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Director’s Foreword

Dear Readers,

It is with great pleasure that I share with you the second year publication of the AIBD Annual Media Research (AAMR) titled The Role of Broadcasting Media in Communication for Development. We take pride in having partnered with IPPTAR Training Institute, under the Ministry of Communications and Multimedia, Malaysia and Taylors University, Malaysia in successfully completing this research project.

As approved by the 14th General Conference of AIBD, the AAMR will address the theme of the forthcoming Asia Media Summit. The AAMR is a reflection of the empirical status quo of AIBD members in the areas to be addressed by the Asia Media Summit of the year and an intellectual warming-up for the AMS. It is of course also a stand-alone research project.

The Proceedings of the AMS, published after the event, is a compilation of the views of the various speakers and the organisations they represent on the same topic. Together, these two volumes of work form AIBD’s contribution to the discourse on the topic in the field of media in our region and the world.

When AAMR 2017 was conceived in September 2016, AIBD had formulated the theme of the Asia Media Summit 2017 – how media should address development of the human world - which later acquired the formal wording “Media on the Frontline of Global Development”. The theme was warmly welcomed by our partner for the project – IPPTAR and the School of Communication of Taylor’s University, who was going to conduct the research. According to them, development is a central issue addressed in the everyday programmes of many media organisations, and a study into it would definitely help the industry to realign itself to the core purposes of their respective broadcasting organisations.

Processes of the research include:

1) Taylor’s University, in consultation with AIBD and IPPTAR, drafts the questionnaires according to the theme.
2) AIBD distributes the questionnaires to its members relevant to the research topic.
3) Members who are interested in the research fill in the survey and return to AIBD.
4) Taylor’s University tabulates the data, does the computation, analyses and interprets the main trends and writes the report.
5) AIBD checks the report and gives approval.

As a result, we are able to present a study that delves into the making of broadcast programmes on development. The study asked and provided explanations to questions such as: What are the attitudes of media organisations on development programmes? What are the specific topics that they touch upon? How do the media treat them? How about the quality of these productions?

We are most grateful to the 22 members who responded with resourceful data for the research. They are the fundamental basis for our work. Taylor’s University designed the survey and analysed the responses to the questionnaire with rigorous academic capability. IPPTAR, host and long-time supporter of AIBD, made the substantial financial contribution.

Last but not least, since our research is going to be published during the 14th Asia Media Summit on 6 June 2017 in Qingdao, China, we have asked the Communication University of China to translate the research into Chinese. We are pleased to announce that next year’s AMS will be in India. We look forward to AAMR 2018.

Thank you.

Chang Jin
Director AIBD
Greetings from the Tun Abdul Razak Broadcasting and Information Institute (IPPTAR), Ministry of Information, Communications and Culture, Malaysia. Successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda requires collective and collaborative partnerships, participation and contribution of the private sector, academia and civil society. This research is an important platform to evaluate the role played by members of the Asia-Pacific Institute of Broadcasting Development (AIBD) in relation to coverage of global development issues, sustainable development goals and the organisational principles, policies and practices behind the coverage.

It is my pleasure on behalf of IPPTAR to embark on another joint effort with AIBD to publish a handbook on the role of the media in relation to (global sustainable) development. Certainly, it marks another significant milestone in IPPTAR’s efforts to become a center of excellence. IPPTAR as a government training institute that offers professional courses in broadcasting will continue to hold joint activities with AIBD in the areas of research, programming and broadcast engineering.

The field of broadcasting is undoubtedly progressive and dynamic, working in tandem with technology development. The advent of new media with practical and ideological changes of traditional media has impacted social change and subsequently transformed the world’s broadcasting landscape. Therefore, there is a need to understand and evaluate the role of media that is evolving in line with technological development and to constructively participate and contribute towards the implementation of 2030 Agenda. Against this background of rapidly global communication and transformation, it is my sincere wish that this research paper will bring about awareness as well as positive changes and development with a spirit of common goal although with different approaches.

IPPTAR would like to thank Taylor’s University, as well as AIBD for their fruitful cooperation and their tireless efforts in making this publication possible.

SITI MOHANI SAAD
Head of Academic IPPTAR
Message from Ms Josephine Tan Lian Lei, Dean of the School of Communication, Taylor’s University, Subang Jaya, Malaysia

Dear Asia Media Summit Participants

It is a great honour for Taylor’s School of Communication to be part of AIBD’s initiative to promote dialogue among its members by harnessing the results of academic research. On behalf of my school and faculty, I would like to thank AIBD’s Director, Mr Chang Jin, for this opportunity and for the wonderful collaboration over the past year and a half. I would also like to express my hope that the current project may help strengthen the ties between our two institutions.

Research plays an increasingly important role also in Taylor’s University and has been identified as a key plank in its 2017–2022 strategic plan. Our ambition is to build an international reputation not only for excellence in teaching and learning but also research. As the Dean of the School of Communication, I am particularly proud that we have managed to increase our school’s Malaysian Research Assessment (MyRA) score to more than double since its first measurement in 2011.

The research team behind the current project illustrates our expertise and aspirations well: Associate Professor Dr Antoon De Rycker, Dr Yang Lai Fong and Mr Mohammad Abeer Syed. The collaborative effort was expertly managed by Associate Professor Dr Ramachandran Ponnan (Principal Investigator), who combines years of passion and experience in broadcasting with a growing list of television, broadcasting and film publications.

I hope that you will find the survey research presented here interesting, thought-provoking and useful. AIBD plays a critical role in ensuring the future quality of broadcasting as well as in the context of global development, and we hope our work may contribute to that.

Let me round off by wishing you all a most productive and enjoyable time at the Asia Media Summit 2017 in Qingdao, China.

Kind regards

Ms Josephine Tan Lian Lei
Dean of the School of Communication, Taylor’s University, Malaysia
Message from Zhengrong Hu, President, Communication University of China

Broadcasting media play key roles in socio-economic development in every society. It fosters personal growth, facilitates social integration, promotes economic development, and enriches cultural diversity across the globe.

For the sustainable development of broadcasting media, various new information and communication technologies (ICTs) bring enormous challenges on the one hand, and create unprecedented opportunities on the other. Those new creative concepts and technologies, including sharing economy, user-centrism, AI, VR, Big Data, and open platform are certainly originated but not unique on the internet. Broadcasting media could also adopt some of them into its strategy towards more inclusive and integrative future of development. After timely transformation, broadcasting media are capable to reenter people’s daily life, rebuild the relationship of sound, image and humanity, and furthermore, promote the national and social progress.
Most countries in Asia are developing countries. Broadcasting media should shoulder the responsibility in their diverse developmental processes. AIBD made great achievements in the past few years. This year, in collaboration with IPPTAR of Malaysia and Taylor’s University, AIBD conducted systematically designed and thorough investigation in order to explore the potential broadcasting media could contribute to social development in Asia.

On behalf of Communication University of China, I would like to congratulate the publication of the second AIBD Annual Media Research (AAMR) and wish a great success of the “Asia Media Summit” to be held in Qingdao very soon.

With best regards,

HU Zhengrong
President, Communication University of China
The AAMR Research

THE ROLE OF BROADCASTING MEDIA IN COMMUNICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT
1 | Introduction

The current study has to be seen in the dual context of the United Nations’ 2030 agenda for sustainable development (UN, 2015) and the recent trend in communication studies to reflect more critically on the role of media and communication in “imagining, conceiving and implementing development interventions” that are “realistic, sustainable and effective’ (Manyozo & Mansell, 2017). Nowadays much academic research – understandably – focuses on new media platforms, digital technologies and peripheral information providers. In Anderson’s (2006) analysis, media markets are no longer solely dominated by the high-volume “head” of a traditional demand curve – i.e. the traditional mass media – but also by “the long tail” of near limitless choice (e.g. alternative news blogs, citizen journalism).

Even so, the long-established media – print, television and radio – still contribute to public-sphere discourses and remain involved in the social construction of what constitutes successful development practice. Public broadcasting media in particular have a duty to cover development topics – whether with global, regional or local reach – and to function as agenda-setters; at the same time, they can also actively promote development issues and even challenge traditional views. It should be emphasised, however, that increasingly, also private-sector broadcasters pursue the same objectives. Many commercial media embrace sustainable development as part of their corporate social responsibility, that is, programmes, activities and initiatives beyond what their country’s regulators demand. Business strategies include, among other things, community outreach, engagement with global stakeholders, measuring the social impact of programming and social marketing. In short, both public and private media organisations contribute and/or work together as equally important partners.

Over a short period of time, the “converging spectrum” (Kenix, 2011) of alternative and mainstream media has severely disrupted, however, the usual practices of major broadcasting institutions, also in the Asia-Pacific region. It is important, therefore, to find out how these institutions have addressed these changes and how they realise – or wish to realise – their unique role in communicating development issues and “transforming our world” (UN, 2015). In this respect, the membership list of the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development (AIBD) is a suitable starting point for collecting reliable information about broadcasters’ coverage of global development issues, sustainable development goals (SDGs) and the organisational principles, policies and practices behind the coverage.

2 | Research questions

This study seeks to answer the following two questions:

1. What do AIBD members think about the role of the media in relation to (global) (sustainable) development?
2. What do AIBD members do in their coverage of development (issues/goals)?
The focus is on description – self-reported opinions and behaviour – but where relevant, we will examine relationships between opinions, behaviours and respondents’ attributes (sample characteristics), offer explanations of members’ media practice and make recommendations within the scope of AIBD’s mandate.

3 | Method

The research design consists in a census survey that was conducted among all 93 members of AIBD. Prior to email distribution, a questionnaire instrument was developed (see Appendix) and trialled on a subset of survey participants; the pilot test helped to improve content, layout and completion time (November–December 2016). The actual data were collected in January–February 2017. The total number of questionnaire items is 51 divided over six sections.

The response rate was 22 out of the total, or 23.7%. It should be noted that the response rate for full members was 57.6% (or 15 out of 26). For statistical analysis, this percentage is considered adequate in light of the 25–30% average for external email surveys with no incentives or follow-up communication (Yun & Trumbo, 2000). The high representativeness among full members lowers the risk of response rate bias and provides a basis for cautious generalisation to the broader AIBD broadcasting community.

Overall, however, the research aim is not so much to generalise as to gain insight and to discover and interpret patterns. This can be done by means of descriptives, using SPSS. The study is also interested in finding out whether, for example, private (commercial) media organisations think or act differently from those that are national or state-owned (non-commercial). To enrich the quantitative findings, the survey included a number of open-ended questions (19, or 37.3% of the total). Respondents were given the opportunity to share additional information, provide explanations for their responses or reflect on their practice.

4 | Survey findings and discussion

4.1 | Who participated in the survey?

The survey produced a total of 22 completed questionnaires. The participating AIBD member organisations are listed in Table 1, alphabetically ordered by country.

Table 1: Participating media organisations by country and ownership structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Saba Media Organisation (SMO)</td>
<td>MO²</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Bangladesh Betar (BB)</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Radio National of Cambodia (RNK)</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>National Television of Cambodia (TVK)</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>SAPPRFT³</td>
<td>Media authority</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In describing ownership structure, the adjective ‘public’ will be taken to refer to public broadcasters in general, i.e. whether or not they are directly financed or controlled by the government or state. For example, some of the public media organisations listed here have editorial independence and their own means of funding or engage in commercial activities while others do not.

A majority of 18 (81.8%) are public state-owned media, 4 are private enterprises. Moreover, they are predominantly made up of radio (7 respondents, or 31.8%), radio/TV (5, or 22.7%) and TV (4, or 18.2%). As Table 1 shows, the AIBD members participating in the survey also include one training organisation and one media authority.

Table 2: Local versus syndicated content by percentage, media organisation and decision-maker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL CONTENT (%)</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DECISION-MAKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>Bangladesh Betar (BB)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean Broadcasting System (KBS)</td>
<td>Broadcast law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan Broadcasting Corporation (PBC)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippine Broadcasting Service (PBS)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Broadcast Institute of TVRI¹</td>
<td>Regulators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Service Media (PSM)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rádio Moçambique</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio National of Cambodia (RNK)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Republik Indonesia</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Televisyen Malaysia (RTM)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka Rupavahini Corporation (SLRC)</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Capital Maharaja Organisation Limited</td>
<td>Media organisation itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Media organisation
² State Administration of Press, Publication, Radio, Film and Television of the People’s Republic of China
³ Deutsche Welle
⁴ Televisi Republik Indonesia
⁵ Media Prima is a publicly traded government-linked company.
The sample of AIBD respondents is predominantly broadcasting organisations that allocate 60% or more of their programming to local content. For over half of them (54.5%), the range is 80–100%, compared with less than one third (27.3%) with 60–79%.

These sample characteristics give us a rough idea of the opportunities, expectations and constraints within which the various radio and television broadcasting organisations can strategise their development programming. The overall picture seems to be that the media organisations themselves determine the proportion, and thus, can play a significant role in promoting pluralism, stimulating creativity and protecting local production (UNESCO, 2006).

4.2 | How do we define and understand “development”?

The term “development” broadly refers to a project of transformation, a plan for making the world free of poverty, hunger, disease and want while also promoting peace, prosperity, human dignity and equal opportunities (UN, 2015). Among institutional agents, definitions of “development” and related key concepts are not always made so explicit, however. Definitions in the social sciences are also “essentially contested” (Collier et al., 2006, p. 211). Mosse (2011), among others, observes that at the World Bank, “[t]he framing goals, the definition and the measurement of development success all derive from economics frameworks” (p. 84). However, different conceptualisations based on, for example, ethnographies of other social actors – including those affected – may help shape more effective development practices.

Among AIBD members, only few do not work with a definition of development (goals/issues) or replied that they have no idea whether they do. The vast majority – 18 out of 22 (or 81.8%) – sets out from a conceptualisation of development. Six of those also included their definitions in the questionnaire. Following Manyozo (2016), most of them combine livelihood issues (“improved nutrition”, “sustainable agriculture” or “climate change”) with social change (“social justice” or “equal opportunities”). Two respondents mention how sustainable development goals have a basis in the religious beliefs in their countries. Analysis shows that AIBD members largely focus on the meaning of
development within their own countries while some also narrow the concept down to local priorities such as eradicating poverty or promoting reconciliation.

Most of these broadcasting media – including the training institution DW Akademie – communicate their “development” definition explicitly within their organisation (13 out of 18, or 72.2%), through various media and informative meetings, especially – in the case of one respondent – with “editors, journalists, reporters and presenters”. One AIBD member stated that their interpretation of development is also communicated indirectly through their programmes (e.g. sustainable farming).

Regardless of their responses to the above, all 22 media organisations were asked to share their understanding of what is meant by development, allowing us to identify the boundaries of the category as well as to determine salient themes.

Table 3: Development issues (in descending order of frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development issues</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Climate change</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Economic growth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poverty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social development</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Empowerment of all women and girls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gender equality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Justice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peace</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Well-being</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Innovation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Natural and man-made disasters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Physical health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Vulnerable groups (children, the disabled, the elderly)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Human dignity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Hunger</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Technological development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Access to water and sanitation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Inclusive societies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Industrialisation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sustainable agriculture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sustainable management of terrestrial ecosystems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Global solidarity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Improved nutrition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mental health</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Resilient and safe cities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Spiritual development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Terrorism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Full employment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Life-long learning</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Reduced inequality within and among countries</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sustainable management of oceans, seas and marine resources</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Decent work</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sustainable consumption</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sustainable production</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 N stands for the number of respondents per response category.
2 % stands for the percentage this number represents out of the total number of respondents.

Note that the selection of development issues that featured in the survey questionnaire is based on the recurrent themes and key concepts in Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015).

All 38 issues that were listed in the questionnaire received a mention – or tick – from over 50% of the total number of respondents. For 18 of them (or nearly half of the issues), over 70% of the respondents agreed that they are an aspect of development. Education tops the list, followed by – in alphabetical order – climate change, economic growth, infrastructure, poverty and social development. Note that two respondents mentioned “other” issues (e.g. talent development) but these could be subsumed under the existing categories (e.g. education).

The percentages show that AIBD members take an inclusive and comprehensive approach to development, an approach that is in keeping with the broad definition given by the UN. Sustainable development consists in five Ps: the 2030 agenda is “a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity” while also promoting universal peace and global partnership (UN, 2015, p. 3). Judging from the highest-ranking issues in Table 3, the AIBD respondents attach equal weight to all “three pillars of sustainable development” distinguished by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): society (education, social development, well-being, empowerment of all women and girls, gender equality, peace and justice), the economy (poverty, economic growth and infrastructure) and the environment (climate change) (Strange & Bayley, 2008, p. 27).

Without exception, all 22 media organisations also agree that these and other development issues are “integrated and indivisible” (UN, 2015, p. 3), with 17 expressing strong and 5 mild agreement. In all likelihood, this means that AIBD members are aware of the complexity of reporting and communicating development issues within the context of broadcast media. As Strange and Bayley (2017, pp. 27–30) argue, recognising the interdependence of people, economic systems and habitats is essential in framing the concept of sustainable development and understanding its mobilising force as both process and end goal. See also the OECD’s Better Policies for 2013, a recent action plan for helping the UN achieve its SDGs (OECD, 2016).
4.3 | What are our views about media and development?

We distinguish between AIBD members’ views about (1) the role of the media industry in their country in communicating for development and (2) how their own media organisation fits into that bigger picture.

4.3.1 | Media industry

Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with four statements about the role of media in their respective countries, using five-point Likert scales anchored at 1 ("strongly agree") and 5 ("strongly disagree"). The results have been summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: Views about media and development in general by ownership structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The media have an important role to play in reporting development issues.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media have an important role to play in promoting development.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media have an important role to play in challenging existing views.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media’s role (in reporting, promoting and challenging) is a collective responsibility.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Two cases missing
2 Lower-case n stands for the number of respondents within a subset of the sample.
3 M stands for the mean score, that is, the total of all the scores divided by the number of respondents involved.
4 SD stands for the standard deviation, a measure of the spread of scores around the mean; if it is low (e.g. SD = .34), then we can conclude that most respondents gave scores close to the mean.

Both privately and publicly owned broadcasters strongly agree with the “news and information function” of media in covering development, i.e. the “surveillance” of what is happening in the world and reporting information and news (Laswell, 1948).

For the other three statements, both types of media give slightly different responses. The private media organisations agree more strongly than the public ones that their country’s media are social actors in their own right and promote development issues; this refers to the so-called “mobilizing function” of the media (McQuail, 1978). The media are “a major agent of socialization that shapes the way we see ourselves and the world around us” (Ritzer & Ryan, 2011, p. 375). By contrast, it is the public media organisations that are somewhat more convinced that the media industry as a whole should also function “as a watchdog, promoting government transparency and public scrutiny of those in power” (Norris, 2010, p. 33).

The public broadcasters also agree somewhat more strongly that performing the various functions is a shared responsibility; their view is that communication for development should be the responsibility of all media. The main reason they give is that the sum total of
media effects in society exceeds the impact of individual media organisations. At the same time, AIBD respondents realise that state-owned media are “most devoted to development” and will thus – by default – play a “major role”. Even so, a positive contribution at the macro-level can only be expected if there is “a collective direction towards development”.

The study also sought AIBD members’ opinions about the overall quality of development-related programming in their respective countries and whether the amount was sufficient. As Table 5 shows, for the majority of respondents, development-programming quality is “acceptable” to “good” (17, or 77.3%).

Table 5: Quality of media content in your country that is devoted to development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) N stands for the number of respondents per response category.

Their evaluation is based on the following factors:

- Professionalism and enthusiasm (in spite of the many challenges)
- Dedicated channels and “focused activities” (e.g. health)
- Availability of a range of formats (e.g. “from a fund-raising program for the poor to international aid promotion programs”)
- Reliable content (“real facts and figures”)
- Good scheduling decisions (e.g. development programmes as a “priority” rather than a “filler”)

Some respondents added suggestions for quality improvement. Development programmes should be made more interactive, more concise and more attuned to “local perspectives and flavours”. The implication seems to be that much current programming is one-way only, lengthy and not always relevant to local audiences. There is also a need for more resources, more effective strategies and more staff training and professional development.

Judging from Table 6, there is more variation in the way AIBD members assess the quantity of their country’s development programming.
Table 6: Amount of media content in your country that is devoted to development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ N stands for the number of respondents per response category.

Though there is generally mild to strong satisfaction with the current situation (59.1%), a significant number of respondents find the total amount devoted to development either insufficient or not quite sufficient yet (31.8%).

The above frequency distribution also indicates that different AIBD members may have different views about the ideal programming volume to be allocated to development issues. In fact, the majority (36.4%) thinks that it should be between 60 to 79%, compared with 40.8% who think it should be less; only 13.6% feel it should be 80% or more (tabulated data not shown). Note that a one-way ANOVA test showed that both assessments vary independently of one another (no statistical significance at p < .05: F(4,15) = .22, p = .923).

Turning to the open-ended questions, some AIBD members cite the complex nature and all-pervasiveness of development as a justification for a higher percentage. One respondent refers to sustainable development as “transversal” in that it intersects many of our daily social practices, and hence, is somehow always in the foreground. In the different countries that make up AIBD’s membership, the total amount of development programming is affected by budgetary constraints, competitive pressures and profit-making tendencies, with the highest proportion of broadcasting time devoted to entertainment, however, and – in the words of one respondent – “road accidents, robberies”.

4.3.2 | Media organisation

Commitment

Arguably, regardless of any regulatory frameworks, it is an organisation’s overall commitment to promoting sustainable development that informs their views and actual programming decisions. As shown in Table 7, AIBD members agree mildly to strongly that such a commitment exists within their media organisation. Though agreement ratings remain high (with mean scores between 1 and 2), the next three statements – similar to those in Table 4 – point up potential different orientations between private and public media.
Table 7: Level and type of commitment in covering development issues by ownership structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUBLIC 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n²</td>
<td>M³</td>
<td>SD³</td>
<td>n²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, our media organisation is committed to actively promoting global sustainable development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting development issues is relevant activity of our media organisation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting development is a relevant activity of our media organisation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging existing views on development is a relevant activity for our media</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Two cases missing
2 Lower-case n stands for the number of respondents within a subset of the sample.
3 M stands for the mean score, that is, the total of all the scores divided by the number of respondents involved.
4 SD stands for the standard deviation, a measure of the spread of scores around the mean; if it is high (e.g. SD = 1.63), then we can conclude that most respondents gave widely different scores.

A first observation is that private and public media do not attach the same relevance to the three media functions: for the public organisations, the promoting and challenging roles are slightly more important than the reporting one. Secondly, among the public-sector AIBD media, there is stronger agreement throughout, especially regarding the relevance of actively promoting development issues and challenging mainstream views and practices. It is interesting that of the three media functions, the critical one has the highest variability in ratings ($SD_{public} = 1.08$ and $SD_{private} = 1.15$), even higher than those found for respondents’ expectations towards the media industry as a whole (see Table 4).

The high dispersion also means that the media companies in our sample are divided as regards the role of critical programming. While some see it as one of their main tasks “to provide an intellectual antidote to mainstream and classical theories and approaches” (Maynozo & Mansell, 2017), others do not. As is well known, commercial television and radio are concerned about “content that [negatively] affects consumption of advertised products” (Germano, 2009, p. 3). There is some evidence that oversimplified – “dumbed down” – media content “appears to improve the effectiveness of advertising on the reception and eventual consumption of advertised products” (Germano, 2009, p. 6). Given AIBD members’ commitment to development and their awareness of its multi-dimensional and complex reality (see 4.2), a critical stance to development communication is likely to require analytic and investigative programmes, which make greater cognitive demands on audiences.

**Content**

A distinction has to be made between organisations that have a measurement system in place to identify, quantify and categorise programming content and those that do not. Discarding the two “no idea” responses, the AIBD sample is divided equally, with 10 members for each.
Note that determining the type, nature and potential bias of media content is not straightforward, with producers, audiences and “a posteriori” media researchers interpreting the same media message differently (on the limits of quantitative media content analysis, see, among others, Gunter, 2000, pp. 81–82). Moreover, development topics, issues and goals can be addressed separately (e.g. as a news item or documentary) but also integrated into other broad thematic categories (e.g. reality TV or drama).

As for the subsample of 10 respondents that measure media content systematically, half of them devote 60–79% of their programming to development, with 3 more than 79% and 2 less than 60% (tabulated data not shown). These figures have to be understood in light of their mission and vision as public media organisations: development is a “top issue”, development is essential to “serving the people”. Note that television or radio content is not the only measure of an organisation’s commitment to development. One private-sector respondent observes that it is involved in “public engagement” by means of themed “road tours” and organising “volunteer squads” to be deployed in disaster-stricken areas.

For all of the AIBD respondents, the programming decisions are theirs to make (within certain regulatory boundaries), which may explain why the majority strongly or mildly agrees that the amount of development content is sufficient (80%). The development content that they provide can be broken down in terms of the three media functions of reporting, promoting (agenda-setting) and challenging – see also Table 4.

Table 8: Amount of development content by media function (percentage of coverage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>REPORTING</th>
<th>PROMOTING</th>
<th>CHALLENGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80–100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generalising over the results shown in Table 8, news and information make up 60–79% of development content for 6 out of 10 AIBD members, followed by promoting development (5 out of 10) and challenging existing views (3 out of 10). These percentages are consistent with members’ views about the role of the media industry as a whole (see 4.3.1). The dynamic complexity of the five development Ps is such that – at least in terms of amount of news media content – objective, impartial and fair reporting take preference over other forms of journalism. On the other hand, the differences are small, and the analysis suggests that most respondents adopt a balanced and discerning approach.

Qualitative analysis of the open-ended questions suggests, however, that development broadcasting is predominantly a matter of “news and information”. For all AIBD members, reporting events and providing information comes first (“reliable information rather than sensationalism”) and takes place in news programmes and for one respondent, also in dedicated channels. One AIBD member emphasises that development news also includes “good news” (e.g. successful initiatives and effective policies). One of the private-sector respondents feels that social media should play a bigger role in the dissemination of news.
Magazine-type programmes and television or radio documentaries are more suitable for promoting social transformation and sustainable development. One AIBD state broadcaster points out that reporting and promoting is part of their mission statement, namely to “inform, educate and entertain”, unlike adopting a critical stance and challenge existing views and policies. Only three respondents mention this function explicitly, giving current affairs programmes, talk shows or interviews as examples. One AIBD member observes that “we need more skillsets to do more in this area”. On the other hand, as one respondent puts it, media messages can be direct or indirect (“subtle”), with the latter approach also suitable for entertainment programmes.

Resources

Views, intentions and actual practices are not just a matter of commitment; they are also partially determined by the availability of resources. Only 7 out of the total of 22 respondents (31.8%) report that their media organisation has a systematic way of measuring the amount of resources (e.g. financial, material or human) committed to covering development (tabulated data not shown).

Out of those 7 who have access to reliable figures, 3 say that they commit 80–100% of their resources to programmes about development while 4 commit 60–79% (tabulated data not shown). As with broadcasting time and content, the decision-making power lies with the media organisations themselves rather than their regulators. This autonomy may explain why there is mild to strong agreement that the total amount of resources is sufficient (5 respondents), with only one who neither agrees or disagrees and one who disagrees mildly.

However, the open-ended questionnaire items paint a somewhat different picture, with a large majority of respondents referring to a lack of resources (“insufficient budget”, “limited resources”, “budget problems”) while at the same time expressing the need for “more and more sustainable resources”. Two respondents highlight, however, that the lack of resources does not stop them from doing the best they can.

4.4 | What is our development programming like?

Analysis and discussion will be based on the 19 organisations that completed this section of the questionnaire – 4 commercial and 15 state-owned media.

Topics

As can be seen in Table 9, public broadcasters prioritise development topics such as economic growth and climate change (mentioned by 100% of all respondents), followed by physical health, education, infrastructure, peace, justice and social development (mentioned by 92.9%). The 3 private enterprises share most of these interests but also pay attention to poverty, access to water and sanitation, sustainable agriculture, gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls (100%).
Table 9: Coverage of development topics (by percentage of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80–100</td>
<td>Economic growth, infrastructure, industrialisation</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate change, access to water and sanitation</td>
<td>Climate change, access to water and sanitation, sustainable agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical health, education, social development</td>
<td>Education, social development, empowerment of all women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace, justice, gender equality</td>
<td>Justice, gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–79</td>
<td>Poverty, innovation, technological development, full employment, access to energy</td>
<td>Economic growth, infrastructure, industrialisation, technological development, innovation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable agriculture, sustainable production, sustainable consumption, sustainable management of terrestrial ecosystems, natural and man-made disasters</td>
<td>Sustainable production, natural and man-made disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved nutrition, well-being, human dignity, mental health, spiritual development, life-long learning, vulnerable groups (children, the disabled, the elderly), empowerment of all women and girls</td>
<td>Physical health, mental health, hunger, improved nutrition, well-being, vulnerable groups (children, the disabled, the elderly), human dignity, life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced inequality within and among countries, conflict, terrorism</td>
<td>Peace, reduced inequality within and among countries, conflict, terrorism, inclusive societies, resilient and safe cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global solidarity</td>
<td>Global solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59</td>
<td>Sustainable management of oceans, seas and marine resources</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunger, decent work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive societies, resilient and safe cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Full employment, decent work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to energy, sustainable consumption, sustainable management of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainable management of oceans, seas and marine resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–19</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that every single development issue is mentioned by at least 50% of all public-sector respondents (e.g. human dignity, life-long learning or resilient and safe cities). As in Table 3, AIBD members set out from an inclusive and broad conceptualisation of development and development issues and goals in line with the UN’s 2030 agenda. As was also observed in relation to Table 3, the development issues mentioned in the survey
were chosen following the identification of key concepts and salient topics in *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (UN, 2015).

**Audiences**

The range and diversity of development issues is matched by an equally wide and diverse range of target audiences. An overview can be found in Table 10.

Table 10: Audiences targeted by development programmes (by percentage of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥90–100</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>The poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–89</td>
<td>⊘ Young adults, children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ Men, women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ Victims of disasters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–79</td>
<td>⊘ The poor, the unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ Mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ School children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–69</td>
<td>⊘ Major ethnic groups, ethnic minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ The sick, the disabled, the elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊘ Victims of discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤59</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Major ethnic groups, ethnic minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With few exceptions, all viewer, listener and/or online user categories listed in the survey are mentioned by at least 60% of the participating AIBD members. Only “others” and – for the commercial broadcasting companies – also major ethnic groups and ethnic minorities score less. The privately owned media organisations make no mention of victims of disasters or the elderly.

Even though the absolute numbers are too small for meaningful generalisation, we can still ask the question why this should be the case. For the ethnic minorities, victims of disasters and the elderly, there may be a purely economic imperative. However, Bakøy (2006) observes that media may also fail to attract ethnic minority audiences – whether indigenous or immigrant – due to unfair representation or cultural differences in uses and gratifications needs; additionally, some may choose to stay in touch with their countries of origin (by means of, for example, satellite television or the Internet); younger generations especially can be hard to reach due to westernisation and a preference for new media platforms.

Another difference between the public and private media organisations can be found in the highest-ranking audiences. Why the poor should constitute a prime target audience for the commercial channels is not immediately obvious. Maybe this can be partly attributed to a
narrower focus on surveillance rather than other media functions such as social transformation or critical programming.

*Formats and genres*

The respondents were asked about the genres and formats of programmes that they use in covering, integrating or touching upon development issues. As shown in Table 11, radio and new media platforms (e.g. websites and Facebook) are popular among all AIBD members, with percentages ranging from 63.2% of the sample to 78.9%. For the majority, development topics are a regular feature of radio news broadcasts, interviews, documentaries and talk shows.

Table 11: Genres and formats used in covering development topics (in descending order of frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio news item</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio interview</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio documentary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio talk show</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV news item</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio music programmes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio public service announcement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV documentary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV talk show</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio drama</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio weather forecast</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV public service announcement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV weather forecast</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV docudrama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV series</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV sports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV reality show</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV game show</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV sitcom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N stands for the number of respondents per response category.

Interestingly, for many media organisations, also entertainment programmes serve a purpose in the communication of development topics or issues; this is especially the case for radio drama (with 52.6% of the respondents). Lower percentages (10.5–31.6%) can be found for TV series, reality or game shows and sitcoms.
All of these offer creative opportunities for broadcasters to raise, frame or discuss development issues. Entertainment is considered a means to an end, with dedicated programmes designed to engage audiences in the sustainable development agenda. Alternatively, entertainment programmes can form an attractive, low-threshold context for providing knowledge and information about development topics, raising awareness or meeting the practical needs of certain groups in society (e.g. teenage girls, ethnic minorities or those out of work). This would allow media to combine various functions while providing their audiences with “enjoyment, relaxation [...] and escape” (Chandler & Munday, 2011, p. 127).

Among the AIBD members, weather forecasts on radio (52.6%) and television (42.1%) are also relevant to development and are used, among other things, to give practical and up-to-date information (e.g. for the agricultural sector or in case of a disaster).

Original versus repurposed content

“Repurposing” has emerged in the context of cross-media distribution, content creation and media convergence. The idea is that materials produced for one medium (e.g. radio) are used in another medium, for example, one that uses a different digital delivery system (e.g. news website); the changes involved in this practice can be both minimal and significant (e.g. Lotz, 2014, p. 138; Pavlik, 2008, Ch. 5).

As Table 8 shows, different AIBD organisations use different amounts of new versus repurposed content. This is especially the case among respondents in the public media sector, suggesting variability in awareness, availability and/or acceptance. By contrast, private media companies tend to have much smaller amounts of repurposed content, with up to roughly 40% of their programming being tailor-made from scratch.

Table 12: Amount of repurposed development content by ownership structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80–100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1One case missing from the 19 who completed this section of the questionnaire

Following Pavlik (2008), both original and repurposed content can (1) utilise “a traditional media design or model” or (2) capitalise on “a design unique to a digital media or online environment” (p. 104). Examples of such platform-specific features are interactivity (with user-generated content), multimedia and non-linearity of presentation as well as the opportunities provided by small-screen devices or even three-dimensional home printers (Pavlik, 2008, p. 103).
Quality

A substantial majority of 14 out of 18 AIBD respondents rate the quality of their organisation’s development content “good” to “very good” (a combined percentage of 77.8%).

Table 13: Quality of media content that respondent’s media organisation devotes to development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 N stands for the number of respondents per response category.
2 One case missing from the 19 who completed this section of the questionnaire

When compared with Table 5, the AIBD respondents are more satisfied with the quality of their own media content than with that produced by their country’s media industry as a whole. The following considerations seem to be relevant. Good programming requires a great concept (e.g. “innovative”) and well-researched content (“all the facts and figures” as one respondent put it), targeted at a specific audience (rather than the general public) and of high production value (one respondent emphasised the role of the producer). Material resources (e.g. “modern media systems”) and human resources (e.g. “dedicated personnel” or “professional team”) are indispensable. Finally, one respondent also refers to the availability of broadcasting time slots while one of the public media organisations highlights the quality gains that can be achieved – in both content and format – from collaborating closely with the government. Among a small number of AIBD members (5 respondents), there is concern over “limited resources”, “out-dated equipment” and lack of staff training (“we need more skills”). Though most express satisfaction with the overall quality of their media content (see Table 13), some observe that there is “always space for improvement” and that “we need to work harder”.

Those who rated their media content as “good”, “very good” or “acceptable” (n = 17) were subsequently asked to identify the factors contributing to the programming quality, at least where their coverage of development topics is concerned.
Table 14: Factors contributing to the quality of media content devoted to development (in descending order of frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity of the key creative team²</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and know-how of the key creative team²</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local content for local audiences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media organisation’s mission and vision</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training and development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and know-how of the production department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity of the production department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest among regular audiences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity and professionalism of anchors, reporters, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market segmentation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ N stands for the number of respondents per response category.
² Producer, director and screenwriter

Creativity is at the top of the list, with mentions by nearly 90% of the subsample. The skills and know-how of the key creative team is mentioned by 82.4% while 76.5% also attribute quality to the creativity, skills and know-how of the production team. When taken together, these four factors alone account for 31.2% of the total number of responses (i.e. 173, the sum of the “n” column); this highlights the importance that the AIBD community attaches to concept and execution at both programme level and below.

There is also strong agreement among the AIBD members that quality is determined by programming, maximising local relevance (“local content for local audiences”) and working within the organisation’s mission and vision statement. As Perebinossoff et al. (2012) argue, creatives, producers and programmers should also be able to navigate various “important influences” such as “advertisers, pressure groups, government agencies, in-house departments, and professional critics” (p. xviii).

Not surprisingly perhaps, a large majority of respondents associate quality of media content and programming with staff training and development (76.5%). It is encouraging that against a background of smaller budgets, digital disruption (e.g. micro-targeted media), new patterns of consumption and “long tail” competition (e.g. Küng, 2016), financial resources are not seen as the main driver of good development programming or high production value; with mentions by 58.8% of the respondents, “money” is towards the bottom of the list, alongside reliance on popular – and hence, more highly-paid – anchors, reporters and other media professionals. Finally, with only 41.2%, only few AIBD respondents regard market segmentation as a significant contributing factor.
Public and private media organisations do not differ much in their selection and ranking of quality-enhancing factors (tabulated data not shown). They equally value, for example, the role played by the creative team, the mission and vision, management support and strategic planning. Factors that are more commonly mentioned among the private media organisations and/or get a higher rating are the creativity, skills and know-how of the production team and staff training and development (100% versus 71.4%). As for public or state-owned media, the responses suggest a greater role attached to financial resources (78.6% versus 33.3%) and interest among regular audiences (64.3% versus 33.3%). Because the sample sizes are small and unequal, these observations can only be tentative, and further research needs to be done.

Success

The existence and strength of media effects has been the subject of much academic literature and social commentary. Despite criticism and uncertainty over how to interpret evidence, Perse and Lambe (2016, Ch. 1) argue that studying media effects has practical benefits and may help inform programming decisions. In the context of sustainable development and social transformation, broadcasters and other media practitioners need to understand how they can increase the likelihood of prosocial media effects.

Media effects form a multi-dimensional construct that has been conceptualised and measured in a variety of ways. Judging by the answers given by the AIBD respondents, the dominant model is the “conditional model”, which is “audience-centered” and holds that “media effects are conditional on the audience” rather than the media content itself (Perse & Lambe, 2016, p. 43). Of the 18 media organisations that answered the question, just over half conduct some form of audience research (e.g. using surveys, focus group discussions or web analytics) and capture a programme’s success in terms of an appreciation or public service index (7 respondents). Few of them, however, involve third parties. Others rely on the feedback and comments that viewers or listeners share over the phone, on social networking services (e.g. Facebook and Twitter) and online discussion forums as well as talk shows or interviews (6 respondents). Still others do not have “a concrete approach” yet (5 respondents). We can conclude that there are three different groups: those with a formal measurement system (38.9%), a more informal one (33.3%) or no systematic approach yet (27.8%).

Regardless of the measurement system used, respondents report the following success ratings for the main media functions identified earlier. Note that the five-point Likert scales range from 1 (“very successful”) to 5 (“unsuccessful”).
Table 15: Success of respondent’s media organisation in communicating for development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n^1</td>
<td>M^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide coverage of development^4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine the public agenda on development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help bring about policy change in development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^3 Lower-case n stands for the number of respondents within a subset of the sample.

^2 M stands for the mean score, that is, the total of all the scores divided by the number of respondents involved.

^3 SD stands for the standard deviation, a measure of the spread of scores around the mean.

^4 In order to raise awareness, promote the realisation of sustainable development goals or change people’s views of development.

Table 15 shows that the private media rate themselves as “good” to “very successful” in the performance of their surveillance, mobilisation and agenda-setting functions. By contrast the ratings given by the public broadcasters range from “fair” to “good”. Their self-reported evaluations are slightly less positive than those of the private organisations except for their role in bringing about policy change in development ($M_{public} = 2.07$ compared with $M_{private} = 2.33$). Standard deviations for the public media organisations are low, suggesting that respondents are in close agreement about how successful they are. The lower scores for public media may have to be attributed to their higher expectations regarding communication for development.

For both groups, the following elements seem to play a crucial part in accounting for their success or lack of it.

- Quality of development programmes (relevant, current, reliable, interesting)
- Use of local languages to communicate with various ethnic groups
- Reputation of the media organisation
- Alignment of sustainable development issues with social benefits
- Existence of dedicated channels with in-house expertise (e.g. health) that are also relevant to sustainable development topics
- Size of coverage area, broadcast range and population reach
- Degree of collaboration with – and access to – relevant government authorities and agencies

The last two success factors were only mentioned by national state-owned media. Some of the AIBD members commented that their performance was “limited only by our funding” and that assessments such as “fair” or “poor” were partly due to “the budget limitation”. There is also awareness that effects on, for example, policy change are sometimes indirect only.
4.5 | Where are we headed?

Commitment

This section is about the future allocation of resources and programming to communicating development issues. Taken together, both can be considered a proxy indicator of our respondents’ commitment. Are AIBD’s member organisations likely to devote more resources and provide more content in respectively the next five and three years? Five-point Likert scales were used with anchors at 1 (“very likely”) and 5 (“very unlikely”).

The summary table below shows that AIBD respondents remain firmly committed to covering and promoting sustainable development, with composite scores close to “likely” ($M_{public} = 1.86$ and $M_{private} = 1.75$). This compares favourably with their current level of commitment as reported in Table 7.

Table 16: The likely future role for media organisations in relation to development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n^1$</td>
<td>$M^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite means$^4$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources 2017–2022</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More content 2017–2020</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other organisations$^5$ 2017–2022</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the UN’s SDG agenda$^6$ 2017–2022</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Lower-case $n$ stands for the number of respondents within a subset of the sample.

$^2$ $M$ stands for the mean score, that is, the total of all the scores divided by the number of respondents involved.

$^3$ $SD$ stands for the standard deviation, a measure of the spread of scores around the mean.

$^4$ The composite means can be regarded as an indication of the respondents’ future commitment.

$^5$ In development programming

$^6$ Success in helping the UN realise its sustainable development goals (SDGs)

There is strong agreement among all respondents that within their own organisation, more resources (financial, material or human) and more content will “likely” be made available in the near future. In a separate follow-up question, respondents were asked for an estimate: 10 put it at “within the next year”, 6 “within the next three years”, 2 “within the next two years” and 1 “within many years to come”.

Going back to Table 16, there is somewhat less agreement among AIBD members that the media in general will have a positive effect on the development agenda in future. Still, a majority thinks that their combined effort will be “likely” to make some contribution. In trying to improve the impact of development-related programming, collaboration with other media organisations does not seem to be a strategic option or priority, with some respondents saying that it is “neither likely or unlikely”.
Support

To continue or increase the current level of development programming, AIBD members would benefit – in roughly equal measure – from government policy support, external financing and external expertise in development programming.

Table 17: External support required by respondent’s media organisation (in descending frequency of mentions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government policy support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External financial resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External expertise in development programming</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The number of times one of response options received a mention

Since respondents were allowed to choose – or tick – more than one response option, the total frequency of 36 indicates that most of the 22 participating AIBD members mentioned two or more options: the average number of mentions per respondent (36 divided by 22, or 1.6) is close to two. It is clear that according to the respondents, external support will have to address more than one concern.

Except for dedicated expertise, the public and private media organisations in our sample differ significantly: among public AIBD members, future programming and broadcasting activities will require supportive government policies while the private members seem to expect more from external financial resources (tabulated data not shown). Successful development programming does not take place in a vacuum and requires access to – or investment in – capital equipment and human resources as well as a conducive legal environment.

Quality

The quality of future development programming depends first and foremost on the availability of financial resources: 88.2% of all AIBD members identified this as a contributing factor. This is followed by creativity of the key creative team, staff training and development, and management support (82.4% of the sample each). Note that three of the highest-ranking factors differ from those that were said to determine the quality of respondents’ current development programming. Despite the realisation that big budgets do not necessarily lead to more quality in the present (with only 58.8% – see Table 14), AIBD members seem to imply that to guarantee quality in the future, adequate funding does make a difference. And the same holds for active support from management as well as training and developing staff.

Table 18: Factors contributing to the future quality of media content devoted to development (in descending order of frequency)
Comparison of Tables 14 and 18 also suggests that future quality improvements will have to be part of top-down strategic planning (70.6% of all respondents versus 82.4%) rather than a concern at the level of content creation or programming (82.4% of all respondents versus 70.6%). As in Table 14, few AIBD media organisations are convinced that future programming quality will depend on popular and professional anchors, reporters or other well-known media figures (58.8%) or market segmentation (41.2%).

These percentages suggest that traditional concepts like market segmentation may have lost some of their relevance in view of digital media, the “long tail” demand curve and a balance of power that has shifted dramatically in favour of consumers and social networking services (e.g. Facebook). Lister et al. (2012), among others, observes that “[c]onsumers and users are increasingly able to customise their own media use to design individualised menus that serve their particular and specific needs” (p. 33). High levels of audience differentiation and discrimination may also make it increasingly difficult to identify suitable “popular” anchors or reporters.

Finally, the survey brings out that public and private respondents express roughly similar views about the future quality of development programming (tabulated data not shown). As for the differences, two observations can be made. First, among the public media organisations, the mission and vision gets the lowest ranking (with 56.3% of all respondents) while for the commercial media organisations it comes at the top of the list (75%) – two extreme positions, which explains the resulting rank order in Table 18. Secondly, local content for local audiences is considered an influential quality-enhancing factor by a larger number of public media (75%) than private media (25%). As we pointed out above, these conclusions are necessarily tentative due to the sample sizes.
5 | Summary

The survey study was guided by two research questions: (1) What do AIBD members think about the role of the media and their own media organisation in relation to communication for development? (2) What do AIBD members do in their coverage of development issues and goals? Rather than separate opinions and behaviour in this summary, the main findings have been grouped together in order of their discussion in the previous section.

AIBD members take an inclusive and comprehensive approach to development, an approach that is in keeping with the broad definition given by the UN. For most of them, the highest-ranking development concerns are education, poverty, economic growth, infrastructure, climate change and social development. They are in agreement that these and related development issues are “integrated and indivisible” (UN, 2015, p. 3).

The definitions that the AIBD members use in their own organisations are usually left implicit, and where they are not, somewhat more limited in scope and with a stronger focus on local – rather than regional or global – development issues.

Their main function as media is to provide news and information, to mobilise, and to a lesser extent, challenge existing views and development practices. The public broadcasters also agree that performing these various media functions is a shared responsibility.

Most respondents are satisfied with both the amount and quality of development programmes in their respective countries. However, they also acknowledge that there is room for growth and improvement and that this will require additional resources, including the facilities and means to train and develop staff. Many report a lack of resources as a hindrance to further quality improvements.

Most respondents are highly committed to their role and responsibility in communicating for development and have the autonomy to decide content, genres and formats. Development topics that frequently show up in television and radio programmes are economic growth, climate change, physical health, education, infrastructure, peace, justice and social development. All AIBD members define their audiences in the broadest possible terms and offer a wide range of programme types, genres and formats to cater to their needs, expectations and preferences. Communication for development does not only consist in news, information and education but also entertainment.

The quality of the media content provided is rated “good” to “very good”, thanks to the key creative team (producer, director and screenwriter), programming, local content for local audiences and the media organisation’s mission and vision. There is also agreement that their development programmes have an impact, especially in covering news events, providing up-to-date information and setting the agenda.

According to the AIBD respondents, the near future will see an increase in resources and content, a sign of their continued commitment to communication for development. However, these ambitions will require supportive and consistent government policies,
external financial resources – especially a concern among the private media organisations – and staff training and development, also with a view to improving the overall quality.

Though some of the survey findings were reported separately for public and private media organisations, the overall conclusion must be that both are in fact very similar, and share the same concerns for our planet’s sustainable development and for a peaceful, prosperous and healthy future in which all people can live and work together in global solidarity.

6 | Recommendations

For the AIBD respondents, development includes multiple topics, multiple audiences, multiple genres/formats and multiple platforms (television, radio, websites and social media). From a programming and production point of view, this inclusiveness may be challenging. Some respondents are in favour of more dedicated and focussed programming. Perhaps AIBD could bring together members’ experiences and expertise and try to distil “best practices” that strike an optimal balance between breadth and depth.

A second area where AIBD could be of assistance is the measurement of inputs (e.g. resources) and outputs (e.g. success). The answers to this open-ended question show that formal and informal systems co-exist among AIBD’s members. It would be interesting to find out in more detail what their practices consist in, what the alternatives are and how to assess them in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

Finally, both the quantitative and qualitative parts of the survey provide evidence of the critical importance of human, material and financial resources. One respondent sums it up poignantly: “We are constantly challenged to provide quality information despite not having as much resources as other media, but still do well”, followed by “If we had more, we could do more”. These and similar quotes speak of the enthusiasm, optimism and resilience among AIBD member organisations but also their frustration and – across the Asia-Pacific broadcasting industry – the existence of pent-up investment demand.

Though respondents do not attribute quality or success to just resources, they feel strongly about future resource requirements and the need for adequate financial support. Ironically, to safeguard the future of mass media communication for global sustainable development, AIBD will have to help its members improve their own sustainability through, among other things, innovative models of income generation and resource management.
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AIBD Annual Media Research (AAMR) 2017

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is divided into six sections:

SECTION 1
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION

SECTION 2
DEFINING AND UNDERSTANDING ‘DEVELOPMENT’

SECTION 3
VIEWS ABOUT MEDIA AND DEVELOPMENT IN GENERAL

SECTION 4
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION’S ROLE IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT | GENERAL

SECTION 5
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION’S ROLE IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT | PROGRAMMES

SECTION 6
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION’S ROLE IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT | THE FUTURE
SECTION 1
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION

1.1. What is the name of your media organisation?


1.2 In which country is your media organisation based?


1.3. What is the ownership structure of your media organisation? Please tick the appropriate box.

- □ Private
- □ Government/public
- □ Private-public partnership
- □ Other

1.4. What is the percentage your media organisation devotes to local content (as opposed to syndicated content)?

- □ 80–100%
- □ 60–79%
- □ 40–59%
- □ 20–39%
- □ 0–19%

1.5. Who decides what percentage of total content is local (as opposed to syndicated)?

- □ Our media organisation itself
- □ Our regulators (for example, as part of the licensing conditions)
- □ Other [please describe]
SECTION 2
DEFINING AND UNDERSTANDING ‘DEVELOPMENT’

In this survey, the term "development" broadly refers to a project of transformation, a plan for making the world free of poverty, hunger, disease and want while also promoting peace, prosperity, human dignity and equal opportunities.


Part of this project consists in identifying issues or themes and formulating sustainable goals. A good example of development is agriculture, where sustainable farming, livelihood, education and other issues are all interconnected.

2.1 Does your media organisation work with a definition of development and/or development goals and issues? Please tick the appropriate box.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ No idea

If “No” or “No idea”, proceed to 2.6.
If “Yes”, proceed to 2.2.

2.2. Is that definition explicitly stated in your media organisation’s governance? Please tick the appropriate box.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ No idea

If “No” or “No idea”, proceed to 2.6.
If “Yes”, proceed to 2.3.

2.3. What is that definition?

2.4. Is the above definition explicitly communicated within the media organisation? Please tick the appropriate box.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ No idea

If “No” or “No idea”, proceed to 2.6.
If “Yes”, proceed to 2.5.
2.5. How is the definition communicated?

2.6. Which of the following are included in your media organisation's understanding of what is meant by development issues? Please tick the appropriate box or boxes.

1. ☐ Poverty
2. ☐ Hunger
3. ☐ Improved nutrition
4. ☐ Sustainable agriculture
5. ☐ Physical health
6. ☐ Mental health
7. ☐ Well-being
8. ☐ Spiritual development
9. ☐ Education
10. ☐ Life-long learning
11. ☐ Gender equality
12. ☐ Empowerment of all women and girls
13. ☐ Vulnerable groups (children, the disabled, the elderly)
14. ☐ Access to water and sanitation
15. ☐ Access to energy
16. ☐ Economic growth
17. ☐ Full employment
18. ☐ Decent work
19. ☐ Infrastructure
20. ☐ Industrialisation
21. ☐ Innovation
22. ☐ Reduced inequality within and among countries
23. ☐ Resilient and safe cities
24. ☐ Sustainable consumption
25. ☐ Sustainability production
26. ☐ Climate change
27. ☐ Sustainable management of oceans, seas and marine resources
28. ☐ Sustainable management of terrestrial ecosystems
29. ☐ Peace
30. ☐ Justice
31. ☐ Conflict
32. ☐ Terrorism
33. ☐ Human dignity
34. ☐ Social development
35. ☐ Technological development
36. ☐ Natural and man-made disasters (e.g. floods, earthquakes)
For the following three statements, please tick the box that matches your media organisation’s views most closely.

2.7. The various development issues are “integrated and indivisible” (interconnected, interdependent).

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree
SECTION 3
VIEWS ABOUT MEDIA AND DEVELOPMENT IN GENERAL

For the following statements or questions, please tick the box that matches your media organisation’s views most closely.

3.1. The media have an important role to play in reporting development issues.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

3.2. The media have an important role to play in actively promoting development (for example, by actively supporting development goals).

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

3.3. The media have an important role to play in challenging existing views on development.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

3.4. The media’s role in reporting development issues, serving development goals or challenging existing views on development is a collective responsibility.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer.
3.5. Approximately how much of its total content should any media organisation devote to development?
NOTE: This question is about your views on all media organisations in your country. The percentage of total content for your media organisation alone should be reported in Section 4.

☐ 80–100%  ☐ 60–79%  ☐ 40–59%  ☐ 20–39%  ☐ 0–19%

Please explain your answer.

3.6. The total amount of content that the media in your country devote to development is sufficient.

☐ Strongly agree  ☐ Mildly agree  ☐ Neither agree or disagree  ☐ Mildly disagree  ☐ Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer.

3.7. In general, what is the quality of the media content in your country that is devoted to development?

☐ Very good  ☐ Good  ☐ Acceptable  ☐ Poor  ☐ Very poor

Please explain your answer.
SECTION 4
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION’S ROLE IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT | GENERAL

For the following statements or questions, please tick the box that matches your media organisation’s views or contribution most closely.

4.1. In general, our media organisation is committed to actively promoting global sustainable development.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

4.2. Reporting development issues is a relevant activity for our media organisation.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

4.3. Promoting development is a relevant activity for our media organisation.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

4.4. Challenging existing views on development is a relevant activity for our media organisation.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ Mildly agree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Mildly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

4.5. Does your media organisation have a systematic way of measuring the amount of content devoted to development?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ No idea

If “No” or “No idea”, proceed to 4.12.
If “Yes”, proceed to 4.6.
4.6. Approximately how much of its total content does your media organisation devote to development?

☐ 80–100%  ☐ 60–79%  ☐ 40–59%  ☐ 20–39%  ☐ 0–19%

Please explain your answer.

4.7. Who decides what percentage of total content is devoted to development?

☐ Our media organisation itself
☐ Our regulators (for example, through requirements about public service announcements)
☐ Other [please describe]

4.8. Approximately how much of your total content is devoted to reporting development issues?

☐ 80–100%  ☐ 60–79%  ☐ 40–59%  ☐ 20–39%  ☐ 0–19%

Please explain your answer.

4.9. Approximately how much of your total content is devoted to promoting development?

☐ 80–100%  ☐ 60–79%  ☐ 40–59%  ☐ 20–39%  ☐ 0–19%

Please explain your answer.
4.10. Approximately how much of your total content is devoted to challenging existing views on development?

☐ 80–100%  ☐ 60–79%  ☐ 40–59%  ☐ 20–39%  ☐ 0–19%

Please explain your answer.

4.11. The total amount of content that your media organisation devotes to development is sufficient.

☐ Strongly agree  ☐ Mildly agree  ☐ Neither agree or disagree  ☐ Mildly disagree  ☐ Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer.

4.12. Does your media organisation have a systematic way of measuring the amount of resources (e.g. financial, material, human) committed to development?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ No idea

*If “No” or “No idea”, proceed to 5.1.*

*If “Yes”, proceed to 4.13.*

4.13. Approximately how much of its resources (e.g. financial, material, human) does your media organisation commit to programmes about development?

☐ 80–100%  ☐ 60–79%  ☐ 40–59%  ☐ 20–39%  ☐ 0–19%

Please explain your answer.
4.14. Who decides what percentage of total resources (e.g. financial, material, human) is devoted to development?

☐ Our media organisation itself
☐ Our regulators (for example, through requirements about public service announcements)
☐ Other [please describe]

4.15. The total amount of resources (e.g. financial, material, human) that your media organisation commits to programmes about development is sufficient.

☐ Strongly agree  ☐ Mildly agree  ☐ Neither agree or disagree  ☐ Mildly disagree  ☐ Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer.
SECTION 5
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION’S ROLE IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT | PROGRAMMES

For the following statements or questions, please tick the box that matches your media organisation’s views or contribution most closely.

5.1. In its coverage of development issues, what areas or topics does your media organisation pay attention to? Please tick the appropriate box or boxes.

1. ☐ Poverty
2. ☐ Hunger
3. ☐ Improved nutrition
4. ☐ Sustainable agriculture
5. ☐ Physical health
6. ☐ Mental health
7. ☐ Well-being
8. ☐ Spiritual development
9. ☐ Education
10. ☐ Life-long learning
11. ☐ Gender equality
12. ☐ Empowerment of all women and girls
13. ☐ Vulnerable groups (children, the disabled, the elderly)
14. ☐ Access to water and sanitation
15. ☐ Access to energy
16. ☐ Economic growth
17. ☐ Full employment
18. ☐ Decent work
19. ☐ Infrastructure
20. ☐ Industrialisation
21. ☐ Innovation
22. ☐ Reduced inequality within and among countries
23. ☐ Resilient and safe cities
24. ☐ Sustainable consumption
25. ☐ Sustainability production
26. ☐ Climate change
27. ☐ Sustainable management of oceans, seas and marine resources
28. ☐ Sustainable management of terrestrial ecosystems
29. ☐ Peace
30. ☐ Justice
31. ☐ Conflict
32. ☐ Terrorism
33. ☐ Human dignity
34. ☐ Social development
35. ☐ Technological development
36. ☐ Natural and man-made disasters (e.g. floods, earthquakes)
37. ☐ Inclusive societies
38. □ Global solidarity
39. □ Other [please describe]

5.2. In its coverage of development issues, what audiences does your media organisation aim to reach? Please tick the appropriate box or boxes.

1. □ Children
2. □ Young adults
3. □ School children
4. □ Students
5. □ Adults
6. □ Men
7. □ Women
8. □ Mothers
9. □ Major ethnic groups
10. □ Ethnic minorities
11. □ The unemployed
12. □ The poor
13. □ The sick
14. □ The disabled
15. □ The elderly
16. □ Victims of disasters
17. □ Victims of discrimination
18. □ Other [please describe]

5.3. What format/genre of programmes or items about development does your media organisation produce?

1. □ TV news item
2. □ TV series
3. □ TV documentary
4. □ TV talk show
5. □ TV docudrama
6. □ TV game show
7. □ TV reality show
8. □ TV sitcom
9. □ TV weather forecast
10. □ TV sports
5.4. When producing development items/programmes in your media organisation, what is the percentage of repurposed content (as opposed to new content)?

- □ 80–100%
- □ 60–79%
- □ 40–59%
- □ 20–39%
- □ 0–19%

5.5. In general, what is the quality of the content that your media organisation devotes to development?

- □ Very good
- □ Good
- □ Acceptable
- □ Poor
- □ Very poor

Please explain your answer.

If the answer is "Very good" or “Good”, proceed to 5.6.
If the answer is "Poor" or “Very poor”, proceed to 5.7.

5.6. Which of the following factors explain the (very) good quality? Please tick the appropriate box or boxes.

1. □ The media organisation’s mission and vision
2. □ Management support
3. □ Strategic planning
4. □ Financial resources
5. □ Staff training and development
6. ☐ Skills and know-how of the key creative team (producer, director, screenwriter)
7. ☐ Creativity of the key creative team (producer, director, screenwriter)
8. ☐ Skills and know-how of the production department
9. ☐ Creativity of the production department
10. ☐ Popularity and professionalism of anchors, reporters, etc.
11. ☐ Programming
12. ☐ Market segmentation
13. ☐ Interest among regular audiences
14. ☐ Local content for local audiences

5.7. How does your media organisation measure the impact of your coverage, promotion or challenging of development issues?

5.8. In general, how successful is your media organisation in providing coverage of development issues, raising awareness, promoting the realisation of sustainable development goals or changing people’s views of development?

☐ Very successful ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Unsuccessful

Please explain your answer.

5.9. In general, how successful has your media organisation been in determining the public agenda on development?

☐ Very successful ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Unsuccessful

Please explain your answer.
5.10. In general, how successful has your media organisation been in helping bring about policy change in development issues?

- [ ] Very successful
- [ ] Good
- [ ] Fair
- [ ] Poor
- [ ] Unsuccessful

Please explain your answer.
SECTION 6
YOUR MEDIA ORGANISATION’S ROLE IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT | THE FUTURE

For the following statements or questions, please tick the box that matches your media organisation’s views or contribution most closely.

6.1. How likely is it that your media organisation will devote more resources to development programming in the next five years?

☐ Very likely  ☐ Likely  ☐ Neither likely or unlikely  ☐ Unlikely  ☐ Very unlikely

6.2. How likely is it that your media organisation will provide more content about development in the next three years?

☐ Very likely  ☐ Likely  ☐ Neither likely or unlikely  ☐ Unlikely  ☐ Very unlikely

*If the answer is “Very likely” or “Likely”, proceed to 6.3.
*If the answer is “Neither likely or unlikely”, “Unlikely” or “Very unlikely”, proceed to 6.4.*

6.3. What is the timeline within which your media organisation will provide more content about development? Please tick the appropriate box.

☐ Within the next year  
☐ Within the next two years  
☐ Within the next three years

6.4. How likely is it that your media organisation will collaborate with other media organisations in development programming in the next five years?

☐ Very likely  ☐ Likely  ☐ Neither likely or unlikely  ☐ Unlikely  ☐ Very unlikely

6.5. What kind of external support would your media organisation require in order to either continue or increase its current level of development programming? Please tick the appropriate box or boxes.

1. ☐ External expertise in development programming  
2. ☐ External financial resources (e.g. sponsorship)  
3. ☐ Government policy support
6.6. How likely is it that the media will be successful in helping the UN realise its sustainable development goals in the next five years?

☐ Very likely  ☐ Likely  ☐ Neither likely or unlikely  ☐ Unlikely  ☐ Very unlikely

6.7. Which of the following will help your media organisation improve the quality? Please tick the appropriate box or boxes.

1. ☐ The media organisation’s mission and vision
2. ☐ Management support
3. ☐ Strategic planning
4. ☐ Financial resources
5. ☐ Staff training and development
6. ☐ Skills and know-how of the key creative team (producer, director, screenwriter)
7. ☐ Creativity of the key creative team (producer, director, screenwriter)
8. ☐ Skills and know-how of the production department
9. ☐ Creativity of the production department
10. ☐ Popularity and professionalism of anchors, reporters, etc.
11. ☐ Programming
12. ☐ Market segmentation
13. ☐ Interest among regular audiences
14. ☐ Local content for local audiences

Thank you for your time.
A Brighter Tomorrow Begins Today
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The research presented in this report owes everything to the 22 AIBD member organisations who took time off to complete the survey questionnaire.

Questionnaires are a useful instrument in social science, media and communication research but as we all know, motivating people or organisations to participate can be a challenge.

First of all, it is time-consuming, and we realise that the survey we used was long, with no fewer than 51 items divided into 6 sections, a total of 16 pages. Secondly, there is the so-called “response burden”: the effort required to complete the questionnaire form. We can imagine that it may have been necessary to consult various forms of documentation such as governance, policies, annual reports or in-house statistics. The open-ended questions we included made extra demands on respondents’ time as they had to think through the answers, occasionally in dialogue with colleagues or superiors. Finally, studies show that over the past ten to fifteen years, response rates have been decreasing, partly due to “questionnaire fatigue”.

For all these reasons, a very big “thank you” is in place to all respondents. We sincerely appreciate the expertise, experience and energy that they have made so generously available. Additionally, we would like to express our gratitude to those who also helped us improve the pilot version of the questionnaire in the early stages of the research project. Their contribution was invaluable in vetting and streamlining the questionnaire, fine-tuning the wording of individual questions and safeguarding the relevance and logic of the study we conducted.

We can truly say that the research we present in this publication is the result of a collaborative effort, not just AIBD and the research team but also the AIBD member organisations who made it possible. As is common in participatory inquiry and the transformative social science paradigm, we do not carry out research “on” people but “with” people.

We are sure that our survey respondents, the entire AIBD community and our many conference attendees and friends are eager to learn about the findings and we hope that our work lives up to your expectations.

Thank you all once again.

The AIBD Research Team
TVRI Acknowledgement

TVRI SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN INDONESIA

TVRI is designated as a Public Broadcasting Institution in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 32 of 2002 on broadcasting. In article 14 of the Act states that Public Broadcasting Institution in the form of a legal entity established by the state is independent, not commercial and serves to provide services for the benefit of the community. Therefore, as a Public Broadcasting Institution in Indonesia TVRI is independent and not commercially functioning to provide services for the benefit of the community. Implementation of TVRI as a new public TV started in 2006. This means that TVRI’s age as Public TV has only reached 11 years.

Previously TVRI had undergone institutional status as Foundation, Technical Implementation Unit of the Ministry of Information of the Republic of Indonesia, Bureau companies, and Limited Company or Persero. But all of these institutional statuses are not working as expected. Currently TVRI as Public TV, strives to carry out its function as an Independent Institution, by carrying out constructive social controls in every broadcast program, and promoting sustainable development in Indonesia.

The Role of TVRI in Sustainable Development

TVRI has a very important and strategic role in encouraging the achievement of sustainable development goals. The achievement of sustainable development goals is also determined by the role of the media in each country and specifically in Indonesia. The media also has a decisive role in reporting and promoting sustainable development in the world.

The media also needs to build a common concern to realize the achievement of sustainable development goals in various countries. This joint concern needs to be done through the Joint Movement globally by all media in the world pioneered by AIBD. This is to create a Global Movement to accelerate the achievement of sustainable development goals in various countries.

TVRI as a public TV in Indonesia has a strong commitment to promote global issues related to sustainable development. That is why TVRI broadcasts include information broadcast, 66.21%, education 22.02% and entertainment 11.7%.
Response to AAMR

We agree with the results of research on 38 development issues that 70% of AIBD members put development aspects as an important aspect of each program. Where education occupies the highest position followed by poverty reduction, economic growth, infrastructure and climate change and economic imbalances. Education related to human resource development. Indonesia for the past 15 years has adopted a compulsory school policy for all school-aged children from elementary, junior and high school levels. Compulsory school is accompanied by the allocation of education budget 20% of the budget Revenue and state expenditure. However, the national education system has not run well. Therefore, the media has a strategic role in encouraging the achievement of the implementation of the 12 year compulsory education policy in Indonesia. This means that all school-aged children are required to receive education from elementary and junior high school, and high school. Reduction of poverty is a second priority because the goal of development is to reduce poverty.

Poverty reduction is also accomplished with a country’s economic growth rate. Indonesia’s economic growth in the first quarter of 2017 of 5.01% is considered good enough amid the global economic slowdown. But economic growth is not enough to drive the economy as a whole. Indonesia is currently prioritizing on the construction of a periodic international maritime port infrastructure, MRT, LRT and Rapid Express Trains and others, as well as development between regions to address gaps between regions in Indonesia. These development issues are also the main focus of broadcast TVRI content.

TVRI also agrees with AAMR -AIBD research results that although there is generally a strong satisfaction from AIBD members (59.1%), some respondents found that the portion for development issues is inadequate or inadequate (31.8%). This is due to differences in problems, challenges, obstacles and even insufficient budget allocations in each country.

TV programs on sustainable development issues are also affected by budget allocations, especially for Public Broadcasting Institutions. A relatively small budget allocation also affects TVRI as a public TV in Indonesia in contributing to sustainable development. Nevertheless TVRI remains committed to development issues in Indonesia.

Competitive pressure and profit-generating factors, with the highest proportion of broadcasting time devoted to entertainment, are a major challenge for private media.

Jakarta, May 8, 2017

Daniel A.W Pattipawae
Head of TVRI Research and Development Center
The Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development serves to promote, encourage, and support vibrant media environment in the Asia-Pacific region. The AIBD provides a range of training programs & workshops and information necessary for the member countries to update with their domestic policies and management goals.

It is certainly timely and forward-looking for the AIBD to lead such a research initiative as Annual Media Research. It is vital to share information on where we stand, particularly in terms of development issues, in this rapidly evolving broadcasting milieu. Public media organizations are faced with a constant negotiation and challenges to find a balance between commercial viability and public responsibilities.

The outcome of the annual project will tremendously contribute to the creation of strategies for the future in the area of what public broadcasters should do, for instance, to raise awareness on pressing agendas ranging from gender equality and cultural diversity to economic development.

We have found some questionnaires provided as part of Annual Media Research too vague to complete in a simple form. Also, we felt that further explanation is required for the term, development program, to avoid ambiguity. Nevertheless, this trivial comment should not diminish in any way the Herculean efforts made by the AIBD team to collect data and come up with an in-depth analysis. Many congratulations on the highly creative achievement.

Kim Wan-soo  
Deputy Director International Relations  
Korean Broadcasting System
aamr

envisioning tomorrow...