

Non-U.S. Funders of Media Assistance Projects

by

Lee B. Becker & Tudor Vlad

James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Report prepared for the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. The assistance of graduate research assistants Douglas Jordan, Yevgeniya Mussuri, Renée Pelton and Misti Turnbull is gratefully acknowledged.

December 15, 2005

Executive Summary

- At least 70 organizations in 25 donor countries outside the United States are involved in funding media assistance projects.
- Donors are units of governments in single countries, nongovernmental organizations, including foundations, and multinational organizations.
- Based on the most recent year for which reporting organizations provided data on media assistance, \$0.75 billion is being spent each year on media assistance projects by donors from outside the United States.
- The actual level of spending for media assistance is likely to be in the neighborhood of \$1 billion annually.
- Spending is spread around the world, with eastern and central Europe and African countries major recipients.

Governments have been concerned with the type of media that operate outside their borders at least since modern colonial times. In the period after World War II, the United States and its allies invested heavily in the training of journalists and other forms of media assistance and control in the countries they occupied.

During the Cold War, both sides to the conflict were concerned about media development. In fact, the emergence of the Non-Aligned Movement had at its core a concern with media policy and, in particular, access to the media on the part of non-aligned countries. One consequence was the establishment of alternative news agencies.

After the fall of communism in 1989 in eastern and central Europe, western governments, nongovernmental organizations, foundations and others began a concerted effort to provide assistance to the media to develop along western lines. Ellen Hume has estimated that at least \$600 million was spent by U.S. government and media foundations alone during the decade after 1989.¹

What has not been documented is the extent of investment in media assistance on the part of other developed countries. This report is a first attempt to systematically examine the media assistance landscape outside the U.S. and provide a listing of donor organizations.

This project was undertaken as part of a larger effort to examine empirically the relationship between media assistance and its expected outcomes. At present, as is documented in this report, relatively little is known about the effectiveness of media assistance efforts.

Methodology of Project

No comprehensive list of organizations involved in funding or providing media training and assistance existed prior to the initiation of this project. Hume, in her report on U.S. support for media development, estimated that “hundreds” of U.S. and European organizations are involved in media development work and included a list of “selected media developers and experts.” Researchers from the Cox Center had visited a number of European organizations involved in

¹Ellen Hume (2004). *The media missionaries: American support of journalism excellence and press freedom around the globe*. Miami: The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

media training for earlier projects for the Knight Foundation. In addition, the Cox Center has worked with and continues to work with organizations around the world involved in media training. These initial, informal lists served as the springboard for this project.

International Finance Corporation (IFC), which is a member of the World Bank Group, identifies 26 countries as Donor Countries. These are Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States. Included are all 22 members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The European Commission, which is a member of the DAC, was included on the list of 26 Donor Countries.

During the early stages of this project, efforts were made to identify all organizations in these 26 countries involved in some phase of media assistance, either as a funder of these projects or as provider of some form of assistance, such as training, support for media organizations, or assistance in the development of law in support of operation of independent media. Researchers in the Cox Center used a “snowballing” tactic of checking linkages among these organizations in their web and printed documents. Organizations providing training often partner in projects. These partnerships resulted in the identification of additional organizations. The training organizations can get funding from multiple sources. The identification of funding sources provided new information on organizations involved in media assistance.

The most difficult challenge initially was organization of the information. The government agencies and trainers were uneven in the amount of information they reported on their web sites, in their printed reports, and in interviews, so it was difficult to know what the final data base would look like. Researchers in the Center explored a number of options for the creation of a data base and ultimately decided on a relatively open structure for the records, created in Microsoft Access. This allowed for modification as the project developed.

As the project evolved, work focused most heavily on the funding organizations in the 25 donor countries other than the United States, consistent with the project goal. Two documents that surfaced as part of the “snowballing” procedures provided considerable assistance. The first was a draft report for an aborted project by a group of researchers at the Programme in Comparative Media Law & Policy at the University of Oxford.² The second was an OECD report on international development.³ The Oxford project, which came to halt shortly after a draft report was issued in 2002, focused only on the United States and Europe. The OECD report focused on member states.

The definition of media assistance used in the Oxford report was adopted for this project. Media assistance includes the following:

1. Journalism training and education.
2. Training in marketing and business management and efforts to ensure financial independence for the media.
3. Training to transform state broadcasters into public service organizations.
4. Training in professional ethics, accountability and professionalism.
5. Material assistance to help build the infrastructure needed for media independence, such as printing presses and transmission facilities, as well as the development of Internet sites and capability.
6. Assistance in the development of networks of independent media and in development of trade associations.
7. Assistance and advice in building the legal and regulatory framework for media operation and in legal defense.
8. Assistance in development of models for coverage of conflict and conflict resolution and of security measures for coverage of conflict.

²Price, M., Noll, B. D., & De Luce, D. (2002). Mapping media assistance. Unpublished document, The Programme in Comparative Media Law & Policy, University of Oxford, UK.

³International Development Statistics (IDS) online. Retrieved on September 21, 2005, from: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/50/17/5037721.htm>

9. Support for media monitoring and watchdog groups.
10. Development of community support for media independence and of community use of media technologies.

To identify organizations in countries on the OECD list but not found through other techniques, Cox Center researcher made telephone calls, sent e-mail messages, and traveled to meet with key sources of information on media assistance.

Outcome of the Research

The Cox Center has identified 70 organizations and foundations in the 25 countries outside the United States involved in the funding of media assistance. Of these, 27 are units of governments in a single country, 22 are nongovernmental organizations, including foundations, and 21 are multinational organizations.

At least one organization providing funding for media assistance was identified in 24 of the 25 countries. Bahrain is the single donor country without an organization involved in media funding. Germany had the most organizations, with 10, the United Kingdom had six, followed by Japan with four and Norway with three.

An effort was made to obtain detailed financial information from each of these funding sources. Some of the governmental organizations directed Cox Center researchers to the OECD web site for their records. Others provided them directly. Where possible, estimates provided directly were compared with those on the OECD web site. Where conflicts existed, the estimates obtained directly were taken as more accurate.

In the end, 38 of the 70 funders provided a figure for the amount of media assistance they had funded in at least one year from 1999 through 2004. Most of the estimates were for 2003 or 2004. Based on the most recent year, it is possible to say that \$0.75 billion is being spent each year at present for media assistance projects by these 38 organizations. The actual tally for the 38 organizations is \$776,609,000.

An additional nine organizations provided total disbursement funds for a year but did not provide data solely for media assistance, indicating that spending is not broken down in that

fashion. Of the 38 organizations that provided a figure on the amount of media assistance, 23 also provided a figure representing their total assistance disbursement that same year. For these organizations, the media assistance component represented 2.5% of total assistance spending. If the nine organizations not providing media budgets are spending at a similar ratio to those that provided data on media assistance and total assistance, these nine organizations have been spending \$42.5 million in media assistance in recent years .

Of the 23 organizations that did not provide either type of data, six were government organizations and 17 were private organizations.⁴ Five of those six government agencies were units within the European Union, and much of their funding actually was accounted for by other EU units to which they transfer funds and for which data were provided. Foundations generally provide lesser amounts than government agencies. For this reason, it probably is a reasonable estimate that about \$1 billion is being spent by organizations outside the U.S. each year on media assistance programs.

Some of the organizations provided detailed records on their media assistance projects across time. Others provided more limited information. Based on the records compiled by the Cox Center researchers, it is clear that assistance has been provided to countries all over the world, with particularly large amounts being committed to eastern and central Europe and to Africa.

While obtaining detailed records back in time from the funders and from other organizations involved in media training clearly is a complex task, the data base created for this project is an appropriate framework to organize data from that undertaking. The data base includes a short description of each of the organizations, contact information, geographic and programmatic areas of interest and financial information. Excerpts below illustrate how financial information is managed within the data base. The full data base is being submitted with this report.

⁴One of the organizations, a foundation, explicitly refused to provide the data. The others, despite repeated telephone and e-mail contacts, simply did not provide the information.

In the examples below, and in the data base, spending is converted to U.S. dollars, using the exchange rate for June of the year of the spending. Details on characteristics of the three organizations used as examples are in the data base.

Organization Name Directorate General for Development Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Italy (DGCS)

MEDIA BUDGET		DISBURSEMENT BUDGET	
2005		2005	
2004		2004	
2003	\$381,220.00	2003	\$581,288,030.00
2002	\$1,895,420.00	2002	\$296,667,900.00
2001	\$2,580,270.00	2001	\$388,161,700.00
2000	\$533,000.00	2000	\$258,963,800.00
1999	\$612,000.00	1999	\$326,526,900.00
1998	\$4,653,000.00	1998	\$445,522,200.00
1997	\$26,393,000.00	1997	\$164,293,800.00
1996	\$71,000.00	1996	\$324,734,000.00
1995	\$40,366,000.00	1997	\$190,757,500.00
1994	\$2,645,000.00	1994	\$78,756,740.00
1993	\$64,134,000.00	1993	\$457,911,300.00
1992	\$150,149,000.00	1992	\$829,029,200.00
1991	\$70,507,000.00	1991	\$953,918,400.00
1990	\$39,839,000.00	1990	\$925,200,000.00
1989	\$0.00	1989	\$0.00

FIELD OF SUPPORT Administrative Management. Communication Policy, Print Media, Radio, Television, Workshops on mass media in areas of conflict for senior journalists.

BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, East Timor, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyz Rep., Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Macedonia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Moldova, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Palestinian Authority, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

MEDIA EXPENDITURES 2003 Media Expenditures:

1. Amount: \$2,370. Recipient: Kenya. Region: Africa - South of Sahara. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Station of Telesurvey S. Marco sent Esperti.
2. Amount: \$8,040. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: EURAC European Academy for Metacommunication.
3. Amount: \$4,020. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: The development CD - Multimedia Atlantis - contribute to program.

4. Amount: \$58,340. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Invisible Africa - Strategies to win the invisibility of a continent. Information 2001.
 5. Amount: \$67,610. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Radio/Television/Print Media. Description: Mass Media for North/South Project - Contribut. Program.
 6. Amount: \$23,670. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications Policy and administrative management. Description: Italy and the Mediterranean: Migrations, Identities and Common Values (inform. 2000) - Contribut. Program
 7. Amount: \$4,680. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Mi Piace on Mondo - information campaign on development problems - Contribut. Program
 8. Amount: \$64,180. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Africa Cinema Festival (information 1999) Contribut. Program.
 9. Amount: \$70,010. Recipient: LDCS Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: The link between debt, forgiveness and poverty reduction. (Infor. 2000) Contrib. Program
-

Organization Name Finland Department for International Development Cooperation of
Ministry for Foreign Affairs (FINNIDA)

MEDIA BUDGET **DISBURSEMENT BUDGET**

2005		2005	
2004	\$3,107,120.00	2004	\$391,680,000.00
2003	\$3,400,220.00	2003	\$381,467,000.00
2002	\$781,270.00	2002	\$298,238,000.00
2001	\$925,870.00	2001	\$280,306,000.00
2000	\$992,000.00	2000	\$199,041,000.00
1999	\$294,000.00	1999	\$213,319,000.00
1998	\$655,000.00	1998	\$215,164,000.00
1997	\$42,000.00	1997	\$175,208,000.00
1996	\$272,000.00	1996	\$197,677,000.00
1995	\$0.00	1995	\$285,200,000.00
1994	\$1,895,000.00	1994	\$254,800,000.00
1993	\$7,192,000.00	1993	\$341,700,000.00
1992	\$12,179,000.00	1992	\$485,700,000.00
1991	\$7,169,000.00	1991	\$632,500,000.00
1990	\$8,014,000.00	1990	\$544,000,000.00
1989	\$0.00	1989	\$509,800,000.00

FIELD OF SUPPORT Administration, Communication Policy, Information and
Communication Technology, Telecommunication

BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES Albania, Algeria, Angola, America,(unspecified), Afghanistan, Asia (unspecified), Azerbaijan, Africa (unspecified), Argentina, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Benin, Botswana, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Croatia, Chile, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Colombia, Cuba, Central America (unspecified), Congo Democratic Republic, Congo Republic, Developing countries (unspecified), Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, El Salvador, Egypt, Ex-Yugoslavia (unspecified), Far East Asia (unspecified), Guatemala, Gambia, Ghana, Georgia, Guinea, Haiti, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Mali, Morocco, Mauritania, Mauritius, Moldova, Mozambique, Maldives, Myanmar (Burma), Nepal, Nicaragua, North and Panama, Namibia, Nigeria, Oceania (unspecified), Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa (unspecified), Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, South America (unspecified), Serbia and Montenegro, Venezuela, Lebanon, Palestinian administrated areas, Syria, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, South and Central Asia (unspecified), Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Indonesia, Korea Democratic Republic, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Thailand, Timor, Viet Nam, Turkey,

MEDIA EXPENDITURES

2004 Media Expenditures:

1. Amount: \$80,760. Recipient: South of Sahara Unall. Region: Africa - South of Sahara. Purpose: Information and communication technology. Description: Finnish cooperation in the area of ICT. DSDC will serve the stakeholders and partners inside and outside the SADC region with a relevant, accurate, timely and interactive web-site.
 2. Amount: \$571,500. Recipient: Russia. Region: NIS. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Development program for telematics in foreign trade. The operational routines of a foreign trade event and its logistic chains and their reciprocal message traffic will be planned.
 3. Amount: \$124,240. Recipient: Russia. Region: NIS. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Promoting knoweldge society through renewal.
 4. Amount: \$4,970. Recipient: Russia. Region: NIS. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Of Kola Peninsula Sami Radio
 5. Amount: \$248,480. Recipient: Asia Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: ICT strategy study through international telecommunications union. To carry out feasibility study for a regional project to support Asian and Pacific countries in elaboration of national.
 6. Amount: \$43,480. Recipient: Africa Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: From local to global - developing ICT. Supporting economic and social development in Southern Africa.
 7. Amount: \$1,490,870. Recipient: Asia Unspecified. Region: unspecified. Purpose: Information and communications technology. Description: ICT support to Asia. Description: INFODEV is to help developing countries to maximize to impact of ICT technologies in combating poverty and promoting broad-based sustainable development.
 8. Amount: \$498,090. Recipient: Palestinian Admin. Areas. Region: Middle East. Purpose: Communications policy and administrative management. Description: Digital Media Education. Improved social and political status of Palestinians by introducing latest development in the Media Sector. Creation of virtual education environment. Job creation to media section.
-

Organization Name The Myer Foundation (Australia)

MEDIA BUDGET

2005
2004
2003 \$27,732.60
2002 \$103,631.00
2001 \$148,701.00
2000 \$146,062.00
1999 \$37,439.00
1998
1997
1996
1995
1994
1993
1992
1991
1990
1989

DISBURSEMENT BUDGET

2005
2004
2003 \$3,642,455.00
2002 \$3,875,973.00
2001 \$3,952,840.00
2000 \$3,225,485.00
1999 \$2,545,838.00
1998
1997
1996
1995
1994
1993
1992
1991
1990
1989

FIELD OF SUPPORT

BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES

MEDIA EXPENDITURES

1. Amount: \$5,000(VIC) Purpose of Program: The Emerging Writer's Festival. Recipient: Express Media Power Workshop, Inc.
2. Amount: \$10,000 Purpose of Program: Connecting CLAD Youth. Recipient: National Ethnic & Multicultural Broadcaster's Council, Inc.
3. Amount: \$4,000. Purpose of Program: Media Skills Building Project. Recipient: People Living With HIV/AIDS (NSW) Inc.
4. Amount: \$11,450. Purpose of Program: Peace Journalism in the Asia Pacific Region. Recipient: Curtin University of Technology Centre for Human Rights Education, Division of Humanities.
5. Amount: \$12,000. Recipient: University of Sydney Media and Communications Program.

Evaluation

The work done for this project illustrates the wide range of media assistance. In the years since the fall of communism in eastern and central Europe, many governmental and nongovernmental agencies have invested heavily in assisting the development of the media around the world. Interest in efforts to evaluate these programs seems not to have kept pace with the level of investment.

In recognition of this fact, In July of 2002, USAID Senior Social Scientist Krishna Kumar summoned a group of about 30 USAID and public diplomacy officials, congressional aides, journalists, and nongovernmental organizations involved in media development to reflect on what had been learned about media assistance and what should be done in the future. According to a summary of that meeting, participants “underlined the need for a meaningful way of assessing media development” and particularly for techniques that went beyond simply counting the number of persons trained.⁵ According to the report, “winning funding will be difficult unless clearer assessment benchmarks are devised.”

Despite this admonition, relatively few efforts have been made to do more than simply tally the number of persons trained. The exceptions are reviewed below.

Carothers, in his 1996 report on democracy assistance to Romania, included an assessment of two major media assistance projects in that country.⁶ In 1990, the U.S. government underwrote the purchase of a printing press and provided newsprint and other supplies for the newspaper *România Liberă*. Between 1990 and 1993, the International Media Fund helped the newspaper get the press in working order. The International Media Fund also from 1990 to 1993 helped launch the first private television station in Romania. Carothers concluded that the support for *România Liberă* “ failed to contribute to the development of independent media” and “has not contributed to the development of professionalized media” in the country. SOTI failed in 1993. Carothers believes the lessons are two: it is very difficult to develop an organization in a setting where the foreign interest in its survival outweighs the local interest; and the management expertise needed for such an organization is not likely to exist locally.

In 1999 and 2000, the Cox Center conducted an evaluation of the Knight International Press Fellowship Program, operated by the International Center for Journalists (ICFJ) in

⁵USAID (2003). *Media assistance: Best practices and priorities*. (PN-ACR-754). Washington, D.C.: Hume, E.

⁶Carothers, T.(1996). *Assessing democracy assistance: The case of Romania*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Washington, D.C.⁷ The Knight International Press Fellowship Program, which began in 1994, sends a group of about 15 journalists from the United States to assignments around the world for periods of up to nine months. The trainers, known as Knight International Press Fellows, work in conjunction with local hosts to provide a wide variety of training.

To obtain reports of impact from those with whom the Knight Fellow worked, three evaluators from the Cox Center attempted to find as many of those who worked with the Knight Fellows in the 11 countries as possible and to conduct interviews with them. They used two interview techniques. First, they asked those they contacted to complete a written interview, generally with one of them in close proximity. Next, they asked most of those contacted to answer follow-up questions. The first questionnaire contained clusters of items designed to measure the perceived impact of the interaction with the Knight Fellow. The interview included a variety of questions designed to obtain both discrete indications of impact and examples of that impact.

The evaluation focused on the simple question: Does the Knight International Press Fellowship Program have an impact in the countries in which it operates? The answer, based on evidence from 11 countries in which the Knight Program had a significant presence in the 1994 to 1998 period, was positive.

In 2000, British writer Mark Thompson reviewed efforts by Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to reform the broadcast media of the former Yugoslavian states.⁸ Thompson concluded that efforts at media assistance were not well coordinated, did not recognize that the media in Yugoslavia were some of the most sophisticated in a communist state, as were the audience members, and the United Nations Protection Forces had little understanding of how

⁷Becker, L. B., & Lowrey, W. (2000). *Independent journalism training initiatives: Their impact on journalists and journalism education*. Paper presented to the Professional Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, Singapore.

⁸Thompson, M. (2000). *Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia (FYROM) and Kosovo international assistance to media*. Vienna: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

to implement a coherent communication policy. In his view, there was little evidence of the effectiveness of the media assistance programs.

Guy Berger from Rhodes University in South Africa, in a 2001 study of trainees who had participated in a variety of journalism programs in southern Africa over a two and a half year period, found that trainees reported that they had gained from the programs, that female trainees had more impact on their newsrooms, that some were frustrated they could not implement their skills because of the work environment, and that training took time to have impact.⁹

Philliber Research Associates conducted an evaluation of Free Press Seminars offered by the International Center for Journalists in Latin America between 2000 and 2002.¹⁰ Before and after the workshops, participants were asked to rate how familiar they were with the Declaration of Chapultepec, a free press manifesto for the Americas, and other key free press documents or restrictions. After the ICFJ workshops, familiarity with Chapultepec, Article 19, the First Amendment, and legal restrictions on freedom of expression in the United States and in the home country of the workshops increased significantly. After the workshops, the journalists attending the workshops in most countries were less likely to feel the press should be legally restricted, though the differences were not great. Participants also rated the workshops highly overall and rated individual components highly.

ARD Inc. of Burlington, VT, provided USAID in 2004 an assessment of the impact of media training programs in Kosovo funded by USAID and other sources.¹¹ Much of that investment has been in training, according to the report, and the training has produced mixed responses. Some trainers were judged to be unqualified and course content did not always

⁹Berger, G. (2001). It's the training that did it. Unpublished manuscript, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa.

¹⁰International Center for Journalists (2002). *Assessing the impact of press freedom seminars in 2002*. Washington, D.C.: Philliber Research Associates.

¹¹Nelson, S., Rowland, J., & Stinson, D.(2004). *Kosovo media assessment*. Burlington, VT: ARD Inc.

respond to local needs. ARD faulted USAID for not investing enough of its resources in evaluation of the work that was done.

Press Now, a non-governmental organization (NGO) located in Amsterdam, in 2004 analyzed the media development work of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia.¹² Press Now relied on “media experts” in the countries studied to serve as critics of the programs of OSCE. Most of the comments were focused on the assessment of program process, though these experts did offer comments about impact as well. For the most part, Press Now concluded that the programs were effective, though no systematic evidence was provided of this.

USAID has issued a number of reports based on its assessments of media programs it has funded around the world. A report issued in January of 2004 summarized the findings of those assessments.¹³ The conclusions are based on workshops held by USAID to discuss media assistance projects, fieldwork in Bosnia, Central America, Russia and Serbia and a review of the literature. These activities took place between July of 2002 and June of 2003. The report concluded that USAID-supported professional training programs improved news content and coverage and helped institutionalize notions of press freedom. Participants also learned about their legal rights and responsibilities. USAID concluded that well-designed, comprehensive training programs “can go a long way in improving journalists’ technical skills” and that journalists who received this training often shared it with others, spreading the effect more broadly. The overview is based on four separate assessments, for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Central America, Russia and Serbia.¹⁴ The Central American report dealt most extensively with training. The

¹²Manro, Y., Palmer, P., and Thompson, M. (2004). *Media development by OSCE field missions*. Amsterdam: Press Now.

¹³USAID. (2004, January). *USAID’s media assistance: Policy and programmatic lessons*. Washington, D.C.:(PN-ACU-777).Kumar, K..

¹⁴USAID (2003, September). *Assessment of USAID media assistance in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1996-2002*. (PN-ACR-756). Washington, D.C.:De Luce; USAID (2003, June). *Journalism training and institution building in Central American countries*. (PN-ACR-755). Washington, D.C.: D. Rockwell, R., & Kumar, K.; USAID(2003, August). *Promoting independent media in Russia: An assessment of USAID’s media assistance*. (PN-ACR-757). Washington, D.C.:

evaluators conducted surveys (presumably of trainees) and interviews with “observers of the Central American media scene” before concluding that the Latin American Journalism Project (LAPJ) made “a major contribution toward improving the technical and professional skills of journalists” in the region.

Another study conducted in the Cox Center in 2005 examined the impact of media assistant programs in Ukraine.¹⁵ A researcher compared how four online publications supported by international donors differed in their coverage of the country’s Orange Revolution of late 2004 from four other online publications that had not received support from international donors. Included in the support by international donors was a variety of training programs.

The research assistant sampled stories in these eight publications in October and November of 2004. What she found was that the media with outside support and training were more likely to cover the political events taking place in Ukraine at that time. Though each of these media covered the opposition in those stories, the stories in the media supported by outside donors were more likely to provide balanced coverage of the opposition. The stories about the opposition in the media not getting outside training and support were often sarcastic in tone, the writers often mixed their personal opinions into the news stories, and language choice presented the opposition in a negative way. The web sites that had been given outside training and support did not use biased language, presented more than one point of view, and did not mix editorial comment with reporting. She concluded that the style of reporting in these media was “very close to the western style of reporting, or to what is usually taught in training sessions.”

Kumar, K., & Cooper, L. R.; USAID (2003, November). *U.S. media assistance in Serbia: July 1997-June 2002*. (PN-ACT-553). Washington, D.C.:McLear, R., McLear, S., & Graves, P.

¹⁵Mussuri, Y. A. (2005). *Foreign aid to the media in Ukraine and its impact on the democratization process in the country*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis, University of Georgia, Athens.

The Cox Center also studied the impact of a workshop it conducted in April of 2005 in the Philippines.¹⁶ Sixteen journalists attended a workshop on Alternative Approaches to Covering Conflict, which was held in Cebu City. Fourteen of the participating journalists were from Mindanao, working for radio, television and newspapers in either Zamboanga or Cotabato. Two journalists were from Jakarta, Indonesia, where ethnic, religious and political conflict also have been part of the news in recent years. The Indonesian journalists were included to provide perspective on the conflict in Mindanao.

Among the topics covered by the workshop were the status of current peace negotiations in Mindanao, religion, ethnicity and conflict, international law and conflict, safety strategies for journalists, and techniques for writing about conflict.

Analysis of the responses of the journalists to questionnaires they completed prior to and after the workshop provided no evidence the workshop changed the way they described the seven parties to the conflict, the background of the conflict in Mindanao, or the reasons that the conflict persists, respectively. The journalists answered the questions in some detail, showing ease with the questions. The answers were not simplistic, and the journalists, for the most part, do not place blame on one side or the other. The evidence from these three questions was that the journalists in the workshop were knowledgeable before the workshop, were not inclined to see the conflict in simple terms, and were not overly judgmental about who is to blame for its continuation. Given this starting point, it is not so surprising that the four days of discussion did not produce marked change.

Floyd Takeuchi completed an evaluation in 2005 of a program funded by the Sasakawa Peace Foundation of Japan that, from 1991 to 2004, brought 81 journalists from the Pacific Islands to Japan for visits of differing duration.¹⁷ The purpose of the program was to expose the

¹⁶Becker, L. B., and Vlad, T. (2005). *Developing and evaluating alternative approaches to media coverage of conflict: Performance report*. Report presented to the United States Institute of Peace, Washington, D.C.

¹⁷Sasakawa Peace Foundation. (2005). *Report of SPINF media project*. Tokyo: Hayakawa, R. (ed.).

journalists to Japanese culture, politics and media. Takeuchi surveyed participants and reviewed stories written upon their return to assess impact of the program. The evaluator concluded that the program undoubtedly was successful in exposing a group without prior experience to Japanese life, but there was little evidence the program had an impact on the professional development of the journalists. It also had limited impact on what the journalists wrote or did after they returned.

Conclusions

The findings of this phase of the project reveal the wide range of media assistance programs that have been conducted since 1989 and the relatively limited attempts to evaluate these initiatives. What evaluation has been done has focused on individual programs, rather than on the overall consequences of investment.

This project has been part of a larger effort by the Knight Foundation and the Cox Center to evaluate the media assistance enterprise more generally. The next step in the project is to track the investments made back through 1989 and link them to existing measures of media performance, such as the Freedom House and Reporters sans frontieres press freedom measures and the IREX Sustainability Index. This tracking can be done by working with the donor organizations and with the implementers identified here and by Ellen Hume.

The goal of this next step would be to create a data base for each country of the world in which the amount of money spent on media assistance per year is identified. In addition, the type of programs run in that country would be identified. This would allow for an examination not only of the relationship between amount of investment and outcome but also of the relationship between type of program+ and outcome. The data base for the project has been designed so that it can be expanded in the future to accommodate this goal.

Since a number of indicators of civil society, level of democratization, economic development and the like already exists, it also will be possible to examine the linkage between media investment and these characteristics as well.

The work undertaken here and in earlier projects for Knight indicates that this project is one that can be done and one that needs to be done. It will be tedious and will require the investment of resources. Getting detailed records from funding organizations is not easy, this project shows. Lengthy visits with a variety of parties within organizations is going to be needed.

In fact, UNESCO estimated it “would need one person working full time for 12 months to put together detailed information about all our media projects in the last 10 years.”¹⁸

The strategy proposed would involve triangulation. Information about what was spent and what was done would come from funders, from those who provide the programming, and from collaborating organizations and the recipients of programs. The data from funding organizations has always been viewed as only one part of this effort.

The need to go forward now is imperative, however, as records are becoming more difficult to retrieve as funding organizations shift resources and partners in the training initiative move to other settings.

The consequence of this coordination and integration of existing and ongoing assessment will be evaluative research for the field of media development to parallel the assessment in the general field of democracy promotion. A series of publications by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace already addresses this topic.¹⁹

The overall goal of this work is to inform funders, government organizations and scholars about statistical links between media assistance and press freedom that will guide investment, policy and inquiry in the future.

¹⁸Personal communication with Dr. Kwame Bofo, Chief, Executive Office, Communication and Information Sector, UNESCO, Paris, March 14, 2005.

¹⁹Carothers, T. (1999). *Aiding democracy abroad: The learning curve*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Ottaway, M., & Carothers, T. (eds.) (2000). *Funding virtue: Civil society aid and democracy promotion*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Ottaway, M. (2003). *Democracy challenged: The rise of semi-authoritarianism*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Carothers, T. (2004). *Critical mission: Essays on democracy promotion*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; and Carothers, T., & Ottaway, M. (eds.) (2005). *Unchartered journey: Promoting democracy in the Middle East*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Deliverables

In addition to this report and two preliminary reports in September and October, the following materials are being provided to the Knight Foundation:

1. A report containing thumbnail sketches of the 70 funding organizations in the 25 donor countries (other than the United States) involved in media assistance.
2. A CD that contains the Microsoft Access data base on the 70 funding organizations in the 25 donor countries. This data base was used to create the thumbnail sketches referred to in item 1.
3. A CD that contains the Microsoft Access data base created in the initial phase of this project. This data base contains notes and partial entries on organizations involved in various aspects of media assistance. This data base can be updated across time and serve as a resource for organizations interested in media assistance projects around the world.