

## Appendix 1: The Shared Horizon's methodology used in Part II

Elsebeth Frey

As mentioned in the preface, *Shared Horizons* is a development and collaborative research project between journalism teachers and researchers at the journalism studies in Dhaka, Oslo and Tunis.

The Department of Mass Communication and Journalism at the University of Dhaka (DU) in Bangladesh is the oldest of the three, founded in 1963. The Department of Journalism and Media Studies at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences (HiOA) in Norway celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2015. In 1967, two years after Oslo, Tunis got its journalism education at Institute de presse et des sciences de l'information (IPSI) at the University of Manouba in Tunisia. Regarding bachelor students in journalism, DU has four batches, and the departments in Oslo and Tunis each have three classes. Oslo also has three small classes with students in photo journalism. In 2013, *Shared Horizons* conducted a survey sampling 644 bachelor students in journalism in the three departments, including the photo journalism students in Oslo.

There are many dilemmas to analysing journalistic core values across three very different countries. As we wanted to compare the way of looking at core values in news journalism, finding patterns that could point towards a national view or that of a transnational understanding, we had to scrutinize a wide population of respondents. Surveys are recognized as useful to cover multiple questions given to a larger population, and since our intention was to investigate how journalism students think about journalistic principles, both the ideals and core values in practices, we found that a *quantitative survey* would be the best way to perform our comparative research.

The questionnaire was made in mixed national groups, drawing on the benefits of having local knowledge of the meaning of journalism concepts, the media landscape and outlets as well as the local languages. The survey was intended to be conducted as a Lime Survey, and it was in Oslo.

As for the journalism education in Dhaka, they thought that if the survey was done online, they might not get an adequate number of replies within the scheduled time. Therefore, to get a maximum response, they surveyed the students physically present in the classrooms and exam halls and used hard copies of the questionnaire.

At IPSI, in Tunis, they decided to survey 100 students out of a total of 175, also due to technical and online problems.

As a total of 439 students in the three countries answered, it gave an overall response rate of 68 per cent. However, not every student answered the two open-ended questions: here we only got 406 answers.

The students answered 25 questions (see Appendix II), most of them multiple choice, but there were also two open-ended questions. After this, the answers were translated into English. We have to take into consideration that, although the students answered the questions in their native languages, Bengali, Norwegian and Arabic, there may have been misunderstandings due to translation. In addition, we may not know exactly what the students mean, as we only have the alternatives in the survey they felt to be nearest to their opinion. There is also the possibility that the students felt obligated to cross off the answers they thought their teachers would expect them to.

In order to rule out any differences according to gender, it should be noted that half of the respondents are female and half are male. Furthermore, we tested for gender bias, but in regard to results used in Part II, we did not find any. Due to the fact that they are students, it is also important to take into account that about one-third of the students in Dhaka and Tunis and 66 per cent of the Norwegian students have practical experience in journalism. In this respect as well, they should be good respondents for thoughts about journalistic core values.

As for the *Shared Horizons' qualitative interviews*, we did them because we wanted to delve deeper into concepts and views as well as to examine if the notions of journalism students, journalism teachers and working journalists differ. In-depth interviews give the opportunity for interviewees to elaborate their thoughts more freely and provide richer material. Hence, using a common interview guide (see Appendix II), 47 semi-structured interviews with journalists, teachers and students from the three countries were conducted.

All interviews were done face to face: 18 from Bangladesh, 9 from Norway and 20 from Tunisia. There were 24 females and 23 males, and the ages of the interviewees ranged from 20 to 69. Some of the students interviewed did not have journalistic practice, whereas others – being students, journalists and journalism teachers – had practice. Some even had more than 30 years of journalistic experience. The journalists worked on different platforms: radio, television, online and newspaper. All interviews were, as with the survey, done in the interviewees' native language, transcribed and then converted into English. Although we have put considerable work and effort into translating correctly, there may be some nuances missing that could influence the results.

In addition to dataset 1 (the survey) and dataset 2 (the interviews), there is also a third dataset, which is derived from a 2016 *roundtable conference*, where seven women reflected upon five questions about the notion of objectivity, press freedom and how journalists should relate to power (see Appendix II). All of them are former or present journalism students in our departments; one of them is a bachelor student

in journalism; two are master students; two work as journalists; one is a journalism teacher; and one works with communication.

When referring to those who answered the survey, we call them respondents. We refer to the people who were interviewed for dataset 2 as interviewees, and when quoted, each has a number, since all of our interviewed people are anonymous. As for the seven participants at the roundtable conference, they are called interviewees, and each is given an identifying letter from A to G.

• • •

All chapters in Part II use the methodology that is described above.

In *Chapter 3*, Elsebeth Frey uses results from the survey's questions about objectivity, fact and context. Her chapter also includes comments and answers from dataset 2. Furthermore, Frey also encloses results from dataset 3.

In *Chapter 4*, Hamida El Bour compares notions about how journalists should relate to power. From dataset 1, El Bour uses findings from how the watchdog role is perceived (from the question about the functions of the media) and from two questions about journalists relating to power. In addition, she includes results from dataset 2, the qualitative in-depth interviews with journalism students and teachers as well as working journalists.

Two of the survey's 25 questions dealt with corruption. In addition, the open-ended question on press freedom in the survey allowed for the students' comments on corruption as an obstacle to press freedom. Findings from these questions contribute to *Chapter 5*, as Solveig Steien compares and analyses the respondents' answers. Steien contextualizes the answers with information about the current state of the issues and exemplifies with concrete cases from the survey and its open-ended answers about press freedom and its implications, i.e., corruption and how it hinders press freedom.

In *Chapter 6*, Margrethe Håland Solheim looks into 406 answers to the two open-ended questions: 'What kind of limitations on press freedom exists in your country?' and 'Describe how you find the situation for freedom of expression in your country' (dataset 1).

In addition, Solheim did her own qualitative interviews with ten journalists in Colombia. Notably, the interview guides from the *Shared Horizons* project and the project in Colombia are slightly different. The interviews in Colombia probed the interviewees' journalistic values and asked to what extent they were able to work according to these values. The interviews were done in different cities all around the country.

Whereas also the interviews in Bangladesh, Norway and Tunisia (dataset 2) focus on core values, these interviews contained only a few questions about the interviewees' journalistic work. Nevertheless, the interviewees in Bangladesh, Norway and Tunisia gave many practical examples from their daily work. Solheim systematizes the interviews from Colombia with the *Shared Horizons'* interviews with journalists: ten from Bangladesh, eight from Tunisia and eight from Norway. That makes a total of 36 interviews used in her chapter, and 15 of the interviewees are female and 21 male.

