence of the actual work of the Fellows and its contributions to the Programming by the host organization. These data, then, are additional evidence of the organizational impact of the Knight International Press Fellowship Program.

We conducted the interviews in a variety of settings, including hotel lobbies, restaurants, places of work, and the offices of hosts of Knight Fellows. When interviews were completed in the offices of hosts, we always conducted those interviews in rooms in which no staff member was present. All contacts were guaranteed and provided complete confidentiality for their responses. In some cases, we faxed or mailed questionnaires to contacts and completed the second interview over the telephone.

In every country and in every setting, we asked those we interviewed to direct us to others they knew who had worked with the Knight Fellows. We interviewed every such individual with whom we could make contact, either at that time or subsequently.

### ***Outcomes of the Search***

We were able to complete interviews with 531 individuals in the 11 countries selected for study. The smallest number of interviews completed was in Poland, where we successfully contacted and interviewed 31 persons who had worked with the Knight Fellows there. We completed 92 interviews in Ecuador. The number of interviews completed per country reflected a number of factors, including the

type of work done by the Fellows, the length of time that elapsed between their visits and ours, the size of the country, the assistance we were able to obtain from the local host, and, it seems, the success of the Program itself. The vast majority of the activities of the Fellows in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia were in service of the hosts, the Independent Journalism Centers in those countries. These Centers provided extensive logistical support. The same was true in Moldova, where one Knight Fellow helped found an Independent Journalism Center that hosted another. In Poland, one of the hosts of a Knight Fellow went out of existence. A university served as a second host, and it provided support and assistance in that locale. In Russia, Fellows worked with more than one host, and all provided help. In Ukraine, a center that had not hosted Knight Fellows stepped forward and provided us a home base. In Chile, a university hosted both Fellows, and it offered a base of operation and assistance. In Peru, two of the Fellows had been assigned to media organizations; both provided extensive assistance. In Ecuador, we relied primarily on the extensive lists of contacts provided by the Fellows.

The 531 completed interviews include 269 with individuals on the original lists provided by the Fellows and 262 with individuals whom we identified in the field. In the end, we completed interviews with 61.4% of those persons whose names we ultimately had in our database and 44.6% of those whose names were on our original lists. Of those individuals identified by the Fellows as the most important in terms of impact, we interviewed 61.8%. These return rates varied by country. The overall return rate was highest in Peru at 94.4% and lowest in Romania at 44.5%. Table 3 presents detailed information on returns for each of the 11 countries in the study.

We completed the second interview with 387 (72.9%) of the 531 persons we contacted. These, too, were dispersed across the 11 countries (Table 4). In Hungary, we were able to complete the follow-up interview with 89.5% of those who completed the first interview. The figure was only slightly lower in Chile. In the Czech Republic, however, we were able to complete the second interview with a little more than half (53.7%) of those who filled out the first questionnaire. In the end, we completed the second interview with at least 22 people in each of the 11 countries in the sample.

Chart 1 shows how the 531 completed interviews were broken down by country. The largest number of respondents we were able to interview came from individuals working at daily newspapers, as Chart 2 shows. The next largest group was made up of individuals at television stations. University students made up the third largest group of contacts. Media centers, including those that hosted Fellows, contributed the next largest number of contacts we were able to interview. More than half of the interviews were conducted outside the Capital city, as Chart 3 shows.

## Results in Detail

### *What the Fellows Did*

Knight Fellows engage in many different types of training activities during their time abroad. We asked each of the persons we interviewed to classify the types of interactions they had had with the Knight Fellows, using a list of possibilities we provided. Six in 10 said they had attended a presentation given by the Fellow, while a just slightly smaller percentage had attended a discussion group with a Fellow. Forty-five percent participated in a class led by a Knight Fellow (Chart 4). About half of those we interviewed said a Knight Fellow had discussed their work with them individually, just under three in 10 said the Fellow had provided information about additional training opportunities, and a similar ratio reported a Fellow advised them about career opportunities (Chart 5). About two in 10 said a Knight Fellow actually went with them on assignments, eight in 10 said they had one-on-one conversations with a Fellow about journalism and related topics, and about four in 10 said a Fellow provided them materials or documents they had used (Chart 6). About a third of the persons interviewed said they had interacted with a Knight Fellow on a social basis. Only one in 10 said they had some kind of contact that did not fit into these categories (Chart 7).

The reports of the people we interviewed show a high level of activity on the part of the Knight Fellow. Only one in 10 of the persons we interviewed reported only one type of contact. On average, the Fellows reported 4.5 of the types of contacts listed. Of those who attended a presentation given by a Knight Fellow, almost all (96%) reported some additional interaction. The same was true for those who attended a discussion group and attended a class given by the Fellow. Half of those who attended a presentation by a Knight Fellow reported that the Fellow discussed “my work with me individually” in addition. For those who attended a discussion group, the ratio was just under six in 10; for those who attended a class by a Knight Fellow, the ratio was just over six in 10.

Most of those we interviewed had sustained involvement with the Knight Fellow. One in three worked with the Fellow for more than a week; almost three of four had at least several days of interactions with a Fellow (Chart 8). For the most part, those we interviewed participated in a Program of the Knight Fellow by choice. Fewer than one in 10 did so only because they were required by a superior. The remainder

either participated entirely on their own or were required to participate but reported they wanted to anyway (Chart 9).

### ***Impact Globally Measured***

The first question in the self-administered instrument that dealt with the influence of the Knight Program was a global one. It asked the person completing the questionnaire to indicate how much impact, if any, the Knight Fellow(s) had on nine different areas that included attitudes, knowledge and behavior. The questions covered such things as impact on career goals and ambitions and impact on knowledge of tactics and strategies to be used on the job. Responses to the questions are summarized in Charts 10 through 18, in the order of presentation in the questionnaire.

These items suggest that the Knight Fellows had much impact on those with whom they worked. A quarter of the respondents said a Knight Fellow had a “great deal” of impact on their career goals and ambitions, and more than six in 10 said the Fellows had at least some impact on them in this regard (Chart 10). Slightly higher ratios reported impact on their understanding of the basics of journalism (Chart 11). About six in 10 said a Fellow had impact on their understanding of audiences of the mass media (Chart 12).

Those we interviewed were less likely to give the Knight Program credit for changing their understanding of the economics of journalism. Only four in 10 said a Fellow had at least some impact on them in this way (13). More impact was reported on how the respondents thought about news (Chart 14) and on the possible roles of the press in a democratic society (Chart 15). Similar percentages of respondents reported that a Knight Fellow had impact on the actual ways they carry out their job (Chart 16).

Seven in 10 of the respondents said a Knight Fellow had at least some impact on knowledge they had about tactics and strategies to use in carrying out their jobs (Chart 17). More than six in 10 said a Knight Fellow had impact on their knowledge about how to work with other people (Chart 18).

Chart 19 summarizes the responses across the eight items used to measure overall impact. Clearly, the level of self-reported consequences of the Knight International Fellowship Program are quite dramatic. Only in the case of one of the eight areas did fewer than six in 10 of the Fellows report at least

some impact. The Knight Fellows changed career goals, imparted knowledge about the basics of journalism, imparted knowledge about the audiences of the media, and helped those they worked with think in new ways about news and about the roles of journalism in democracy. The Fellows also helped the vast majority of those they worked with carry out their jobs, understand tactics relevant to those jobs, and know better how to work with people. Four in 10 of those with whom the Fellows worked said they gained an understanding of the economics of journalism.

There is no known standard against which these questions should be evaluated. On the face of it, the reported levels of impact are quite large. Against a standard of no impact—a response option open to the respondents—the level of reported impact is indeed dramatic.

### ***Why Impact was Not Greater***

We anticipated that some of those with whom the Knight Fellows came into contact would find at least some of the things the Fellows taught to be not relevant for the context. We asked eight questions designed to measure this reaction. The questions were asked in the negative—because some of them make no sense asked in the positive—and this created problems for some of the respondents not used to such an approach. Most answered the questions without difficulty, though, for the most part, they rejected the idea that the content of the Knight Fellow instruction was out of place in their work environments.

About three in 10 of those we interviewed said the ideas offered by the Knight Fellow were not appropriate for their workplace (Chart 20). Fewer than two in 10 said the ideas offered by the Knight Fellow were not practical (Chart 21). A quarter said they were simply “too busy” to make use of the advice provided by the Fellow (Chart 22). Fewer than two in 10 said the suggestions of the Knight Fellow simply did not work (Chart 23). Two in 10 said their boss was not open to change (Chart 24). More than three in 10 of those answering the questionnaire said it was at least somewhat true that the ideas suggested by the Knight Fellow would not work in their country (Chart 25). More than half said the economic situation made change difficult (Chart 26), and four in 10 said the political situation made change difficult.

In each of the eight charts just reviewed, relatively large numbers of respondents indicated they did not know the answer to the question, yet in all cases but one, the most common response to the criticism suggested by the question was a “not true” answer. More than half of the respondents rejected the suggestion that the ideas offered by the Knight Fellow were not appropriate for the workplace, and more than six in 10 rejected the criticism that the ideas offered by the Knight Fellow were not practical. Only when the economic situation in the host country was offered as an explanation for a lack of impact did the percentage of respondents rejecting this explanation not dominate.

As summary Chart 28 makes clear, difficulties resulting from the economy and from the political environment were seen as limitations on the impact of the Knight Fellows. Overall, however, most of those we interviewed did not see many constraints on the effectiveness of the Knight Fellows. Such a finding is consistent with the already reported finding that most people felt the Program had an impact.

### ***Evaluations of the Fellows***

We included four items on the survey instrument designed to measure reactions to the Knight Fellows themselves. We asked if the Knight Fellow provided the respondent with new ways of thinking about things, helped solve the problems the individual felt were most relevant, worked with the respondent to come up with solutions to problems, and was open to suggestions from the person we interviewed. By overwhelming ratios, those we interviewed gave the Fellows good marks.

Nearly eight of 10 said the Knight Fellow provided new ways of thinking (Chart 29). Six in 10 said the Fellow helped solve problems relevant to the respondent’s needs (Chart 30) and worked with the respondent to come up with solutions to problems (Chart 31). Almost nine of 10 said the Fellow was open to suggestions (Chart 32).

Clearly, the vast majority of the recipients of the Knight Fellowship training efforts felt the Fellows were sensitive to their needs and open to their suggestions. As summary Chart 33 makes clear, the Knight Fellows in our 11 countries get high marks on these measures of sensitivity. There is little here to support an “ugly American” criticism sometimes associated with such training initiatives.

### ***Specific Measures of Impact***

In a final set of questions on the self-administered instrument, we asked those we interviewed to answer specific questions about the impact of their interactions with the Knight Fellows. The questions were similar to those in the first set, but they were more specific. The responses to these questions are shown in Charts 34 to 41.

Seven in 10 of the respondents said they gained a wider range of skills from their interactions with a Knight Fellow (Chart 34). Six in 10 said they think more about the audiences of the mass media as a result of the Fellows (Chart 35). More than four in 10 said they think differently about the roles of journalism in society as a result of what they learned from a Knight Fellow (Chart 36). Just fewer than six in 10 said they are more likely to strive for journalistic independence as a result of their interactions with a Knight Fellow (Chart 37).

About four in 10 of the persons we interviewed said they had a more positive attitude toward the United States as a result of their interaction with a Knight Fellow (Chart 38). Three in 10 said the interactions with the Knight Fellow had resulted in their having a more positive attitude toward their own country (Chart 39). About half said they were more committed to journalism as a result of the Knight Program (Chart 40). About the same ratio said they found it easier to do their job as a result of the contact they had with a Knight Fellow (Chart 41).

A comparative reading of the responses to these eight questions, shown in summary form in Chart 42, suggests the Knight Fellows had relatively more impact on the learning of specific skills (Items A and H) and on some basic attitudes about journalism (Items B and D), and relatively less impact on more fundamental attitudes, such as those about the role of journalism in a society, about the Knight Fellow's country of origin, or about the country where the Fellow worked. That even three in 10 of the respondents said the Fellow changed their attitudes—in a positive way--toward their own country is quite impressive. That four in 10 would say they became more positive toward the U.S. is even more so.

### ***Probes about Impact on Attitudes and Behavior***

The second survey instrument, which we administered to 387 of the 531 initial respondents, contained, as noted, a series of general questions, followed by prompts, that was designed to force

respondents to think concretely about the nature of impact of the Knight Fellow on themselves, on others, on organizations, and on the country itself.

The first two questions in this set were asked differently, depending on whether the person we were talking to was in a supervisory capacity. For those who were in such a capacity, we asked if the person had noted attitude change on the part of those in the organization as a result of the work of the Knight Fellow. We followed this with a question about behavioral change. For those not in a supervisory position, we asked if the Knight Fellow had changed their own attitudes and behavior. In all cases, the specific question was followed by a request for specific examples of changed attitudes and behaviors.

We know from other research on projection of influence that people are more likely to say others are influenced by social forces than to say that they, themselves, are influenced, and the responses we received to this question are consistent with this. As Chart 43 shows, three of four of the respondents reported that their own attitudes were influenced, while four of five of those asked about the impact on others said the Knight Fellows changed opinions. In both cases, however, the level of reported impact was quite striking.

The same can be said for the reports of behavioral change reported in Chart 44. Seven in 10 of those interviewed said the Knight Fellow had impact on the behaviors of those under their supervision, while about six in 10 said their own behavior had been influenced. Some of the differences in responses shown in both Charts 43 and 44 come about as a result of higher uncertainty when projecting to others. It also is true that individuals are more likely to report that the Fellow had no impact than are the supervisors.

A journalist in Ukraine who attended a workshop on covering AIDS gave the following examples of impact on her own attitudes and behaviors:

“The main thing I found out—and it is unusual for us—is that the people with AIDS have a right. We should not be afraid of them. We have to live with them. Not to be afraid is the main idea. Before that I thought the state should defend us from these people...

“Now I understand that it is the task of the journalist to change the opinions of people about AIDS and homosexuals...

“I mention these problems in my articles. People should be given information so as not to become ill. It is important for me to write articles and include information on condoms and syringes and how to prevent the illness.”

To be sure, a close reading of the responses to the open-ended, probe questions that followed each of these items indicates that many respondents reported an attitudinal change after the question on behavioral change and a behavioral change in response to the attitudinal question. For this reason, a combination of the responses to these questions makes some sense. Chart 45 summarizes the results and shows that, overwhelmingly, respondents reported change. Fewer than one in 10 of those responding for others and just more than one in 10 of those responding for themselves said there was no change in the attitudinal and behavioral areas. More than half of the respondents in both cases reported seeing evidence of impact.

#### ***A Probe about Impact on Careers***

More than half of the respondents to the second survey indicated that a Knight Fellow had impact on their career (Chart 46). Four in 10, however, said there was no impact.

A Hungarian university student who participated in a workshop with a Fellow summarized the impact the Knight Fellow had on his career in the following way:

“I was about to become an architect. I’m still a student in that area at the university. When I became involved (through classes and personal contact) I thought it was just another world. I would take a peek at it. Now I’m at the point where I think I’m a journalist.”

Another Hungarian respondent said simply:

“It (journalism) became quite concrete for me. I thought of it as a career.”

A Russian broadcast journalist who attended a seminar on AIDS given by a Knight Fellow answered the question about the Fellow’s impact on her career in the following way:

“I made new programs on AIDS after attending the seminar. In lots of ways I was inspired by (the Fellow). I was interested in doing even more programming on TV about AIDS. My name became even more famous than before because of this.”

### ***Probes about Impact on New Story Type and Quality***

The next two questions in the supplemental instrument asked respondents both to reflect on the types of and quality of stories written by journalists in the host country and to indicate whether the Knight Fellows had impact on either, both, or neither. Half of those interviewed said the types of stories written by journalists had changed as a result of the work of the Knight Fellows; seven in 10 said the quality of stories had changed (Chart 47). Responses to the open-ended probes that followed these questions produced a variety of responses, and they also indicated that many respondents did not distinguish clearly between changes in quality and story type. For this reason, we have combined responses to these two questions, as we did for the items on attitudes and behavior above, and the result is shown in Chart 48. Only one in five of the respondents did not report evidence of impact of the work of the Knight Fellows on the journalistic product in the host country.

A Peruvian respondent, who works in promotion and marketing at a media organization, said he noticed a change in the ways journalists at the organization covered stories, particularly in the political area, after the Knight Fellow was there:

“Maybe it was a coincidence, but maybe it increased people’s flexibility. They viewed things less negatively and with more openness.”

A Czech respondent said television news improved in quality as a result of the work of the Knight Fellows who visited that country:

“Their news became news. Before it was commentaries. They also started being more careful.”

This theme, actually, was a common one that surfaced at many places in the interviews. The Knight Fellows taught a “fact-based” style of journalism, not one that was based on opinions. This was seen as a major change in all of the countries visited.

Another theme of the Fellows mirrored in many of the responses was that news should be written for the general audience, not for elites and not for other journalists. A Russian newspaper journalist explained that he observed great changes in both the types of stories and quality of stories journalists in

that country produced as result of this message. The question on changes in types of responses produced this response from him:

“This was the main result (of the work of the Fellow). She offered us a questionnaire for us to learn what readers want, and now we try to orient to the findings of that questionnaire.”

In terms of changes in quality, he said the following:

“It was a dramatic change. The staff (of the paper) changed to a modern ideology on how to work and get news. This was most considerable. We had a special reporter on economic issues. Her articles were oriented for business people, but (the Fellow) said, ‘Business is for all people,’ so now the writer makes it easy to understand for all householders.”

### ***Probes about Institutional Impact***

The next three questions on the instrument were difficult for many of our respondents to answer. These questions asked, first, about the impact of the work of the Knight Fellows on the economic situation of the media in the host country, then about the impact of the Knight Fellow on other institutions in society, and finally about the impact on the functioning of democracy in the country.

Three in 10 of the respondents, in fact, said they did not know if the Knight Fellows had had impact on the “economic stability of the media in this country,” and only two in 10 said that they had. Five in 10 said simply that the Fellows had not had impact of this sort (Chart 49).

One Russian respondent, who said he did not know if there was impact of this sort, explained the answer in this way:

“Americans can better teach the business of journalism than journalism itself. There are more similarities. You don’t get to cultural differences. But I cannot imagine an American publisher who could survive in this (the Russian economic) environment.”

A Slovakian respondent said of the possibility that a Knight Fellow might have impact on the economic stability of the media in that country:

“Theoretically it could. But not here.”

A Romanian newspaper journalist was somewhat more optimistic. He said:

“In the sense that it helped to professionalize the media it had impact (on economic stability), but not in the sense of changing the big economic problems in the country.”

The question on impact on other institutions offered a suggested example—impact on organizations providing journalism training in the country. Even with this tip, nearly four in 10 of the respondents said they did not know the answer. More than half, however, said they saw evidence of impact of this sort (Chart 50).

A Slovakian university student saw the situation as follows:

“I am a student at the university, and the Center for Independent Journalism is in the same building. The influence is obviously there. CIJ influenced the university. The University didn’t have enough money for computer technology, so we use CIJ equipment, which it got free from the United States.”

In Moldova, a university student who already was working professionally recounted the following example of the impact of one of the Knight Fellows:

“He went to the radio station of the university. The staff is more theoretical, even there. He gave them ideas about how to make the station interesting to journalism students. He also taught the students to get practice. This was especially good for our university.”

Perhaps the “biggest” question on the instrument was the final one in this group, which asked the respondent if she or he thought “the work of the Knight Fellow(s) has had impact on the functioning of democracy in this country.” Three in 10 said the answer was negative, and two in 10 said they ‘Didn’t Know.’ Half answered in the affirmative (Chart 51).

The Moldovan student quoted above answered in the following way:

“If (the Knight Fellow) gave journalists the idea that he can say what he wants, this is the first step in the process of democracy. If a journalist isn’t afraid to give three or four points of view...”

An Ecuadorian newspaper journalist expressed a view held by a number of those interviewed. He said the Knight Fellows had no impact on the functioning of democracy in that country and explained his answer as follows:

“I think sometimes Americans believe their point of view on democracy is good all over the world. I believe we have more democracy and press freedom here than in the U.S. Democracy comes from inside a country—when you have more equality and a better justice system. You also need a middle class.”

A senior Hungarian journalist had a different point of view. He said the journalists did have an impact on the functioning of democracy, in the following way:

“They spoke about virtues and the values of an independent journalism. They were convincing journalists that they should fight for an independent press.

“The first wave of trainers—(first Knight Fellow) was an example—came here espousing the values of the First Amendment and freedom of the press. To some extent, they were unsettling for Hungarians. The values they espoused were against the record of Hungary.

“The second wave of journalists, including (second Knight Fellow) could differentiate between the realities. With a little bit of self criticism, they could acknowledge that in the U.S. the owners had influence. The (first Knight Fellow) expressed his desire. He knew it was not true in the U.S. It was not true in Europe and not in Central Europe. Maybe it will be in 20 years, but maybe never.

“There is a difference between the first wave of trainers and the second and third waves. Maybe it is not necessarily attributable to America, but to the Hungarian press as well. If (first Fellow) were to come back today what he said would be better understood, partly because of him and because of what has changed. The two countries and the ideals are closer today. Hungary is a market economy. The newspapers have changed.

“How to separate fact and opinions—that has always been part of the American focus. Now that is understood here. The Knight Fellows probably played a significant role in this.”

By changing journalism, he said, the Fellows contributed to the democratization of Hungary.

Overwhelmingly, the respondents to the second interview indicated that the Knight Fellowship Program addressed the most urgent needs of journalists in the host country. As Chart 52 shows, nearly eight in 10 answered in the affirmative to this question, and only about one in 10 said “No.”

### ***Responses to Questions about Themselves***

We included questions on the first instrument to find out something about the types of people in our sample, that is, the types of people with whom the Knight Fellows had contact. Chart 53 shows, that, for the most part, the programs of the Fellows served people actually working as journalists or preparing for journalism careers. Two of 10 of those we interviewed reported they were working as editors when they interacted with the Knight Fellow, and a similar ratio classified themselves as reporters. University students made up the next largest group—setting aside those who did not fit into the provided categories. In fact, this latter group is large because so many of those we interviewed held more than one position and did not fit into the classification scheme. Many were working as editors and reporters, for example, as well as teaching at the university or taking university classes.

The fact that the Knight Fellows targeted young journalists and those still preparing for careers in journalism is reflected in Chart 54, which breaks respondents down by age. One in five of those we interviewed was less than 25 years old when we talked with them. Three in 10 were 25 to 34. One in four was 45 years old or older.

One in four of those we interviewed had between one and five years of professional experience, and about one in five had no experience at all. Only 16% had more than 20 years of professional experience (Chart 55). Clearly, the work of the Knight Fellows has targeted young people.

Four in 10 of those we interviewed reported they had some formal training in journalism (Chart 56). This, of course, included most of those still at the university when we interviewed them. Large numbers

of students still enrolled at the university were included among the respondents in Chile and Ecuador.

About one in three of the respondents across all countries had a university journalism degree.

About four in 10 of those we interviewed were women (Chart 57).

## Country-by-Country Comparisons

We selected the 11 countries we visited because of their similarities and their differences. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia were part of the Warsaw Pact. During the Cold War, these countries were controlled by Soviet politics, but they retained a strong degree of national identity. These independent identities offered tremendous advantages after the fall of the communist system. In contrast, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine were incorporated into the Soviet state, and much was done to crush their national identities. They emerged after the dissolution of the Soviet Union with weaker senses of distinctiveness, even less economic independence, and fewer ties to the west. The three Latin American countries had none of these experiences with communism, yet each has struggled historically to develop strong democratic institutions.

As a result of the differences among these countries, we expected differences in outcomes of the activities of the Knight International Press Fellows, and we designed the study to allow for a test of this possibility. For example, we attempted to—and successfully did—complete enough interviews in each country to allow for these comparisons. We also attempted in each country to represent the diversity of activities of the Fellows there so as to be able to give a representative picture of Fellow work on a country-by-country basis.

At the same time, we recognize what scientists call “natural confounds” in these comparisons. The Knight Fellows in four of the five former Warsaw Pact countries operated largely under the auspices of the Independent Journalism Centers. (Poland is the exception.) These Centers provided a solid base for the work of the Knight Fellows, and they also shaped the types of programs and other work of the Fellows. In contrast, Fellows in Moldova, Russia and Ukraine had less established and, certainly in the case of Russia, more varied bases of support. In fact, in Moldova and Ukraine, the assignment of some of the Fellows was to build independent journalism centers that could host future trainers. Fellows in these countries, in general, had less centralized and more limited bases from which to work. In Chile, the Fellows used as a base an old, well-established, prestigious university. In Peru and Ecuador, the hosts were often media organizations themselves.

Other factors played a role as well. Russia is a huge country, and Fellows had to travel widely. Romania presented more travel challenges, because of its size, than did Slovakia. Fellows traveled much more widely in Ecuador than they did in either Chile and Peru, in part because of geography.

These “natural confounds” complicate the comparisons among our 11 countries. More than one explanation for any given difference can be offered. Yet the confounds are naturally occurring ones. Work in Russia for a Knight Fellow is not the same as work in Romania, and the differences in outcomes are important to document.

### ***Indices of Effects***

To allow for these comparisons, and others we planned, we created nine indices from the various measures of impact in our two questionnaires. To create these indices we used a statistical technique called factor analysis, which looks for patterns of responses to different questions, to help us see if items we thought belonged together actually did empirically. Before creating these indices, however, we also simplified some of the data we had gathered. We noticed that our respondents were reluctant to use the full ranges of responses on many of our questions, preferring, for example, to say they did not know the answer to a question rather than to say the Fellow had no impact on them. In fact, we noticed this tendency in the field, and we asked those we interviewed about it. Invariably, a “Don’t Know” response or a skipped question meant that the person did not feel the question was relevant to them because the Fellow had no impact on them in that way.

For the items presented in Charts 10 through 18, we recoded the initial responses so that a “Don’t Know” answer was the equivalent of no impact and we summed the responses to these nine items to form a single index, which we called a Global Measure of Impact. Our analyses of the interrelationships among the eight individual items suggested this was warranted.

For the items presented in Charts 20 through 27, we first reduced the data by treating a “Don’t Know” response as the same as a “Not True” response, again based on what our respondents who did not answer this question said. The analysis of responses showed us that these items actually formed two clusters. The first cluster consisted of the first four items (labeled A-D in Chart 28), and the second cluster consisted of the last three items in the set (labeled F-H in Chart 28). The first cluster consisted of

items that focused on the limitations of what the Knight Fellows had done based on forces local to the respondent. The second set of items offered more distant, structural explanations for why the Knight Fellow's instruction might not have been more effective. The fifth item (E) did not fit well with either of these clusters, and we dropped it from further analysis. We created one index by summing responses to the first four items and called it Criticized Program for Personal Reasons and a second index by summing responses to the last three items and called it Criticized Program for Structural Reasons.

Four items, shown in Charts 29-32, provided an evaluation of the Knight Fellows themselves. Here we modified the data so only the responses "Strongly Agree," "Agree," and "Other" remained. The factor analysis showed that the four items evaluating the Fellow hung together well, and we summed responses to them to create an index, which we termed Evaluation of Fellow.

The next set of items, which we intended to cover diverse areas of potential impact, proved to be the most complex empirically. We first recoded the responses to these items (Shown in Charts 34-41) in the same way as we reduced the items used to create the Evaluation of Fellow index. Then, based on the analysis of the patterns of responses, we summed responses to Items A, B, C and H (Chart 42) to create an index that we called Professional Attitudes and Learning. These items clustered together empirically and report on impact in the professional area. We summed responses to Items E and F and called this index Attitudes Toward Host Country and U.S. They are related empirically. We treated Items D and G as separate measures because responses to them indicated they were, in fact, distinct. We have termed Item D a measure of Striving for Journalistic Independence and Item G as a measure of Career Commitment.

We created a final index based on responses to the items measuring impact in the second questionnaire. We simply counted the number of areas in which the respondent said the Knight Fellow had impact. These areas are shown in Charts 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50 and 51. We called this final measure a Checklist of Effects.

To show the relative levels of these indices across our 11 countries, we computed the mean score for each index in each country and then created an average of these 11 scores. We next subtracted from the mean score for a given country the mean score for the 11 countries to determine whether a given

country was below or above average on a given index. All measures of impact were positive, so a score that is below average does not indicate low impact, but rather less impact than was reported on average across the 11 countries.

### ***Czech Republic***

In the Czech Republic, our respondents reported relatively low levels of impact of the Knight Program as measured by our Global Measure of Impact (Chart 58). In fact, the average score in this country is 1.85 points below the mean score for the 11 countries. Our Czech respondents were above average in terms of Criticism of the Program for Personal Reasons, that is, saying the Program was less effective than it might have been because the ideas of the Fellows did not work in the particular setting of the respondent. On the other hand, the Czech respondents were less likely to blame structural reasons of the country for limitations of the Program. The Czech respondents were average in terms of their Evaluation of the Fellows. The Czech respondents reported below average levels of impact for each of the other measures of impact shown in Chart 58. By these measures, the Czech Republic was a relatively low impact country, perhaps because it began as relatively westernized and perhaps because of cynicism on the part of those involved toward programs such as those offered by the Knight Fellows.

### ***Hungary***

Hungarian respondents reported relatively high levels of impact, as measured by the Global Measure of Impact index (Chart 59). The respondents were just below average in terms of criticism of the relevance of the ideas offered by the Fellows, but they were above average in their evaluations of the Fellows themselves. They were just above average in reporting impact on Professional Attitudes and Learning and below average in reporting impact on attitudes toward Hungary and the U.S. On the remaining measures of impact, the Hungarian respondents were just slightly above average in terms of reported impact. Hungary in general would seem to be a country in which, in the view of those who participated, the Program had impact.

### ***Poland***

Poland is considerably below average in terms of reported level of impact, based on the Global Measure of Impact score (Chart 60). In fact, Poland is below average in every index except

one—Professional Attitudes and Learning, where it is average. Being below average in terms of the two criticism items means Polish respondents were just slightly less likely to criticize the content of the Fellow Programs. In general, however, Polish respondents report relatively low levels of impact, at least in comparison with respondents in the other countries.

### **Romania**

Romanian respondents reported low levels of impact in terms of the Global Measure of Impact index (Chart 61). They also are below average in terms of criticism of the content of the Program. On all of the remaining measures of impact, Romanian respondents are average or just slightly above average in terms of reported impact. Overall, the Romanian context is a relatively positive one. For the most part, respondents reported at least average levels of impact, relative to the other countries.

### **Slovakia**

Slovakia looks much like its former partner, the Czech Republic, on most of the measures of impact (Chart 62). Respondents are below average in their reported level of impact of the Knight Program using the Global Measure of Impact score, though not nearly as far below average as were the Czech respondents. They are nearly as far below on the Professional Attitudes and Learning index and even further below average on the Checklist of Effects measure. Slovak respondents were more likely to criticize the Knight Program for personal reasons and less likely to criticize it for structural reasons, as was true of the Czech respondents. Both groups were just above average in terms of the evaluation of the Fellows. The Slovak respondents were just above average in terms of report influence on Striving for Journalistic Independence and at average in terms of Career Commitment, while the Czech respondents had been just below average on both of these measures.

### **Moldova**

Respondents in the former Soviet republic of Moldova were less likely, on average, than other respondents to report impact of the Program, if the Global Measure of Impact index is used as the criterion (Chart 63). Otherwise, however, Moldovan respondents report average to generally positive responses to the Program. The Moldovan respondents do not criticize the Fellows who worked there for delivering content they could not use, despite the very difficult economic and political circumstances of

that country. They are above average in reporting that contact with the Fellows resulted in more positive evaluations of their own country and of the U.S. And they are more likely to have reported impact of the Program in responses to the items in the second questionnaire, resulting in the higher score on the Checklist of Effects measure. Overall, the Moldovan scorecard is a just slightly positive one.

### ***Russia***

Russia responses to the measures that make up the various indices are complex (Chart 64). On the Global Measure of Impact index, Russia respondents scored considerably below average, meaning that they felt the Program had more limited impact than was the case in the other countries. Russian respondents were less likely to criticize the Fellows for delivering programming that wouldn't work in their individual context, but they were a bit more likely to criticize them for delivering programming that would not work because of economic and political factors in Russia. Russian respondents reported lower evaluations of the Fellows than average across the 11 countries. Responses on the other measures of impact varied around the average with little consistency. There is little here to suggest Russia is a high impact country but not a strong case that it was particularly below average either.

### ***Ukraine***

In general, the situation in Ukraine is more tilted toward the positive than is true for Russia (Chart 65). Ukrainian respondents reported above average levels of impact as reflected in the Global Measure of Impact score. They, however, were above average in criticizing the Knight Program for delivering a message that was not applicable to the country and below average in their evaluation of the Fellows overall. On all other measures of impact, however, Ukrainian respondents were at or just above average. Ukraine, and Moldova, among the three former Soviet republics, generally are above average settings for the Knight Program.

### ***Chile***

Chilean respondents reported above average levels of impact of the Knight Program, based on the Global Measure of Impact index (Chart 66). Respondents in the Latin American country, however, were at average or below average on most of the other measures. Overall, the evidence is that the Knight Program was a success in Chile, but the level was more toward average than exceptional.

## ***Ecuador***

By almost all accounts, the Program in Ecuador was above average in terms of impact. The score on the Global Measure of Impact index was far above those for the other 11 countries, including all three in Latin America. The only critical element of Chart 67 has to do with the two measures of criticism of the messages delivered by the Fellows. The Ecuadorian respondents were just above average in reporting that the training of the Knight Fellows was not applicable to their work environment because of problems there and because of problems in the country itself. Overall, however, the data from Ecuador show it to be one of the major success stories of the Knight International Press Fellowship Program.

## ***Peru***

The situation in Peru is more complex (Chart 68). Respondents reported above average impact on the first measure shown in the chart, but respondents also were just above average in criticism of the content of the programming and just below average on four of the remaining six measures of impact. Yet they were notably above average on the evaluations of the Fellows and on the final measure of impact, the Checklist of Effects. Of the three Latin American countries, Peru represents the most complex situation politically and economically, and that seems to be reflected in the measures of impact of the Knight Program.

## ***Summing up the Country Comparisons***

The first thing to remember about the country-by-country comparisons is that they are among settings where the Knight Program had impact, at least as reported by those who participated in them. Unless the situation is exactly the same across all 11 countries, some countries are going to be above average on any given measure, and some are going to be below. The analyses summarized in Charts 58 to 68 indicate that there is variability among the countries, and that some countries are more consistently above average performers (Hungary, Romania, Moldova, Ukraine, and Ecuador), some are more consistently below (Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia), some are average (Chile), and some present a more mixed picture (Russia and Peru). The classification is not perfect, but rather a generalization of the data in these 11 charts.

Based on the measure of Global Measure of Impact alone, above average countries are Hungary, Ukraine, Chile, Ecuador and Peru (Chart 69). Criticism of the Knight Program because the ideas would not work in the individual workplace is greatest in the Czech Republic and Slovakia and least pronounced in Romania (Chart 70). Criticism of the Knight Program because the ideas would not work in the host country is most pronounced in Russia, Ukraine, Ecuador and Peru and less pronounced in the Czech Republic and Poland (Chart 71). The Fellows received their highest evaluations in Hungary and Peru and their lowest evaluations in Poland, Russia, Ukraine and Chile (Chart 72). Respondents were most likely to say their attitudes had changed and that they had learned as a result of contact with the Fellows in Ecuador and least likely to report this effect in the Czech Republic and Slovakia (Chart 73). Attitudes toward the U.S. and the host country were most likely to have been changed as a result of the Knight Program in Ecuador, Moldova and Romania and least likely to have changed in Poland and Hungary (Chart 74). Striving for journalistic independence was more likely to be an outcome of the Knight Program in Ecuador, Ukraine, Moldova and Romania than in Poland and Peru (Chart 75). Career commitment was more likely to be increased in Ecuador and Hungary than in Poland (Chart 76). The Checklist of Effects measure produced higher scores in Moldova, Ecuador and Peru than in the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia and Chile (Chart 77).

There are a number of possible explanations for these variations. One rather problematic one is differences in the meanings of words used in the questionnaires when translated into the various languages used. We cannot rule this possibility out entirely, but the variability among the three Latin American countries is counter to this explanation, since all used the same translation of the questionnaire. In addition, the Russian questionnaire was used in Moldova and Ukraine as well as in Russia, and the Romanian questionnaire was used in both Moldova and Romania.

Another explanation of the differences among the countries is that the programming was different in them. We noted this difference already when we discussed the differences among the host settings. What the Fellows did in the various countries for this and other reasons often was quite different. In Chile, all of the programming was done out of a university setting, and most of it involved university students. In Poland, many of our respondents had taken university classes from a Knight Fellow who

taught public relations at a business school. Clearly the limited effect of this Program on Striving for Journalistic Independence (Chart 75), and journalistic Career Commitment (Chart 76) can be easily explained for this reason. In Peru, there was no university instruction and the bulk of the work was at two media outlets. In other countries, such as Russia, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, both university-type instruction and individual consultancies were part of the package.

It is possible, using a statistical technique called regression analysis, to sort out and explain some of these differences. The survey instruments included measures of characteristics of the experiences the respondents had with the Fellows and of the respondents themselves. From the surveys we conducted with the 33 Knight Fellows who worked in our 11 countries from 1994 to 1998 and from their application materials, we were able to obtain measures of the characteristics of the Fellows. The role these factors played in explaining variability in the responses to our measures of the impact of the Knight Fellowship Program is addressed in the following section.

### **Impact of Characteristics of Recipients on Outcome**

From the primary questions completed by respondents, we selected eight characteristics that we felt might be related to the success of the Program. These included the checklist of types of interactions with the Fellows (shown in Charts 4-7), and the time spent with the Fellows (Chart 8). In the case of the former, we created an index that simply counted the number of types of contact. We also included a measure of the voluntary nature of the interaction with the Fellow (based on a recoding of the responses to the item shown in Chart 9). Other measures examined were age of the respondent, the number of years they had been a communication professional, and whether they had formal journalism training (Charts 54, 55 and 56). We also looked at gender of the respondent (Chart 57), and the number of Fellows with whom the respondent had contact. We also looked at whether the respondent was a member of the staff of one of the formal centers that hosted the Fellow and the location of the organization that employed the respondent (Chart 3).

For each of the criterion measures of the Program's impact (shown in, for example, Chart 58 for the Czech Republic), we performed a linear regression. We first controlled for the variability in the criterion measure due to country (that is, took it out of consideration) and then looked at the effects of these 10 variables that tell us something about the respondent and his or her interaction with the Fellow. The first question is: Do these characteristics of the respondent matter? The second question is: If so, what predicts to an effect from the Knight Program? In this way we could determine if these characteristics of our respondents mattered, regardless of the country where they worked.

We have summarized the results of these analyses graphically in Charts 78 to 86. We dropped from those charts four measures: age of the respondent, whether they had formal journalism training, gender of the respondent, and the number of Fellows with whom the respondent had contact. These four characteristics had no impact on any of our criterion variables once we eliminated the effect of country and looked at the six remaining variables. The charts show the effects of the remaining six variables as bars, which represent a statistic called a standardized regression coefficient. This coefficient can vary from -1.00 to +1.00, with a larger score (either negative or positive) indicating greater importance. We show only those coefficients that are statistically significant—a standard benchmark for this type of

analysis. Finally, in each chart we produced a pie chart showing how much of the variance or variability in our criterion variable we were able to explain. Ideally, one would explain 100% of the variance in a criterion variable. In actuality, this is not likely to occur. The charts show the relative amount of variance explained across the criterion measures. In each case shown, the amount of variance explained is statistically significant—again a standard benchmark for this type of analysis.

Those respondents who had a lot of different types of contacts with the Fellows and who spent more time with them were more likely to report impact from this experience based on the Global Measure of Impact than were those who had less contact and spent less time (Chart 78). Respondents who were not part of the Center staff also reported more impact. The effects of country and these characteristics of the respondents are pronounced. Nearly a third of the total variance in this index is explained by them.

Criticism of the Program because its content is not relevant to the personal work setting of the respondent is negatively related to time spent in the Program (Chart 79). In other words, those who spent more time with the Fellows were more likely to find the content of the training relevant to their work settings. Those who participated voluntarily also were less critical, while those in the cities outside the Capital were more critical. In general, however, the variance in this measure is not well predicted by either country or the characteristics of the respondents. Only 8% of the total variance in the measure is explained by these factors.

Criticism of the interaction with the Fellows because the content of their instruction was not deemed relevant to the country was more common by those forced to participate in the Program than by those who did so voluntarily (Chart 80). Those not on the staff of a center also were more likely to give this criticism. Overall, as with the other measure of criticism, these responses are not easily predicted by knowing the country in which the respondent resides or the nature of his or her interaction with the Fellow.

Those who had more types of contact with the Fellows and spent more time with them evaluated the Fellows more highly than did those who had more restricted contact and spent less time (Chart 81). The relationships are quite strong. The country does not matter so much here, but these two individual

features of the Program do. Together, country and these factors explain 20% of the total variance in the measure.

Those who reported the greatest amount of impact of the Knight Fellows on their attitudes and their knowledge were those who had a large number of types of contacts with the Fellows, spent a lot of time with them, and were early in their professional careers (Chart 82). Country and these characteristics of the respondents explain a quarter of the total variance in the measure.

The Knight Fellows were most likely to change the attitudes of the respondents about their own country and the U.S. if the respondents had differing types of contact with the Fellow, if they spent more time with the Fellow, if they were older rather than younger people, and if they worked outside the Capital city (Chart 83). Country explains 10% of the variance in this measure, and these factors add another 4% of explanation.

The Knight Fellows were more likely to have been able to encourage striving for journalistic independence if they had more types of contact with the individual and if the individual worked outside the Capital (Chart 84). These factors explain about the same amount of variance as country alone.

Career Commitment of the respondents was influenced by the amount of contact with the Fellow and location, with those outside the Capital most affected (Chart 85). Country makes a big difference here, and types of contact and location, combined with country, explain 20% of the variance in the final measure.

The Checklist of Effects measure also is influenced by types of contact and amount of time with the Fellows. Here, however, maturity in the field also matters (Chart 86). This measure more than others requires that the respondent be able to see impact on institutions and society more generally, and those with more experience in the field are more likely to report this type of impact. Country is important, but these other factors combine with country to explain nearly 20% of the variance in the final measure.

In sum, two characteristics of the interaction of the Fellows and those they are working with are extremely important, regardless of country. These are the number of different types of interaction and the amount of time spent. For each of the nine criterion measures of impact except one, either amount of contact, amount of time, or both predict to impact. Such a finding is hardly surprising except that it

comes from people who participated in a Program that by-and-large provides an extended amount of contact. Most of these people did not have fleeting interactions with the Fellows, but rather they had interactions over at least several days and often over several weeks and even months. Even within this context—where the amount of contact is already high—diversity of contact and amount of time matter.

Less consistent are the findings for the other factors. Location does seem to matter in several cases, however, with those outside the Capital more likely to be affected. Those who participate voluntarily are less likely to criticize the Program. For some effects, those who are more senior are more likely to change. In other cases, they are less likely to show change.

## Impact of Characteristics of the Fellows on Outcome

If the characteristics of the targets of the Knight Program help to determine the outcomes, is it not also likely that the characteristics of the Fellows have impact?

To answer this question we conducted a second regression analysis, like the first except that now we added in several characteristics of the Fellows. From the information we obtained from the interviews with them and from the records in their files at the International Center for Journalists we knew each Fellow's age, gender, position when they applied for the Fellowship, year of assignment, number of countries they visited, and the length of the assignment. In this second analysis, we studied the responses only of those 411 respondents who had had contact with a single Fellow, and we used the characteristics of that Fellow in the analysis.

Once we eliminated the influence of the country in which the respondent resided and the influence of the characteristics of the respondent, the characteristics of the Fellows made very little difference. In the case of our Global Measure of Impact, for example, no single characteristic was related in a statistically significant way to reports of impact as reflected in this measure. Age, gender and the number of countries visited by the Fellows are the only variables that are predictive in at least two of nine criterion measures. Older Fellows produced higher levels of criticism that the content of their programming was not relevant to the recipient, but they also produced more change in Striving for Journalistic Independence. Female Fellows were less likely to be criticized for providing training that did not meet the individual needs of the recipient but more likely to be criticized for providing training that would not work in the country because of its political or economic status. Those Fellows who visited several countries were more likely to be criticized for providing training that did not meet that country's needs and less likely to be evaluated positively by those they worked with.

In general, however, little was gained in terms of an understanding of the evaluation measures by considering the characteristics of the Fellows, once the country itself and the characteristics of the recipients of the Program were eliminated as factors. In the case of the Global Measure of Impact, only just under 2% new variance was explained. In the case of the Criticized Program for Structural Reasons measure, the increase in variance explained is just under 3%. In both cases, this change is statistically

significant, but the characteristics of the Fellows explained a significant amount of new variance in none of the other seven test cases.

### **Some Alternative Explanations of Factors Influencing Impact**

The interpretation of the determinants of the effectiveness of the Knight Program, based on the responses of those who participated, is tricky. In the analyses above we looked first at the impact of the country itself, then on the impact of the characteristics of the recipients of those programs on impact, and finally on the impact of the characteristics of the Fellows. We did this because we felt the situation within which the program was conducted, as represented by country, was the most important likely determinant of impact. We felt the next most important factors were those associated with the recipients of the training initiatives. We felt the characteristics of the Fellows were of importance only after these other factors were considered.

Had we chosen to look first at the characteristics of the Fellows, we would have reached different conclusions. Chart 87 provides an example. Here the age of the Fellow is used as a potential explainer of the way the Fellow was evaluated by the respondents to our survey. Only those who worked with a single Fellow are shown here. The relationship is not simple, but, in general, Fellows in the 45 to 55 age range get the better scores. Clearly there are exceptions, as the 70-year-old Fellow had the highest scores of any, but the general shape of the curve is that of an upside down U.

Chart 88 shows that, without taking other factors into consideration, the scores on the Global Measure of Impact were higher for Fellows who completed their work in 1998 than for Fellows who completed their work in 1995. The year 1995 was exceptional, but, in general, scores on this measure are improving across the years. Chart 89 shows that those respondents who worked with female Fellows were more likely to report high scores on the Striving for Journalistic Independence measure than were respondents who worked with male Fellows. Chart 90 shows that Career Commitment was more likely to be increased among respondents who worked with Fellows who had been reporters or writers when they took on the assignment abroad than for any others. Finally, those respondents who worked with a Fellow who had been assigned to only a single country reported more impact on the Checklist of Effects measure than did those who worked with Fellows with multiple-country assignments (Chart 91).

We attribute these effects to other factors. For example, the Czech Republic and Slovakia are two countries where all of the Fellows worked in a second country, and, as Charts 58 and 62 show, these countries had very low scores on the Checklist of Effects measures. (Hungary and Romania, where Fellows also had multi-country assignments, scored closer to average on these measures.) In our analysis, the effects of country were taken into consideration first, and then the effects of the characteristics of the respondents were eliminated. In this case, the number of countries visited by the Fellow does not matter. Standing alone, however, as Chart 91 shows, the number of countries visited by the Fellow certainly does matter, and in a very negative way. Specialization, it seems, does make a difference, if this is the only factor considered.

Our analytic strategy, in sum, places priority on country differences as a predictor of Program success. We looked at individual characteristics of the Program recipients and characteristics of the trainers only secondarily. Does this approach overestimate the importance of country?

To answer this question, we reran the analyses summarized in Charts 78 to 86, this time looking at the effects first of characteristics of the respondents to our survey—the recipients of the Knight Fellow training—and then at country as an explainer of Program success. We focused on the changes in the explained variance in our criterion measures to see if, had we given primary status to the characteristics of the respondents, we would have concluded that country did not matter. In fact, that would not have been the case. Even after we eliminate the effects of the characteristics of the recipients of the training initiatives, country makes a difference for each of the nine measures of impact we constructed. The order of our analysis would not have changed the outcome.

## **Examples of Organizational Impact**

The data presented to this point document rather convincingly that the Knight Fellows had impact on those with whom they worked. Included among those influenced by the Knight Program were high school and university students, working journalists, and members of the staffs of organizations that hosted them.

Impact on an individual is likely to be amplified to the extent that individual has contact with others. A young person can influence many individuals as she or he moves through the stages of a career. A leader of an organization can employ managerial skills or other tips provided by the Fellows in working with those under him or her and have great impact throughout the organization. Clearly those in media centers and other organizations that hosted the Knight Fellows could use what they learned from the Fellows to improve their programming and, in this way, extend the impact of the Knight Fellow into the future.

The host organizations are a reasonable place to look for organizational or structural impact. If the work of the Fellow was incorporated into activities of an ongoing organization, it should be possible to document Knight Fellow institutional impact through an examination of the work of that institution while the Fellow was present. Organizations with strong programming that serves their constituencies survive into the future. By extension, then, documented immediate impact can be expected to have continuing impact on the structure of a society even after the Knight Fellow has left.

In each of the countries we visited, we asked the leaders of host organizations to show us concrete records of the programming they did that involved the Knight Fellows. We were looking for examples of courses taught that would not have been taught had the Knight Fellow not been present, of workshops held that could not have been done without the Fellows, or other initiatives that were wholly dependent on the work of a Knight Fellow. Using a Knight Fellow to teach a class that someone else taught in the past was considered to be of less importance than using a Knight Fellow to teach a class that no one else could teach. We wanted to know how the Knight Fellow changed what that organization did.

The results of these probes were informative. In the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Romania, we were able to obtain detailed reports and in three of those cases concrete records of what

types of programming the Knight Fellows offered. Poland was more problematic. One of the Fellows there was hosted by an organization that went out of existence. The other taught a class in public relations at a university that clearly would not have been taught otherwise. Plans are being made to incorporate some of the instruction into the curriculum permanently, though the final shape of this change has not yet been determined.

In Moldova, a Knight Fellow is given much credit for actually creating a journalism center, which hosted a second Fellow and offers programming that is highly valued by journalists in the country. A Knight Fellow played an important role in developing a press center in Ukraine that continues to provide services to journalists in that country. In Russia, the Fellows provided expertise used in programming at two centers, and an individual served as an expert consultant for a third organization.

The situation in Latin America was rather different. In Chile, to be sure, the Knight Fellows strengthened the offerings of a university and allowed that university to do outreach programming it could not have done on its own. In Peru, however, there is little evidence the Fellows left behind an infrastructure that will serve others in the future, though, certainly, those with whom the Fellows worked gained from the experience. Much the same can be said for Ecuador, where the Fellows worked largely on their own initiative. Two of the hosts there said they did programming with the Fellows, and almost certainly they did, but neither provided documentation. The impact the Fellows had in that country seems to have had little to do with the activities of the hosts and much to do with the initiatives of the Fellows themselves. Several hosts in our 11 countries made a simple point to us. Really strong Fellows probably do not need a lot of local assistance. They will make contacts and have impact on their own. Probably all Fellows will gain from strong local support, however, and weaker Fellows need it.

The evidence about organizational impact can be divided into three sections, one dealing with center programming contributions, the other with institution building, and the final with university curricula. Almost all of our 11 countries provided some evidence of impact in each of these areas, but the best evidence of the first type of impact comes from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Russia. The discussion below focuses largely on those countries. The second type of impact comes

from Moldova and Ukraine, and these cases are detailed below. The final type of impact comes largely from Poland and Chile, covered in the final section below.

### ***Impact Through Center Programming***

In the Spring of 1997, the Center for Independent Journalism in Prague, Czech Republic, listed 17 different offerings in its program catalog. Four of them were provided by the Knight Fellows working in the Center during that period. A year later, the Center listed 25 different programs; seven of them were provided by the three Knight Fellows associated with the Center that Spring. In the Fall of 1998, the Center listed 20 offerings, none of which were taught by a Knight Fellow. If these three programs are typical, and the Center leadership said they are, somewhere between 15 and 20% of the programming of the Center is dependent on availability of a Knight Fellow. But the content area is particularly important. The Center leadership said:

“We could not have done the TV offerings without the Knight Fellows. We can find print trainers here, but we cannot find local TV trainers. There is not enough talent in the country and what is here is being used by three different stations. It will take another generation to get (local) trainers.”

The Center for Independent Journalism in Budapest, Hungary, listed 80 workshops or short courses in published program booklets covering the period from Spring 1996 to January of 1999. Seventeen of those courses were taught by Knight Fellows, or roughly one in five of the offerings. The Center leadership said the Knight Fellows did more than just cover the courses, however:

“We could not afford top trainers (of the caliber of the Knight Fellows). We are using local trainers more and more but it is important to have a combination of local and outside trainers...It is getting more difficult to raise money for the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. It is important that the Knight Fellows come with funding. To do this at a commercial rate would be too expensive.”

Two Knight Fellows have returned to the Budapest Center to do additional programs in the years since they completed their Fellowships. The Budapest leadership gave particular meaning to this:

“This is a kind of success. We were happy with them (initially) and happy when they came back. This is an effect of the Knight Fellowship Program. There is a pool of American trainers who can do immediately a very good job. This is a very important contribution of the Fellowship Program.”

The Center for Independent Journalism in Bucharest, Romania, relies heavily in its programming on what its staff term “targeted assistance,” and the Knight Fellows have contributed extensively to this outreach effort. Trainers have visited media organizations all over the country, offering workshops and other kinds of training. Often, these workshops are offered by trainers from outside Romania. In 1998, for example, the Center employed the services of eight western trainers, five of whom were Knight International Press Fellows.

The Center for Independent Journalism in Bratislava, Slovakia, also sends its Knight Fellows out to do workshops around the country. For example, one Fellow, during a one-month assignment with the Bratislava Center, did two-day workshops on layout and design at five media outlets and two universities. Another Fellow, during a four-month assignment, did a workshop on basic journalism for the staff of a magazine four days each week for three hours each day. The Center leadership uses other trainers but expressed a preference for Knight Fellows:

“The Fellows are of a high quality—on a personal and professional level. Compared to other trainers—Fulbright Fellows and those we pick up on an ad hoc basis—the Knight Fellows are of the highest quality. I have great respect for the selection process.”

In St. Petersburg, Russia, and Moscow, most Knight Fellows worked with the National Press Institute, providing staff for NPI projects. In St. Petersburg, for example, one Fellow did workshops on television journalism—until the equipment was stolen over the Christmas holiday break. The Fellow also taught classes twice a week at two university programs for a full semester. The Moscow Institute sends Fellows assigned to it out of Moscow to do individual consulting and teach seminars.

In all five countries, then, the Fellows become a type of staff member for the host organizations. Their hosts plan programs around them, and use the Fellows to fill programming needs. Successful programs enhance the status of the host organizations, in the same way that an American university’s status is

enhanced by the quality of its visiting faculty and speakers and the programs in which it participates. Some of the “glow” from the Fellow shines on the host.

The hosts gain in other ways as well. One reported, in reference to a Fellow who had been at his organization:

“I learned from him—how he did his job, how he planned this time, how he prepared his material. He impacted on me as a manager.”

In several instances, the Fellows left behind at their host organizations training manuals and other materials that could be used by those who came after them. They also left behind new contacts and new ideas for future programming. One of the Russian hosts said of a Fellow:

“She came up with her own suggestions. She had all the imagination one could have. She didn’t need assignments. Wherever I go now I can see her trail.”

### ***Impact Through Institution Building***

The most dramatic evidence we observed of the organizational impact of the Knight Program was in Moldova, where the work of a Fellow was instrumental in the creation of the Independent Journalism Center there. The Center is now staffed by Moldovans, has an active program that serves the needs of journalists in the country, and has even hosted a successful visit of another Knight Fellow.

Shortly after her arrival in Moldova, the Fellow began working with representatives of the Open World House, a Soros Foundation organization, to create the journalism center.

The Center is located in Chisinau, the Capital of Moldova, and it has done programming aimed at the Russian and Romanian linguistic constituencies, both in the Capital and in other areas of the country. In 1998, the Center offered short-term training courses in basic computer use, TV journalism, radio reporting (taught by a Knight Fellow), basic journalism for young journalists, radio management, and economics writing. The Center published a bi-monthly bulletin for journalists and a magazine called *Media in Moldova*. The Center also organized internships for economics journalists in Ukraine and Romania.

The Leadership of the Open World House attributed the success of the Center to the Knight Fellow:

“Her presence here in the very beginning was instrumental in creating a small but very influential journalism Center. The Center is very efficient. With a small team, they did a lot of activities. It is because of her presence in the very beginning. She showed how it could be done. Her daily presence here and the fact that she worked here and colleagues here in the Center could observe how a well-trained person worked (had a lot of impact). Other saw how she organized her day and other things.”

The current Center director worked as a translator for the first of the two Knight Fellows and was involved from the beginning in the discussions about creation of the Center. She became interested enough to take over operation of the Center when the Knight Fellow left. One of the Center staff we interviewed summarized the impact of the Knight Fellow succinctly:

“What (the Fellow) did was create a new organization that does now exist. It is working.”

The first of the two Knight Fellows who served in Ukraine during the 1994 to 1998 period did not create a journalism center, but she had a great deal of impact on one that was emerging there at the time. She joined a press center focused on training for broadcasting and offered ideas on how to serve the print community as well. While she was there, she trained newspaper journalists, visited university journalism programs, worked to start a student newspaper, met with journalists to learn of their needs, and developed a business plan for the center. She also wrote a handbook for Ukrainian journalists that was distributed all over the country and launched the center on a publishing and information distribution path it still follows. The center operates today as a Ukrainian Nongovernmental Organization and offers programs for all types of journalists in the country.

According to one of those we interviewed at the Center, the Knight Fellow helped shape the Center by educating the staff about the basics of journalism. He said:

“I came to understand what is journalism from (the Knight Fellow)—what is the mission and what is the role. For many people in the press center, the understanding of the role of the media was to build an independent Ukraine—a kind of propaganda. It was

at the very beginning of our professionalism. It was a very good start and push into proper training.”

The librarian at the Center added:

“She taught me the basics of being a librarian, setting up a schedule for me and training me on how to work with journalists. I worked for a long time in this environment with journalists but before (the Knight Fellow) came nobody told me how to do the job.”

The Ukrainian center continues to exist, offers a broad range of services to journalists in the country, and continues to follow many of the initiatives provided by the Knight Fellow who worked there in the center’s formative years.

### ***Impact on University Curricula***

In a very real sense, the Knight Fellows do work abroad that professional educators and trainers do in an institutional setting in the United States and other westernized countries. In this sense, they stand in opposition to the universities that might otherwise provide journalism training, and the relationship between many of the organizations that host the Knight Fellows and the universities has been strained. Many of those we spoke to at the host organizations said their work was necessary because the universities were not doing their jobs and were too inflexible to adapt to the rapid changes taking place in the host countries.

In two of the 11 countries we studied, Fellows were assigned directly to universities, which served as the host. One of those countries was Poland; the other was Chile. In Poland a Knight Fellow taught public relations at a private business school. In Chile, two Knight Fellows taught journalism at an old, well-established Catholic university. In both cases, the Fellow provided instruction not otherwise available to the students. In both cases, the Fellow had impact on the instructional approach of the universities.

The Polish business school, as a consequence of the influence of the Knight Fellow, plans to begin a master’s level program in public relations in late 2000. It will be the only such program in the country and will be built on a general undergraduate business degree. One of those we interviewed put it simply:

“He (the Knight Fellow) left us a curriculum for public relations...PR is very important to us, and he gave it special support while he was here.”

In Chile, hosting the Knight Fellows was part of a plan by the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile to strengthen that institution’s journalism program and develop a new model of journalism instruction for the whole of Latin America. One of the leaders explained:

“In the 1980s we started a movement to change what was thought about journalism in Latin America. We thought social information was the most important thing. We thought if Latin America didn’t have a good press system we would not have a stable regime.

“We changed all of our curriculum into a very professional curriculum. We thought what was being done by (many in journalism training) had nothing to do with the Latin American people. We built a new model. Now we are explaining to other journalism programs in Latin America other ways to do journalism. We want to help them to change the way they do journalism.”

Part of the approach was to model the curriculum after curricula in the United States. The University now is the first journalism program outside the United States to be accredited by the U.S. Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism in Mass Communication.

Inviting Knight Fellows to teach at the university fit into these plans. The Fellows provided American experience and an American approach to journalism and journalism education. In addition, the Knight Fellows helped the program build in at least one area it was weak in—radio journalism. Faculty at the university worked with the Fellow while he was there to assist them and to learn from them so that expertise could be fed back into the curriculum. Another of the administrators said:

“They (the Fellows) came here and helped us with our weaknesses-- methodologically and in terms of how to get along with things. It will have influences afterwards. We can make an impact in the long term.”

The Chilean university operates an outreach center that provides training programs for media around the country. Its resources are limited, however, and serving the areas outside of the Capital of Santiago

is difficult. Each of the Knight Fellows was sent to regional media outlets, where they conducted workshops for journalists. This activity contributed to the professional development of the journalists, but it also bolstered the status of the University's outreach program, increasing the probability it will be able to do such work in the country and region in the future. This is yet another example of the organizational impact of the Knight Fellowship Program.

## Summary

This evaluation study was designed to answer a simple question: Does the Knight International Press Fellowship Program have an impact in the countries in which it operates? The evidence—drawn from 11 countries in which the Program had a significant presence in the 1994 to 1998 period—is unambiguous. The recipients of the training offered by the Knight Fellows answer affirmatively. There is concrete evidence as well that the Fellows changed key organizations in those countries in a way that serves journalism practice there.

The recipients of the Knight training say the Fellows changed their attitudes, gave them new knowledge, and changed their behaviors. Many said their attitudes toward their own countries had changed as had their attitudes toward the United States. Many said they were more committed to journalism, and that they were more likely to strive for journalistic independence as a result of the work of the Knight Fellows. Many said they noticed differences in how stories were written in their countries and how other key organizations, such as those providing journalism education, went about their jobs. Many said they also saw evidence that the functioning of democracy in their countries had improved.

These positive evaluations of the Knight Program did not come about casually. The data show clearly that the Fellows invested heavily in their work, and that there was a clear relationship between their investment and how what they did was evaluated. The amount of time the Fellows spent with the individuals we interviewed and the number of different types of contacts the Fellows had with the respondents were consistently related to the evaluations the Fellows received. The success of the Program clearly depends on the diligence, creativity and sensitivity of those individuals who take on the assignment of being a Knight Fellow.

The recipients of the training of the Knight Fellows did not say the Program was perfect. Some criticized the Fellows for their limited language skills and gaps in their knowledge of the particulars of the society that was hosting them. Several stressed that the Program should be viewed more as a true exchange: Fellows need to realize that they will be learning from people who have a lot to teach. But many struggled when asked to give specific suggestions to those who operate the Knight Program. They simply couldn't come up with any. A Ukrainian who hosted many trainers said:

“The Knight Fellows are probably the best trainers we have ever had. You have a very good way of selecting trainers. You should show how you do that!”

The evaluation study did not cover every country in which the Knight Program operates. Limitations of time made it necessary to select. The countries visited were many of those where the Knight Program has operated the longest and where it has sent large numbers of Fellows. Is it a certainty that the Program was equally successful in others countries? No. It is unlikely, however, given the success observed in the 11 selected countries, that it had no impact elsewhere.

It is impossible to set a firm standard against which to evaluate the reports of those who worked with the Knight Fellows and the evidence of organizational change observed. No other study of the impact of the Knight Program has been undertaken. No other comparable data from other such programs are available.

At the same time, it is important to remember what the evaluation study might have found. There was no guarantee that people would come out of the countryside, cross political borders, take time out from their busy lives and work, and do all of the others things that the respondents to this study did to make sure their voices were heard. Those we found could have said the Program was a waste of their time. People did talk, and what they said was clear: The Knight International Press Fellowship Program meant a great deal to them.

Their message is the message of this report as well: The Program mattered for those it was designed to serve!