

MEASURING CIVIC JOURNALISM'S PROGRESS:

A Report Across a Decade of Activity

A Study Conducted For:

The Pew Center for Civic Journalism

Conducted By:

Lewis A. Friedland, Professor
School of Journalism & Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Sandy Nichols, Ph.D. Candidate
School of Journalism & Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin-Madison

September 2002

The first stirrings of civic journalism began more than a dozen years ago, in newspapers in Columbus, Georgia and Wichita, Kansas. Since then, the movement has grown and spread throughout the U.S. newspaper world. Scholars and practitioners alike have known that “hundreds of projects” have taken place across the country since then, but, how precisely how many, when, and where has not been known.

To remedy this gap, the Pew Center for Civic Journalism (Center) commissioned the Center for Communication and Democracy at the University of Wisconsin–Madison to study the range and scope of civic journalism experiments undertaken by newsrooms across the country since the early 1990s. Our study attempts to provide a descriptive analysis of the reach of the movement based on the following questions:

- What newsrooms across the country have experimented with civic journalism practices?
- What exactly do editors and journalists in these newsrooms consider to be civic journalism?
- What are the types of community issues being addressed by these practitioners?
- How and to what extent are the tools and techniques of civic journalism being used?
- How did these tools and techniques change over time?
- What has been the effect of these experiments, the depth to which civic roots are established in local communities and any impact on public life that is realized?

To begin to answer these questions, we examined and coded material generated by newsrooms seeking funding from the Center for civic journalism experiments, competing for the Center's Batten Awards for Excellence in Civic Journalism, and/or submitting examples of civic journalism for informal recognition, advice or assistance from the Center. As of the last date of data collection, the Center's archive contained evidence of 651 journalism projects published between the years 1994 and 2002. Of this total, 121 projects were selected by the Center for funding, 466 cases were submitted for the Batten Award competition, and 109

projects were sent to the Center for informal recognition. The majority of our analysis is based on this database. However, for purposes of systematic evaluation of categorical trends of the movement, we used a reduced database containing only those cases published between 1995 and 2000, the first and last years of complete data at the time of our data collection. We rely on the primary dataset for our analysis in this report, unless we note otherwise. The complete data and methods are presented in detail in later in the report. This summary introduction presents and highlights our major findings:

1. Some form of civic journalism was practiced in at least a fifth of all American newspapers, in almost every state and in every region. This figure is the most conservative possible, and we believe the actual number may be closer to double.
2. There is a clear pattern of development in civic journalism content, as journalists learned in what appear to be phases. Civic journalism generally started with elections, moved fairly quickly to coverage of general community issues and problems, and then began to address specific community issues.
3. There is a parallel development of technique. Civic journalism coverage was "invented" through a series of practical experiments in the early 90s. It was extended through the attempt to develop daily and weekly routine from the mid-90s on. And with the advent of the Internet, new interactive approaches to civic news coverage emerged starting in the late 90s.
4. The goals of news organizations show a strong commitment to the traditional public news values of informing the public and, to a lesser extent, the civic and democratic values of problem-solving and increased deliberation.

5. New ways of reporting the news have emerged that help citizens deliberate on important problems, address and solve them, and increase their voices in the community and in the pages of the papers.
6. A substantial minority of papers, about 35%, continued their civic journalism involvements for three or more years, with almost 20% practicing for more than four years.
7. Finally, there is significant (but not conclusive) evidence of impact in communities where civic journalism is practiced. About a third of all cases showed some community/newspaper partnerships. More than half reported evidence of improved public deliberation. Other results included: use of projects by others, improved citizens skills, new civic organizations formed, and increased volunteerism.

Our report is presented here in two parts. The first section presents our executive summary containing a descriptive analysis of the movement and its evolutionary shifts over time. It is followed by an overview section in which we present our methodology and a comprehensive cross-sectional analysis of the data that describes the full scope and range of civic journalism projects contained in the Center's archives.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Basic Numbers

We found a total of 322 media or civic organizations in the sample that took a lead role in the implementation of projects and their submittal to the Center. The vast majority of these organizations are represented by newspapers, with 310 primary organizations or 96% of the total cases. Based on the average number of U.S. newspapers from 1995-2000 of 1,505, this figure represents about a fifth of all newspapers.

These numbers need to be understood in context. As noted above, the case population divides into three categories: projects funded by the Center; projects submitted for the Batten Award; and project submitted for recognition or advice to the Center. With the partial exception of a minority of the Batten Award submissions, which may have been entered solely to compete for prizes (discussed in section two), these projects constitute the solid core of civic journalism practice in the United States during this period. For this reason, we believe the figures significantly undercount the actual extent of civic journalism practice during this period. A 1997 survey of journalists for ASNE found levels of support for civic journalism practices (without naming them as such) ranging from 68 to 96%. And a 1997 APME survey that asked news executives explicit questions about civic journalism found support for civic journalism by 56%.¹ While it is impossible to estimate precise figures for newspapers that have practiced civic journalism from these studies, both suggest that the numbers of those that have at least tried civic journalism are higher than the 20% of our population of active, self-identified civic journalism newspapers.

Our study, then, represents the heart of civic journalism, and suggests the range of best practices among those news organizations that have explicitly practiced it.

¹ Voakes, P. (1997). The Newspaper Journalists of the '90s. Washington, D.C.: American Society of Newspaper Editors. Lindenmann, W. K. (1997). Views of Print and Broadcast Media Executives Toward Journalism Education. New York: Virginia Commonwealth University and Associated Press Managing Editors.

The projects were published by organizations located in 220 U.S. cities and in all but three U.S. states (Hawaii, Nevada and Wyoming). The four most prominently represented regions are the South Atlantic States, with 19% of the cases, the Pacific States, with 16%, and East North Central states, with 13%, and Middle Atlantic states, with 11%. The remaining regions each represent less than 10% of the cases.

A large majority of the projects, or nearly 75%, were published by news organizations with circulations of 250,000 or less. In fact, nearly 45% of them were published by small to mid-sized organizations with circulations of 100,000 or less. Only 41 projects, or 7% of the sample, were published by organizations with circulations over 500,000.

However, a disproportionate share of cases were published by primary news organizations in major metropolitan areas. In fact, 45% of the cases were published by organizations serving major metropolitan areas, with another 40% of the cases published by organizations serving populations outside major metropolitan areas. The cases published by organizations with statewide, multiple state or national distributions, including both newspapers and magazines, represent just over 5% of the total. The remaining cases involved primary organizations that serve niche markets with either an ethnic, special interest group, university or alternative audience. Several projects were produced by news services for distribution to their participating organizations.

Development of Civic Journalism Content²

We found several broad patterns in the data that show the trajectory of civic journalism over six years of the study. Many early experiments began with attempts to develop civic election coverage. This was true of almost all of the major innovating newsrooms and almost all newsrooms that were new to civic journalism. The pattern of election coverage was cyclical, but began tapering off after 1996. There was a broad middle period in which community projects

² The analysis in this section, Development of Civic Journalism Content, is based on the reduced dataset of 603 cases, published between 1995 and 2000.

dominated, at first taking the form of large projects addressing community vision or major community problems, like Charlotte's "Taking Back Our Neighborhoods." By 1998 community projects began to address specific issues like race, immigration and youth. In the late nineties, projects began to shift toward mapping communities to understand their diversity and integrating new technologies to expand community connection, as news organizations set new priorities for experimentation. To measure the degree to which these projects established civic roots in the community, they were given a civic index rating: high (4); moderate (3); low (2); very low (1); and none (0). Details of the index are explained in the Civic Index section of the Coding Guide, attached as Appendix A to this report.

Elections

The invention of civic journalism began with election coverage in projects like Wichita's "Your Vote Counts," Charlotte's 1992 "Citizen's Agenda" project, and Madison's "We the People Wisconsin." These early projects addressed the role of the press in democracy, but also had to invent the new civic coverage, developing a wide variety of now-familiar techniques like citizens' agendas, polling, focus groups and comprehensive analyses of issues and candidates. The new coverage spread rapidly, with new organizations joining annually, but naturally peaking during bi-annual election cycles.

After early election successes, newspapers began to look for ways to deepen their coverage. For example, the Wichita "People Project," which was pivotal in the shift to community-wide coverage, began as an attempt to dig more deeply into citizens' issues during an election year. The Maine Citizens Campaign, which began in 1995 but continued through 2000, engaged 90 citizens in continuing discussions of issues they identified as important in the '96 presidential campaign and expanding deliberations through public forums.

Civic election coverage peaked in 1996 at 25 projects, or nearly half of all election projects in this sample, with the Center funding only six of them, suggesting that election coverage had its own momentum by that point. There was an early focus on partnerships

among newspapers and broadcasters, a pattern that began to decline after 1996. The *Philadelphia Inquirer's* "Citizen Voices '96," one of the breakthrough projects this year, sponsored a series of deliberative forums with attendance solicited and selected by the editorial board of the paper as an "experiment in political conversation." The *Charlotte Observer's* "Your Voice, Your Vote" project expanded to collaborate on public coverage of the 1996 elections with other news organizations statewide. By 1997, the number of elections projects began to decline, not just cyclically but continuing steadily through the present. Still, significant electoral projects in Maine, Philadelphia, Madison, Charlotte, and elsewhere continued, as did innovation, like the Rochester, New York coverage of a proposed state constitutional convention.

The election projects as a whole scored high on our civic index. Of the 55 total election projects, over 58% were highly civic and 30% were moderately civic. The remaining 12% fell between low and very low, with none receiving a zero rating.

Community

The community category breaks down into two phases and two types of coverage. The first phase featured major community-wide deliberations on public problems. The second tended to focus on specific issues, particularly those concerning race and diversity, immigration and youth. These lines are not sharp, as large community projects have continued to the present and specific issues were present in the early years of the movement.

Perhaps the archetypal large community project is Charlotte's "Taking Back Our Neighborhoods," which began in 1994 as an investigative story and continued into 1997 as a community action project. While focused on the specific issue of crime, the project sought to bring the entire community together to find and implement solutions, and succeeded remarkably. The *Binghamton Press and Sun Bulletin's* "Facing Our Future" in 1996 organized a community-wide deliberation on the future of the regional economy in the wake of economic collapse, and was taken over by citizens themselves. And the *Philadelphia Daily News* began "Rethinking Philadelphia" in 1997 (continuing today), which has focused broadly on the quality

of life, economic development, schools, as well as on specific neighborhood issues. The community category, with 61 projects, also rated quite well on the civic index. Nearly 64% of them rated either high or moderate on the index, with only 8% falling between very low to none.

Race, Diversity, Family and Youth

As early as 1995, papers began to explore new community issues in new ways. That year there were 16 projects concerning diversity, including 10 on race relations. Among them was "America Coming Together" by the Akron *Beacon Journal*, which began as "A Question of Color" in 1994 and has continued ever since. The number of diversity projects dropped during 1996 and 1997, but a few strong projects like the *Bronx Journal's* "Eyes on the Bronx" were developed. The year 1998 saw a surge of race and diversity projects, including "The New City: La Nueva Ciudad," at the *San Francisco Examiner*, an early use of civic mapping to explore urban racial and ethnic change. This trend continued with diversity category dominating in years 1998 through 2000. With an overall total of 79 projects, they scored well on the civic index. Although not as highly civic as elections and community projects, over 46% of the diversity projects received high to moderate ratings, with about 54% rating from low to no civic elements.

Family and youth stories represent another strong trend in the community category. All totaled, there were 56 youth projects, many of which were from the perspective of young people themselves. In 1995, there were 12 projects on youth, including *Tallahassee Democrat's* "Baby's a momma, Daddy's gone," which examined the cycle of teen pregnancy and community wide solutions. The *Syracuse Herald American's* "Through the Eyes of Children" and *Detroit Free Press's* "Listening to the Children" were the early projects emphasizing the voice of a community's youth. The number remained steady in 1996, with 13 projects, exemplified by *Democrat and Chronicle/Times Union's* "Make Us Safe: Teens Talk About Violence," a multi-media effort to listen to youth about their personal experiences of violence. In 1997 and 1998, youth projects substantially drop, with only four and six respectively, but rise again in 1999 to

14 projects, including the *Minneapolis's Star Tribune* series on "Teen Drinking." Overall, youth projects were evenly spread between high, moderate, low and very low on the civic index, with only two cases showing no civic elements. In the wake of the school shootings in Columbine and elsewhere, there was a short-lived trend of projects examining the incidence of school violence in 1998 that continued into 1999, when one-third of the cases in this category focused on issues of school safety.

In sum, we see a rather clear trajectory throughout a decade of practice. Beginning with the problems of democracy and the press, expressed initially in the elections of 1988, 1990, and 1992, organizations move to broader coverage of the issues that trouble citizens in their own communities, looking for ways to extend a citizens' agenda to community and public problem-solving. As these new tools are forged, news organizations begin to apply them to community problems that are specific and difficult: race and diversity, youth, and so on. This last phase of learning also extended the search for new techniques of mapping issues and actors in community life, as we see below.

*Development of Technique*³

Just as there was cycle of learning in civic content, we saw a parallel cycle of learning and development of new technique and craft. The first need, as we have noted, was to invent civic journalism. Shortly thereafter, by 1995, newspapers began to recognize the need to incorporate the new techniques into their daily work. This, in turn, led to the development of civic mapping techniques, and, eventually, the use of new interactive tools, including the Internet.

The *Charlotte Observer* was a pioneer in daily integration. Its "Civic journalism: Doing it Daily" project began in 1995, and remains one of the most successful models of integrating civic reporting throughout its daily newsgathering. The *Virginian Pilot's* "Doing public journalism,"

³ The analysis in this section, Development of Technique, is based on the reduced dataset of 603 cases, published between 1995 and 2000.

particularly its thrice-weekly public life, education, and public safety pages, ran for almost four years, starting in 1997. Probably no other paper achieved as high a level of consistent civic coverage week in and week out.

Interactive journalism was a small segment of our data (24 cases overall, most since 1998), but it grew quickly. We defined this area primarily as the use of new tools and technologies to improve the connection between news organizations and citizens. In 1998, with the growth of the Internet, we started to see online projects emerge. The first to use web-based technology to empower citizens was the "New Hampshire Tax Challenge" led by New Hampshire Public Radio, including the *Nashua Telegraph* and a broad civic coalition. The project created an online tax calculator to give citizens an idea of what might happen to their taxes under various scenarios for a broad-based tax, to see how different tax proposals would affect their individual tax bills, and to complement on-air reports and public forums. This technique reached a new level of refinement in 2001 with the Everett (Washington) *Herald's* "Waterfront Renaissance" project, which used a "Sim City" approach to build clickable maps online for residents' visions about the city's waterfront renovation, give citizens a voice in development of the waterfront, and create an interactive map to help citizens create a community vision of the future.

In 1999, Alabama's *Anniston Star* undertook the first civic mapping project, "Setting the Agenda," which created a database of community leaders in the newsroom as a resource to stimulate dialogue between public officials and citizens. This proved particularly effective in organizing community forums of opinion leaders and elected officials to give lawmakers a sense of what county residents want the state government to do. By 2000, there were four more civic mapping projects, including a "Cyber Mapping" project in Anniston, and other online projects (13 total), including "Handle Extra," an ongoing weekly civic journalism section of the *Spokane Spokesman-Review*. We also saw renewed interest in comprehensive election coverage using new interactive tools, including Wisconsin Public Television's "Web TV-2000 Elections."

Civic mapping continues to grow and develop, with new projects in Madison, Wisconsin and elsewhere. And there is an unsurprisingly high and growing interest in how new web-based tools of reporting and data gathering can be integrated with new forms of citizen-interaction in both special projects and daily work.

Commitment to Public and Civic Values

Our study found evidence of strong commitment to the traditional public values of journalism. Nearly 56% of the projects were designed to *primarily* inform the public and raise awareness, goals shared by civic journalism and more traditional news organizations. Projects coded this way might, however, have involved other explicit goals, for instance to give citizens a voice on the issues or survey public opinion, but they were designed primarily to give citizens information on project-related issues. This finding, on the strength of traditional goals, is ambiguous. On the one hand, it suggests that even when relatively committed news organizations experimented with civic practices at a high level, they sought to frame their work in traditional terms. On the other hand, it suggests that the incompatibility between civic and traditional journalism, claimed by some critics, was not really there: the vast majority of civic journalism's most experienced practitioners felt comfortable with both sets of values.

The next highest category, 15% of this sample, is represented by those projects in which the primary goal was to conduct an investigation. Although these investigative projects represent a significant number of the overall total in this study, they are not likely to rate high on the civic index. This can be explained by the higher percentage of these projects that were entered into Batten Award competition. As part of the Batten Award entries, they tried to embrace the label "civic journalism," although more often they described themselves as "public service" projects. There were, however, important examples of specific civic journalism investigation, for example the *Asbury Park Press* "House of Cards," which focused on both real estate fraud and civic action to expose and correct it, or the *Portland Newspapers'* "The Deadliest

Drug: Maine's Addiction to Alcohol," which investigated the sources of alcoholism and possible solutions.

The third largest goal category, improve civic life in a community, is represented by nearly 15%. Here, organizations intentionally set out to play a role in, for instance, improving the electoral process, engaging citizens in public deliberations, and/or bridging the gap between citizens and their elected officials. Four percent were designed specifically to provide citizens with the means of expressing their opinions in a community's problem-solving efforts. The remaining goals are less evident, each found in less than 2% of the cases.

There are no clear conclusions to be drawn from the coding of values and goals, other than that civic journalism is clearly seen as compatible with the traditional journalism goals of informing the public by its leading practitioners.

New Ways of Covering the News

Beyond changes in the substance and orientation of coverage, we also found evidence of a series of changes in the way that stories were covered. These can be divided into changes in the way that stories were reported, the development of new techniques for citizen interaction, and changes in how stories were framed and written.

We found strong evidence that public deliberative events were held outside the newsroom to facilitate community conversations. We included any type of forum held to facilitate public conversations with and among citizens, civic leaders and/or public officials, including roundtable discussions, town hall meetings, task force groups, specific-action groups, informal neighborhood discussion groups, etc. Of the 617 cases with available data to evaluate public deliberative events, slightly more than 48%, or 295 cases, convened and/or covered some form of public conversation.

In addition, small group interviews, or focus groups, were used in 56 cases, or almost 10%, of the 601 cases with available evidence for evaluation. A vast majority of these projects used between one and five focus groups to gather information from citizens and gauge public

sentiment relevant to the project. This relatively low percentage suggests that focus groups were one tool in a broad toolkit for covering citizens, in contrast to charges of some critics that civic journalism was “focus group driven.”

We also found evidence that surveys were used in projects. Of the 617 cases with sufficient evidence to determine whether survey techniques were employed, nearly 33%, or 203 cases, used some form of public opinion data. About 22% of the cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate the type of method used a scientific method with random and representative samples. Additionally, about 11% used some form of informal (non-scientific) surveys, either surveying readers (usually through mail-in coupons) or citizens (usually through “person on the street” interviews).

Perhaps more significant than the use of new techniques for reporting on citizens' voices was the way these voices were incorporated into the writing of stories. Ninety-six percent of the projects showed some evidence of *explanatory* framing in which the story is presented to readers in ways to increase readers' relationship to and understanding of the issues. As opposed to the traditional conflict frame, which tends to narrow the story to two or more opposing viewpoints, the explanatory frame explores an issue, in all its depth and complexity, to provide readers with the information necessary to thoroughly grasp the issue's scope, relevance and potential impact on their community and personal lives.

Sixty-three percent of the cases showed some evidence of a *problem-solving* frame, one that engages the reader in the process of identifying potential solutions to the issues being explored and, perhaps, participating in the implementation of solutions. The solutions are usually drawn from either the news organization's research, the citizens themselves or from other communities with experience in addressing a similar problem.

Over three-quarters, or 78% of the 608 cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate this variable, provided some form of possible solutions to the problems addressed by the project. Thirty-two percent of the cases offered solutions that combined a citizen perspective with that of an official perspective. Another 29% emphasized the solutions offered by citizens, while

another 19% placed an emphasis on the official point of view. A total of 127 cases, or about 21% of these cases made no effort to offer possible solutions to the public.

A fairly equal balance between relying on citizens and officials for information and quotes represent the most prevalent type of sourcing in the sample. Forty-seven percent of the 586 cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate this variable relied on both citizens and officials as sources of information and expertise. The number of cases that relied upon citizens as primary sources and those that relied most heavily on the official point of view are equally represented, each with about one-quarter of the cases

In addition to soliciting citizen voices, a total of 512 cases, or about 85% of the 603 cases with sufficient information to evaluate this variable, published citizens' perspectives on the issues in the print or online phases of the project. We measured here the degree to which citizen voices were used to express a citizen perspective on the issues in the publication, either print or online, of the projects. Each case was evaluated for evidence of efforts to encourage feedback from readers on the issue and the project itself at the end of the project during the publication phase. This measure represents invitations for readers to communicate with the editors and journalists working on a project. Of the 578 cases with sufficient evidence for analysis of this variable, we found that 47%, or 272 cases, actively solicited feedback from readers via the newspaper, magazine or Web site.

The findings in this category are among the most unequivocal and important in our research. Civic journalism clearly extended the *reach* of journalism, incorporating new voices of citizens that simply would not have been otherwise heard. These voices were both captured by new ways of reporting, and actually incorporated into stories. Further, citizens were encouraged to respond to the new reporting.

Beyond the incorporation of citizen voices, there was a clear *frame shift*. Research by Iyengar and others⁴ has clearly shown that *how* news is framed, whether it employs a frame that

⁴ Iyengar, S., & McGuire, W. J. (1993). Explorations in political psychology. Durham: Duke University Press. Iyengar, Shanto. Is Anyone Responsible: How Television Frames Political

emphasizes conflict between two sides or explains issues in greater complexity, has a strong effect on whether citizens are more or less likely to become civically engaged. The clear shift to explanatory frames is perhaps one of civic journalism's most important, if still under-explored, achievements.

Commitment Over Time

We expected that the majority of our cases would show a low level of involvement in civic journalism, two years or less. A typical case in this class would have tried one or two projects during our time frame, evidence of experiment but not significant commitment. If an organization was involved in civic journalism for less than two years, the case was coded for a "low" level of involvement. A "medium" level was used when a case was published by an organization with three to four years of experience. Lastly, a "high" level was used if the primary organization showed evidence of five years or longer. The data in this area were surprising.

Using our larger database of 651 cases (the percentages using the more restricted 603 case database are essentially the same), we found that 193 organizations, or 65% of all 322 *organizations* practiced civic journalism for two years or less. This is consistent with our expectation. Most of our cases involved news organizations experimenting with a project or two, the incorporation of new ideas or techniques, or in the case of the Batten awards, seeking recognition.

What did surprise us somewhat was that 46 organizations, or 15% practiced civic journalism from three to four years, while a remarkable 20%, or 56 organizations, practiced civic journalism for four years or more. This latter figure is quite unexpected. This shows a very high level of commitment from about 4% of all U.S. newspapers, with strong commitment from an additional 3%. While it would take us too far a field here to conclusively analyze these questions, we want to note that this figure of 7% of strong and very strong adopters *may* be

Issues. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991. Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.

sufficient to sustain the diffusion of new practice, as civic journalism loses the incubator of the Pew Center. Whether this constitutes a critical mass remains an open question.

The relationship between length of practice by a news organization and number of cases of civic journalism generated is, not surprisingly, inverse. Only 35.7% of cases were published by organizations with a low level of involvement, 19% by organizations showing a medium level. And fully 45.3% of the 651 cases in the database, or 295 cases, were published by primary organizations with a high level of involvement in experimenting with civic journalism practices.

We further found that a majority of the cases were published by primary organizations working alone. Of the 646 cases with sufficient evidence for evaluation of organizational partnerships, slightly less than two-thirds, or 415 cases, showed no evidence of working in collaboration with other organizations. It is also important to note that a vast majority of those 415 cases without partnership arrangements were primarily represented by those projects submitted to the Center for the annual Batten Award competitions. In fact, 78% of these cases were Batten entries and with no funding support from the Center. In other words, those projects on the journalism "prize circuit" tended to involve media organizations working alone.

In sum, a larger number of news organizations than expected had a medium to high level of involvement with civic journalism, about 7% of all U.S. newspapers over our investigation period. A large proportion of the civic journalism published, 45%, came from these papers.

Impact on Communities and Public Life

One of the most important issues in our research was whether, how, and to what extent the civic journalism projects had impact on their communities. This was a difficult measure to develop, for two reasons. First, most of the evidence in this area was based on self-reports, and so was inevitably somewhat biased towards the good. Second, the measures themselves were necessarily indirect. We could not independently evaluate community impact. However, the

overall results are consistent with in-depth case research reported on eight communities in several studies.⁵

Still, to develop the broadest and most independent measure possible, we evaluated each case for ways in which the project impacted and changed community life. With very few exceptions, there was evidence of more than one type of outcome found for each case. Details of our method are discussed in the next section. Each variable was analyzed according to the total number of cases with sufficient data available for analysis.

The most prominent outcome was an *improvement in a community's public deliberative process*. About 53% of the cases with sufficient evidence, or 297 projects, demonstrated some success in directly impacting the deliberative process by convening events, or indirectly impacting the process by providing the impetus, and perhaps necessary tools, for citizens to organize public deliberative events themselves.

The *use of the project by other organizations*, such as media or other institutions, represents the next most prominent outcome and was found in 220 cases, or about 43% of the total cases with sufficient evidence. These cases contained evidence that other media organizations used the project in some way, either by using the material to supplement their own print or broadcast coverage of the issues, or as a guide in the design of their own civic journalism projects. Some cases contained evidence that other institutions, most commonly the educational system, used the material as instructional material in classrooms.

Improving the skills of citizens, found in 209 cases or 40% of the cases with sufficient evidence, was measured by data indicating that citizens were more able to perform the duties of citizenship, i.e. more informed to vote, to participate in a debate between candidates, to challenge the position of leaders, to engage in public deliberations, to actively work to change community life.

⁵ Sirianni, C. J., & Friedland, L. A. (2001). Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; Thorson, E., Friedland, L. A., & Chaffee, S. H. (1996). Evaluation of Civic Journalism Projects. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts; Friedland, L. A. (2003 (forthcoming)). Learning Public Journalism. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation.

A *positive reader response* was found in 192 cases, or 40% of the cases with sufficient evidence. This outcome variable was measured by data indicating that readers, through phone calls or letters to the organizations, approved of the project and appreciated the efforts of the primary organizations.

Changing public policy, found in 179 cases or 37% of the total cases with sufficient evidence, was measured by claims that the project directly influenced the implementation of, or change to, a policy that impacts the community.

Influencing the *formation of new organizations*, found in 126 cases or 26% of the cases with sufficient evidence, was measured by claims that people, including public officials, civic leaders and/or citizens, collectively organized to solve problems and improve public life.

The remaining outcomes, each of which is found in less than 20% of the cases, represent claims of improving volunteer efforts (17%); claims of influencing the amount of public money dedicated to address a specific issue (11%); claims of influencing the amount of private money donated toward causes (9%); claims of influence over investigations undertaken to further address the issues (5%); and claims of initiating citizen letter or telephone campaigns organized to influence some aspect of public life.

In sum, although based on self-reports and therefore limited, our data demonstrates evidence of a positive impact of civic journalism on public deliberation, improved civic skills, changed public policy, and the formation of new community organizations, as well as increased volunteerism. This evidence is consistent with other case-based qualitative research conducted by Friedland and others.

Summary

Civic journalism of some kind has been practiced in at least 322 newspapers, one fifth of all newspapers in the U.S. This is a very conservative estimate, based only on those news organizations that have submitted their work to the Pew Center for Civic Journalism, the most solid core of self-identified civic journalism practitioners. We believe the actual number of those

who have experimented with civic journalism practices in some form or another to be somewhere between one-third and one-half.

Civic journalism has developed in a clear pattern. Early on, newspapers focused on the relation of the press to democracy, which led to a focus on elections. In the beginning, this forced them to invent the techniques of civic journalism, including citizens' agendas, issues grids, and other ways of getting citizen voices into the paper. After they learned how to do this, they naturally moved on to look at broader, more daily ways that civic as well as public life could be better addressed. Large community wide problems were addressed, with the search for new citizen solutions. As the larger community-wide deliberations and problem solving efforts worked, newspapers began to refocus attention on specific issues, particularly about who was included or excluded in the "civic map" of coverage. This led to attention to how racial and ethnic diversity could be systematically incorporated into coverage, and to attention to the problems of young people and students, among others.

These developments in content also pushed new technique forward. Community problem solving led naturally to a concern with daily reporting, and how the daily routine could be reorganized to incorporate new civic journalism practices. A concern with diversity led to the exploration of civic mapping. And more conversation with the community opened newspapers to the ideas of interactivity, which meant that as new technologies like the Web developed, there was a civic context to deploy them.

The core goals of news organizations remained well within the traditional frame of informing the public. But new, explicitly civic goals did become a part of the repertoire of a significant minority.

There was particularly impressive progress in reframing coverage, as civic news organizations shifted in large numbers to emphasize explanatory over conflict frames in their coverage of public and civic life. This is particularly important, as research shows that explanatory frames have a greater potential for mobilizing citizens; conflict frames have the opposite effect.

While the majority of civic journalism news organizations, about 65%, have practiced for two years or less, 15% have done civic journalism for three to four years, and 20% for four or more years. The latter two categories taken together represent about 7% of all newspapers in the U.S. This number suggests a potential critical mass of civic newspapers in the United States, although whether this number is enough to continue diffusion of civic journalism within the journalism community remains uncertain.

Finally, there is clear evidence in our data, which must be qualified, however, because it is based on self-reports, that the practice of civic journalism has increased public deliberation, civic problem solving, volunteerism, and changed public policy. This evidence is supported by other, case-based research and suggests the first quantitative support for these previous qualitative findings. The evidence of both findings is consistent and points in the same direction: civic journalism has been a success in the communities where it has been practiced with any consistency, even over relatively short periods of time.

OVERVIEW OF THE MOVEMENT

Method

The research process involved five extended visits, each between one to two weeks in length, to the Center by the principal researcher, Sandy Nichols, to review and record evidence of civic journalism projects identified by Center staff for the study. The visitation period began January 2000 and ended May 2001. During each visit, Nichols gathered comprehensive descriptive information on each case from the material contained in the Center's archive and entered the data into a FileMaker program. When the data gathering process was complete, the descriptive data was then coded according to the quantitative coding protocol, specified in the Coding Guide attached as Appendix A, and entered into a SPSS database.

The examples of civic journalism projects we examined were submitted to the Center in varying degrees of thoroughness and completeness. A majority of submittals include formal applications for recognition by way of cash awards (Batten Award entries) and formal proposals for newsroom experiments seeking financial assistance (funded projects). Generally, these submittals contain samples of the published project and any supplemental material requested by the Center. In the case of the Batten Award entries, the supplemental material generally consisted of an application form and a letter providing details of journalistic practices and processes involved. For funded projects, the supplemental material generally included proposal letters and, if funded, all progress reports sent to the Center. A small number of cases were submitted for more informal recognition or feedback from the Center and contain far less information about the project design and production processes. Therefore, the evidence we gathered ranges from cases with extensive information, including claims of project outcomes, to those with very limited information and no evidence of potential outcome. We take this range of evidence into consideration in our overall analysis of the movement.

The final sample for the study contains 651 cases of civic journalism work categorized by the Center as either print projects (newspaper or magazine) or online projects (posted on the Internet) and published between 1994 and 2001. The cases in the sample span a range between

exclusively print or Internet projects to those involving multi-media efforts. The submitting organizations were, for the most part, either a print or Internet organization. There are, however, a small number of cases in the sample that were submitted by a broadcast organization (radio or television), civic or professional associations or news services, all of which qualified for the study because their print or Internet elements played a major role in the overall project. According to the Center, all projects classified under the broadcast category, those projects with only broadcast elements, will be examined in a separate study.

It is important to note that not all cases we examined contain civic elements. That is, there are projects submitted to the Center that contain no evidence of any effort to engage citizens in the civic life of their community. Where this was observed, it was most often found in projects submitted to the Center seeking to win an award. In fact, all but two of the 39 cases with no evidence of civic elements were sent to the Center as an entry in the Batten Award competition. Most likely, they are examples of journalism that were widely circulated for various prizes, awards and recognition, regardless of their intent to improve civic life.

Since a goal of the research was to provide a picture of the range of what journalism practitioners *consider* as civic journalism, from those who practiced traditional journalism without any civic engagement to those who developed deep civic roots in their community, each case was evaluated on a "civic index." Depending on the degree to which the participating organizations attempted to dig roots in their community and re-engage citizens in public life, each case received a civic index rating on a five-point cumulative scale, ranging from "0" for those projects with no evidence of civic elements to a "4" for those with deep civic roots. Generally, then, each project was evaluated for efforts to raise awareness about an issue, use problem-solving reporting, encourage citizens to engage in civic life, give them resources to do so, solicit their informal feedback and give them a voice on the issues, use survey techniques for public opinion purposes, convene and/or cover public deliberative events. A more detailed description of the civic index criteria is provided under the Civic Index section of the Coding Guide, attached as Appendix A to this report.

It is also important to note here that because the data collected for this study is limited to the material contained in the Center's archive, the study's sample systematically undercounts the full range of civic journalism work conducted by news organizations across the country since the movement's inception. The sample is also biased in favor of the more self-conscious efforts to conduct civic journalism – those that news organizations believe themselves to be deserving of recognition or support. Although it undercounts the extent of the movement and is biased, the sample does, however, provide a framework for understanding the evolution of the civic journalism movement. The fact that the data are primarily generated by a higher degree of self-conscious practitioners, who are more likely to have practiced a higher level of civic journalism, creates a sample of civic journalism work biased toward the good. As such, the evidence provided by the Center's archive provides a way for us to understand how civic journalism has been practiced in this country, following the movement as it evolved to its present state. We use the evidence in this study to paint a picture of civic journalism with all the inherent vicissitudes of any movement working to affect change.

Overview Analysis

The following analysis provides a descriptive overview of the movement underscoring the full range and scope of projects considered by news and related organizations as experiments in civic journalism. The variables analyzed and described below shed light on the participating organizations, the communities in which the projects were published, the types of projects published, the issues covered and the various tools and techniques used by the news organizations to develop civic roots.

Since the cases in the Center's archive contain varying degrees of evidence, as discussed earlier, some cases provided sufficient evidence to code all variables while others provided more limited evidence. Therefore, the analysis of each variable is based on the total number of cases with sufficient evidence for evaluation. To avoid potential confusion in this analysis, we

have attempted to specify the total number of cases for each variable that provided sufficient evidence for our purposes.

Year of Publication

The 651 cases contained in the study sample were published between 1994 and 2002. Since the Center began its active solicitation for project submittals for the Batten Award competition in 1995 and the data collection for this study ended before all 2001 and 2002 projects were submitted to the Center, the vast majority (of cases in the sample were published between the years 1995 and 2000.

TABLE 1.
YEAR OF PUBLICATION

Year	Cases	Percent
1994	18	2.8
1995	112	17.2
1996	88	13.5
1997	83	12.8
1998	94	14.4
1999	118	18.1
2000	108	16.6
2001	26	4.0
2002	4	.6
Total	651	100.0

Participating Organizations

There are a total of 322 media or civic organizations in the sample that took a lead role in the implementation of projects and their submittal to the Center. These organizations, referred to as "primary" organizations, can be grouped using seven organizational categories. The vast majority of these organizations are represented by newspapers, with 310 primary organizations or 96% of the total.

In order to understand the full scope of all organizations experimenting with civic journalism practices, it is necessary to include those organizations that participated, in varying

degrees, as partners with the primary organizations. Thus, if these “secondary” organizations are included in the analysis, there are a total of 360 participating organizations in the sample, with the vast majority represented by newspapers (90%). Magazines represent the second largest category with 20 news organizations, or nearly 6% of the total. Broadcast organizations represent the third largest category with five organizations, or just over 1% of the total. The remaining organizations in the sample, each of which comprises less than 1% of the total, are represented by Internet companies, news services, civic organizations and professional associations.

It should be noted that the five broadcast organizations, all of which are primary organizations that took a leading role in the project, do not represent the total projects in the broadcast category contained in the Center's archives; rather, they represent cases in which a broadcast organization led a project where the print or Internet elements played a dominant role. We did not include in this study those projects that were led by broadcast organizations and contained little to no print or Internet elements. According to the Center, the broadcast-driven projects fall into a separate category and are being studied separately.

TABLE 2.
TYPE OF ORGANIZATION*

Type of Organization	Number	Percent
Newspaper	325	90.3
Magazine	20	5.6
Broadcast	5	1.4
Internet	3	.8
News service	3	.8
Civic organizations	3	.8
Professional associations	1	.3
Total	360	100.0

* For a complete list of all organizations, including both primary and secondary organizations, refer to Appendix B attached to this report.

Location of Publication

Geographically, the projects were published by organizations located in 220 U.S. cities and in all but three U.S. states. The states not represented in the sample are Hawaii, Nevada and Wyoming. Two projects in the Center archive were published outside the United States, both in Canada.

In a regional analysis of the cases, the three most prominently represented regions are the South Atlantic States, with 18% of the cases, the Pacific States, with 16%, and East North Central states, with 13%, and Middle Atlantic States, with 11%. The remaining regions each represent less than 10% of the cases.

TABLE 3.
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS*

<i>Region</i>	Cases	Percent
Pacific	107	16.4
Mountain	36	5.5
West North Central	54	8.3
East North Central	85	13.1
West South Central	41	6.3
East South Central	33	5.1
New England	59	9.1
Middle Atlantic	73	11.2
South Atlantic	121	18.6
Canada	2	.3
Other	40	6.1
Total	651	100.0

* For a geographic distribution of cases by city, state and region, refer to Appendix C.

Circulation

The primary newspapers in the sample range from a local newspaper with a circulation of 2,000 to a national news magazine publication with a circulation of 37,019,000. Using a four-point scale, the circulation for each case in the sample was coded using the circulation data for each of the primary organizations. For more details on the scale, refer to the Coding Guide in Appendix A under "Circulation."

Of the 606 cases with sufficient evidence to code circulation data, a vast majority of the projects, or nearly 75%, were published by news organizations with circulations of 250,000 or

less. In fact, nearly 45% of them were published by small to mid-sized organizations with circulations of 100,000 or less. Only 37 projects, or 6

% of the sample, were published by organizations with circulations over 500,000.

TABLE 4.
CIRCULATION OF PUBLISHED PROJECTS*

Level	Circulation	Cases	Percent
1	Under 50,000	134	22.1
2	50,000 to 100,000	136	22.4
3	100,001 to 250,000	176	29.1
4	Over 250,000	160	26.4
Total		606	100.0

*Data provided by the 2001 Working Press of the Nation Newspaper Directory.

Publication Frequency

Of the 648 cases with sufficient evidence for evaluation of publication frequency, nearly 80% of the cases were published by organizations with daily publication schedules. If six- and five-day publishing schedules are included, those publishing more than once a week represent about 85% of the cases. The second largest group, those cases submitted by organizations with weekly publication schedules, represent only 7% of the sample. The remaining categories, cases with bi-weekly, monthly and bi-monthly publication schedules, together comprise only about 4% of the total.

TABLE 5.
PUBLICATION FREQUENCY*

Publication Frequency	Cases	Percent
Daily	516	79.5
Six days per week	27	4.2
Five days per week	5	.8
Weekly	47	7.3
Bi-weekly	4	.6
Monthly	19	2.9
Bi-monthly	5	.8
Other	25	3.9
Total	648	100.0

*Data provided by the 2001 Working Press of the Nation Newspaper Directory.

Level of Civic Journalism Involvement

Each case was coded according to the depth of involvement of the primary organization in experimenting with civic journalism practices. If the evidence in the Center's archives indicated that an organization was involved in civic journalism for less than two years, the case was coded for a "low" level of involvement. A "medium" level was used when a case was published by an organization with three to four years of experience. Lastly, a "high" level was used if the primary organization showed evidence of five years or longer.

Our analysis found that 45% of the cases, or 295 of the 651 cases in the database, were published by primary organizations with a high level of involvement in experimenting with civic journalism practices.

TABLE 6.
LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT WITH CIVIC JOURNALISM

Level of Involvement	Cases	Percent
Low (1-2 years)	232	35.7
Medium (3-4 years)	124	19.0
High (5 or more years)	295	45.3
Total	651	100.0

Organizational Partnerships

To determine the extent to which the primary organizations collaborated with other organizations in the design and implementation of projects, we evaluated each case for evidence of partnerships. To capture the complexity of these partnerships, we coded for the type and number of partners. In our evaluation here, it is important to note that when the primary organization entered into partnerships with more than one organization, there is the possibility of more than one *type* of organization being involved. For instance, a newspaper might partner with a number of other newspapers, a broadcast organization and an Internet company. As a result, numbers in this analysis do not necessarily correspond to the total number of cases in the sample and percentages do not necessarily correspond to 100%.

We found that a majority of the cases were published by primary organizations working alone. Of the 646 cases with sufficient evidence for evaluation of organizational partnerships, slightly less than two-thirds, or 415 cases, showed no evidence of working in collaboration with other organizations.

TABLE 7.a.
FREQUENCY OF PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships	Cases	Percent
No partnerships	415	64.2
Partnerships	231	35.8
Total	646	100.0

It is also important to note that a vast majority of those 415 cases without partnership arrangements were primarily represented by those projects submitted to the Center for the annual Batten Award competitions. In fact, 78% of these cases were Batten entries and with no funding support from the Center. In other words, those projects on the journalism “prize circuit” tended to involve media organizations working alone. Additionally, of the 98 cases designed primarily as investigative efforts, only 14% involved some form of partnership. However, if we take those projects funded by the Center, then we see a higher incidence of partnership involvement. More specifically, nearly 85% of all Center funded projects involved some form of partnership, three-quarters of which involved multiple partnerships.

Of the 231 cases involving some form of partnership arrangement, 163 involved multiple partners, or 70% of collaborative projects.

TABLE 7.b.
SINGLE VS. MULTIPLE PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships	Cases	Percent
Partnerships – Single	68	29.4
Partnerships – Multiple	163	70.6
Total	231	100.0

Generally, collaborative efforts involved media partners (print, broadcast and Internet), community partners (educational, civic) and other types of partners (business, government). Of the 231 cases with partnerships, about 85% involved some form of media partners.

TABLE 7.c.
PARTNERSHIPS WITH MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

Types of Partnerships	Cases	Percent of Partnership Cases*	Percent of Total Cases **
Partnerships – Media	195	84.4	30.2
With broadcast partners	164	71.0	25.4
With print partners	64	27.7	9.9
With Internet partners	25	10.8	3.9

* Represents percentage of 231, the total number of cases with partnership involvement.

** Represents percentage of 646, the total number of cases with sufficient evidence.

In terms of partnerships with broadcast organizations, there is nearly equal representation between cases that involved some form of partnership with commercial television, public television and public radio, each of which were found in about one-third of the partnership cases. Partnerships with commercial radio were involved in about 14% of these cases. Arrangements with cable television were less prevalent, representing just under 10% of all partnership cases.

TABLE 7.d.
PARTNERSHIPS WITH MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

Types of Broadcast Partners	Cases	Percent of Partnership Cases*	Percent of Total Cases **
Commercial television	76	32.9	11.8
Public television	74	32.0	11.5
Cable television	21	9.1	3.3
Commercial radio	33	14.3	5.1
Public radio	80	34.6	12.4

* Represents percentage of 231, the total number of cases with partnership involvement.

** Represents percentage of 646, the total number of cases with sufficient evidence.

Additionally, about 118 cases, or a little more than one-half of the projects with partnerships, involved community and other types of organizations, generally educational

institutions, civic organizations and "other" types of organizations (business or government related).

TABLE 7.e.
PARTNERSHIPS WITH COMMUNITY AND OTHER TYPES OF PARTNERS

Community and Other Partnerships	Cases	Percent of Partnership Cases*	Percent of Total Cases**
Community	118	51.1	18.3
With high schools	5	2.2	.7
With universities	49	21.2	7.6
With civic organizations	77	33.3	11.9
With other types (bus/ gov't)	18	7.8	2.8

* Represents percentage of 231, the total number of cases with partnership involvement.

**Represents percentage of 646, the total number of cases with sufficient evidence.

Publication Format

To evaluate the range of publication frequency, we evaluated each case for the manner in which they were published in print. That is, we examined print evidence to determine if the project was published as a special section, a formal series over a period of time, or published on an informal and periodic schedule.

Of the 605 cases with sufficient evidence to determine publication format, 405 cases, or 67%, were published as a formal series, either on a consecutive daily, weekly, monthly or periodic basis. A formal series involves continuity in topic, aim and presentation format of the project as published over time. Those that were originally published in one-day special sections represent nearly 10%. Informal publication formats, those that irregularly published single articles over a period of time and those that involved just one to two articles, represent another 20% of the cases.

TABLE 8.
FREQUENCY OF PROJECT PUBLICATION

Publication Frequency	Cases	Percent
Daily consecutive series	124	20.5
Weekly consecutive series	30	5.0
Monthly consecutive series	7	1.2
Periodic series	244	40.2
Periodic articles	64	10.6
Articles (1 to 2)	52	8.6
Special section	60	9.9
Other	24	4.0
Total	605	100.0

There was also evidence of 92 projects that were not originally published as special sections but were re-published as “reprint” sections at some point after their original publication dates. Because reprint sections were not always included by the primary organizations in their submittal material to the Center, there was insufficient evidence to determine the existence of reprint sections in each case. Therefore, this is not a true picture of the prevalence of reprinted material used by news organizations in the publication of their projects.

Length of Projects

Each case was also coded for the length of time in which the project was published in print. We found that only 6% of the cases involve publication periods longer than one year. In fact, the vast majority, or 94%, of the cases were published in less than one year, ranging in time periods from one day to twelve months.

TABLE 9.
LENGTH OF PUBLICATION PERIOD

Length	Cases	Percent
Less than 1 year	613	94.2
Between 1 and 2 years	28	4.2
Between 2 and 3 years	6	.9
Between 3 and 4 years	2	.3
Between 4 and 5 years	1	.2
More than 5 years	1	.2
Total	651	100.0

Populations Served

Of the 651 cases in the study, the vast majority were published by primary organizations serving either a major metropolitan area, representing 45%, or serving populations outside major metropolitan areas, representing 40%. The cases published by organizations with statewide, multiple state or national distributions, including both newspapers and magazines, represent just over 5% of the total. The remaining cases involved primary organizations that serve niche markets with either an ethnic, special interest group, university or alternative audience. Several projects were produced by news services for distribution to their participating organizations.

TABLE 10.
POPULATIONS SERVED BY PRIMARY ORGANIZATION*

Populations Served	Cases	Percent
Major metropolitan	290	44.6
Outside metropolitan area	263	40.5
Multiple cities w/in state	12	1.8
Multiple states	3	.5
National	21	3.2
Ethnic	15	2.3
Special interest	14	2.2
University	2	.3
News service	2	.3
Alternative	2	.3
Other	27	4.0
Total	651	100.0

*Data provided by the 2001 Working Press of the Nation Newspaper Directory.

Project Goals

The cases were evaluated on the basis of the goals articulated by the primary organizations. These goals, if stated, were either found in the published project or in the supplemental materials submitted to the Center by primary organizations. Specifically, the cases were first evaluated for the primary goal, one in which was determined as the most prominent aim of the project. Each case was then evaluated for the general goals, or secondary

goals, the organization set out to achieve. While only one primary goal was identified and coded for each case, most cases were coded for multiple secondary goals.

A majority of cases of the 651 cases in the study, or nearly 56%, were designed to primarily inform the public and raise awareness. These projects might involve other goals, for instance to give citizens a voice on the issues or survey public opinion, but they were designed primarily to give citizens the information on the project-related issues.

The second largest group, with 15% of this sample, is represented by those projects in which the primary goal was to conduct an investigation. Although these investigative projects represent a significant number of the overall total in this study, they are not highly likely to rate high on the civic index. That is, only 15 cases of the 96 investigative projects, or a little over 2% of this category, rated above a "2" on the scale. The remaining cases, rating either a "0" (6 cases), "1" (42 cases) or a "2" (33 cases), did not involve efforts to survey public opinion or facilitate public deliberative processes.

According to Jan Schaffer, Executive Director of the Center, the vast majority of these investigative efforts are not true "civic" initiatives. Many of them were good public-service investigations that were on the "prize circuit" in any given year. They were entered in all the major journalism competitions, including the Batten Awards, in hopes of garnering a prize and some recognition for their news organizations. As part of the Batten Award entries, they tried to embrace the label "civic journalism," although more often they described themselves as "public service" projects.

The third largest goal category is represented by 94 projects (nearly 15%) designed to improve civic life in a community, followed by the fourth largest category with 27 cases (4%) designed to give citizens a voice in problem-solving activities. When combined, the remaining categories comprise just 11% of the cases.

TABLE 11.
PRIMARY PROJECT GOALS

Primary Goals	Cases	Percent
Inform and Raise Awareness	363	55.7
Investigate	98	15.1
Improve Civic Life	94	14.5
Give Citizens Voice	27	4.2
Improve Journalism	11	1.7
Conduct Daily Journalism	10	1.5
Editorialize	9	1.4
Convene Public Deliberations	9	1.4
Develop Civic Map of Community	9	1.4
Survey of Public Opinion	5	.8
Change Policy	6	.9
Other	10	1.4
Total	651	100.0

Categories

The cases were also categorized and coded according to the topic addressed by the project. The topic was identified as the primary subject matter, or theme, of the published project. Although a case might address several themes, it was classified according to its primary topic. For instance, a case addressing youth involved in criminal behavior was placed in the juvenile crime category rather than the crime and safety category because it emphasized the juvenile behavior aspect of the story.

The iterative classification process began by identifying an exhaustive list of specific, narrowly defined categories, referred to as “specific” categories, into which the cases could be placed. After placing all cases into one of 62 specific categories, the categories were collapsed into 16 more inclusive categories, referred to as “inclusive” categories. For final analytic purposes, these inclusive categories were then collapsed into five “final” categories: (1) elections; (2) community; (3) government; (4) interactive; and (5) other (e.g., projects investigating status of journalism profession, general “bodies of work” submitted by reporters and columnists). Appendix D provides detailed information on the distribution of cases by these different levels of categories.

Community Category

In terms of “final” categories, the vast majority of the 651 cases in this study were classified as community projects. In fact, slightly more than three-quarters of the projects, or 499 cases, addressed some issue important to improving the quality of community life. In general, these projects were designed to enhance the quality of public life, encourage and facilitate citizen participatory processes, and address specific issues important to improving the lives of citizens. This category is best understood by examining its 13 “inclusive” subcategories.

Diversity projects represent the largest community category with 84 cases, or 13% of the sample. Of these cases, 58% addressed race and ethnic relations and issues of inequality. Another 21% addressed issues of immigration and its impact on communities, while about 13% addressed a community's growing diverse population and ways to appreciate different cultures. The remaining projects focused on international ethnic struggles (5%) and issues facing immigrant and black farmers in rural communities (2%).

Community projects, the second largest subcategory representing 66 cases or about 10% of the total, primarily involved community efforts to improve the future of their communities and dealt with specific problems facing the community, including both current and anticipated problems. These projects, which represented about 83% of this subcategory, focused on engaging citizens in identifying the issues, searching for solutions, developing and implementing strategic planning programs. A smaller number, or 12%, represent projects designed to facilitate citizen efforts to reclaim their deteriorating neighborhoods, sometimes working toward organized clean up efforts. About 5% of these cases were efforts to educate citizens on their community's history in order to learn from past mistakes and celebrate its successes.

Civic projects, the third largest subcategory with 58 cases or just about 9% of all cases, primarily addressed the more abstract issues of improving civic life of a community. Fifty% of these civic projects were designed to discover ways to re-re-engage citizens in public life, most often through promoting public community conversations. The remaining cases in this category

provided inspirational stories of exemplary citizens with desirable civic leadership qualities (22%), promotion of philanthropic programs (14%), ways to improve the selection of civic leaders (9%) and organized social protest efforts (5%).

Youth, the next largest category with 57 cases or about 9% of the total cases, focused on issues specific to young people. Generally, they addressed such youth-related issues as, in descending order of prominence within this subcategory: a range of general social issues facing youth today often from the perspective of young people themselves (35% of this subcategory); juvenile crime, including gang violence (21%); child care issues, including foster care and adoption (16%); school violence (14%); teen sex, including teen pregnancy and sex education (9%); and alcohol and drug abuse among teens (5%).

Education, a subcategory representing 48 cases or about 7% of the total cases, addressed the quality of a community's educational system while focusing on such issues as overcrowded schools, under-funded school districts and poor academic performances of students (67% of this subcategory). A common theme here was to evaluate the status of the community's educational system by comparing it to a known successful system elsewhere in the country. The remaining education projects focused on specific educational policies such as school choice policies (19%), evaluating performance of specific schools (12%), and building values and character development into curricula (2%).

Economic development, with a total of 38 projects or nearly 6% of the total cases, represents those projects that explored ways to improve an area's economy. Fifty percent of these projects involved land development issues, including urban growth, suburban sprawl and planning strategies for solutions. Projects addressing transportation (i.e. issues of traffic safety and growth-related congestion) represent about another 21%. Another 21% focused on efforts to address the economic development issues specific to rural communities. The remaining cases focus on improving very specific ways of addressing a local economy, including covering proposals for specific development projects (18%), specific community efforts to improve a lagging economy (2%) and ways to improve poor employment conditions (2%).

Health projects represented the next largest category with 35 projects or about 5% of the total. Just over one-third of these projects, or 34%, focused attention on the health care system itself, addressing issues such as insurance, HMOs, healthcare for minority groups. Another 31% addressed specific diseases, with more than half of them covering AIDS. An additional 23% addressed adult addictions, from alcohol, drug and gambling abuse, to their social consequence (i.e. drunk driving and violent crimes associated with such addictions). The remaining cases involved disability issues (9%) and suicide (3%).

Domestic life, with 26 cases or 4% of the sample, for the most part, dealt with issues considered relevant to family life, with 39% of this category focusing on issues of domestic violence (i.e., child abuse, spousal abuse and efforts to remedy the problem). The second largest subgroup, with 30%, addressed aging and generational issues (i.e., care of the elderly and discord between parents and children). A much smaller group, or slightly less than 12% of this category, directly addressed issues of disintegration of the family and ways to strengthen them. Another 12% focused on gender issues, specifically addressing issues such as female circumcision, equal opportunities. The remaining projects addressed animal rights issues (7%).

Crime and safety projects, representing 26 cases or 4% of the total, generally focused on efforts to improve a community's experience with crime and its impact citizens. A majority of these projects, or about 70%, dealt with adult violence and crimes, rape, ways to stop crime (i.e., community policing) and victims' rights. Another 19% focused on public safety issues, such as quality of rental properties, fire safety and promotion of safety programs. The remaining group dealt specifically with gun violence, addressing ways to stop gun violence and the right to bear arms (11%).

Poverty projects, with a total 23 cases or about 4% of the total, addressed conditions of those living in poverty. The majority, or about 66% of them, focused on issues of public housing, affordable housing, and the quality of health care and schooling for the poor. The remaining projects specifically addressed homelessness as a social issue (17%) and welfare programs (17%), such as ways to reform them or the personal experience of being on public assistance.

Environment projects, with 20 cases or 3% of the total, addressed community life as it relates to the quality of the environment, including pollution-related health issues, public health policies and ways to clean of the community.

Industry projects, with 10 cases or just under 2% of the total, primarily investigated local or national industries such as those in real estate, construction and sweepstakes. Only two cases dealt with unions and labor relations.

Ethics/Morality projects, with nine cases or just about 1% of the total, specifically addressed ethical and moral issues as they relate to improving the quality of community life, such as ethical standards, and qualities of integrity, civility and tolerance.

Elections Category

The second largest "final" category, with 62 cases or 10% of the total, primarily addressed upcoming local and national elections. Almost nine out of ten of these projects, 55 cases or 89% were attempts to move away from traditional election horserace coverage to more citizen-driven journalism. That is, they asked citizens what they considered the most relevant issues impacting their lives, educated them on the issues and candidates, stimulated public discussion of the issues and facilitated dialogue between citizens and candidates. The remaining 11%, or 7 cases, focused on ways to improve their community's electoral processes, including improving the manner in which communities elect their national, regional and local representatives.

Government Category

The third largest "final" category, with 39 projects or 6% of the total, focused on government policy and agencies, examining issues of general government spending, military spending, prison spending and conditions, capital punishment and racial profiling. One project examined a local public official involved in a political scandal. The vast majority of these projects, or 85%, were designed as formal investigative projects, representing over one-quarter of all investigative projects in the study.

Interactive Category

The interactive category represents the fourth largest “final” category with 28 cases, or a little over 4% of the total, and primarily concerns the use of new tools and technologies to improve the connection between organizations and citizens. For instance, nearly one-third of these projects, or nine cases, were designed specifically by primary organizations to apply civic mapping techniques in their efforts to develop a deeper understanding of community life, think more broadly about sources and report on issues in more meaningful ways for citizens. While we found evidence of experimentation with civic mapping techniques in 21 projects, the cases in this interactive category represent those cases whose main goal was to develop a civic map of their community and use it to improve coverage of an issue. That is, the issue covered was second to the primary goal of experimenting with civic mapping techniques to tap into different layers of community life and, thus, improve the quality of reporting.

Another 11 projects, or 40%, experimented with Internet-based technologies to aid and empower citizens in their efforts to participate in community-level decision-making processes. The Everett Herald's Waterfront Renaissance project, for instance, developed a “Sim City” approach to the city's waterfront development project and offered citizens a clickable map to view different planning scenarios and communicate their vision for the future of their city. The information obtained through the use of this interactive tool, along with the results of a survey and numerous community meetings, was shared with city planners, resulting in increased communication between citizens, the news organization and city officials.

The remaining 10 projects, or 36% of the interactive category, represented efforts to conduct daily civic journalism in various U.S. newsrooms. For the most part, these cases were examples of published articles from an editor's or reporter's portfolio to demonstrate their ongoing efforts to incorporate civic journalism practices in their daily work.

Other Category

In this miscellaneous “final” category, about one-half (11 cases out of 23) were represented by projects specifically designed to investigate the journalism profession or to explore ways to improve upon it. The other half of this category (12 cases) was largely

comprised of samples of work by various columnists and journalists for recognition of good journalism. For the most part, these cases were examples of traditional journalism and rated low on the civic index, with only one rating above a "2" on the scale.

TABLE 12.
CASES BY CATEGORY*

Category	Cases	Percent
COMMUNITY		
Diversity	84	12.9
Community	64	9.8
Civic Life	56	8.6
Youth	58	8.9
Education	48	7.4
Economic Development	39	6.0
Health	35	5.4
Domestic Life	26	4.0
Crime & Safety	26	4.0
Poverty	23	3.5
Environment	20	3.1
Industry	10	1.5
Ethics	9	1.4
Subtotal	498	76.5
ELECTIONS	62	9.5
GOVERNMENT	39	6.0
INTERACTIVE	29	4.5
OTHER	23	3.5
Total	651	100.0

* For a more detailed distribution of cases by category, refer to Appendix D.

Story-telling Elements

The cases in the study used a wide range of story-telling elements, including the type of frame used in telling the story, sources used to inform the story, the degree to which the editorial board contributed to the project, the structural elements of the story in print, and the source of solutions to if offered by the project. The analysis of the story-telling variables discussed below is based on the number of cases in which there is sufficient evidence for evaluation for each variable.

Framing

Each project was evaluated for the types of frames the writer used for purposes of telling the story. In this context, a frame represents an organizing theme around which the story is told to help the reader make sense of it. Since one project might involve multiple organizing frames, the percentages in the following analysis do not correspond to 100%.

A vast majority of cases, or 96% of the projects, showed some evidence of *explanatory* framing in which the story is presented to readers in ways to increase readers' relationship to and understanding of the issues. As opposed to the traditional conflict frame, which tends to narrow the story to two or more opposing viewpoints, the explanatory frame explores an issue, in all its depth and complexity, to provide readers with the information necessary to thoroughly grasp the issue's scope, relevance and potential impact on their community and personal lives.

Sixty-three percent of the cases showed some evidence of a *problem-solving* frame, one that engages the reader in the process of identifying potential solutions to the issues being explored and, perhaps, participating in the implementation of solutions. The solutions are usually drawn from either the news organization's research, the citizens themselves or from other communities with experience in addressing a similar problem. It should be noted that the problem-solving frame can be used toward achieving any project goal and should not be confused with the goal to identify solutions, which is discussed earlier in this report. The former represents a story-telling theme organized around the processes of solving a particular problem; the latter represents an organization's primary stated goal to identify and offer solutions to citizens.

Almost 28% of the cases used an *investigative* frame to tell the story, usually involving a systematic search for information previously held from the public eye. This frame was either used as the primary frame to tell an investigative story or used to support explanatory and problem-solving frames.

The *human-interest* frame, found in about 21% of the cases, was used to present the human face of civic and social problems. More specifically, it was used to increase issue relevance by telling the story through perspective of those individuals with personal experience

with the problems and potential solutions. Although it was used in a small number of cases as the sole frame, it was most often used to support explanatory and problem-solving frames.

TABLE 13.a.
TYPE OF FRAMES USED

Type of Frames	Cases	Percent*
Explanatory	577	95.8
Problem-solving	377	62.7
Investigative	169	28.2
Human-interest	123	20.5

*Represents a percentage of the total number of cases with sufficient evidence available for evaluation of this variable.

Sources

A fairly equal balance between relying on citizens and officials for information and quotes represent the most prevalent type of sourcing in the sample. Forty-seven percent of the 586 cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate this variable relied on both citizens and officials as sources of information and expertise. The number of cases that relied upon citizens as primary sources and those that relied most heavily on the official point of view are equally represented, each with about one-quarter of the cases. The cases that were exclusively written by editors or columnists comprised only 3% of these cases.

TABLE 13.b.
TYPE OF SOURCES USED

Type of Sources	Cases	Percent
Citizen and officials used	276	47.1
Citizens emphasized	150	25.6
Officials emphasized	140	23.9
Editorial/ Essay only	18	3.1
Other	2	.3
Total	586	100.0

Editorial role

Each case was evaluated for evidence of an editorial role in the project, which was measured by the degree to which opinion pieces were found in the published projects and/or according to evidence in the application forms and letters submitted to the Center.

The vast majority of projects, or three-quarters of the 584 cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate this variable, maintained the impression of a distinct barrier between the editorial board and the newsroom, with no evidence of an editorial role in the process of publishing projects. Just under 20% showed some evidence of the editorial staff supplementing the work of the newsroom staff. Those projects that emphasized the editorial role over that of the newsroom represented only about 3% of the cases. The remaining projects, or another 2% of the cases, represent those that were exclusively editorial projects with no evidence of a newsroom role.

TABLE 13.c.
ROLE OF EDITORS

<i>Editorial Role</i>	Cases	Percent
Not present, no evidence of editorial role	444	76.0
Present, editors worked with newsroom staff	111	19.0
Emphasized, editors took lead role	15	2.6
Exclusive, editors worked independently	14	2.4
Total	584	100.0

Print presentation

The cases in the study represent a wide range in print presentation formats, from a single article to a formally structured series published over a period of time with multiple presentation elements. When print evidence was available, projects were analyzed in terms of their presentation format used to attract readers to the project and the informative elements provided to help them understand and relate to the relevant issues.

The following table shows the number of cases in the sample that used a uniquely designed layout and logo to identify and draw attention to the project, stated and explained the goal of the project, provided a guide to help readers follow the progression of the project, provide a historical perspective on the issue, analyzed and presented data in some visual form (graph or table), provided information necessary to empower and enable readers to take some form of action, provide contact information to link readers with civic leaders, organizations and/or legislative representatives. This analysis also evaluated benchmark information

provided to help readers understand the goals of the project set by the news organization, the citizens themselves or by examples provided by other communities facing similar issues.

Since each case contains multiple story-telling elements, the following analysis does not correspond to the total number of cases in the sample. The percentages for each variable are based on the total number of cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate the variable.

TABLE 13.d.
STORY-TELLING ELEMENTS USED

Story-Telling Elements	Cases	Percent [*]
Designed with formal structure	377	65.9
Stated aim of project	342	59.8
Provided data analysis, graphs	312	55.0
Provided empowerment information	266	46.8
Provided guide to project	257	45.4
Provided civic linkage information	212	37.5
Provided historical perspective	80	14.1
Used benchmarks	56	9.8

*Represents a percentage of the total number of cases with sufficient evidence available for evaluation of this variable.

Solutions

Each case was coded for evidence and source of solutions offered to citizens relative to the problems addressed by the project. Solutions, in this context, are differentiated from the aim to identify solutions and the problem-solving frame, both discussed earlier, by their role as a story-telling element. Solutions represent the existence of specific actions that are offered by officials, staff and/or citizens and deemed helpful in solving problems.

Over three-quarters, or 78% of the 608 cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate this variable, provided some form of possible solutions to the problems addressed by the project. Thirty-two percent of the cases offered solutions that combined a citizen perspective with that of an official perspective. An official perspective here includes solutions identified by community leaders as well as by the news organization itself. Another 29% emphasized the solutions offered by citizens, while another 19% placed an emphasis on the official point of

view. A total of 127 cases, or about 21% of these cases made no effort to offer possible solutions to the public.

TABLE 13.e.
SOURCE OF SOLUTIONS

Solutions	Cases	Percent
Offered by both officials and citizens	194	31.9
Offered by citizens	175	28.8
Offered by officials and/or staff	112	18.4
None offered	127	20.9
Total	608	100.0

Interactivity

The organizations represented in the study used a variety of tools and techniques to facilitate a greater degree of interactivity between themselves and citizens. Surveys, both informal and scientific, and focus groups provided useful methods of gathering information from citizens helpful in the design and implementation of projects. Through the use of these public opinion techniques, the projects identified the issues citizens consider most important to their community and the potential solutions to problems. A variety of public deliberative events were also convened by organizations as a means to facilitate community conversations and encourage citizen participation in public life. Encouraging feedback from citizens and giving them a voice, either in the print or broadcast elements of the project, represent other ways organizations encouraged interactivity with citizens. As the civic journalism movement evolved, Internet-based technologies were increasingly used to improve the degree of interactivity between the organization and citizens, most commonly accomplished through online feedback and deliberative features.

Surveys

Each case was evaluated for evidence of any form of survey technique used to gauge public opinion. Because a project could involve more than one type of survey technique, the numbers in the following analysis do not necessarily correspond to totals and percentages do not necessarily correspond to 100%.

Of the 617 cases with sufficient evidence to determine whether survey techniques were employed, nearly 33%, or 203 cases, used some form of public opinion data to inform the project.

TABLE 14.a.
USE OF SURVEYS

Survey	Cases	Percent
No survey used	414	67.1
Some form of survey used to measure public opinion	203	32.9
Total	617	100.0

About 22% of the cases with sufficient evidence to evaluate the type of method used a scientific method with random and representative samples. Additionally, about 11% used some form of informal (non-scientific) surveys, either exclusive of readership (usually through mail-in coupons) or of citizens (usually through "person on the street" interviews). A vast majority of the surveys and focus groups were conducted by the organization themselves or by a research consultant. Only 13 cases, or 2% of the total, involved the use of existing scientific data.

TABLE 14.b.
TYPE OF SURVEY USED

Type of Survey	Cases	Percent *
Scientific survey	136	22.1
Informal survey of readers only	37	5.8
Informal survey of citizens in community	20	4.9
Existing scientific polling data	13	2.1

*Represents a percentage of the total number of cases with sufficient evidence available for evaluation of this variable.

Focus Groups

Small group interviews, or focus groups, were used in 56 cases, or almost 10% of the 601 cases with available evidence for evaluation. A vast majority of these projects used between one and five focus groups to gather information from citizens and gauge public sentiment relevant to the project.

TABLE 14.c.
FREQUENCY OF FOCUS GROUPS

<i>Number of Focus Groups</i>	Cases	Percent
No focus groups used	545	90.7
Between 1 and 5	42	7.0
Between 6 and 10	3	.5
Over 10	11	1.8
Total	601	100.0

Public Deliberative Events

Each case was evaluated for evidence of any form of public deliberative event held outside the newsroom to facilitate community conversations. This measure takes into consideration evidence of any type of forum held to facilitate public conversations with and among citizens, civic leaders and/or public officials, including roundtable discussions, town hall meetings, task force groups, specific-action groups, informal neighborhood discussion groups, etc. This measure includes focus groups because they were often used as a first step in developing a community conversation, and coverage of an existing event convened by outside entities. In other words, this variable was meant to measure the extent to which projects in this study were committed to, in varying degrees and using various methods, improving public dialogue in the process of solving public problems.

Of the 617 cases with available data to evaluate public deliberative events, slightly more than 48%, or 295 cases, convened and/or covered some form of public conversation.

TABLE 14.d.
FREQUENCY OF PUBLIC DELIBERATIVE EVENTS

Public Deliberations	Cases	Percent
No public deliberations held or covered by organization	322	52.2
Some form of public deliberations held or covered	295	47.8
Total	617	100.0

In an effort to distinguish between the various types of public deliberative events evidenced in this study, we coded each case for evidence of specific types of forums convened. Because a case could involve more than one type of event, percentages in this analysis do not

correspond to 100. A project, for example, might be designed to convene town hall meetings, organize task force groups and facilitate a neighborhood cleanup event as a comprehensive effort to dig deep civic roots in a community.

Rather than simply covering an existing public event, the organizations in 233 projects, or 38% of the cases, took a lead role in organizing some type of public deliberative, action event or a combination of formats. Nearly 25% of the cases involved one or more town hall meetings, and 12% of the cases involved smaller roundtable discussions. Miscellaneous discussion groups, such as neighborhood pizza parties, prayer breakfasts and picnics were present in 32 cases, or 5% of the total. Nearly 14% convened action projects, in which citizens collectively worked, for instance, to clean up a neighborhood, gather signatures for petitions or volunteer for a community cause. Additionally, nearly 7% of the cases involved task force meetings, where citizens take a proactive role in strategic planning processes.

Other types of deliberative formats found in 64 cases, or 11% of the sample, include broadcast elements (i.e., radio or television call-in programs), online forums (i.e., chat rooms or bulletin boards), and virtual forums (i.e., the use of cyber optic technology).

Rather than actively convening public events, news organizations in 35 cases, or nearly 6% of the sample, chose instead to give citizens information about other public forums in their community, actively encouraged their participation in the events and covered the deliberations. The events promoted and covered in these cases include, for instance, candidate debates and legislative hearings.

TABLE 14.e.
TYPE OF PUBLIC EVENT CONVENED

Type of Public Event	Cases	Percent*
Convene town hall meetings	146	24.1
Convene roundtable discussions	75	12.4
Convene action projects	49	8.1
Convene task force meetings	41	6.8
Convene neighborhood events	32	5.3
Convene other types of deliberative events	65	10.8
Promote/cover public events in community	38	6.3

*Represents a percentage of the total number of cases with sufficient evidence for this variable.

It is also noteworthy to mention here that nearly one-half of the 295 cases involving some form of public deliberative event (140 cases) showed evidence that the print coverage of the forum was supplemented with either television or radio broadcast coverage.

Reader feedback

Each case was evaluated for evidence of efforts to encourage feedback from readers on the issue and the project itself at the end of the project during the publication phase. This measure is not the same as the informal reader survey previously discussed; rather, it represents invitations for readers to communicate with the editors and journalists working on a project.

Of the 578 cases with sufficient evidence for analysis of this variable, we found that 47%, or 272 cases, actively solicited feedback from readers via the newspaper, magazine or Web site. The vast majority of these cases provided contact information, usually in the form of a mailing address, telephone number and e-mail address. If the project was supplemented by a Web site with feedback features, the URL was included. Eight percent of this sample, or a total of 46 projects, provided a mail-in coupon in the newspaper to aid readers in providing feedback to the news organization.

TABLE 14.f.
SOLICITATION FOR FEEDBACK
(Back-end)

Solicitation for Feedback	Cases	Percent
Reader feedback solicited (w/out coupon)	226	39.1
Reader feedback solicited (used coupon)	46	8.0
Subtotal of projects with evidence of soliciting reader feedback	272	47.1
No evidence of back-end reader feedback solicited	306	52.9
Total	578	100.0

However, if we broaden the criteria to measure efforts to solicit feedback from citizens over the *entire* course of the project and include evidence of more formal methods (focus group and survey techniques), the total number of projects that actively sought some form of public

opinion is increased by 7% to a total of 307 cases, or 46% of the 571 cases with sufficient evidence for evaluation of these variables.

TABLE 14.g.
SOLICITATION FOR FEEDBACK
(Overall)

Solicitation for Feedback	Cases	Percent
Reader feedback solicited (in print publication, polls and/or focus groups)	307	53.8
No evidence of solicitation for feedback	264	46.2
Total	571	100.0

Citizen Voices

In addition to soliciting citizen feedback as just discussed, a total of 515 cases, or about 85% of the 603 cases with sufficient information to evaluate this variable, published citizens' perspectives on the issues in the print or online phases of the project. The variables we used to measure "citizen voices" do not include those we used to measure solicitation of feedback; rather, we measured here the degree to which citizen voices were used to express a citizen perspective on the issues in the publication, either print or online, of the projects.

A majority of the cases, or 59%, gave citizens a strong voice on the issues. Giving a strong voice to citizens involved incorporating and emphasizing quotes from citizens (often in side bars), presenting the issue through the perspective of citizens with personal experience on the issue, publishing transcripts of citizen interviews and/or broadcasting deliberative forums in which citizens took part.

Another 26% gave citizens a more limited role in voicing opinions. A more limited role of the citizen voice was evidenced when citizens were used as sources but their voices were not highlighted or emphasized in the publication.

TABLE 14.h.
PROMINENCE OF CITIZEN VOICES

Voice of the Citizen	Cases	Percent
Strong citizen voices	356	59.0
Limited citizen voices	159	26.4
No citizen voices	88	14.6
Total	603	100.0

Internet-based technology

The innovation and adoption of Internet-based technology has led to increased interactivity between organizations and citizens. Each case was evaluated for evidence of an Internet site designed to supplement the project. If a project offered a link to an Internet site, the site was evaluated according to its purpose. That is, we coded each for evidence of informative, feedback, deliberative and participatory features.

Of the 600 projects with sufficient evidence for analysis of this variable, 199 cases, or 33% of the cases in the sample, were linked to an Internet site specifically designed to supplement the project. The cases in which the online site served only as an archival source for project material and additional information represent 17% or 103 cases. Another 22 cases, or nearly 4%, supplemented the archival feature with a feedback feature, most commonly a link for email correspondence with the organization. About 8% of the projects, or 46 cases, provided deliberative features in addition to informative and feedback features on their Internet sites. Online deliberative features include, for the most part, chat rooms and message boards.

Lastly, what we call "participatory" features are evident in 28 cases, or nearly 5% of the total. These online features are designed to enable and empower citizens in their efforts to participate in problem-solving activities and include, for instance, the use of technology to post comprehensive databases for citizens to use in their own analyses of an issue, facilitate a virtual town hall meeting, survey users on the issues, or provide multi-media content such as video and audio clips of community events held in the community. Several projects used simulation technology enabling citizens to participate in their community's development plans, while several others provided empowerment tools to help citizens understand the personal impact of, for instance, proposed tax legislation and ways to take action in either support or opposition of such legislation.

TABLE 15.
TYPE OF INTERNET-BASED FEATURES USED

Internet-based Features	Cases	Percent
No evidence of Internet-based features	401	66.7
Archival and informative	103	17.2
Deliberative features	46	7.7
Feedback features	22	3.7
Participatory features	28	4.7
Total	600	100.0

Project outcomes

Each case was evaluated for ways in which the project impacted and changed community life. With very few exceptions, there was evidence of more than one type of outcome found for each case. While one case might contain evidence of only a few outcomes, another case might contain evidence of a wide range of outcomes. When there was insufficient evidence to code outcome variables for a case, we coded these variables as missing. The following analysis of outcome variables, therefore, reflects this variation of outcome evidence. Each variable is analyzed according to the total number of cases with sufficient evidence for evaluation.

The evidence for this outcome analysis, for the most part, was in the form of self-reports by the primary organization. Although there were a small number of cases with empirical evidence of impact found in published articles, the vast majority of outcome evidence was self-reported in the submittal material. The primary organizations submitting projects in the Batten Award competition, for instance, might mention in their application form and introductory letters a variety of ways their project impacted community life. For those projects funded by the Center, the evidence of outcomes might be included in the mid-term and final reports required by the Center. Or editors and reporters might include progress reports in their print or online publication as a way of informing citizens about a project's success in solving community problems. By the very nature of submitting a project to the Center for recognition and/or financial support, or informing citizens, the outcome data is biased in favor of the primary organizations' favorable evaluation of their own work.

It should also be noted that this analysis is influenced by wide variances in the material primary organizations submitted to the Center. While some cases contain detailed outcome evidence, as stated by the primary organizations, other cases show no evidence of impact on the community due to lack of primary organization input. For instance, more input is available from later Center funded entries because the Center began to require mid-term project reports, used to trigger the disbursement of the final funding, and final reports at the end of the projects, used to evaluate overall effectiveness. The following analysis, therefore, serves only to inform a general understanding of the various ways in which the impact of civic journalism on community life is perceived, primarily by its practitioners.

Aside from informing citizens and raising awareness, an outcome claimed in all but a few projects, the most prominent outcome is an *improvement in a community's public deliberative process*. About 53% of the cases with sufficient evidence, or 297 projects, demonstrated some success in directly impacting the deliberative process by convening events, or indirectly impacting the process by providing the impetus, and perhaps necessary tools, for citizens to organize public deliberative events themselves.

The *use of the project by other organizations*, such as media or other institutions, represents the next most prominent outcome and was found in 220 cases, or about 43% of the total cases with sufficient evidence. These cases contained evidence that other media organizations used the project in some way, either by using the material to supplement their own print or broadcast coverage of the issues, or as a guide in the design of their own civic journalism projects. Some cases contained evidence that other institutions, most commonly the educational system, used the material as instructional material in classrooms.

The third most prominent outcome is *positive reader response*, found in 192 cases, or 40% of the cases with sufficient evidence. This outcome variable was measured by data indicating that readers, through phone calls or letters to the organizations, approved of the project and appreciated the efforts of the primary organizations.

Improving the skills of citizens, found in 209 cases or 40% of the cases with sufficient evidence, was measured by data indicating that citizens were more able to perform the duties of citizenship, i.e. more informed to vote, to participate in a debate between candidates, to challenge the position of leaders, to engage in public deliberations, to actively work to change community life.

Changing public policy, found in 179 cases or 37% of the total cases with sufficient evidence, was measured by claims that the project directly influenced the implementation of, or change to, a policy that impacts the community.

Improving journalistic practices, found in 162 cases or nearly 30% of the total cases with sufficient evidence. This outcome variable was measured by claims that the process of experimenting with civic journalism techniques, including civic mapping techniques and efforts to integrate civic practices into daily coverage, improved the way a news organization will practice journalism in the future or how the project contributes to an overall improvement in the profession itself.

Influencing the formation of new organizations, found in 126 cases or 26% of the cases with sufficient evidence, was measured by claims that people, including public officials, civic leaders and/or citizens, collectively organized to solve problems and improve public life.

The remaining outcomes, each of which is found in less than 20% of the cases, represent claims of improving volunteer efforts (17%); claims of influencing the amount of public money dedicated to address a specific issue (11%); claims of influencing the amount of private money donated toward causes (9%); claims of influence over investigations undertaken to further address the issues (5%); and claims of initiating citizen letter or telephone campaigns organized to influence some aspect of public life.

TABLE 16.
PROJECT OUTCOMES

Outcomes	Cases	Total*	Percent
Improved public deliberative process	297	561	52.9
Project used by others (media, civic orgs)	220	520	42.3
Improved citizen skills	209	521	40.1

Positive reader response	192	491	39.1
Changed public policy	179	488	36.7
Improved journalistic practices	162	554	29.2
New organizations formed	126	493	25.6
Increased volunteerism	84	487	17.2
Increased public funds	53	483	11.0
Raised donation money	41	484	8.5
Launched further investigations	24	494	4.9
Generated citizen call/letter campaigns	23	484	4.8

*Represents total number of cases with sufficient evidence for analysis for each outcome variable.

APPENDIX A Coding Guide

Project

Analysis of the civic journalism (CJ) projects in the archives of the Pew Center for Civic Journalism (PCCJ) undertaken by news organizations nationwide and submitted to the center for a Batten Award (BA), project funding or any other more general purpose.

Unit of Analysis

The CJ project undertaken by the news organization. A project might involve one article or a series of articles published over any length of time appearing under the same project name.

.....
Level of analysis: use the following to determine the level of data available for each project according to the amount of information available for coding and analysis.

0. Incomplete evidence – have only mention of project, evidence of existence of it in BA letter, funding binder or a PCCJ publication.
1. Incomplete evidence of project in print – have evidence in print, but limited to name of news organization and category and very limited information on how project was conducted.
2. Incomplete evidence of project in print– have name of organization, category, and some information about how project was conducted from BA letter, funding information or PCCJ publication.
3. Complete PCCJ projects - but no BA award application information.
4. Complete PCCJ projects with award applications: years 1996-2000
5. Complete PCCJ projects with award applications: year 2001

Article ID#: use the number assigned to the project by FileMaker.

PCCJ#: use the number assigned the project by the Pew Center. If there is no number, use 88.

Type of news organization: the type of media organization that led the project,

1. Newspaper
2. Magazine
3. TV
4. Radio
5. Online
6. Newspaper, television
7. Newspaper, radio
8. Newspaper, television, radio
9. Print, online
10. Broadcast, online
11. Print, broadcast, online
12. Other

Level of involvement in civic journalism: the degree to which the news organization has been involved in doing civic journalism in years.

1. Low – 1 to 2 years of doing CJ.
2. Medium – 3 to 4 years of doing CJ.
3. High – 5 plus years of doing CJ.

Primary news organization name: the name of the organization that sent the project to the PCCJ for review [Open coding]

1. Winston-Salem Journal

City: the name of city in which the media organization is located. [Open coding]

1. Winston-Salem

State: the name the state in which the media organization is located. [Open coding]

1. North Carolina

Population served: use the population served information from the Bowker Newspaper Directory. If unavailable, use the designated market or city zone/target market data from Editor & Publisher directory. If not applicable, use 0.

Type of population served: use the type of population served by the news organization as designated by the Bowker Newspaper Directory:

0. Not a major metropolitan population (or any of the following)
 1. Major metropolitan population
 2. National population
 3. Multiple populations within one state
 4. Ethnic population
 5. Special interest population
 6. Multiple state population
 7. General interest population
 8. University population
 9. Major metropolitan paper and ethnic population
 10. News service publication
 11. Alternative publication
 12. Other publications

Publication frequency: use the frequency with which the news organization's publication is published.

1. Daily
2. Weekly
3. 6 days per week
4. 5 days per week
5. Bi-weekly
6. Monthly
7. Bi-monthly
8. Annually
9. Other

Circulation: use the circulation figure for the news the Bowker Newspaper Directory, or as given by news organization in a BA application or funding proposal. [Open coding]

Level of Circulation: the level of circulation according to the following:

1. Under 50,000 population
2. Between 50,000 and 99,000 population
3. Between 100,000 and 250,000 population
4. Over 250,000 population

Frequency of publication of the parts: use the frequency with which the series or parts were published.

1. Daily – consecutive series
2. Weekly – consecutive series
3. Monthly – consecutive series
4. Periodic – series
5. Periodic - articles
6. One day project – special section
7. One article
8. Periodic series – extended over more than one year
9. Other

Start date: use the date the project commenced; use the numerical code for month (i.e. 1 for January), day, and year.

End date: use the date the project ended; use the numerical code for month (i.e., 1 for January), day, and year.

Number of parts in series: use the number of parts into which the series was divided for publication.

Number of articles: use the number of articles included in the project's publication.

Number of pages: use the number of pages of the project's publication.

Length of project: use the number of months over which the project was developed and published.

Project reprint: was the project reprinted in a special section for later publication?

0. Not present
1. Present

Project Category (specific): use the specific category under which the main topic of project falls: [open coding] See "specific category" sheet.

Project Category (general): use the general category under which the main topic of project falls: [open coding] See "general category" sheet.

Partnerships: is there evidence that the news organization submitting the application partner with other media organizations?

0. None
1. Yes

Partnerships: is there evidence that the news organization submitting the application partner with other types of partners (i.e. civic)?

0. None
1. Yes

Type of partners: What other types of organizations (excluding submitting org.) were involved in the project? [Dummy coded]

Newspapers

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Commercial television

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Public television

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Cable television (includes community access)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Commercial radio

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Public radio

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Internet

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Schools (K-12)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Universities (i.e. schools of journalism)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Miscellaneous organizations (civic, businesses, governmental agencies)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Other

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present (use #)

Impetus for project: what was the catalyst for the project?

Specific events in community

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Evidence of social trends

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Upcoming, elections, campaigns, legislative sessions

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Type of aim: what is the aim or goal of the project as stated in published articles, BA application or funding proposal? [Dummy coded]

Investigate an issue, event; expose issue to readers, conduct public service journalism

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Inform readers, raise awareness of issue, examine issue, improve knowledge of readers, educate citizens

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Editorialize

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Give citizens a voice, listen to citizens ("listening post"), encourage community conversation.

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Improve civic life, improve lives of citizens, improve public discourse, to connect citizens, to build community, to call for action, encourage public to become engaged in solving problems.

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Change public policy, laws.

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Survey of public opinion, identify issues and solutions.

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Convene public deliberations, build consensus (specifically to hold public forums of some sort)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Identify citizen-generated solutions, to work toward finding solutions

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Develop civic map of community, conduct civic mapping project

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Improve the way journalism is practiced.

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Practice "daily" civic journalism

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Other (usually used for providing "empowerment tools" for citizens, primarily Internet related)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present
- 2. Primary

Reporting frame: what frame was used in reporting the story? [Dummy coded]

Human-interest

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Investigative (public service)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Conflict-oriented

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Issue-oriented (explanatory)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Problem-solving

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Other (usually used for election coverage, standard type of election coverage)

- 0. Not present
- 1. Present

Sources: what type of sources did the reporters use in developing the story? [Dummy code]

1. Citizen – emphasized over official
2. Official – emphasized over citizen
3. Both – official and citizen
4. Editorial or essay only
5. Other

Editorial role: was an editorial role evident in the CJ project?

0. Not present
1. Present - shared with the reporting staff
2. Present - editorial only, no reporting staff involved
3. Other

Presentation: did the news organization use a structured format for the presentation of the project that separated it out from the rest of the news?

0. Not structured
1. Structured

Stated aim: is there evidence that the news organization clearly stated the aim of the project for the reader?

0. Not present
1. Present

Project guide: did the news organization help readers understand the evolution of the project through the use of a project guide; was there a schedule of upcoming stories in the series?

0. Not present
1. Present

Photographic element: did the news organization emphasize the use of photos?

0. Not present
1. Not emphasized
2. Present - emphasized citizens over officials
3. Present - emphasized officials over citizens
4. Present – included photos of both officials and citizens
5. Other

Historical perspective: did the news organization provide a historical perspective to tell the story?

0. Not present
1. Present

Data analysis: did the news organization use CAR for analysis using outside data or present the results of a project-generated survey?

0. Not present
1. Present

Empowerment information: did the news organization give readers information that would help them understand the issue? Self-help info? How-to-get involved info? Community resources? Reading lists?

0. Not present
1. Present

Civic linkages: did the news organization give readers the contact information for civic leaders, officials, experts and civic organizations?

0. Not present
1. Present

Online component: was the project linked to an online site?

0. Not present
1. Present - for information, resources, archives, self-publishing
2. Present - for feedback from readers
3. Present – for continued discussion via message boards, chat rooms.
4. Other

Reader feedback: did the paper invite reader feedback?

0. Not present
1. Present
2. Present - including a mail-in coupon for the reader.
3. Other

Citizen voices: did the news organization give citizens a voice?

0. Not present
1. Present - but limited citizen voices
2. Present - strong citizen voice element for story
3. Other

Benchmarks: was there evidence that the news organization used other community's experiences as ways to measure progress, goals to achieve or examples to use?

0. Not present
1. Present

Resource packet: did the news organization make available resource packets (informative material aside from printed version of project) to the community?

0. Not present
1. Present

Hired outside consultant: did the news organization hire outside consultant, use an advisory board or a panel of experts to help them design their project?

0. Not present
1. Present

Surveys: is there evidence that the news organization conducted any type of survey (or used an existing survey) for public opinion purposes?

0. None
1. Yes

Surveys: what types of surveys were used by project to determine public opinion

Informal survey of readers only (use of mail-in coupon)

0. Not present
1. Present (use #)

Informal survey of citizens

0. Not present
1. Present (use #)

Existing survey

0. Not present
1. Present (use #)

Scientific survey

0. Not present
1. Present (use #)

Survey methodology

0. Not present
1. Present (use #)

Other category

0. Not present
1. Present (use #)

Meetings: what type of informal, private meetings did the news organization participate in? Committee meetings? Steering committees?

0. Not Present
1. Present – w/ citizens (Community, neighborhood groups, associations)
2. Present – w/ officials (Candidates, legislators)
3. Present – both
4. Other

Deliberations: is there evidence that the news organization convene public deliberations ("listening posts") to listen to citizens engage in public discourse?

0. None
1. Yes

Deliberations: If the project convened public deliberations, use the number of deliberative events held by the news organization. If none, use 0. For example, if there were 2 focus groups held with no other type of public deliberations, use 2 for focus groups, 0 for all other types of deliberative events. If there is evidence that there were more than one but no exact numbers of events held, use 66 if the number of events is between 1 and 5, 77 if between 6 and 10, and 88 if over 10.

Focus groups: use number of focus groups convened by project.

Roundtable discussions: use number of roundtable discussions convened by project (including small discussion groups, panel discussions).

Town hall meetings: use number of town hall meetings convened by project (including large public assemblies, summits, public forums, community meetings, school assemblies, rallies).

Public meetings with public officials and civic leaders that citizens are encouraged to attend and that are convened by the project.(including panel of experts).

Miscellaneous public forums: use number of other types of public forums convened by project where news organization listened to citizens identify and deliberate concerns and solutions (including pizza parties, study circles, prayer breakfasts, living room chats, picnics).

Public forums not convened by project: use number of public forums that were either covered by the project in print, attended by reporters or encouraged citizens to attend.

Task force groups: use number of task force group meetings convened by new organization where citizens work on solving problems (including workshops, citizen advisory panels).

Action projects: use number of events convened by project in which citizens engaged in some form of action to improve civic life (including neighborhood clean up, sign petitions or pledges, debates convened by news organization for citizen involvement in electoral process).

Print coverage of public events: were the public events reported in the news organization?

0. Not present
1. Present
2. Not applicable

Broadcast coverage: were the public events broadcast (TV and/or radio)?

0. Not present
1. Present
2. Not applicable

Solutions: did the news organization offer solutions to the issues addressed?

0. Not present
1. Yes - solutions offered by news organization, staff and/or community elites.
2. Yes - solutions offered only by citizens and civic leaders
3. Yes – solutions offered by combination of both staff/elites and citizens.
4. Other

Outcomes: what outcomes are evident as a result of the project? [Dummy coded]

Raised awareness, informed the community on the issue

0. Not present
1. Present

Improved participatory skills of citizens (increased voter turnout, more informed voters, improved relations between groups, citizens voiced opinions at public forum, posed questions, took a pledge to improve).

0. Not present
1. Present

Generated reader response to project – calls, letters, etc., to news organization.

0. Not present
1. Present

Generated calls for change – call or letter campaigns to other organizations

0. Not present
1. Present

Raised private funds, donations

0. Not present
1. Present

Increased public/private funds targeted toward solving problem

0. Not present

1. Present

Increased level of volunteer efforts

0. Not present

1. Present

Changed public policy, legislation introduced and/or adopted, laws passed, programs initiated, defeated legislation, studies proposed.

0. Not present

1. Present

New organizations formed as result of project (political, civic, government agencies, actions groups)

0. Not present

1. Present

Public deliberated problem and identified solutions, improved public deliberative process

0. Not present

1. Present

Further investigation launched.

0. Not present

1. Present

Project (concepts, material) used by other institutions (i.e. media, schools, civic org.)

0. Not present

1. Present

Improve journalism practices, positive change in newsroom

0. Not present

1. Present

Other

0. Not present

1. Present

Evidence of outcome: where was the evidence found? [Dummy coded]

Published articles

0. Not present

1. Present

2. Not applicable – no copy of published articles in archives

Batten award application

0. Not present

1. Present

2. Not applicable – no award application involved

Project funding application

0. Not present

1. Present

2. Not applicable – no funding application involved.

PCCJ Publications

0. Not present
1. Present
2. Not applicable

Other

0. Not present
1. Present
2. Not applicable

Evidence of continuing efforts: was there evidence that the project continued beyond the publication dates in the Batten Award application or funding application?

0. Not present
1. Present - efforts continued by news organization
2. Present - efforts continued by citizens
3. Present - efforts continued by both news organization and citizens
4. Other

Multiple-year project: Is there evidence that this project is part of a larger project published during previous years? Use number of years the project was previously in existence. If there is no evidence that the project was in existence during previous years, use 0.

of years

Funding: did the project receive any type of funding this year?

0. None
1. Yes – from PCCJ
2. Yes – from other sources
3. Other

If the project was funded by PCCJ in previous years, what amount was granted the news organization in the following years? If not funded in any of these years, use 0.

Year 1:1993-1994

Year 2: 1994-1995

Year 3: 1995-1996

Year 4: 1996-1997

Year 5: 1997-1998

Year 6: 1998-1999

Year 7: 1999-2000

Year 8: 2000-2001

Award: did this project win a Batten Award this year?

0. No
1. Yes

Was the project previously awarded a Batten Award?

1996
 0. No
 1. Yes

1997
 0. No
 1. Yes

1998
 0. No
 1. Yes

1999
 0. No
 1. Yes

2000
 0. No
 1. Yes

2001
 0. No
 1. Yes

Civic Index: Use the cumulative civic index below, with ratings from 0 to 4, to rate the degree to which the project established civic roots in the community, the degree to which it encouraged and facilitated citizen efforts to identify and solve public problems and improve public life.

0. None (no civic elements)

The project shows no evidence of facilitating citizen engagement in civic life, the news organization simply published a story about a person, issue or event, and the project is short in duration (1 article, 1-2 day installments).

Required elements	Optional
No civic elements evident	Investigative reporting

1. Very low (consciousness raising, civic enterprise efforts)

The project shows evidence that it attempted to raise awareness about an issue important to civic life, or investigate an issue, but no evidence that it attempted to solve problems or encourage citizen participation in civic life. It might be an investigative project. It might also invite citizen feedback on issue, give them voice and encourage participation in public forums not convened by project.

Required elements	Optional elements
Civic enterprise or investigative reporting	Invite reader feedback
	Citizen voices

2. Low (civic participation encouraged)

The project shows evidence that it attempted to raise awareness about an issue, involve problem-solving reporting, invite citizen feedback, give them voice, encourage citizens to engage in civic life (i.e., community forums, organize, volunteer), discuss possible solutions, but

does not survey citizens for public opinion (i.e., informal/formal survey, focus group, interviews) or convene public forums. The project might facilitate meetings with between news organizations and officials or civic leaders, or might provide resources to assist citizens in their civic participation

Required elements	Optional elements
Civic enterprise & problem-solving reporting	Meet w/ officials or civic leaders
Invite reader feedback	Provide resources to assist citizen participation
Citizen voices	
Encourage citizens participation	
Offer possible solutions to problems	

3. Moderate (public opinion sought)

The project shows evidence that it attempted to raise awareness about an issue, involve problem-solving reporting, encourage citizens to engage in civic life, give them voice, encourage citizens to participate in existing community forums, discuss possible solutions, and seek public opinion (i.e., informal/formal survey, focus group, interviews), but does not convene public forums specifically designed to address issue. The project might use multi-media format, cover community forums and provide resources to assist citizens in their deliberations.

Required elements	Optional elements
Civic enterprise & problem-solving reporting	Multi-media partnership
Invite reader feedback	Coverage of public forums
Citizen voices	
Encourage citizen participation	
Provide resources to help citizens participate	
Offer possible solutions to problems	
Survey citizens for public opinion	

4. High (working through the issues, deliberations convened and solutions deliberated)

The project shows evidence that it attempted to raise awareness about an issue, involve problem-solving reporting, encourage citizens to engage in civic life, give them voice, encourage citizens to participate in public forums, discuss possible solutions, seek public opinion and convene public forums specifically designed citizen deliberation of community issues and solutions. The project might seek citizen feedback for opinions (i.e., informal/formal survey, or use existing polling data, focus group, interviews), use multi-media format, cover forums and provide resources to assist citizens in their deliberations.

Required elements	Optional elements
Civic enterprise & problem-solving reporting	Multi-media partnership
Invite reader feedback	Multiple deliberative forums
Citizen voices	Coverage of public forums
Encourage citizen participation	
Provide resources to help citizens participate	
Offer possible solutions to problems	
Survey citizens for public opinion	
Convene deliberative forums	