

# The Duration of Impact Of Midcareer Training Programs for Journalists

By

Tudor Vlad  
[tvlad@uga.edu](mailto:tvlad@uga.edu)

&

Lee B. Becker  
[lbbecker@uga.edu](mailto:lbbecker@uga.edu)

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

Presented to the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, November 17 & 18, 2006, Chicago, IL.

The research used in this report was supported by a grant from the Knight Center for Professional Journalism at the University of Maryland.

## **The Duration of Impact Of Midcareer Training Programs for Journalists**

Training opportunities for working journalists have become a common feature of the professional environment. In the U.S., approximately 130 different training programs operate. These training programs—often referred to as midcareer training—are offered by the employer, by formal educational institutions, or by independent training organizations.

Despite the prominence of these training programs for working journalists, little systematic information has been available about their effectiveness.

Yet there has been much speculation, particularly among those who offer these programs, that they do, in fact, have impact. Proponents of midcareer training argue that journalists who participate in them actually acquire new skills and that they use these new skills on the job. Journalists who participate in these programs are expected to be more highly motivated and to perform differently from those who do not, to gain stature in the newsroom, and to advance in their careers.

The training programs are expected to have impact on the work of the journalists for some period of time after the program has been completed, though no evidence regarding the duration of that impact exists.

This paper summarizes the findings of an evaluation of a training program operated by the Knight Center for Professional Journalism at the University of Maryland. The Knight Journalism Fellowships are different from other media training programs in that the topics of the sessions are very diverse and generally do not focus on journalism per se. The Knight Center for Specialized Journalism has been offering these intense seminars since 1988 to more than 1,800 print, broadcast and freelance journalists.

The study provides evidence that the training program had impact in key areas of news work and that the impact persisted across time.

### **Impact of Training**

In evaluation research, a distinction is made between the evaluation of program process and the evaluation of program outcomes (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, 2004). The former monitors how the

program was conducted; the latter looks at impact. Most of the evaluations that have been conducted of journalism training programs have focused on process.

One strategy for examining program impact is to ask participants to self-report on what they learned or did as a result of the participation in the program. Using this technique, Becker and Lowrey (2000) examined the impact of training programs conducted in eight European and three Latin American countries from 1994 to 1998. The researchers interviewed more than 530 program participants, who reported that the training programs had altered the ways they thought about journalism and did their work. They provided concrete examples to support that conclusion. Berger (2001), in a 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.

Becker, Punathambekar & McConnell, P. J. (2002) analyzed interviews that had been conducted with 33 U.S. journalists who served as international trainers. Almost all the journalists said the international experience had a positive influence on their lives. Many cited personal growth and said they were able to learn the history and culture of other countries and to challenge themselves by learning to deal with new situations. For some journalists, the international experience sparked an interest in other career options. Philliber (2002) conducted an evaluation of Free Press Seminars offered for Journalists in Latin America between 2000 and 2002. 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 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.

Nelson, S., Rowland, J., & Stinson, D. (2004) in an assessment of the impact of media training programs in Kosovo, found that 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 respond to local needs.

Becker, Vlad, Mace, & Apperson (2004) found that U.S. journalists participating in an international seminar said the experience provided them an opportunity to develop an international network of professionals with expertise in the topic covered by the seminar, exposed them to different views of the United States around the world, and provided them an understanding of the complexity of various issues affecting other parts of the world. These findings were supported by examples of impact provided by the journalists to the interviewers and by interviews with the editors to whom the journalists reported when they returned to work. In addition, the journalists provided the interviewers with stories they had written. An analysis of these stories supported their claims of program impact.

Becker, et al. (2004) also found that journalists who participated in two separate health training programs said they gained valuable information and in-depth knowledge on several ongoing health topics, developed working relationships with researchers and others that proved helpful to their reporting, and gained a better understanding of public health and public policy issues. Again, these reports of impact were consistent with examples given by the respondents and with independent reports of the editors to whom they reported. In addition, the journalists provided examples of stories they had written that supported their assertions of impact.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID, 2004) has summarized the findings of its assessment work of media assistance projects in Bosnia, Central America, Russia and Serbia. The report concluded that USAID-supported professional training programs improved news content and coverage and helped institutionalize notions of press freedom. Kumar (2006) has developed a series of recommendations for media assistance programs based on this research.

Mussuri (2005) examined the impact of media assistance programs in Ukraine by comparing how four online publications supported by international donors in large part through training programs 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. She found 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.

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

Becker, et al. (2006), in a follow-up study of the news stories produced by participants in the two-health care training programs, found that, while there is little evidence that the journalists radically changed what they did as a result of the program, there is evidence that at least one important change took place. The journalists changed their sources, relying more heavily on the experts at the training organization. What does not seem to change also was interesting and important. What the journalists wrote about health did not become more difficult to understand as a result of their increased knowledge. They did not include more statistical material. They did not rely more heavily on technical reports and research findings. The type of stories the journalists wrote did seem to change in one significant way. In two of the three years examined, the journalists were more likely to deal with health risks after spending time in the program than they did before. This suggests more sophisticated coverage is one outcome of the program.

### **News Construction**

The findings on the impact of media training programs suggest that these programs would have impact on the news construction process itself by changing the stories that journalists produce and the sources they use in creating them.

For Gans (1979), the key process in news creation is story suggestion. Reporters have the responsibility for thinking up story ideas. To this end, they are required to “keep up with what is going on in

the beats they patrol or in the areas of the country assigned to their bureaus, and they are evaluated in part by their ability to suggest suitable stories.” Other staff members, including top editors and producers, are also expected to come up with story ideas, and nonjournalists are encouraged to do so as well, Gans notes.

Gans’ conceptualization is informative, for it focuses on the generation of the idea that lies behind the story. In this view, raw material has the potential to become news only if it is recognized as having that potential by someone in the news construction business. Bantz, McCorkle and Baade (1980) have termed this process of story idea generation story ideation. Something became news, they observed in the television newsroom they studied, as a result of a process that began with the story idea. Individual newsmen assessed the information flowing into the newsroom from various sources, such as press releases, general mail, newspapers, magazines, reporter ideas, police-fire-FBI radios, and phone calls to determine what could be a story. These story ideas were then discussed in the daily story meeting, where decisions were made on which of the raw material would become news.

Becker, et al. (2004), argued that it is possible that media organizations differentiate themselves in terms of the roles they seek to play in a community. These roles were found to have impact on the types of stories ideas the organizations need. The roles helped to determine the structure the organization puts in place to help it generate story ideas.

### **Expectations**

Training programs for journalists, as shown by the review above, can focus on a number of outcomes. Many of the programs indicate that story ideation is a planned outcome. Journalists need story ideas, so they ought to be particularly likely to be influenced by programs that focus on providing them with new ideas.

Similarly, programs that offer new sources for news should be particularly impactful. Journalists need sources to turn story ideas into stories.

The impact of these training programs should decline over time, since the supply of story ideas should run out and sources should move and become less relevant.

## **Methodology**

The Knight Journalism Fellowships at the University of Maryland are different from other media training programs in that the topics of the sessions are very diverse and generally do not focus on journalism per se. The Knight Center for Specialized Journalism has been offering these intense seminars since 1988 to more than 1,800 print, broadcast and freelance journalists.

Six residential seminars, three to five days in length, are organized each year. Between 20 and 30 journalists participate in the seminars, which take place at the University of Maryland. The journalists are selected based on their resumes, a statement of their goals, a nominating letter from a supervisor, and three published or broadcast stories.

The seminars cover a variety of topics. Most of the seminars deal with topics unique to that session, but other topics have been repeated over the years. The seminar includes lectures by experts in the topic area of the seminar, discussions, and visits to sites related to the seminar topics.

This evaluation is based on the responses of the participants in 12 seminars offered by the Knight Center for Specialized Journalism at the University of Maryland since 1988. The 12 seminars were selected because they dealt with topics that had been repeated at least once during the 1988 to 2005 period. The topics were Race and Ethnicity, Paying for Health Care, Religion, and Electricity.

The evaluation focused on how the seminar participants felt about their experience and on what they reported doing as a result of that participation. It also examined the short-term and the long-term impact of the program on the Fellows' careers. The goal of the evaluation was to move beyond simple reports of satisfaction to concrete examples of behavioral consequences of participation.

The Knight Center for Specialized Journalism provided to the Cox Center the list of the 304 journalists who participated in the 12 workshops. Listed in Table 1 are the topics, dates and number of seminar participants, based on the lists provided.

In addition to the session in which the participants took part, the list indicated gender, type of assignment, and contact information, including a telephone number at the time of participation. The list included 154 female and 150 male participants. Of those listed, at the time of the workshop, 128 were general assignment reporters, 26 were health reporters, 26 were business reporters, 20 were religion

reporters, 52 were writers, 45 were editors, one was a producer, one was an anchor, and five were listed simply as "Fellow."

The Cox Center developed a structured survey instrument consisting mostly of brief, closed-ended questions followed by a probe asking the respondents to explain their answers. The tactic, used extensively by the Center in its evaluation projects, is designed to force respondents be specific in providing evidence to support their initial answers. The questionnaire asked the journalists to evaluate individual elements of the seminar and to indicate what consequence, if any, the program had on them once they completed it. They also were asked what could be done to improve the quality of the programs.

The Survey Research Center at the University of Georgia programmed the interview schedule into its Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) System. Trained interviewers at the Survey Research Center then attempted to interview each of these 304 journalists via telephone beginning in late July and ending in early November of 2005. The telephone interviews were conducted using the CATI system. The average length of the interviews was 23 minutes.

One journalist on the list had passed away, and five names appeared on the list twice. Some of the duplicates appear to have participated in more than one session. The final list consisted of 298 journalists. Most of the telephone numbers initially did not result in a completed interview because the person listed was no longer available at that number. In many cases, the journalists no longer worked at the media organization that sent her or him to the workshop, and no information about the current job was available. In many cases, the number simply was no longer operative.

Cox Center research assistants attempted to find recent contact information in those cases where an initial attempt did not reach the designated journalist. By using the Google search engine, the research assistants sometimes found a link to a recent article the journalist had written and thus could find the new newspaper or other media organization for which the person worked. Other times the Google search led to a personal homepage or online resume with contact information. The research assistants used *Editor & Publisher* to get accurate contact information for the publications where the participants were employed. The researchers also used the people search feature of the Yahoo search engine.



In the end, interviewers completed interviews with 130 participants in the program. The return rate, computed as the ratio of completed interviews to attempted interviews, was 43.5%. The return rate, computed as the ratio of completed interviews to eligible respondents (299 minus the speakers, deceased participant, and nonparticipants), was 44.4%. The details on the final verdict for each of the participants is shown in Table 2.

The sample matches almost perfectly the population of participants in terms of gender. Based on the records provided by the Knight Center, 50.7% of the participants in the 12 sessions were female, while 49.2% of those interviewed were female as Table 3 shows. The sample of participants interviewed does over-represent persons who had been in more recent sessions. Among the four sessions on race, for example, the June 1995 and June 1996 sessions are under-represented compared with the October 1998 and September 2004 sessions. Interviews were conducted with persons from all 12 of the sessions, however, and the under-representation of early session participants is not great. Those who participated in more than one session were assigned to the first session they attended and asked questions about it.

In the analyses that follow, respondents were classified based on the session they attended and on the time period. Table 4 shows the original classification of participant by year and session.

The year in which the journalists participated in the workshop was subsequently coded into two time periods, 1994 to 1998 and 2003 and 2004. This reclassification is shown in Table 5. Participants from each of the four topic areas for seminars were in each of the two time periods.

Near the end of the interview, each of the Fellows was asked to provide the name and the title of the editor or news director to whom the participant reported. Each Fellow next was asked if she or he would be willing to allow an interviewer to contact that supervisor and ask questions about the work of the seminar participant since completion of the seminar.

Of the 130 Knight Fellows who were interviewed, 81 provided information regarding the editor or news director to whom they reported when they returned from the seminar.

Fellows who participated in workshops in 2003 and 2004 were nearly twice as likely as respondents who participated in workshops from 1995 to 1998 to list an editor or news director to be

contacted (Table 6). This is not surprising, given the mobility of the field and the likelihood that the editor would be different or that the Fellow had changed jobs.

Fellows who participated in workshops dealing with religion also were more likely to name an editor or news director to be contacted than were journalists who participated in workshops on other topics (Table 7). Participants in the religion workshops, however, also were more likely to have participated in years 2003 and 2004, rather than in the 1995 to 1998 time frame (Table 8). Participants in the health care workshops, who also were less likely to name an editor, were more likely to have been Fellows in the earlier time period. Further analyses of the data show that topic matters little when the year of the workshop is eliminated as an explanation.

To learn about the evaluations by the editors of the performance of the Fellows, the Cox Center developed a structured survey instrument consisting of brief, closed-ended and open-ended questions, designed to get the editors' opinions about the impact of the Fellowship on the participants and on the newsroom. The questionnaire asked the editors and news directors if the Fellowship changed the way the journalist did the job, if it changed the status of the journalist in the newsroom, and if the participant shared the experience with colleagues.

The Survey Research Center at the University of Georgia programmed the interview schedule into its Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system. Trained interviewers at the Survey Research Center then attempted to interview each of these 81 editors and news directors via telephone beginning in the middle of February and ending in late March of 2006.

In six cases, the contact information was incomplete, making it impossible to locate the editor or news director. Several editors and news directors no longer worked at the organization and could not be located. In five cases, the telephone numbers were no longer operative and replacement numbers could not be located, given the contact information provided. Some of the supervisors contacted could not remember anything about the journalist's participation in the program. Two editors refused to participate in the survey. In the end, interviews were completed with 33 editors and one news director. The details on the final verdict for each of the editors and news director is shown below in Table 9.

The completion rate, computed as the number of editors and news directors interviewed divided by the total number of names given, was 42.0%. The completion rate, computed by dividing the number of completed interviews divided by the number of interviews attempted with a located respondent (49), was 69.4%.

The editors and news directors nominated by Fellows in the workshops conducted from 1995 to 1998 were less likely to be interviewed than were the editors and news directors nominated by Fellows in workshops that took place in 2003 and 2004 (Table 10). The topic of the session also made a difference, though generally to a lesser extent (Table 11). The editors and news directors of the Fellows who participated in the workshops on race and ethnicity were a bit less likely to be interviewed than were the editors and news directors of the Fellows who participated in the health care workshops. Because of the more pronounced impact of time of the workshop, it has been used as a control in the tables that follow. The small number of cases makes it problematic to use both time of the workshop and topic as a control in these analyses.

In the analyses below, traditional statistical tests have not been performed. The ratio of sample to population is very high, making traditional tests of differences misleading. As a general rule, differences of only a few percentage points should be treated as trivial.

## **Findings**

The survey instrument used for the Fellows interviews began by asking respondents to indicate the most valuable and least valuable parts of the workshop.

*First, what, in your view, was the most valuable component or element of the Fellowship Program?*

Nearly all the respondents were able to answer the question, regardless of when they attended the session. Clearly the seminar remained something the respondents could talk about even 10 or more years after participation. Also, there was no real difference in ability to identify the most valuable component of the workshop based on the topic of the workshop.

Most of the Fellows said that meeting the speakers and interacting with them were the most important accomplishments of the program. Typical of the responses was the following:

“I would say connecting me with the sources. The people that spoke are people that I've used for story interviews.”

*Did your participation in the Knight Fellowship change the way you work in any way?*

Two-thirds of the participants said the workshop changed the way they worked. Those who participated in the workshops from 1994 to 1998 were more likely to give this response than those who participated in more recent workshops (Table 12). There are two possible explanations for this: the first workshops were more impactful, or across time the early group could “count up” more instances of impact. Respondents who had participated in the religion workshops were more likely to say the Fellowship changed the way they worked than those in other sessions (Table 13).

The Fellows elaborated on the closed-ended question by saying the program improved their knowledge about the topics discussed in the seminar, gave them new sources and story ideas, and made their reporting more authoritative.

“It exposed me to new sources that I had not tapped before.”

“I just gained an in-depth knowledge, not specifically changed the way I work.”

“Gave me more avenues, resources, and expanded my source network.”

“It gave me some really good story ideas that I was actually able to write.”

“It made my reporting more authoritative. It gave me questions to raise in my reporting that I doubt I would have raised otherwise.”

*Did you get any story ideas from the Knight Fellowship Program that you turned into stories since it ended? What were the ideas and how did you use them?*

Nearly eight in 10 of the respondents said the seminars gave them story ideas, and it didn't matter much whether the seminar was held between 1994 and 1998 or in 2003 and 2004 (Table 14). The religion seminar was particularly likely to produce this response, with nine in 10 of the respondents who were in those seminars saying they got story ideas from them (Table 15).

The participants said they turned those story ideas into stories once they returned to the newsroom. The stories varied, depending on the topic of the program. Many journalists who participated in early seminars could not remember specific story ideas as well as those who participated more recently.

*In your view, how long after you returned from the fellowship program did you continue to generate new story ideas from it?*

Respondents generally could answer this question, and the time lag between the seminar and the interview did not matter much. Topic also did not matter. The answers varied from three months to as long as the participants had been on the beat, but most of the participants indicated that they continued to generate story ideas from the seminar for one or two years.

*Did you develop any new sources through the Fellowship Program that you used in your work since the Fellowship ended?*

Three-quarters of the respondents said they developed new sources as a result of participation in the seminars. Those who participated more recently were a little more likely to give this response than those who participate in the early seminars (Table 16). The religion seminar was particularly successful in producing new sources (Table 17). Nine in 10 of the participants in the religion seminars said they got new sources from it. The race and ethnicity seminars were less likely to produce new sources.

*In your view, how long after you returned from the fellowship program did you continue to use sources you learned about from it?*

Respondents had no difficulty answering this question. Time of the seminar and topic did not matter. Many Fellows said they were still using these sources at the time of the interview. Others gave the same time frame as for question 11 to indicate how long they used the new sources. In general, the impact seems to be for about two years.

*Is there any particular kind of expertise that you gained at the Fellowship that has been particularly helpful to you since you returned?*

*What is this expertise and how did you use it?*

Two-thirds of the journalists who responded to the survey said they gained in expertise. Time of the seminar did not matter (Table 18), but topic did (Table 19). The religion and health seminars were particularly likely to produce this response. Only about half of the participants in the race and ethnicity seminars said they gained expertise as a result. The participants mentioned a better or more in-depth understanding of the issues and the capacity to identify good sources as examples of the expertise gained.

“I think it's just knowing what sources to turn to on such issues as stem cell research.”

“Knowledge and deeper understanding of the Muslim community.”

“I could report better and knew where to go. I could use more depth in my stories.”

“Just a better, fuller background on things to have more authority over the issue, and to take the story beyond what it would have been.”

*In your view, how long after you returned from the program did you continue to use that experience?*

Time did not matter in terms of responses to this question. Those participants in the race and ethnicity seminar had more difficulty offering an answer than did those in the other seminars. Many Fellows indicated that they were still using that experience when they completed the interview.

*Did you make any efforts to share your experiences at the Fellowship with your colleagues since you returned?*

*What did you do and with whom did you share your information?*

Three-quarters of the respondents said they made efforts to share their experiences with their colleagues once they completed the seminar. Time of the seminar did not matter (Table 20), but topic did (Table 21). Those who participated in the race and ethnicity and religion seminars were more likely to have tried to share than were those in the health or electricity seminars.

Most of the participants said they shared the information with their colleagues in an informal capacity. Several had brown bag presentations, or the editor organized a presentation in the newsroom.

*In your view, how long after you returned from the fellowship program did you continue to share your experiences with your colleagues?*

Respondents by and large could provide an estimate. Time of the workshop and topic did not make a difference. The answers varied from a couple of months to much longer periods.

Following are findings from the survey of editors and news directors.

*As far as you can tell, has participation in the Knight Program changed the way [NAME OF KNIGHT FELLOW] does her/his work in any way? If so, in what way?*

The editors and news directors overwhelmingly agreed that the Knight Program at Maryland had changed the way the Fellows did their work when they returned to the work setting. This was true regardless of the timing of the workshop.

The comments the editors provided to explain the answer indicated that most said the program did not change dramatically the way the Fellow worked, but improved her/his skills and her/his ability to identify new sources and broadened her/his perspective on the beat.

“It gave him a broader perspective in his beat and made him a better reporter and writer.”

“Change is an illusive thing to quantify. It has to do with how he approaches the subject involved.”

“It has made her a better reporter with a depth of info and tools.”

“Yes, but I would say it was to inform her and deepen her understanding of where to go for sourcing and things like that.”

*As far as you know, did [NAME OF KNIGHT FELLOW] get any story ideas from the Knight Program that she/he has turned into stories since the Knight Program ended? If so, what were the ideas and how did she/he use them?*

In general, the editors and news directors said the Fellows got story ideas from the Knight Program at Maryland. Editors and news directors of the Fellows from the 1995 to 1998 period were less likely to be able to answer the question than were editors and news directors of the Fellows who participated in workshops in 2003 and 2004.

While the editors said that the Fellows got story ideas that they turned into stories since the program ended, only few of them were able to give concrete examples.

*As far as you know, did [NAME OF KNIGHT FELLOW] develop any new sources through the Knight Program that she/he has used in her/his work since the Program ended? If so, what or who were these?*

Again, the editors and news directors were inclined to say that the Fellows obtained new sources from the Knight Program at Maryland. Across both time periods, two-thirds of the respondents gave this answer. Once again, many of them did not remember specifics about these new sources.

*As far as you know, is there any particular kind of expertise that [NAME OF KNIGHT FELLOW] gained at the Knight Program that has been particularly helpful since she/he returned? If so, what is this expertise and how did [NAME OF KNIGHT FELLOW] use it?*

Seven in 10 of the editors and news directors interviewed said the Fellows gained expertise. Timing of the workshop did not influence the response. Most of the editors said that the Knight Program helped the participants improve their knowledge and increase their understanding of the area that was covered at the seminar. Some editors also said that the program re-energized the journalists.

*As far as you know, has [NAME OF KNIGHT FELLOW] made any efforts to share her/his experiences at the Knight Program with others at your organization since she/he returned? If so, what did she/he do and with whom did she/he share information?*

The editors clearly felt that the Fellows had made an effort to share the expertise gained in the workshops. Editors and news directors of Fellows from the earlier workshops were less likely to have an answer to this question than were editors and news directors from the more recent workshops. Many of the editors said their newsrooms had special procedures to make sure that journalists share with their colleagues their experiences after participating in training programs. These procedures include brown bag luncheons, debriefings, conversations with senior editor, and informal meetings with people in the newsroom.

## **Conclusions**

The journalists who participated in the Knight Fellowship Programs organized by the Knight Center for Specialized Journalism at the University of Maryland said the programs had a strong and long lasting impact on them.

Nearly eight in 10 of the respondents said the seminars gave them story ideas.

The respondents said they turned those story ideas into stories once they returned to the newsroom and many of them gave examples of stories written as a result of the Fellowship.

The Fellows stated that the programs gave them new expertise, connected them with new sources, and made their reporting more authoritative.



A vast majority of the participants said the Fellowship reinforced their belief that their work as journalists was important and made them more confident about their ability to report on the topics covered.

More than seven in 10 of the respondents said they made efforts to share their experiences with their colleagues once they completed the seminar.

The impact of the Knight programs last at least two to three years after the program is completed. For example, most of the participants indicated that they continued to generate story ideas from the seminar for years after they completed the program.

Nearly two thirds of the respondents thought the seminar would continue to have impact on them in the future.

The religion seminars were particularly likely to have impact. For example, nine in 10 of the respondents in those seminars said they got stories ideas from them—a considerably higher percentage than offered by participants in the other seminars examined.

The editorial supervisors of the participants in the Knight Fellowship Program at the University of Maryland overwhelmingly confirmed the participants' statement that the Knight seminars had a strong impact on their work as journalists.

Seven in 10 of the editors and news directors said the Fellows gained expertise through the programs organized by the Knight Center for Specialized Journalism.

Editors said that the program re-energized the participating journalists, which is consistent with the Fellows' assertion that the program reinforced their belief that their work was important and gave them new enthusiasm.

Almost all the editors and news directors confirmed that the Fellows had shared the expertise gained with their colleagues; many editors said their newsrooms had special procedures to make sure that journalists share their experiences after participating in training programs.

Thirty-three out of 34 of the editors and news directors said they would encourage others to participate in the Knight Program at the University of Maryland.

The evidence shows that journalists who participated in the Knight Fellowship Programs organized by the Knight Center for Specialized Journalism at the University of Maryland gained from the experience in

a variety of ways. Most important outcomes include new ideas about stories to cover, and new sources. The findings suggest that these seminars have had impact on the news construction process itself by changing the stories that journalists produced and the sources they used in creating them and that, for many participants, this impact lasted long time after the Fellowship.

## References

- Bantz, C. R., McCorkle, S. & Baade, R. C. (1980). The news factory. *Communication Research*, 7(1), 45-68.
- Becker, 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.
- Becker, L. B., Punathambekar, A., & McConnell, P. J. (2002). *The impact of journalism training on the trainers: Reflections of U.S. international fellows*. Paper presented to the Professional Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, Barcelona, Spain.
- Becker, L. B., Vlad, T., Mace, N. R., & Apperson, M. (2004). *Midcareer training of journalists: Evaluating its impact on journalistic work*. Paper presented to the Professional Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, Porto Alegre, Brazil.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Coffey, A.J., Hebert, L., Nusser, N., Arceneaux, N. (2004). *The impact of newsroom philosophy on story ideation and story narration*. Paper presented to the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, 2004, Chicago.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Swennes, A., Parham, B., Tefteau, L. (2006). *The impact of midcareer training on journalistic work*. Paper presented to the Professional Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research at the Congress in Cairo, Egypt.
- Berger, G. (2001). *It's the training that did it*. Unpublished manuscript, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa.
- International Center for Journalists (2002). *Assessing the impact of press freedom seminars in 2002*. Washington, D.C.: Philliber Research Associates.
- Kumar, K. (2006). *Promoting independent media: Strategies for democracy assistance*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Mussuri, 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.
- Nelson, S., Rowland, J., & Stinson, D.(2004). *Kosovo media assessment*. Burlington, VT: ARD Inc.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W. & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (Seventh Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sasakawa Peace Foundation (2005). *Report of SPINF media project*. Tokyo: Hayakawa, R. (Ed.)
- USAID. (2004). *USAID's media assistance: Policy and programmatic lessons*. Washington, D.C.:(PN-ACU-777); Kumar, K..

**Table 1. Sessions and Participants**

<b>Session</b>	<b>No. Participants</b>
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>	
1995 (June 4-9)	21
1996 (June 9-14)	21
1998 (October 25-30)	12
2004 (September 12-17)	30
<b>Health Care</b>	
1994 (February 13-15)	28
1995 (April 9-14)	21
1997 (June 1-6)	26
2003 (February 18-21)	32
<b>Religion</b>	
Religion in America	
1996 (April 14-19)	30
Islam and America	
2003 (April 21-25)	27
<b>Electricity</b>	
Big Shifts	
1998 (February 15-18)	32
Grids, Gridlock, Power	
2004 (February 17-20)	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>304</b>

**Table 2. Verdict for the 298 Session Participants**

Final Verdict	Number
Interview completed	130
Refusal	20
Participant no longer worked at the original media organization; no additional information found	62
No one ever answered the number, though it was tried at least 20 times at different dates and hours	36
Telephone number wrong and no number located	20
????	20
Disconnected number	10
Participant deceased	1
Total	299

**Table 3. Population and Sample Comparisons**

	Population		Sample	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	154	50.7	64	49.2
Male	150	49.3	66	50.8
<b>Session</b>				
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>				
1995 (June 4-9)	21	6.9	3	2.3
1996 (June 9-14)	21	6.9	6	4.6
1998 (October 25-30)	12	3.9	8	6.2
2004 (September 12-17)	30	9.9	18	13.8
<b>Health Care</b>				
1994 (February 13-15)	28	9.2	9	6.9
1995 (April 9-14)	21	6.9	4	3.1
1997 (June 1-6)	26	8.6	11	8.5
2003 (February 18-21)	32	10.5	19	14.6
<b>Religion</b>				
<b>Religion in America</b>				
1996 (April 14-19)	30	9.9	9	6.9
<b>Islam and America</b>				
2003 (April 21-25)	27	8.9	15	11.5
<b>Electricity</b>				
<b>Big Shifts</b>				
1998 (February 15-18)	32	10.5	13	10.0
<b>Grids, Gridlock, Power</b>				
2004 (February 17-20)	24	7.9	15	11.5
	304			

**Table 4. Respondents by Session and Year**

		Year of Workshop							Total
		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	2003	2004	
Topic of Workshop	Race Ethnicity	0	3	6	0	8	0	18	35
	Health Care	9	4	0	11	0	19	0	43
	Religion	0	0	9	0	0	15	0	24
	Electricity	0	0	0	0	13	0	15	28
Total		9	7	15	11	21	34	33	130



**Table 5. Respondents by Session and By Year Recoded to Two Time Periods**

		Year of Workshop Recoded		Total
		1995 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Topic of Workshop	Race Ethnicity	17	18	35
	Health Care	24	19	43
	Religion	9	15	24
	Electricity	13	15	28
Total		63	67	130

**Table 6. Respondent Gave Name of Editor, News Director By Time of Workshop**

		Year of Workshop		Total
		1995 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Yes	Count	27	54	81
	%	42.9%	80.6%	62.3%
No	Count	36	13	49
	%	57.1%	19.4%	37.7%
Total	Count	63	67	130
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 7. Respondent Gave Name of Editor, News Director by Topic**

		Topic of Workshop				Total
		Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Yes	Count	21	23	19	18	81
	%	60.0%	53.5%	79.2%	64.3%	62.3%
No	Count	14	20	5	10	49
	%	40.0%	46.5%	20.8%	35.7%	37.7%
Total	Count	35	43	24	28	130
	% within	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 8. Year of Workshop by Topic of Workshop**

		Topic of Workshop				Total
		Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
1995 to 1998	Count	17	24	9	13	63
	%	48.6%	55.8%	37.5%	46.4%	48.5%
2003 & 2004	Count	18	19	15	15	67
	%	51.4%	44.2%	62.5%	53.6%	51.5%
Total	Count	35	43	24	28	130
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 9. Verdict for the 81 Editors and News Directors**

Final Verdict	Number
Completed	34
Refusal	2
Unable to interview after repeated calls	13
Respondent not located	21
Non-working or disconnected number	5
Inadequate detail provided to locate respondent	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>

**Table 10. Editor, News Director Interviewed by Time of Workshop**

		Year of Workshop		Total
		1995 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Yes	Count	10	24	34
	%	15.90%	35.80%	26.20%
No	Count	53	43	96
	%	84.10%	64.20%	73.80%
Total	Count	63	67	130
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Table 11. Editor, News Director Interviewed by Topic of Workshop**

		Topic of Workshop				Total
		Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Yes	Count	7	13	7	7	34
	%	20.00%	30.20%	29.20%	25.00%	26.20%
No	Count	28	30	17	21	96
	%	80.00%	69.80%	70.80%	75.00%	73.80%
Total	Count	35	43	24	28	130
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Table 12. Program Changed Way Respondent Worked by Time Frame**

			Year of Workshop		Total
			1994 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Change the way you work	Yes	Count	45	43	88
		%	71.4%	64.2%	67.7%
	No	Count	17	24	41
		%	27.0%	35.8%	31.5%
	Don't know	Count	1	0	1
		%	1.6%	0.0%	0.8%
Total		Count	63	67	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 13. Program Changed Way Respondent Worked by Topic**

			Topic of Workshop				Total
			Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Change the way you work	Yes	Count	23	28	19	18	88
		%	65.7%	65.1%	79.2%	64.3%	67.7%
	No	Count	11	15	5	10	41
		%	31.4%	34.9%	20.8%	35.7%	31.5%
	Don't know	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Total		Count	35	43	24	28	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 14. Respondent Got Story Ideas by Time Frame**

			Year of Workshop		Total
			1994 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Got ideas for stories	Yes	Count	48	54	102
		%	76.2%	80.6%	78.5%
	No	Count	10	9	19
		%	15.9%	13.4%	14.6%
	Refused	Count	1	0	1
		%	1.6%	0.0%	0.8%
	Don't know	Count	4	4	8
		%	6.3%	6.0%	6.2%
Total		Count	63	67	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 15. Respondent Got Story Ideas by Topic**

			Topic of Workshop				Total
			Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Got ideas for stories	Yes	Count	26	32	22	22	102
		%	74.3%	74.4%	91.7%	78.6%	78.5%
	No	Count	9	3	2	5	19
		%	25.7%	7.0%	8.3%	17.9%	14.6%
	Refused	Count	0	1	0	0	1
		%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	Don't know	Count	0	7	0	1	8
		%	0.0%	16.3%	0.0%	3.6%	6.2%
Total		Count	35	43	24	28	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 16. Developed New Sources by Time Period**

			Year of Workshop		Total
			1994 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Developed new sources	Yes	Count	45	53	98
		%	71.4%	79.1%	75.4%
	No	Count	16	13	29
		%	25.4%	19.4%	22.3%
	Don't know	Count	2	1	3
		%	3.2%	1.5%	2.3%
Total		Count	63	67	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 17. Developed New Sources by Topic**

			Topic of Workshop				Total
			Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Developed new sources	Yes	Count	23	32	22	21	98
		%	65.7%	74.4%	91.7%	75.0%	75.4%
	No	Count	11	9	2	7	29
		%	31.4%	20.9%	8.3%	25.0%	22.3%
	Don't know	Count	1	2	0	0	3
		%	2.9%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
Total		Count	35	43	24	28	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 18. Respondent Gained Particular Expertise by Time Frame**

			Year of Workshop		Total
			1994 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Gained helpful expertise	Yes	Count	41	46	87
		%	65.1%	68.7%	66.9%
	No	Count	18	20	38
		%	28.6%	29.9%	29.2%
	Don't know	Count	4	1	5
		%	6.3%	1.5%	3.8%
Total		Count	63	67	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 19. Respondent Gained Particular Expertise by Topic**

			Topic of Workshop				Total
			Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Gained helpful expertise	Yes	Count	17	27	20	23	87
		%	48.6%	62.8%	83.3%	82.1%	66.9%
	No	Count	17	14	3	4	38
		%	48.6%	32.6%	12.5%	14.3%	29.2%
	Don't know	Count	1	2	1	1	5
		%	2.9%	4.7%	4.2%	3.6%	3.8%
Total		Count	35	43	24	28	130
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 20. Make Effort to Share Experience by Time Frame**

			Year of Workshop		Total
			1994 to 1998	2003 & 2004	
Shared experiences	Yes	Count	46	52	98
		%	73.0%	77.6%	75.4%
	No	Count	17	15	32
		%	27.0%	22.4%	24.6%
Total	Count	63	67	130	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 21. Make Effort to Share Experience by Topic**

			Topic of Workshop				Total
			Race Ethnicity	Health Care	Religion	Electricity	
Shared experiences	Yes	Count	30	29	20	19	98
		%	85.7%	67.4%	83.3%	67.9%	75.4%
	No	Count	5	14	4	9	32
		%	14.3%	32.6%	16.7%	32.1%	24.6%
Total	Count	35	43	24	28	130	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	