

# The Impact of Post-Employment Journalism Training On Health and Medical Story Ideation

By Lee B. Becker and 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 USA

[lbbecker@uga.edu](mailto:lbbecker@uga.edu) and [tvlad@uga.edu](mailto:tvlad@uga.edu)

Presented to the Professional Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research at the Paris conference, July 2007.

## ABSTRACT

Studies of the impact of post-employment professional training on journalists suggests that these programs have impact on the news construction process itself by changing the stories that journalists produce and the sources they use in creating them.

This paper looks at the impact of one such training program designed to help journalists better cover health and medical news. The study employed newsroom observations, interviews with journalists and their supervisors, and a content analysis of the work of the journalists before and after they participated in a training workshop. The study showed that the training program had impact on the story ideation process.

A body of literature on the impact of post-employment professional training on journalists is beginning to emerge. A review of the existing studies suggests that these programs have impact on the news construction process itself by changing the stories that journalists produce and the sources they use in creating them.

The general literature on news construction indicates that the key process is story ideation. Reporters have the responsibility for thinking up story ideas. In many news organizations, routines have been developed and “beats” created to help the reporters find ideas for stories. Even journalists without beats, including top editors and producers, are expected to come up with story ideas.

From this perspective on news construction, something becomes news as a result of a process that begins with the story idea. Individual newswriters assess the information they encounter to find the nuggets of story ideas. These story ideas are then discussed in daily story meetings, where decisions are made on which of the ideas will become news.

Post-employment training programs, frequently referred to as midcareer training, often are designed to suggest story ideas to journalists and present the journalists with sources that can be used to turn these ideas into news products. The story ideas can be presented as explicit or implicit lists of stories that need to be or can be covered.

This paper looks at the impact of one such training program designed to help journalists better cover health and medical news. The two-day workshop for print and broadcast journalists in small media organizations featured media experts and journalists who spoke on a variety of medical topics and offered suggestions on stories that might be produced on those topics. The participants also were exposed to sources who could help the journalists develop the ideas into stories.

The paper reports on a study that examined the story ideation process and its outcome in four media organizations that sent participants to the workshop. The study employed newsroom observations, interviews with journalists who participated in the workshop and their supervisors, and a content analysis of the work of the journalists before and after the workshop. The study showed that the training program had impact on the story ideation process.

## **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, Rowland, and 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, and Apperson (2004a) 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. (2004a) 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, Vlad, Swennes, Parham, and Tefteau (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 was one outcome of the program.

Vlad and Becker (2006), found evidence that training programs can have a strong and long lasting impact on the participants, at least based on the reports of the journalists interviewed long after the program. The journalists reported that the impact of the program lasted at least two to three years after they completed it. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents thought the seminar would continue to have impact on them in the future. 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 journalists stated that the programs gave them new expertise, connected them with new sources, and made their reporting more authoritative. Interviews with the editors to whom the journalists reported confirmed these conclusions.

### **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 newswriters 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, Vlad, Coffey, Hebert, Nusser, and Arceneaux (2004b), 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**

Many journalism training programs often explicitly seek to alter the stories that participating journalists write by suggesting new story ideas to them and by giving them new sources for stories. The assumption, consistent with the news construction literature, is that journalists need new story ideas because story ideas are the chief commodity of news production. Journalists who have been writing about a topic for a long time might fall into routines and need refreshment. Journalists new to the assignment would need help generating ideas because of their lack of experience.

Typical of many of the training programs is one where journalists attend a series of lectures by experts on a topic and then get a chance to interact with the experts. Often, the experts offer themselves as sources for future stories.

It seems reasonable to expect, given the news construction literature, that these programs could alter the work of the participating journalists. Specifically, the following hypothesis is consistent with that literature.

*H1: Journalists who participate in a training workshop designed to suggest new story ideas and new sources should generate different story ideas using different sources after the workshop than they did before the workshop.*

### **Methodology**

In 2005, the Knight Chair in Health and Medical Journalism at the University of Georgia contracted with the authors to evaluate a training program planned for early 2006. The program was to be a two-day workshop on health journalism, called a News Briefing.

The Knight Chair identified four media organizations located in four different cities in Georgia that planned to send journalists to the upcoming workshop and that were willing to participate in the evaluation. Included were a television station, a radio station, a daily newspaper, and a weekly newspaper.

One trained researcher visited each of the media organizations in the week February 6-10, 2006, that is, a little more than a week before the News Briefing. The researchers observed the newsroom operation, sat in budget meetings and interviewed journalists to find out how health story ideas were generated and how health and medical issues were covered. The study included three interviews at the TV station, five at the radio station, five interviews at the daily newspaper and four interviews at the weekly newspaper. To learn about the coverage of health and medical issues in those media organizations, the researchers used a semi-structured interview consisting of closed-ended and open-ended questions designed to get the journalists opinion about how they and their media organization cover health and media news.

The researchers also gathered copies of the newspapers and tapes of the newscasts produced by those media organizations during the period of December 8, 2005 through February 18, 2006.

Two members of the research team observed the training workshop, News Briefing: Real Health and Medical News for Working Reporters, held in Cordele, Georgia, on February 19-21, 2006.

After the training program, during the interval of March 21 to April 11, 2006, the researchers returned to the four selected media organizations and re-interviewed the journalists who had participated in the workshop and other journalists in the newsroom. One journalist from each of the two newspapers and the television station had participated in the workshop. Two journalists from the radio station had participated in the workshop. This time, four journalists were interviewed at the TV station, two at the radio station, two at the daily newspaper and three at the weekly newspaper. The researchers also gathered copies of the newspapers and tapes of the newscasts produced by those media organizations during the period February 19, 2006 through May 17, 2006.



All the interviews were transcribed. The researchers developed a coding sheet to analyze the stories covering health and medical issues produced by the four media organizations 12 weeks before and 12 after the workshop. Location, type, and sources of the stories were examined.

### **Findings: Pre Workshop Interviews**

For the 17 journalists interviewed, the average years of experience was 13.5. The mean number of years they had worked at the organization was 6.4. All but one of the respondents had a college degree; 11 of them had a degree in journalism and mass communication. Fourteen were female.

The 17 journalists interviewed talked easily about story ideation. They recognized that it was an important and required part of their daily routines. The journalists also indicated that they generated many of the story ideas they turned into news themselves, and that their editors also gave them ideas as assignments. The most common responses of the journalists was that about half the ideas they turned into stories were ones they generated, and about half came from their editors.

“I come up with about half of them and then other people tell me about stories that I should do that we have a very free flowing communication system,” one journalist said.

“I would say 80% of the stories I generate come from myself and my interests, what I see the community, what I saw on the news the night before. About 20% of the time, the news director might say, ‘Don’t forget about this’ or ‘Have you thought about that?’” another of the journalists said.

The journalists said they got the ideas for stories themselves from a number of sources. The most common answers were from the state’s major daily newspaper, from watching television, from the internet, and from personal experiences and contacts.

“I get about 60% from newspapers,” one of the journalists said. “I look at the (daily) and other papers online from different parts of the state. Let’s see... 20% from the AP wires. I think about 20% just coming up with things from what I’ve seen or heard about.”

“I guess my main source is follow-ups from continuing coverage... things that we’ve covered and that I believe we need to follow up, questions I still have perhaps after a story we’ve run... national, state and other local news that I see generally online,” another of the journalist said. “The way I work everyday is I watch CNN and MSNBC and Fox news for about half an hour each every morning.”

Journalists reported they spent an hour or more on most days generating story ideas.

“Every conversation I have... every thing I hear, at some level, goes into a news story,” one of the journalists said.

“I used to worry when I was a young person, when I was in my teens and just beginning to write these kinds of stories, and I thought what am I going to do?” another journalist said. “I lived in a small town, what am I going to do when I’ve done every story there is to write in this town? As I went along I realized that stories generate stories.”

The journalists said they did contact specific sources to help them generate story ideas. The sources given were very diverse. Examples were experts, legislators, beat checks, townspeople, Reuters, family friends, viewers and email.

“Yes, I have a significant number of sources that I’ve developed over the years in the business who I use for insight.”

Most of the journalists interviewed said that they did not have a specific beat and classified themselves as general assignment reporters. Out of the topics covered, the most frequent occurrences were legislature and social issues.

Everyone of those interviewed said they did cover health or medical news at least on occasion. Some said they covered health and medical issues on a regular basis.

Of 17 journalists interviewed, four said they generated most of the story ideas they developed on health and medical news themselves, three said most came from the editors, and the rest suggested an equal percentage from themselves and from editors.

To general story ideas themselves on health and medical news, the journalists turned to two main sources: other publications (magazines, newspapers, internet sites) and national medical organizations.

“Once again, people contact me but a large part too is you try to keep in touch with PR people at the hospitals,” one journalist said.

“I constantly look on the CDC’s (Centers for Disease and Control) website for updates; go to the American Medical Association’s webpage, the Diabetes Association’s webpage,” another said.

“I deal quite a bit with the state division of public health especially on things like the West Nile virus or the flu,” one journalist said. “I talk to the county health departments, the state and federal health departments. I also look at research that’s coming out from different universities.”

“I’ll talk to somebody at the health department who will refer me to a professional who will give me that information,” another said.

### **Findings: Post Workshop Interviews**

Nine female and two male journalists were interviewed after the workshop, including five who had participated in the workshop itself.

Two of the participants in the workshop mentioned CDC as a source for news on health and medical issues now that the workshop was completed. The workshop featured speakers from the CDC. Participants also mentioned the book received at the workshop as a source of story ideas.

“I think there are a number of people that she [Knight Health Chair] pointed me to that might be able to assist us better in understanding what kind of data we should be collecting and the process we are not academics, nor are we researchers,” one of the participants said.

“Oh yes. We must utilize the workshop sources,” another participants said. “And that whole book... we can just look them up and find who we need as we need them.”

Two of the participants said they would use contact information given in the “notebook” at the workshop for sources in future stories. They also commented that the presentations gave them ideas for stories. The participants mentioned at least four different topics that were covered in the workshop that they planned to write about in the future.

“I haven’t used any (sources),” one of the attendees said. “But that notebook is just marvelous as far as that. I will also use some of the web sites.”

Only one of the journalists reported actually having written stories as a result of the workshop. That journalist identified two stories from the workshop.

## **Findings: Content Analysis**

Content analysis was conducted on the 96 health and medical stories used by the four media organizations represented at the workshop 12 weeks before the February 19-21, 2006 workshop itself. The stories were culled from the complete files of the newspapers and from the logs of the television and radio stations, which sorted their stories by topic. In total, the daily newspaper published 72 stories, the weekly published 12, the TV station ran 10 stories and the radio station ran two stories. Tuesday was the day of the week with most of the health stories (46.9%), because a health supplement of the daily newspaper was published on that day.

Within the newspapers and broadcast organizations, 78.1% of stories were located in a special health section while only 17.7 % were in the general news section or in the general newscast.

Content analysis also was performed on 89 stories produced 12 weeks after the workshop. Within six days after the workshop, 22.5% of those analyzed stories were produced. Only seven health stories were published or broadcast in the second half of the 12-week period.

The daily newspaper published 48 stories, the weekly had 27, the TV station ran 11 stories and the radio station ran three. Special health sections contained half of the stories. General news sections or newscasts contained 36 stories or 40.4 %, twice as much as in the pre-workshop analysis.

The stories were considered to be a census, rather than a sample. They represented all the stories on health and medical news produced by these media organizations. The media organizations were selected in a nonprobabilistic fashion, and it is unlikely the stories analyzed were a representative population of stories produced by journalists who attended the workshop.

Table 1 shows the number of health stories run by the four media organizations in the 12-week period prior to the workshop and in the 12-week period following the workshop. A slightly smaller number of health stories was used after the workshop than before, though for two of the organizations the pre-workshop to post-workshop differences were small. The weekly newspaper used considerably more stories after the workshop on health than it did before, while the daily paper used considerably fewer stories on health after the workshop than before.

Table 2 shows that a higher percentage of the stories written after the workshop were straight news stories than before. The pattern of increased news and decreased feature writing is strong.

The health stories also were classified in terms of the amount of initiative involved in reporting them. Table 3 summarizes the data, pre- and post-workshop. Not only were more hard health news stories written after the workshop than before, but more of those stories were classified as routine or breaking news stories. Enterprise pieces declined.

The stories were also classified in terms of five health story characteristics. Table 4 shows that fewer stories were written after the workshop than before based on the results of medical studies. Stories about healthy living were relatively constant. Slight declines in stories about preventative medicine, cosmetic issues, and survivors showed up after the workshop. More studies did not fit these categories after the workshop and were classified here as “other.”

The News Briefing dealt with 10 topics: Reporting on outbreaks, attacks, and other public health emergencies; Prostate cancer and health disparities between black and white men; Where is U.S. health care headed, and do we want to go there; Obesity in children and teens; Race, risk, and the health care of migrant workers in South Georgia; Shrinking the impact of stroke: new ways to prevent and treat “brain attacks”; Advances in heart attack prevention and treatment: are women and African Americans reaping the benefits?; Getting kids moving: how communities and schools can help; Teenagers, trucks, guns and trauma care in rural Georgia, and The perception of risk: Why our fears don’t match the facts.

Each of the health stories written before and after the workshop at the four media organizations studied was examined to determine if it mentioned each of the 10 topics covered in the formal sessions of the workshop. Table 5 shows that six of those topics were mentioned in the stories either before or after the workshop. Three stories had been written about three of the topics before the workshop, and eight stories were written about five of the topics after the workshop. This is striking evidence that the workshop had impact on the work of the journalists.

Table 6 shows, however, that, contrary to expectation, more of the stories written after the workshop than before were based on either no or only one source. After the workshop, 42.7% of the

stories were single source stories or stories with no source at all, while prior to the workshop 34.4% of the stories were based on a single source or no source.

The stories were examined to see if they used the speakers from the workshop as sources. Only one of the stories quoted, either directly or indirectly, one of the sources.

## **Conclusions**

The research reported upon here is limited by the small number of organizations observed. Caution is necessary in making generalizations.

The observation conducted for this project has shown that each of the four selected news organizations developed some routines to generate story ideas. The media organizations began each news day with a need for raw materials, namely, the ideas to be used to generate news stories. The organizations had limited resources available for the acquisition of these materials, and they created procedures to guarantee their availability. For the newspaper, these involved beats. For the television and radio station, they involved less elaborate specialization, but specialization nonetheless.

The interviews with the journalists after the workshop and the content analysis showed that the journalists made use of the materials from the workshop, at least in a limited way. They said they used the workshop to help them generate story ideas. They said they had new sources for future story use. In fact, the content analysis showed that the number of stories written on the topics of the workshop increased after the workshop. Prior to the workshop, the 10 topics covered in the workshop were the subject of three stories in these four media organizations. After the workshop, seven stories were written on eight of the topics. If this same effect was in evidence at each of the other media participating in the workshop but not included in this study, the result would be significant more health coverage on these topics after the workshop than before.

This conclusion must be treated as tentative, since the design did not include a control group, nor did it include a comparison group in which there was no prior observation (represented here by the visits to the media organizations before the workshop). The study was exploratory, and future research should build these additional comparisons into the study.

At the same time, the suggestion of impact is encouraging. Only one journalist from three of the organizations attended the workshop. In the other case, two journalists attended. At the television station, where only one journalist attended, that journalist was moved from a reporting assignment (with emphasis on health) to an anchor position shortly after the workshop, limiting the impact the workshop could have.

One general theme of any workshop on reporting, and certainly at least implicitly a part of this workshop, seems not to have produced the desired outcome. More stories after the workshop than before either contained no source or were based on a single-source. It is at least possible that the journalists, with new confidence in themselves as a result of the workshop, felt less need to include multiple sources in their stories. This is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed in the future.

This pilot project also suggests that the focus of the workshop on the broad themes of story ideation and story sourcing is appropriate. The observations and interviews with the journalists indicate that these activities are at the core of their work. The journalists recognized that the News Briefing helped them develop ideas and sources. They were appreciative of this contribution to their work.

This study also shows the merits of employing multiple measures of impact. Clearly it is important to know how the journalists evaluated the workshop when it ended. (Such an evaluation was included in the evaluation scheme.) It also is important to know what they thought of the workshop nearly one month after the workshop. Finally, it is important to see if the actual work product of the individual journalists and the media organization for which they work changed after the workshop.

Conducting training programs for journalists is a resource intensive activity. The results from this study are consistent with earlier research. In general, journalists value these training efforts. The programs also have impact, though perhaps of a more limited scope than many advocates of training wish were the case. The impact, though limited by the routines of the organization and the mobility of the journalists, does seem to persist for at least a period of time.

In short, it is unlikely these training initiatives will radically change the journalistic product, but they do seem to be able to contribute to its betterment.

## 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. (2004a). *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. (2004b). *The impact of newsroom philosophy on story ideation and story narration*. Paper presented to the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, November 19-20, 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.
- Gans, H. (1979). *Deciding what's news*. New York: Vintage Books.
- 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..

Vlad, T., & Becker, L.B. (2006). *The duration of impact of midcareer training programs for journalists.* Paper presented to the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago.

**Table 1. Number of Stories by Organization by Period**

			Period		Total
			Pre Workshop	Post Workshop	
Organization	TV	Count	10	11	21
		%	10.4%	12.4%	11.4%
	Radio	Count	2	3	5
		%	2.1%	3.4%	2.7%
	Weekly	Count	12	27	39
		%	12.5%	30.3%	21.1%
	Daily	Count	72	48	120
		%	75.0%	53.9%	64.9%
Total	Count	96	89	185	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 2. Type of Health Story**

			Period		Total
			Pre Workshop	Post Workshop	
Type	News	Count	46	55	101
		%	47.9%	61.8%	54.6%
	Feature	Count	37	19	56
		%	38.5%	21.3%	30.3%
	Column/Opinion/ Editorial	Count	12	12	24
		%	12.5%	13.5%	13.0%
	Other	Count	1	3	4
		%	1.0%	3.4%	2.2%
Total	Count	96	89	185	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 3. Amount of Initiative by Period**

			Period		Total
			Pre Workshop	Post Workshop	
Initiative	Routine/ Breaking News	Count	48	65	113
		%	50.0%	73.0%	61.1%
	Enterprise Story	Count	31	12	43
		%	32.3%	13.5%	23.2%
	Other	Count	16	9	25
		%	16.7%	10.1%	13.5%
	Does Not Apply	Count	1	3	4
		%	1.0%	3.4%	2.2%
Total	Count	96	89	185	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 4. Story Focus by Period**

			Period		Total
			Pre Workshop	Post Workshop	
Story Focus	Medical Results Study	Count	19	11	30
		%	19.8%	12.4%	16.2%
	Health Living	Count	34	31	65
		%	35.4%	34.8%	35.1%
	Preventative	Count	9	4	13
		%	9.4%	4.5%	7.0%
	Cosmetic	Count	5	2	7
		%	5.2%	2.2%	3.8%
	Survivor Story	Count	7	4	11
		%	7.3%	4.5%	5.9%
	Other	Count	22	37	59
		%	22.9%	41.6%	31.9%
	Total	Count	96	89	185
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 5. Include Workshop Topics by Period**

			Period		Total
			Pre Workshop	Post Workshop	
Workshop Topics	Emergencies	Count	0	3	3
		%	0.0%	3.4%	1.6%
	Healthcare	Count	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%
	Obesity kids	Count	1	2	3
		%	1.0%	2.2%	1.6%
	Stroke	Count	1	0	1
		%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%
	Heart attack	Count	1	1	2
		%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%
	Kids moving	Count	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%
	Other/Doesn't Apply	Count	93	82	175
		%	96.9%	92.1%	94.6%
	Total	Count	96	89	185
		%	100.0%	101.1%	100.5%

Note: One story after the workshop contained two topics for the workshop, resulting in a total of more than 100%.

Table 6. Number of Sources by Period

		Period		Total	
		Pre Workshop	Post Workshop		
Number of Sources	0	Count	7	8	15
		% within period	7.3%	9.0%	8.1%
	1	Count	26	30	56
		% within period	27.1%	33.7%	30.3%
	2	Count	30	23	53
		% within period	31.3%	25.8%	28.6%
	3	Count	18	14	32
		% within period	18.8%	15.7%	17.3%
	4	Count	6	4	10
		% within period	6.3%	4.5%	5.4%
	5	Count	6	8	14
		% within period	6.3%	9.0%	7.6%
	6	Count	2	2	4
		% within period	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%
	8	Count	1	0	1
		% within period	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%
	Total	Count	96	89	185
		% within period	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%