



Tanzania Media Fund and Twaweza

## Content Analysis Report

*Assessment of Quality of Reporting in TMF and Twaweza Grantees*

December 2014

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a media content analysis study, conducted jointly by Tanzania Media Fund (TMF) and Twaweza. Both TMF and Twaweza work on improving the overall quality of the media in Tanzania, although each organization has its own approach: broad support based on common principles for Twaweza, and a technical, hands-on, training-oriented approach for TMF. For the study, each organization submitted a set of media pieces (print, radio, and television) randomly selected from the portfolio of media products it supported in 2013 and 2014; a third group of randomly-selected media pieces not supported by either organization was used for comparison. The media pieces were analyzed by a team of trained coders, using a detailed content analysis codebook. The data were entered into SPSS and summarized for three groups overall (TMF, Twaweza, and comparison group), as well as for sub-groups. For TMF, the sub-groups corresponded to the type of support provided: Fellowships, Rural Dispatch, and Institutional Grants. For Twaweza, the sub-groups were the two media houses supported: Mlimani, and Sahara Media.

Findings show that both TMF and Twaweza generally perform better than the control group against the measured quality criteria. The recurring trend for the subgroups for TMF is that the Fellowship products perform strongest, generally followed by Rural Dispatch and then by the Institutional Grants. For Twaweza, Sahara Media is overall a stronger performer than Mlimani. Additional highlights from the findings include:

- Overall, 72% of all TMF's media pieces cover rural areas, against 32% for Twaweza and 24% for the control group.
- On average, TMF pieces cited 6.7 sources, as compared to 4.1 sources for Twaweza pieces, and 3.1 sources for the control group.
- In 34% of TMF pieces and 43% of Twaweza pieces there were no female sources, as compared to 55% pieces with no female sources in the comparison group
- Twaweza scores lowest for presenting figures (45%, as compared to 80% for TMF and 68% for control); however, when figures are presented, Twaweza scores highest for putting them in context (52% Twaweza, vs. 35% for both TMF and control group)
- Twaweza has the highest share of stories with a clear-cut idea (85%), followed by TMF (76%) and control group (58%)
- TMF had the highest proportion of pieces with clearly defined problems (46%, vs. 39% for Twaweza and 15% for control), while Twaweza had the highest proportion of pieces demanding an operational or policy change (31%, vs. 21% for TMF and 11% for control).

A practical lesson stemming from this exercise is that the coding tool, which was developed for print, ought to be tailored for radio and television media pieces. More generally, it appears that Twaweza's model of support may be insufficient to change a media outlet's practice; more intense sessions with key members of staff in order to improve journalistic quality may be an effective addition to the Twaweza portfolio. The TMF approach, on the other hand, needs to better train their mentors and grantees in producing media stories that do not only present problems, but also put forward a clear demand for change. Perhaps one of the most interesting questions that arise from this exercise is the overall comparison of the two models of supporting and funding media for development. A future evaluation exercise would benefit from a longitudinal comparison (taking the current exercise as baseline), a coding tool tailored to different types of media, as well as a value-for-money component.



## 1 Introduction

The Tanzanian Media Fund (TMF) is a non-governmental organisation that supports the establishment of an independent, quality, diverse and vibrant media in Tanzania since 2008. In its first project phase, TMF applied an internal method to ascertain whether the media products of grantees met the criteria of quality journalism. However, at the start of its second phase in 2012 it decided to opt for a more objective form of assessing the quality of its products by means of an external content analysis. The first external content analysis was carried out in the second half of 2013, and a second one in the first quarter of 2014. While preparing for the third content analysis, TMF was approached by Twaweza to do a joint exercise.

Both TMF and Twaweza advocate for accountability and change in Tanzania. While the two initiatives are different in many ways, they share a common interest in improving the overall quality of the media in Tanzania. Towards this, each organization has its own approach: broad support based on common principles for Twaweza, and a technical, hands-on, training-oriented approach for TMF.

### 1.1 Tanzania Media Fund

TMF aims to contribute to an increase in domestic accountability through strengthening of the media. In order to achieve this, TMF enables investigative and public interest journalism and facilitates critical reflection and learning. Through funding and learning activities it supports quality journalism that better informs the public, contributes to debate and thereby increases public demand for greater accountability across Tanzania.

TMF has various grant programmes that work with different types of mentoring and support. The products submitted in this content analysis are from the following grants categories:

1. Rural Dispatch Grant: the Rural Dispatch Grant is provided to journalists (radio/TV/print) who want to cover a certain issue in rural Tanzania, or an issue linked to rural development. They are selected based on the quality and originality of their idea, taking into account geographical spread, a balance between different media houses and gender balance. A series of four stories is produced over the period of 3 months with the help of a mentor.
2. Fellowship: the Fellowship is for more experienced journalists. They are enrolled for a period of up to 6 months in an intense mentoring programme and go out on extended projects covering neglected or under-reported areas and issues in order to contribute towards the country's sustainable development.
3. Institutional content grants: this grant type is for media houses, media production companies and officially registered media institutes in Tanzania that have been involved in media related work for at least a year. It provides for the production of content, usually a series of media products around a topic considered of public interest or of an investigative nature.

### 1.2 Twaweza

Twaweza is a citizen-centred initiative focusing on large-scale change in East Africa. It seeks to foster conditions and expand opportunities through which millions of people can get information and make changes happen in their own communities directly and by holding government to account.

As part of this goal, Twaweza has partnered with two large media houses (Mlimani Radio/TV and Sahara Media) with the purpose of promoting high quality independent media. The agreements with the media

houses were based on common principles rather than narrowly defined inputs. With Twaweza's support, the media houses agreed to devote significant and high quality coverage to social issues, in particularly in relation to education, health, and water. Twaweza provided material that could be used in the reporting (e.g. results from the Uwezo annual learning assessment survey), but did not seek to control the shape of the media outputs. In addition to coverage of key areas of interest, another key component of the agreement was an expectation to increase the inclusion of citizen's voices, including rural voices, in the reporting. Randomly selected samples from both media houses have been included in the content analysis.

## **2 Objectives, Methods & Procedures**

### **2.1 Objectives**

TMF and Twaweza would like to know whether the quality of the journalistic work supported by them is in line with their expectations. Complementing the quality assessment already done earlier by mentors and other experts of TMF and Twaweza, this content analysis compares in a systematic way the quality of reporting both amongst their different grant programmes and between their programmes in general, as well as with a non-TMF/Twaweza control group. This systematic comparison should help TMF and Twaweza to identify strengths and weaknesses of their current grants programmes, to know reasons for various degrees of success and to design improvements according to results.

### **2.2 Methods**

One of the acknowledged methods for assessing quality of reporting in media is content analysis, although it is time-consuming. Content analysis is applied very systematically (all media reports are assessed by the same criteria) and rather objectively (all assessors of media reports are distant from the media and trained for a long time to apply the tool). The requirement for content analysis is that criteria for assessing are clear and do not involve too much subjective judgement.

One difficulty in measuring quality is the lack of a crystal clear definition of quality. One approach to overcome this difficulty is not to define one quality, but various quality criteria that are to be fulfilled and that can be easier agreed upon. Those single quality criteria can be adapted to the specific quality objectives of media or stakeholders.

### **2.3 Procedures**

#### **2.3.1 Quality criteria**

It is important that quality criteria are clear and objective. However, they must also be consistent with the goals of those for whom the content analysis is carried out. In preparation for its first content analysis in 2013, a workshop was conducted on 18 February 2013 with TMF staff to identify the most important criteria. During the workshop the advantages and the limits of content analysis were made clear and discussed. Content analysis looks only at the content of media pieces (similar to the ordinary reader or listener), but cannot assess the journalistic processes behind the media piece (because reporters usually don't explain – at least not regularly – to the media consumer how they developed the piece). For assessing the journalistic processes behind a media piece, one has to do a separate exercise (observation, interviews with grantees and mentors etc.). Content analysis can only generate insights on the content. Nevertheless the content analysis data can stimulate discussions about processes.



The TMF content quality indicators developed in the workshop were the following:

- In-depth stories/analytical approach: a good journalistic story must go beyond the superficial facts.
- Balanced stories – variety of viewpoints: a good story presents the story from a number of different viewpoints in order to provide a balanced reflection on the issue being covered.
- Data simplified /Figures and Facts: in order to be attractive to media consumers, a good journalistic story presents figures and facts in a manner that the consumer can understand them.
- Rural coverage (ordinary people): for TMF, stories must cover rural issues and those of ordinary people.
- Diversity in news and issues: for TMF, it is important that the total of stories produced by TMF grantees must reflect diversity in terms of news and issues covered.
- Investigative Journalism (IJ) elements: while IJ is not part of every grant, TMF is interested in seeing IJ elements in, for example, some of the Fellows' stories.
- Variety/Diversity of sources: a quality journalistic story depends on a good variety of sources.
- Clarity and comprehensiveness: for the story to be attractive, it must be clear and comprehensive.

Based on these criteria a codebook was developed by the consultant and agreed upon with TMF, having in mind that not all TMF quality criteria developed were suitable to this kind of content analysis – especially criterion “diversity in news” is hardly possible to assess without a lot of subjective judgement, as well as “clarity and comprehensiveness”.

In the second content analysis, slight adaptations were made to the codebook based on experiences by the coders. For the third and current content analysis, the codebook developed by TMF was reviewed in detail by Twaweza. It was agreed that the topics included, and the coding process, is relevant and useful to analysing the media clips produced through Twaweza's media agreements. Therefore, the codebook designed and refined by TMF in the course of the two previous content analyses was not fundamentally changed. This makes it possible, among others, to make a comparison between this and previous content analyses, and provides an opportunity for using the control group from the previous content analysis earlier in the year. Only some very minor changes were made to the codebook to allow for separation of TMF and Twaweza products.

## 2.4 Training

Six coders – 3 PhD students from St. Augustine University of Tanzania (SAUT)<sup>1</sup> and 3 MA students from the School of Journalism and Mass Communication (SJMC)<sup>2</sup> of the University of Dar es Salaam<sup>3</sup> – were trained during earlier content analysis exercises in applying the codebook, where the common understanding and the inter-coder-reliability of coders was tested and later improved. These coders were already experienced in working with content analysis as they had done a similar exercise with the Media Council of Tanzania from February to May 2013.

A meeting with the coders, TMF and Twaweza was held on 11 July 2014 to familiarize the coders with Twaweza, and to discuss anticipated problems in using both Twaweza and TMF products in one single content analysis. The coding work was started directly after the training in July 2014 and was finished in mid-September 2014

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter C. Mataba, Joyce Bazira and Darius Mukiza.

<sup>2</sup> Neema Mushi, Hadija Maloya Kombo and Gideon Totoman.

<sup>3</sup> The coding exercise was coordinated by Dr. Joseph Matumaini.







## 2.5 Analysis

After coding was completed, the coded material was delivered in an Excel file for analysis in SPSS. Analysis was done by a local consultant, supported by one of the coders. All files were submitted to an external media expert for purposes of quality control before being included in this report.

The analysis focussed strictly on the research questions, i.e. whether the different groups studied here (Twaweza, TMF and control) achieved different performance results in the main quality criteria. The main quality criteria are the diversity of sources (number and using different groups of sources), the number of perspectives in a piece, the mentioning of history and root causes in a piece, the diversity of viewpoints and having opposing viewpoints.

Where significant differences are noted, they are significant at a 95% confidence level, the usual confidence used in media studies. The significance tests were done in cross tables via the Chi-Square test. In tables where multiple answers were cross-tabulated, significance tests were not done as Chi-Square doesn't work with multiple answer sets.

## 2.6 Selection of media pieces

This TMF/Twaweza exercise comprised 523 articles or radio/TV pieces from five different TMF/Twaweza programmes (Twaweza/Sahara, Twaweza/Mlimani, TMF/institutional grant, TMF fellowship" and "TMF/rural dispatch") from print, online, radio and TV, as well as a control group.

The following tables show technical aspects of the coded sample: the distribution per media type and in terms of length. Neither of these say anything about the quality of the media piece. Differences in sample size per media type are caused by different focus of TMF and Twaweza programmes (Twaweza provided no print pieces, for example). The disproportionate focus of the control group on newspaper is also explained by the fact that it was designed as a control group for TMF. The relatively large number of short Twaweza pieces can simply be attributed to selection criteria: for TMF and for the control group, length was a criterion for selection. For Twaweza it was not.

Table 1: Number of media pieces per group and per media type

	Newspaper/ online	Radio programme	Radio talkshow	TV programme	TV talkshow	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	0	64	2	119	14	199
<b>%</b>	0.0%	32.2%	1.0%	59.8%	7.0%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	132	47	3	16	8	206
<b>%</b>	64.1%	22.8%	1.5%	7.8%	3.9%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	88	30	0	0	0	118
<b>%</b>	74.6%	25.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	220	141	5	135	22	523
	42.1%	27.0%	1.0%	25.8%	4.2%	100.0%



Table 2: Length of media pieces per group and per media type

	Short	Middle	Long	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	52	24	123	199
<b>%</b>	26.1%	12.1%	61.8%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	4	17	185	206
<b>%</b>	1.9%	8.3%	89.8%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	2	37	79	118
<b>%</b>	1.7%	31.4%	66.9%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	58	78	387	523
	11.1%	14.9%	74.0%	100.0%

### 2.6.1 Control Group

At an early stage it was decided that coding a separate control group as part of this content analysis was not feasible. At a very practical level, coding of a control group would have meant choosing between making the exercise longer and more expensive, or reducing the number of TMF and Twaweza samples to make room for a control group. Without a control group, TMF and Twaweza still benefit from the opportunity of making a comparison between their products, even though the conditions under which the media products were produced were decidedly different and TMF has a high number of print articles versus a high number of TV pieces for Twaweza.

However, it was decided that a non-TMF/Twaweza control group would add value to the comparison. Therefore, it was decided to re-use coded results of the control group coded as part of TMF's second content analysis. The assumption was that the quality of this control group (selected late 2013) would not differ significantly from the overall quality of a new control group selected six months later.

The control group used consisted of articles, radio and TV pieces from journalists not yet attached to any TMF programme before. For selection of the control group in the second content analysis, an artificial week was made for the print articles from a selection of newspapers, taking care to only select journalists who had not received TMF funding in the past. Only feature-length articles covering issues of public interest (as opposed to simply covering entertainment) were selected in order to make the comparison as fair as possible. The selection was done by TMF. It was much more difficult to find pieces for the radio control group. These were selected from a random sample provided by Push Observer, who record radio programmes off air throughout Tanzania. As with the feature pieces in the newspapers, effort was made to select longer pieces covering issues related to public interest. The primary selection was done by Push Observer, after which TMF did a second selection, removing any programmes which did not meet the criteria of adequate length and/or relevant topic.

## 2.7 Weaknesses

A significant weakness of the control group for comparison with Twaweza is that it contains no TV pieces, a media category that makes up well over half of Twaweza's products. The previous two TMF content analyses did not look at differences between media types, but internal evaluation of the raw data suggests that there is little difference in the quality between the different media types within TMF for the following key indicators: number of sources, diversity of sources, number of perspectives, using of figures in context, mentioning root causes, clear definition of a problem, providing of a solution to the problem, and diversity of viewpoints.

Careful interpretation of the results is therefore required when comparing the three groups (TMF, Twaweza, control). Differences are likely to be influenced by differences in the composition of those groups.









## 3 Results

### 3.1 Topics

In terms of coverage of issues, Twaweza took the lead for coverage of health and education issues – predictably so, given their focus. TMF grantees also produced pieces in those areas but not as much as Twaweza. TMF grantees stand out in their coverage of environmental issues and agriculture, and a focus on extractive industries by the fellows (enrolled in an extractive industries fellowship). Table 3 provides a simplified overview showing only areas in which one of the subgroups scored highly – a full overview is provided in the annex.

Table 3: Focus areas of subgroups

	Health <sup>4</sup>	Agriculture, fisheries & food security	Energy & extractive industries	Education
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	44	2	1	29
%	30.8%	1.4%	0.7%	20.3%
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	19	0	0	7
%	33.9%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	21	18	7	13
%	17.4%	14.9%	5.8%	10.7%
<b>TMF Fellowship</b>	0	0	23	0
%	0.0%	0.0%	95.8%	0.0%
<b>TMF Institutional Grant</b>	5	31	0	4
%	23.0%	50.8%	0.0%	6.6%
<b>Control</b>	11	6	5	8
%	9.3%	5.1%	4.2%	6.8%

### 3.2 Rural values

Coverage of rural issues and rural voices are important to both TMF and Twaweza. This indicator is measured by looking at the geographic area in which the reported story takes place. It does not look at, for example, whether the journalist or media house are from a rural area, or whether the piece includes voices of rural people.

As the table below shows, there are differences between the subgroups. Rural Dispatch and Institutional Grant pieces, both from TMF, show the highest coverage in terms of rural areas. In the control group and both Twaweza subgroups, coverage of rural areas is lower, with over 42% (and for Mlimani 58%) of the pieces focus on *urban* areas.

---

<sup>4</sup> These are indicators 3-6 in the codebook.

Table 4: Rural focus per subgroup

	Major cities	Rural areas	Mixed	Total
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	51	46	22	119
%	42.9%	38.7%	18.5%	100.0%
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	29	12	9	50
%	58.0%	24.0%	18.0%	100.0%
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	24	92	4	120
%	20.0%	76.7%	3.3%	100.0%
<b>TMF Fellowship</b>	7	9	4	20
%	35.0%	45.0%	20.0%	100.0%
<b>TMF Institutional Grant</b>	14	43	4	61
%	23.0%	70.5%	6.6%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	50	30	38	118
%	42.4%	25.4%	32.2%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	175	232	81	488

N=488 ('non-identifiable' was excluded)

Table 4 shows that, overall, TMF has a much stronger focus on rural areas than the Twaweza and the control group, and the differences are significant. This has to do with TMF's selection criteria, and therefore is a confirmation that TMF application of selection criteria has the desired effect. However, the differences might also be influenced by the high prevalence of TV in the Twaweza group. As Table 5 shows, differences between media types in terms of their coverage of rural/urban areas is significant. TV, and specifically TV shows, are much more urban oriented.

Table 5: Rural focus Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Major cities	Rural areas	Mixed	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	80	58	31	169
%	47.3%	34.3%	18.3%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	45	144	12	201
%	22.4%	71.6%	6.0%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	50	30	38	118
%	42.4%	25.4%	32.2%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	175	232	81	488
%	35.9%	47.5%	16.6%	100.0%

N=488 ('non-identifiable' was excluded)

Table 6: Rural focus per media type

	Major cities	Rural areas	Mixed	Total
<b>Newspaper/online</b>	67	109	39	215
%	31.2%	50.7%	18.1%	100.0%
<b>Radio programme</b>	42	78	13	133
%	31.6%	58.6%	9.8%	100.0%
<b>Radio talkshow</b>	1	3	1	5
%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	100.0%
<b>TV programme</b>	52	42	21	115
%	45.2%	36.5%	18.3%	100.0%
<b>TV talkshow</b>	13	0	7	20
%	65.0%	0.0%	35.0%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	175	232	81	488
%	35.9%	47.5%	16.6%	100.0%

N=488 ('non-identifiable' was excluded)

### 3.3 Average number of sources

Having multiple sources is a recognized aspect of quality media. For the analysis, 13 pieces were excluded as the number of sources that was coded was extremely high for those (>17). According to Table 7, TMF fellows have used the most sources on average (8.1) followed by TMF Rural Dispatch (6.8) and TMF institutional grant (6.0). For Twaweza/Mlimani and the control group, the average number of sources is on the low side. In terms of media type (Table 10), radio programmes have the lowest and TV talkshows the highest number of averages sources. In general, radio programmes show the lowest average number of sources.

Looking at the distribution of media pieces with 1 or less, 2-3 and 4 or more sources, the differences are much more marked than when looking at the average. For TMF nearly 87% of all stories have 4 or more sources, which is much higher for the other groups. Conversely, only 3% of TMF products have 1 source or less, compared to 28% and 23% for Twaweza and control respectively. When looking at the distribution per media type in Table 9, however, it must be noted that overall the print media performs better. The TMF sample contains a lot of print, while the Twaweza sample contains no print at all.

All groups have some work to do when it comes to female sources. In the best case, 34% of media pieces were without female sources for TMF, followed by 43% for Twaweza and 55% for the control group. Table 10 also shows that approximately one fifth of all sources per group was female with little difference between Twaweza, TMF and control (sources identified as documents were removed from the equation since documents are neither male nor female).



Table 7: Average number of sources per subgroup

	Average	Total number	% Media products, 0-1 source	% Media products, 2-3 sources	% Media products, 4+ sources
Twaweza / Sahara	4.49	139	20.9%	30.9%	48.2%
Twaweza / Mlimani	3.13	54	46.3%	24.1%	29.6%
TMF Rural Dispatch	6.80	121	2.5%	7.4%	90.1%
TMF Fellowship	8.13	24	0.0%	4.2%	95.8%
TMF Institutional Grant	6.04	54	5.6%	18.5%	75.9%
Control	3.71	118	22.9%	28.8%	48.3%

N=510 (>17 sources was excluded)

Table 8: Average number of sources Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Average	Number	% Media products, 0-1 source	% Media products, 2-3 sources	% Media products, 4+ sources
Twaweza	4.11	193	28.0%	29.0%	43.0%
TMF	6.75	199	3.0%	10.1%	86.9%
Control	3.71	118	22.9%	28.8%	48.3%

N=510 (>17 sources was excluded)

Table 9: Average number of sources per media type

	Average	Number	% Media products, 0-1 source	% Media products, 2-3 sources	% Media products, 4+ sources
Newspaper / online	5.56	220	11.4%	16.4%	72.3%
Radio	4.00	142	28.2%	23.9%	47.9%
TV programme	5.29	148	14.9%	27.0%	58.1%
Total		510			

N=510 (>17 sources was excluded)

Table 10: Female sources Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Average	% media pieces without any female source	% female sources compared to total # of sources
Twaweza	1.22	43.2%	20.0%
TMF	1.63	33.5%	18.6%
Control	0.80	55.1%	18.4%

### 3.4 Use of source groups

A media piece can mention a high number of sources, but for real quality it is at least as important that they come from a variety of (relevant) groups. Two important groups are authorities and ordinary

people. A good journalist will follow up on who is accountable for issues raised in a media story, and these are very often the authorities (government and administration).

This should go hand in hand, however, with giving ordinary people a voice in the same story. Table 11 shows that 79% of TMF pieces have (at least once) authorities as a source group, and 70% have an ordinary person as a source. Twaweza pieces focus much less on authorities (36%), and slightly less on ordinary people (53%). The control group definitively scores lowest, at 35%, when it comes to having ordinary people as sources. Differences for these two source groups (authorities and ordinary people) have been positively tested for significance.

*Table 9: Use of source groups Twaweza/TMF/Control*

	Twaweza		TMF		Control		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>Authorities</b>	72	36.2%	163	79.1%	54	45.8%	289	55.3%
<b>MP/Parties</b>	16	8.0%	25	12.1%	21	17.8%	62	11.9%
<b>Judiciary/security</b>	14	7.0%	26	12.6%	18	15.3%	58	11.1%
<b>Ordinary people</b>	105	52.8%	144	69.9%	41	34.7%	290	55.4%
<b>Doctors/experts</b>	44	22.1%	59	28.6%	23	19.5%	126	24.1%
<b>Special sources</b>	30	15.1%	38	18.4%	23	19.5%	91	17.4%

### 3.5 Transparency of sources

Sources should be transparent to the audience. Coders assessed whether the first five sources mentioned in a media piece were transparent or not. No significance test was done, but it can be observed that there is a difference of over 30% between the worst performer (Twaweza/Mlimani) and the best performer (TMF Fellowship). In Table 13 the difference between TMF and the control group is very small, while Twaweza has a lower share of transparent sources.

*Table 10: Transparency per subgroup*

	Transparent	Non-transparent	Total
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	318	155	473
%	67.2%	32.8%	
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	83	57	140
%	59.3%	40.7%	
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	449	111	560
%	80.2%	19.8%	
<b>TMF Fellowship</b>	105	12	117
%	89.7%	10.3%	
<b>TMF Institutional Grant</b>	185	77	262
%	70.6%	29.4%	
<b>Control</b>	286	82	368
%	77.7%	22.3%	
<b>Total</b>	1426	494	1920

*N=503 ('no source' was excluded)*

Table 11: Transparency Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Transparent	Non-transparent	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	401	212	613
%	65.4%	34.6%	
<b>TMF</b>	739	200	939
%	78.7%	21.3%	
<b>Control</b>	286	82	368
%	77.7%	22.3%	
<b>Total</b>	1426	494	1920

N=503 ('no source' was excluded)

### 3.6 Perspective

Providing the media consumer with different perspectives (economic, political, and perspective from ordinary people, or science) on the issue elaborated in a media piece, and not only one perspective, adds to the quality of a media piece as it informs the media consumer more broadly. A quality media piece, by TMF's definition, will contain at least 2 perspectives. The differences, which show over two thirds of TMF pieces having 2 or more perspectives versus about half for the control group and less than a third for Twaweza, are significant. Including more than one perspective is something TMF grantees are specifically mentored on, while this is not the case for Twaweza. This must be taken into account when interpreting the large difference between the two.

Table 12: Use of perspectives Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No perspective	1 perspective	2 perspectives	3 or more perspectives	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	4	140	41	14	199
%	2.0%	70.4%	20.6%	7.0%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	2	48	109	47	206
%	1.0%	23.3%	52.9%	22.8%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	7	50	40	21	118
%	5.9%	42.4%	33.9%	17.8%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	13	238	190	82	523
%	2.5%	45.5%	36.3%	15.7%	100.0%

When split per subgroup (Table 2A) TMF Fellows perform best and Rural Dispatch worse of the TMF subgroups, and for Twaweza, Mlimani scores slightly better than Sahara (but both are still lower than the control group). In Table 15 both Twaweza and TMF's focus on ordinary citizens comes very clearly to the fore: in over 91% of all Twaweza and TMF media pieces, the perspective of the ordinary people is shown, compared to 64% for the control group. The perspective of ordinary citizen is coded positively for media pieces in which the issue is looked at from the perspective of an ordinary citizen and not just, for example a scientific or government perspective.







Table 13: Type of perspectives Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Twaweza	TMF	Control	Total
<b>Ordinary</b>	185	188	75	448
%	93.00%	91.30%	63.60%	85.70%
<b>Politics</b>	7	3	21	31
%	3.50%	1.50%	17.80%	5.90%
<b>Policy</b>	34	91	40	165
%	17.10%	44.20%	33.90%	31.50%
<b>Economics</b>	22	97	33	152
%	11.10%	47.10%	28.00%	29.10%
<b>Science</b>	8	15	5	28
%	4.00%	7.30%	4.20%	5.40%
<b>Global</b>	1	11	5	17
%	0.50%	5.30%	4.20%	3.30%
<b>Security</b>	4	4	17	25
%	2.00%	1.90%	14.40%	4.80%
<b>Others</b>	4	0	2	6
%	2.00%	0.00%	1.70%	1.10%

### 3.7 Figures and numbers

It is also an indicator of good quality when media pieces use numbers and make those figures understandable by putting them in the right context. The content analysis looks at the presence of numbers, and then looks at whether those numbers are placed in context. Presenting number without context can be confusing. For example, corruption becomes meaningful when one confronts the media consumer with the number of dispensaries, for instance, that could have been built from that money.

The share of media pieces containing numbers is, unsurprisingly, highest for the TMF Fellowship as these journalists receive the most mentoring compared to any of the other groups. For Table 17, which shows that 46% of Twaweza media pieces contain figures versus 67% and 81% for control and TMF respectively, the data was positively tested for significance.

Table 14: Share of media pieces with figures per subgroup

	No	Yes	Total
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	70	73	143
%	49.0%	51.0%	100.0%
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	38	18	56
%	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	15	106	121
%	12.4%	87.6%	100.0%
<b>TMF Fellowship</b>	1	23	24
%	4.2%	95.8%	100.0%
<b>TMF Institutional Grant</b>	24	37	61
%	39.3%	60.7%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	37	81	118
%	31.4%	68.6%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	185	338	523

Table 15: Share of media pieces with figures Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No	Yes	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	108	91	199
%	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	40	166	206
%	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	37	81	118
%	31.4%	68.6%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	185	338	523
%	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%

In terms of putting figures into context, there were no large differences between subgroups of TMF or Twaweza respectively. Differences are significant at the level of Twaweza/TMF/Control, as shown in Table 18, with TMF performing weakest. This suggests that TMF mentoring focuses on including figures but not on putting them into context, which has been noted as well in an earlier content analysis report.

Table 16: Share of media pieces with figures put into context Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No figure in context	Few figures in context	Most figures in context	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	16	28	47	91
%	17.6%	30.8%	51.6%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	41	67	58	166
%	24.7%	40.4%	34.9%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	26	26	29	81
%	32.1%	32.1%	35.8%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	83	121	134	338
%	24.6%	35.8%	39.6%	100.0%

N = 338, excluding the “no figure” category

### 3.8 Clear-cut idea

It is one of the basic requirements of good journalism that journalists have a clear idea about what they have to say in their piece. Otherwise they will produce media pieces which are confusing and of little attraction to media consumers. Twaweza has a larger share of media pieces with a strong clear-cut idea than the other groups, although TMF still performs well compared to the control group.

Table 17: Clear-cut idea Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No	Yes but little, weak	Yes, strong, good	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	9	21	169	199
%	4.5%	10.6%	84.9%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	2	47	157	206
%	1.0%	22.8%	76.2%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	10	40	68	118
%	8.5%	33.9%	57.6%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	21	108	394	523
%	4.0%	20.7%	75.3%	100.0%

A clear-cut idea in a media piece should be supported by sources to give the media piece depth. While the share of Twaweza pieces with a clear-cut idea was higher than for TMF, TMF has a higher share of stories with a clear-cut idea supported by (at least) two sources. The difference is significant. When split up per subgroup, Twaweza/Mlimani has a much smaller share of ideas supported by two sources than the other subgroups (56%), which vary between 78% (control) and 100% (TMF Fellowship).

*Table 18: Support for clear-cut idea per subgroup*

	<b>Idea not supported by 2 sources</b>	<b>Idea supported by 2 sources</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	27	109	136
%	19.9%	80.1%	100.0%
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	24	30	54
%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	2	117	119
%	1.7%	98.3%	100.0%
<b>TMF Fellowship</b>	0	23	23
%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TMF Institutional Grant</b>	2	45	47
%	4.3%	95.7%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	22	86	108
%	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	77	410	487

*N=487 ('there is no clear cut idea' is excluded)*

*Table 19: Support for clear-cut idea for Twaweza/TMF/Control*

	<b>Idea not supported by 2 sources</b>	<b>Idea supported by 2 sources</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Twaweza</b>	51	139	190
%	26.8%	73.2%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	4	200	204
%	2.0%	98.0%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	22	86	108
%	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	77	425	502
%	15.3%	84.7%	100.0%

*N = 502 ('no central idea' is excluded)*

When it comes to providing more detail about the clear-cut idea, defined in the codebook as explanation of details related to the main concept, over 75% of media pieces in all categories do so very well.



Table 20: Expansion of clear-cut idea for Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No expansion of central idea	Little expansion of central idea	Large expansion of central idea	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	6	28	156	190
%	3.2%	14.7%	82.1%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	0	19	185	204
%	0.0%	9.3%	90.7%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	0	27	81	108
%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	6	74	422	502
%	1.2%	14.7%	84.1%	100.0%

It goes almost without saying that, besides from having a clear-cut idea which is supported and explained in some detail, a media piece must be coherent or 'flow' in order for the media consumer to be interested. Table 23 shows that differences between the three groups are small but significant; Twaweza and TMF outperform the control group by 11% and 12.8% respectively.

Table 21: Coherence for Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Lots of weaknesses	Coherence fairly done	Coherence very well done	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	26	23	150	199
%	13.1%	11.6%	75.4%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	0	47	159	206
%	0.0%	22.8%	77.2%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	9	33	76	118
%	7.6%	28.0%	64.4%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	35	103	385	523
%	6.7%	19.7%	73.6%	100.0%

### 3.9 History & Root Causes

Context for a story is, among others, provided through providing a history to the event to explain to the consumer of the story what events led to the issue being discussed. In the codebook, this is defined as the extent to which reference is made to past events related to the central idea. Another is whether reference is made to the root cause of the problem or issue being described.

For history, there are slight differences between Twaweza, TMF and control in for the share of stories that provide no history at all, with the control group doing better than both Twaweza and TMF. But the differences increase significantly when looking at stories with a large amount of history, and put Twaweza (30%) and TMF (51%) well ahead of the control group (19%). In this calculation, one of the coders was eliminated from the analysis as the coded values differed too much from the others and it was felt that the inter-coder reliability was therefore low.







Table 22: History provided for Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No history	Little history	Large history	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	56	26	55	137
<b>%</b>	37.6%	22.0%	30.2%	30.5%
<b>TMF</b>	53	58	93	204
<b>%</b>	35.6%	49.2%	51.1%	45.4%
<b>Control</b>	40	34	34	108
<b>%</b>	26.8%	28.8%	18.7%	24.1%
<b>Total</b>	149	118	182	449
<b>%</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

N=449 (one coder excluded)

The root causes show a similar trend to history, with smaller differences in the 'no root causes' column (again with control doing better) and larger differences in the 'large history' column ranking TMF as having the highest share and control as having the lowest share of media pieces with broad attention for root causes. Again, one of the coders (a different one than for history) had to be eliminated to ensure inter-coder reliability.

Table 23: Root causes provided for Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No root causes	Little root causes	Large root causes	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	39	31	65	135
<b>%</b>	31.7%	27.7%	30.7%	30.2%
<b>TMF</b>	48	40	116	204
<b>%</b>	39.0%	35.7%	54.7%	45.6%
<b>Control</b>	36	41	31	108
<b>%</b>	29.3%	36.6%	14.6%	24.2%
<b>Total</b>	123	112	212	447
<b>%</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

N=447 (one coder excluded)

### 3.10 Problems defined and demand for operational policy

When designing the codebook, TMF also wanted to assess whether media pieces contained some typical elements of investigative journalism. While not all TMF media pieces are investigative in nature, TMF does expect to see some investigative elements in the work funded by TMF. The main problem for content analysis was to pre-define specific elements of investigative journalism that are observable in content. Usually, investigative journalism is defined by the process (longer journalistic research, under-cover, "digging deeper" etc.) that are not suitable for content analysis (see above section 3.2 Procedures). Indicators were chosen around defining a problem and offering solutions, which are possible to measure through content analysis. When tested for inter-coder reliability, however, the indicator offering solutions showed too much variation to provide conclusive results. Instead, demand for operational policy to resolve the problem highlighted has been taken as an indicator.

Table 24 shows that all Twaweza and TMF subcategories performed better than the control group, with Twaweza/Mlimani scoring lowest of Twaweza/TMF (as it does in many of the other overviews).

Table 24: Share of media pieces with problem definition per subgroup

	Not defined at all	Somehow defined	Very clearly defined	Total
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	21	23	95	139
%	15.1%	16.5%	68.3%	100.0%
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	11	13	32	56
%	19.6%	23.2%	57.1%	100.0%
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	8	24	89	121
%	6.6%	19.8%	73.6%	100.0%
<b>TMF fellowship</b>	4	3	17	24
%	16.7%	12.5%	70.8%	100.0%
<b>TMF institutional grant</b>	17	2	42	61
%	27.9%	3.3%	68.9%	100.0%
<b>Control group</b>	27	42	47	116
%	23.3%	36.2%	40.5%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	88	107	322	517

N=517 ('difficult to say' is excluded)

Table 25 shows the difference between the three groups more clearly and has positively tested for significance.

Table 25: Share of media pieces with problem definition Twaweza/TMF/Control

	Not defined at all	Somehow defined	Very clearly defined	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	32	36	127	195
%	36.4%	33.6%	39.4%	37.7%
<b>TMF</b>	29	29	148	206
%	33.0%	27.1%	46.0%	39.8%
<b>Control</b>	27	42	47	116
%	30.7%	39.3%	14.6%	22.4%
<b>Total</b>	88	107	322	517
%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

N=517 ('difficult to say' is excluded)

According to Table 28, Twaweza/Sahara, TMF Fellowship and Twaweza/ Mlimani have the highest share of media pieces demanding for operational policy to resolve the issue. The other categories lag behind, with the control group predictably last. Shown at the level of Twaweza/TMF/Control in Table 29, Twaweza media pieces are clearly in the lead in demanding operational policy – and this difference is significant.

Table 26: Share of media pieces demanding operational policy per subgroup

	No	Yes	Total
<b>Twaweza/Sahara</b>	93	43	136
%	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
<b>Twaweza/Mlimani</b>	38	16	54
%	70.4%	29.6%	100.0%
<b>TMF Rural Dispatch</b>	97	22	119
%	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%
<b>TMF Fellowship</b>	16	7	23
%	69.6%	30.4%	100.0%
<b>TMF Institutional Grant</b>	45	14	59
%	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	103	13	116
%	88.8%	11.2%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	392	115	507

N=507 ('not appropriate' is excluded)

Table 27: Share of media pieces demanding operational policy Twaweza/TMF/Control

	No	Yes	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	131	59	190
%	68.9%	31.1%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	158	43	201
%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	103	13	116
%	88.8%	11.2%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	392	115	507
%	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%

N=507 ('not appropriate' is excluded)

### 3.11 Viewpoint

One quality criterion is that good journalism provides the audience with balanced stories, i.e. not only a diversity of viewpoints, but additionally also mentioning the opposite viewpoint, which balances the story. A viewpoint needs to contain some judgement or assessment of the situation, making it different from perspective, which simply shows a certain side of the story. As with history and root causes, one coder has been excluded from the analysis of viewpoints due to inter-coder reliability problems.

Table 28: Number of viewpoints Twaweza/TMF/Content (N=466 (one coder excluded))

	No viewpoint	One viewpoint	Two viewpoints	Three/more viewpoints	Total
<b>Twaweza</b>	23	66	35	18	142
%	16.2%	46.5%	24.6%	12.7%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	19	81	87	19	206
%	9.2%	39.3%	42.2%	9.2%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	32	42	35	9	118
%	27.1%	35.6%	29.7%	7.6%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	74	189	157	46	466
%	15.9%	40.6%	33.7%	9.9%	100.0%



Table 30 above shows a clear picture of TMF having a higher share of media pieces with two or more viewpoints than the other two categories. Table 31 below shows that, in cases where there is more than one viewpoint, TMF is in the lead in providing opposing viewpoints (67%), followed by control (53%) and Twaweza (25%). The difference is significant.

*Table 29: Opposing viewpoints Twaweza/TMF/Control*

	<b>No opposing viewpoint</b>	<b>Yes opposing viewpoint</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Twaweza</b>	40	13	53
<b>%</b>	75.5%	24.5%	100.0%
<b>TMF</b>	35	71	106
<b>%</b>	33.0%	67.0%	100.0%
<b>Control</b>	20	24	44
<b>%</b>	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	95	108	203
<b>%</b>	46.8%	53.2%	100.0%

*N = 203 (one coder excluded, and all “no viewpoint or only one viewpoint” excluded)*







## 4 Conclusion & Recommendations

The content analysis supports, first and foremost, that TMF and Twaweza have a clear focus on ordinary people, and (though less strongly for Twaweza) the rural areas in which many of them live. It also suggests that overall in the Tanzanian media there is a lack of attention for these overlapping groups. That TMF and Twaweza are different organisations with separate objectives can also be seen in the analysis. Typical focus areas for quality journalism, such as balancing the story through varied and opposing viewpoints, show TMF as the stronger performer. However, when it comes to a clear-cut idea of what the message of a story is, and demanding changes in operational policy, Twaweza comes to the fore. Clear communication is needed to make change happen.

### 4.1 Key observations

In most areas, both TMF and Twaweza perform better than the control group, although in some cases only by a little. The recurring trend for the subgroups, overall, is that for TMF, the Fellowship products perform strongest, generally followed by Rural Dispatch and then by the Institutional Grants. For Twaweza, Sahara is a stronger performer than Mlimani. The following additional observations can be made:

1. Rural focus: 72% of all TMF's media pieces cover rural areas, against 32% for Twaweza and 24% for the control group. The indicator does not look, however, at representation of rural voices, which might well be present in urban-oriented stories. Twaweza/Mlimani has the highest focus on urban areas from the subgroups.
2. Number of sources: on average TMF stories had more sources (6.75) than Twaweza (4.11) and the control group (3.71). Again, Mlimani scores lowest of the subgroups. However, when one looks at the distribution of pieces with 1 source or less (considered very poor) and with 4 sources or more (considered good), a clear picture emerges of TMF performing very strongly.
3. Women as sources: TMF and Twaweza both score better than the control group, where over half the pieces have no female source (55%). However, at 34% and 43% for TMF and Twaweza respectively, one cannot claim women are being fairly represented as sources.
4. Ordinary people as sources: TMF and Twaweza perform better than the control group in having ordinary people as sources, though especially for Twaweza there is room for improvement.
5. Authorities as sources: TMF does very well in having authorities as sources, Twaweza not at all. This is an interesting contrast to Twaweza's higher demand for operational policy in their stories, which is usually geared towards authorities.
6. Transparency of sources: overall, Twaweza scores lower than both TMF and the control group, and Twaweza/Mlimani is the weakest performer. There is little difference between TMF and control.
7. Perspectives: TMF scores much better than the other groups in terms of presenting two or more perspectives in their stories; Twaweza performs poor compared to both TMF and the control group. Both of them do very well in representing the perspective of ordinary people. One might argue that as a citizen-oriented organisation Twaweza's prime interest lies in representing the perspective of ordinary citizens. This is also important for TMF, but the representation of other perspectives besides that of citizens is equally important for journalistic quality.
8. Figures: A very high proportion of TMF stories contain figures compared to Twaweza and control, something actively encouraged by mentors. However, Twaweza has more success in putting these into context. One might speculate that because communicating clearly about what figures mean for is extremely important for getting across a message, Twaweza is likely to pay more attention to this issue. What is clear, also from previous content analyses, is that TMF needs to step up its mentorship in this area.



9. Clear-cut idea: Twaweza has the highest share of stories with a clear-cut idea, though TMF also performs much better than the control group. Though TMF could still sharpen up a little in this area, it is the overall media in Tanzania, represented by the control group, which really needs to step up.
10. Support for and expansion of clear-cut idea: while TMF performs better than the other groups, all sampled stories do quite well in this category. Twaweza/Mlimani, however, has some reason for concern as their performance is not up to scratch compared to the other subgroups.
11. History & root causes: while TMF performs better than the other groups, there is a lot of room for improvement as even for TMF only slightly more than half the stories pay sufficient attention to putting their stories into a broader context.
12. Defining a problem: a third of all stories for TMF, Twaweza and the control group do not define a problem. Less than half of TMF's stories, and even less for Twaweza and the control group, clearly define a problem. If you want to influence accountability and bring change, you need to be able to clearly define the problem. This area needs some attention by both TMF and Twaweza.
13. Operational policy: nearly a third of all Twaweza pieces demand for a change in operational policy to address the issue, and it is well in the lead compared to TMF and the control group.
14. Viewpoints: with this indicator, TMF clearly comes to the fore as a media organisation with mentorship compared to the other organisations.

## 4.2 Recommendations

TMF and Twaweza adopted different approaches to working with the media, as described in the introduction. The analysis presented in this paper is not meant to strictly evaluate one model against the other, although comparisons are insightful. The notes below summarize some of the main lessons from this exercise for Twaweza and TMF.

### 4.2.1 Coding tool

The analysis was based on a quality coding tool developed by TMF specifically for the assessment of the quality of the media it supports. While overall the quality categories were deemed relevant also to Twaweza (and therefore the assessment tool was the same for both organizations), the fact that Twaweza's sample included only radio and television pieces, while TMF was predominately print media, does raise the question of comparability. For example, one of the criteria on the assessment tool is the inclusion of figures (data), but the use of figures on radio and, to a lesser extent, television lags behind that in print media. Similarly radio and television do not easily lend themselves to numerous sources in the same way that print does. Television requires more visually compelling material and on radio multiple voices can, if not well-organised by the presenter or journalist, easily become confusing for the listener. Some of the quality criteria, while clearly important, might in the future have to be tailored for radio and television, and in some cases quality criteria might need to be added.

### 4.2.2 Differences Twaweza Groups

It's interesting to note that there was a large difference between the two Twaweza-supported media houses – Sahara Media Group and Mlimani Media. It is worth noting that Mlimani Media is staffed by student journalists so some variation between the partners is expected. However a deeper consideration of the difference between the two media houses and how well they might respond to Twaweza style of engagement may be worth considering.

### 4.2.3 Inclusion of Citizens

For Twaweza, one of the core priorities was increased inclusion of citizen and particularly rural voices in programs. Though also of key importance to TMF, there was equal emphasis for TMF on general criteria

for quality such as having multiple voices within a piece of content (including a rural focus). There are lessons for Twaweza from the TMF model here, given that TMF grantees sometimes outperformed Twaweza partners even in indicators that were critical for inclusion of citizens. This could suggest that Twaweza's model of support (that is, providing funding, some editorial guidance and end-line objectives) may be insufficient to entirely change a media outlet's practice. More intense sessions with key members of staff in order to improve journalistic quality may be an effective addition to the Twaweza portfolio.

#### **4.2.4 Gender**

TMF and Twaweza had a better representation of women than the control group, but they still performed relatively poorly considering the importance both give to ordinary voices. For Twaweza, this is a consideration to be taken into account in future discussions with key members of staff in the media houses they work with. For TMF, paying attention to gender should be part of training to TMF grantees, especially those benefitting from fellowships.

#### **4.2.5 Accountability**

Bringing change, or accountability, is an important focus area for both TMF and Twaweza. But the content analysis reveals challenges. Twaweza's focus on increased inclusion of citizens may lead to stories being less balanced by overlooking the perspectives of other groups. Twaweza should aim, specifically, for better coverage of the perspective (and responsibilities) of authorities, since they are part of the change that needs to take place. TMF in turn needs to better train their mentors and grantees in producing media stories that do not only present problems, but also put forward a clear demand for change. The content analysis suggests here is something to learn from Twaweza in that regard.

#### **4.2.6 Comparison**

Perhaps one of the most interesting questions that arise from this exercise is the overall comparison of the two models of supporting and funding media for development. A value-for-money component, lacking from the current assessment, would be an important dimension to add. Such an evaluation could perhaps usefully be considered by the two organizations in the future.



