

RESEARCH REPORT

**“A Composite Index by Country
Of Variables Related to the Likelihood
Of the Existence
Of ‘Cash for News Coverage’”**

07/21/03

By

Dr. Dean Kruckeberg, APR, Fellow PRSA¹
Professor, Department of Communication Studies
351 Lang Hall, University of Northern Iowa
1801 West 31st Street, Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614-0139 USA
Ph.: (319) 273-2501 (voice mail); FAX: (319) 273-7356
E-Mail: kruckeberg@uni.edu;
Web: <http://www.uni.edu/~kruckebe>

And

Ms. Katerina Tsetsura
Doctoral Candidate, Department of Communication
1366 Liberal Arts & Education Building 2163, Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1366
Ph.: (Main Office): (765) 494-7790
E-Mail: tsetsura@purdue.edu

**Commissioned by the Institute for Public Relations (USA),
The International Public Relations Association (UK)
And Sponsored by Hürriyet, a Member of Dogan Media Group (Turkey)**

¹ The authors of this report express their immense gratitude to Frank E. Ovaitt, who has been liaison between the researchers and the commissioning organizations. He was, in all respects, a co-researcher throughout the project. Special thanks also are extended to research assistants Anna Levina during summer 2002 and Marina Vujnovic during spring and summer 2003 for their help in data collection and analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
TABLE I: INDEX OF 66 COUNTRIES	3
II. VALIDITY, METHODOLOGY, UNIT OF ANALYSIS	6
III. SOURCES FOR ASSIGNING NUMERIC VALUES TO VARIABLES	8
IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE INDEX	9
V. REFERENCES	9
VI. APPENDICES	11
<u>APPENDIX A—CONCEPTS/CONSTRUCTS</u>	11
<u>APPENDIX B—DESCRIPTION OF “CASH FOR NEWS COVERAGE”</u>	13
<u>APPENDIX C—IMPLICATIONS OF THE MORAL AND ETHICAL PROBLEM FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONERS, CONSUMER NEWS MEDIA PROFESSIONALS AND CONSUMERS OF NEWS MEDIA</u>	15
<u>APPENDIX D—FACTORS USED IN THE FINAL INDEX AND DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY</u>	20
<u>APPENDIX E—IPRA BOARD AND COUNCIL MEMBERS SURVEY FOR CONTENT VALIDITY OF THE INDEX VARIABLES</u>	26
<u>APPENDIX F—SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL PRESS INSTITUTE BOARD, NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND FELLOWS FOR CONTENT VALIDITY OF THE INDEX VARIABLES</u>	41
<u>APPENDIX G—VARIABLES THAT RESEARCHERS HYPOTHESE MIGHT ALSO MIGHT AFFECT “CASH FOR NEWS COVERAGE”</u>	55
<u>APPENDIX H—SIXTY-SIX (66) COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE INDEX</u>	56

RESEARCH REPORT

“A Composite Index by Country Of Variables Related to the Likelihood Of the Existence Of ‘Cash for News Coverage’”

I. INTRODUCTION

This index (see Table 1) has been developed as a baseline to score countries biennially on the likelihood of the existence of “cash for news coverage” paid to consumer newspaper media by news sources. The index—given acceptance of its validity and reliability as well as sufficient publicity worldwide—will not only help public relations practitioners anticipate the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage” among major consumer newspaper media in international media markets, but also will provide a useful indicator for media and governments of each of these countries to compare their relative likelihood that this phenomenon exists to that of other nations (see Appendix A for concise definitions of concepts/constructs for this study; read Appendix B for a description of the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage” and further context of the concepts/constructs; and examine Appendix C to learn the implications of the moral and ethical problem that is associated with this phenomenon).

This index provides a numeric-value score and rank-orders 66 countries that range in their likelihood that the phenomenon *likely does not exist* (high ranking) to *likely does exist* (low ranking). The 66 countries were selected primarily for their global economic and political importance and—to some extent—the availability of reliable data for variables in the index.

Because the incidence of the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage” is virtually impossible to measure directly, the researchers have developed this index based on eight variables that were used for their predictive value to determine the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept “cash for news coverage” from news sources.

TABLE I

Index comparing 66 countries’ likelihood of whether or not “cash for news coverage” likely does not exist (having high mean score and comparative ranking) or likely does exist (having low mean score and comparative ranking).

• (Self-Det.)	Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens
• (Perc. laws)	Perception of comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement
• (Accountability)	Accountability of government to citizens at all levels
• (Literacy)	High adult literacy
• (Prof. Educ.)	High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists
• (Ethics Codes)	Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism codes of professional ethics
• (Free Press)	Free press, free speech and free flow of information
• (Competition)	High media competition (multiple and competing media)

Country	Self-Det.	Perc. laws	Accountability	Literacy	Prof. Educ.	Ethics Codes	Free Press	Competition	Raw Score	Mean Score	Rank
Finland	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	39	4.88	1
Denmark	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	38	4.75	2
New Zealand	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	38	4.75	2
Switzerland	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	38	4.75	2
Germany	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	37	4.63	3
Iceland	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	37	4.63	3
UK	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	37	4.63	3
Norway	5	4	5	Miss. Data	4	4	5	5	32	4.57	4
Austria	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	36	4.5	5
Canada	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	36	4.5	5
Netherlands	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	2	36	4.5	5
Sweden	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	4	36	4.5	5
Belgium	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	4	36	4.5	5
USA	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	36	4.5	5
Australia	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	35	4.38	6
Ireland	5	3	5	5	5	3	4	2	32	4	7
Israel	5	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	32	4	7
Italy	5	1	5	5	5	5	4	2	32	4	7
Spain	4	2	4	5	4	5	4	3	31	3.88	8
Cyprus	4	Miss. Data	3	5	3	3	4	5	27	3.86	9
France	5	2	5	5	4	4	4	1	30	3.75	10
Portugal	4	2	4	5	3	4	3	5	30	3.75	10
Chile	3	3	3	5	3	4	4	4	29	3.63	11
Greece	4	0	4	5	4	3	4	5	29	3.63	11
Estonia	3	1	3	5	3	4	4	5	28	3.5	12
Japan	4	3	4	5	3	4	4	1	28	3.5	12
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	Miss. Data	3	5	2	5	2	Miss. Data	20	3.33	13
Brazil	4	0	4	4	4	5	3	2	26	3.25	14
Hungary	3	1	3	5	3	4	4	3	26	3.25	14
Puerto Rico	4	Miss. Data	4	4	3	Miss. Data	3	1	19	3.17	15
Korea, S.	4	0	4	5	4	3	4	1	25	3.13	16
Latvia	3	0	3	5	3	4	4	3	25	3.13	16
Russia	3	0	3	5	3	4	2	5	25	3.13	16
Slovakia	3	0	3	5	3	4	4	3	25	3.13	16
Bulgaria	3	0	3	5	4	4	4	1	24	3	17
Czech Rep	3	0	3	5	4	3	4	2	24	3	17
Hong Kong	1	3	1	5	3	3	Miss. Data	5	21	3	17
Lithuania	3	0	3	5	3	4	5	1	24	3	17
Singapore	4	5	2	5	3	2	1	2	24	3	17
Mauritius	3	0	3	4	3	Miss. Data	4	4	21	3	17
Slovenia	3	1	3	5	3	3	4	2	24	3	17
Poland	3	0	3	5	3	3	4	2	23	2.88	18
Argentina	4	0	3	5	4	0	3	3	22	2.75	19

Country	Self-Det.	Perc. laws	Accountability	Literacy	Prof. Educ.	Ethics Codes	Free Press	Competition	Raw Score	Mean Score	Rank
Mexico	5	0	4	4	1	5	3	0	22	2.75	19
Taiwan	4	1	4	4	3	0	4	2	22	2.75	19
Ukraine	3	0	3	5	3	3	2	3	22	2.75	19
Croatia	3	0	3	5	3	4	Miss. Data	1	19	2.71	20
Turkey	4	0	4	4	3	3	2	1	21	2.63	21
Venezuela	4	0	2	5	4	0	3	3	21	2.63	21
South Africa	4	0	3	2	3	4	4	0	20	2.5	22
Thailand	2	0	3	5	4	2	4	0	20	2.5	22
UAE	3	Miss. Data	1	3	2	3	1	4	17	2.43	23
Malaysia	4	0	2	4	3	3	1	2	19	2.38	24
India	4	0	3	1	2	5	3	0	18	2.25	25
Kenya	3	0	3	3	3	5	1	0	18	2.25	25
Kuwait	2	Miss. Data	1	3	2	Miss. Data	2	3	13	2.17	26
Indonesia	4	0	2	4	2	3	2	0	17	2.13	27
Nigeria	3	0	3	1	3	5	2	0	17	2.13	27
Bahrain	1	Miss. Data	1	4	1	Miss. Data	1	4	12	2	28
Jordan	2	0	2	4	2	3	2	1	16	2	28
Egypt	4	0	3	1	1	4	0	0	13	1.63	29
Pakistan	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	1	12	1.5	30
Bangladesh	3	0	2	1	1	3	1	0	11	1.38	31
Vietnam	1	0	1	5	1	1	0	2	11	1.38	31
Saudi Arabia	2	Miss. Data	1	3	2	0	0	1	9	1.29	32
China	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	6	0.75	33

Some data in Table 1 are missing (indicated by “Miss.Data”) because they were not available from the standardized (and thereby comparative) sources that were used. The researchers eliminated the categories for these variables in determining the mean scores for those countries for which such data were not available. Although this might inaccurately lower or raise a country’s mean score and comparative ranking relative to other countries in the index, this was a statistically available and more reliable solution to this problem than seeking nonstandardized sources.

Importantly, this index is designed to measure only the likelihood of whether or not “cash for news coverage” likely exists among a country’s major newspaper media. This research does not attempt to examine the relationship between the media and governments of the respective countries, nor journalists' ethics in "mining" public affairs information from government sources or any other phenomenon other than the likelihood of whether or not “cash for news coverage” likely exists among major consumer newspaper media.

II. VALIDITY, METHODOLOGY, UNIT OF ANALYSIS

The variables that were used in this index were chosen because of their criterion-related validity. Stacks and Hocking (1999) note:

Criterion-related validity focuses on the notion that a measure is valid to the extent that it enables the researcher to predict a score on some other measure or to predict a particular behavior of interest. The concern is not with what is being measured but whether the measure predicts relevant behaviors and responses on a second measure.... The interest is in **the criterion** itself—the variable the research wants to predict ... than in the *relationship* between what is being measured and the criterion. (p. 132)

The eight variables that were selected came from a universe of a great many more variables that were tested. An initial assumption was made that variables positively indicating modernity and prosperity and democracy as well as a relatively unfettered free marketplace economy would correlate positively with ethical behavior (or, conversely, with a lessened perceived need for corruption) in general and could reasonably be expected to positively correlate with ethical behavior of media—in this case, with the absence of the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage.”

This assumption suggested another caution, however! Care was taken not to make unwarranted assumptions reflecting a bias toward modern Western countries that have a history of news as a “fair and objective” consumer commodity. For example, the 10 highest-scoring countries in overall corruption (high score indicates the least corruption within a country) that were identified by Transparency International are: 1) Finland; 2) Denmark; 3) New Zealand; 4) Iceland; 5) Singapore; 6) Sweden; 7) Canada; 8) Netherlands; 9) Luxembourg; and 10) Norway—representing huge social/economic/political differences, although one might argue that each country would rank highly in both modernity and prosperity (New Index Highlights Worldwide Corruption Crisis, says Transparency International).

Although the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage” cannot be measured directly, research literature—particularly in international mass communication and development communication—suggests indicators, i.e., variables, exist that reflect the likelihood of whether or not corruption exists in general within a country and, arguably, whether or not “cash for news coverage” exists in particular. The variables that were selected for this index were those that were ranked highest in surveys that the researchers conducted among the populations of the International Public Relations Association (IPRA) Board and Council members and of the International Press Institute (IPI) Board, National Committee members and Fellows, i.e., two populations of experts (representing both public relations and the news media) who have broad international experience in media operations and how news is covered in many environments. These expert populations believed that these eight variables (see Appendix D) had the highest correlation with the likelihood of whether or not “cash for news coverage” exists among major consumer newspaper media within a given country (see Appendices E and F). A highly ranked

variable that was not included was journalists' pay at a professional level within each country. While this should have been included in this index, reliable data were not available for most of the countries in the index.

To identify factors that these experts thought influenced "cash for news coverage" (but not whether respondents thought the practice of "cash for news coverage" was present in any countries with which they were familiar), e-mail questionnaires were sent to the International Public Relations Association Board and Council members in November 2002, with the 97 members of the Board and Council members receiving the survey instrument through an official IPRA Board and Council members listserv. The 39 valid responses (38.1 percent response rate) represented members from 33 countries in eight regions (Latin America, North America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Asia, Middle East, Africa and Australia). To understand the insights of news media representatives, an identical e-mail questionnaire was sent in March 2003 over a three-week period to a total of 70 Board, National Committee members and Fellows of the International Press Institute. The researchers received a total of 19 valid responses (27.1% response rate) from this population. Respondents from this population represented a total of 15 countries and six regions (North America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Asia, Middle East, and Africa). Based on the survey responses, the eight factors in Table 1 were considered to have content validity for this index.

Only major consumer newspaper media were considered in the "unit of analysis." Although consumer news media in the 20th and 21st Centuries, of course, include electronic channels, e.g., radio, television and the Internet, and many non-consumer news media, e.g., business and trade publications could have been examined, the "unit of analysis" for this index was restricted to newspapers as traditionally defined. By restricting the index to major newspapers, a more accurate and fair comparison of consumer news media across countries is possible, i.e., such publications would be more clearly identified as consumer news media than would a range of radio, television and internet media that might focus on a broad range of entertainment and programming other than news. Emery and Emery (1988) provide criteria to define a newspaper:

Under twentieth century standards a true newspaper must meet the following qualifications: It must be published regularly, on a daily or weekly basis; it must appeal to a general-interest audience rather than a specialized one; and it must offer timely news.... The criteria most often noted here are continuity of publication using as much timely general interest material as feasible. (p. 7)

This definition clearly excludes "controlled" media and those channels of communication that have a political or ideological agenda that supercedes the dissemination of news as a consumer commodity in and of itself. Thus, sundry journalistic-appearing media that are owned and controlled by special-interest organizations and that are generally recognized to present information having a primary purpose other than as a commodity for sale to consumers, with accompanying subjectivity of information and with obvious and known partiality, are excluded in this unit of analysis, as are "propagandistic" media that are owned or sanctioned and controlled by authoritarian government regimes. This definition

of a newspaper also excludes television and other forms of electronic media that might have a news function, but that overwhelmingly exist to provide entertainment and "non-news" information.

III. SOURCES FOR ASSIGNING NUMERIC VALUES TO VARIABLES (PLEASE SEE APPENDIX D FOR DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY)

1. GOVERNMENT CATEGORY

Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens

The researchers used the *CIA World Factbook, 2001*, to collect the secondary data. Three-page printouts that contain factual information on "government type," "legal system," "suffrage" and "elections" were collected for each country. The source used for retrieving this information was located on-line at:

<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

Perception of comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement

The *2001 Corruption Perception Index (CPI)* of Transparency International was used for scoring this variable. CPI was found online at

<http://www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2001Data.html>

Accountability of government to citizens at all levels

This variable uses the same source that was used for the first variable, the *CIA World Factbook, 2001*, for evaluating and assigning the scores.

2. EDUCATION CATEGORY

High adult literacy

This variable used data retrieved from UNESCO's Institute for Statistics database that was available online at: <http://www.unesco.org/>

High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists

The source that the researchers used to assign numeric values for this variable was the two-volume *World Press Encyclopedia: A Survey of Press Systems Worldwide* (2003) that describes the press systems of 232 countries and territories.

3. MEDIA CATEGORY

Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics

The data for this variable were collected through the *International Journalism Network* available online at: <http://www.ijnet.org/code.html>

Free press, free speech and free flow of information

The most comprehensive index of press freedom available was *Press Freedom Survey 2002* originally conducted by Freedom House, an internationally known

nongovernmental organization. This comprehensive index analyzes a set of variables and creates its own indexing, results of which was available at:
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/pfs2002/pfs2002map.pdf>

High media competition (multiple and competing media)

Data for this variable were gathered from two main sources: Walden's World of Information Business Intelligence Reports, or Walden Country Reports (*World of Information Business Intelligence Reports, 2001*, Walden Publishing Ltd (online)) and Editor & Publisher International Yearbook 2002 (*Editor & Publisher International Yearbook: The encyclopedia of the newspaper industry, 2002* (82nd edition). New York: Editor & Publisher).

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE INDEX

This index does not directly measure "cash for news coverage," but rather measures variables that two sets of experts consider to be most important in indicating the presence of this phenomenon. Initially, the researchers were going to do a pilot survey of public relations practitioners, journalists and public relations educators in a single country (Sweden), with hopes of expanding the survey to many more countries in future years. However, the pilot survey did not get a good response rate. And, of course, no one country can be representative of a wide range of other countries. Further studies should attempt additional methodologies to measure, both directly and indirectly, the presence in each country of "cash for news coverage."

Both the IPRA and IPI populations judged as an important indicator whether journalists are paid at a professional level, but reliable data comparing journalists' pay to that of other professions in each country were not consistently available. Thus, although the variable is considered to be an important indicator of "cash for news coverage," the researchers were unable to include it in this index.

V. REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. (1992). *The practice of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Behrman, J. N. (1988). *Essays on Ethics in Business and the Professions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Campbell, R., with Martin, C. R. & Fabos, B. (2000). *Media and culture: An introduction to mass communication*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (2000). *Effective public relations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Delattre, E. J. (1984, June). Ethics in the Information Age. *Public relations journal*, p. 12.
- Dicken-Garcia, H. (1989). *Journalistic standards in Nineteenth-Century America*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Emery, M., & Emery, Ed. (1988). *The press and America: An interpretive history of the mass media*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Goodstein, L., Nolan, T., & Pfeiffer, J. W. (1993). *Applied strategic planning: A comprehensive guide*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Guralnik, D. B. (Ed.). (1980). *Webster's new world dictionary of the American language (176)*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Holmes, P. (2001, March 12). IPRA moves swiftly on Zakazukha; PRSA stays out of the Nike fray. *The holmes report*, 2.
- Holmes, P. (2001, March 12). IPRA promises to put an end to "pay for placement" worldwide. *The holmes report*, 13.
- Hunt, T., & Grunig, J. E. (1994). *Public relations techniques*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Johannesen, R. L. (2002). *Ethics in human communication*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kruckeberg, D. (1995). International journalism ethics. In J. C. Merrill (Ed.), *Global journalism: Survey of international communication (77-87)*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Merrill, J. C., & Lowenstein, R. L. (1971). *Media, messages, and men: New perspectives in communication*. New York: David McKay Company.
- Mundt, W. R. (1991). Global media philosophies. In J. C. Merrill (Ed.), *Global journalism: Survey of international communication*. New York: Longman.
- New index highlights worldwide corruption crisis, says Transparency International. Available: <http://www.transparency.org/documents/cpi/2001/cpi2001.html>
- Newsom, D., Turk, J. V., & Kruckeberg, D. (2000). *This is pr: The realities of public relations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Quick, A. C. (Ed.). (2003). *World Press Encyclopedia: A survey of press systems worldwide*, Vols. 1 and 2. Detroit: Gale.
- Shoemaker, P. J., Eichholz, M., Kim, E., & Wrigley, B. (2001). Individual and routine forces in gatekeeping. *Journalism & mass communication quarterly*, 78, 233-246.
- Siebert, F., Peterson, T., & Schramm, W. (1956). *Four theories of the press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Stacks, D. W., & Hocking, J. E. (1999). *Communication research*. New York: Longman.
- Williams, D. E. (1995). Probing cultural implications of war-related victimization in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia. In F. L. Casmir (Ed.), *Communication in Eastern Europe: The role of history, culture, and media in contemporary conflicts (pp. 277-311)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wimmer, R. D., and Dominick, J. R. (1994). *Mass media research: An introduction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

VI. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A—CONCEPTS/CONSTRUCTS

Kerlinger (1973, p. 28-29) defines a *concept* as an abstraction formed by generalization from particulars; a *construct* is also a concept, but a construct has been deliberately and consciously invented or adopted for a special scientific purpose. Babbie (1992, p. 118) says a *construct* is a theoretical creation based on observations, but cannot be observed directly or indirectly. Wimmer and Dominick (1994, p. 42) identify a *concept* as a term that expresses an abstract idea formed by generalization from particulars. It is formed by summarizing related observations. These authors say that a *construct* is a concept that has three distinct characteristics: 1) it is an *abstract notion* that is usually broken down into dimensions represented by lower-level concepts, i.e., a combination of concepts; 2) because of its abstraction, a construct usually cannot be directly observed; and 3) a *construct* is usually designed for some particular research purpose so that its exact meaning relates only to the context in which it is found.

Kerlinger (1973, pp. 29-31) notes that a *constitutive definition* defines a construct using other constructs, while an *operational definition* assigns meaning to a construct by specifying the activities or "operations" necessary to measure it. An *operational definition* is therefore a specification of the activities of the researcher in measuring a *variable* or in manipulating it, with a *variable* being a property that takes on different values and is a symbol to which numerals or values are assigned.

"*Advertisement*" is "... information placed in the media by an identified sponsor that pays for the time or space. It is a *controlled* method of placing messages in the media." (Cutlip, Center and Broom, 2000, p. 11). "*advertising*" is designing advertisements, preparing their written messages and buying time or space for their exposure (Newsom, VanSlyke Turk and Kruckeberg, 2000, p. 6).

"**Bribe**" is "1. Anything, esp. money, given or promised to induce a person to do something illegal or wrong 2. Anything given or promised to induce a person to do something against his wishes" (Guralnik, 1980, p.176).

Code of professional conduct (code of ethics)--"Professional" groups develop codes of ethics to define the scope of membership within their groups and also to attempt to attain for their groups at least the status of a "profession" (Behrman, p. 104). A code of *ethics*, however, codifies the group's relationship to society (Behrman, p. 106). Such a code of ethics must be consonant with the expectations of society, but, within those confines, society allows the professional groups freedom to determine specifically what the group ethically may do in its relationships to society (Behrman, p. 101).

"**Commodity**" is "anything bought and sold; any article of commerce" (Guralnik, p. 286).

"Consumer news media" are channels of communication that are devoted primarily to news dissemination to a general audience, and they include both print and electronic media, e.g., newspapers, radio, television and the Internet.

"Culture" is a social system based on a central set of beliefs and values (Goodstein et al., 1993, p. 58).

"Editorial content" is synonymous with Newsom, VanSlyke Turk and Kruckeberg's (2000, p. 524) definition of **"editorial matter,"** i.e., "The entertainment or educational part of a broadcast program or publication, exclusive of commercial messages." This would include the "news," "feature" and "editorial opinion" sections of consumer news media, not including the advertisements or commercials.

"Gatekeepers" are "editors, producers, and other media managers who function as message filters, making decisions about what types of messages actually get produced for particular audiences" (Campbell, 2000, p. 530).

"Information subsidies" is editorial content that public relations practitioners provide free of charge to media (Hunt and Grunig, 1994, p. 46).

"Likelihood of the existence of 'cash for news coverage' to countries' major consumer newspaper media by news sources" is a better descriptor of the Russian slang word **"zakazukha,"** a practice that can be found globally. Specifically, this is "the payment of newspapers and individual journalists for media coverage" (Holmes, March 12, 2001, p. 2).

"News" is "(t)he process of gathering information and making narrative reports ... which create selected frames of reference and help the public make sense of prominent people, important events, and unusual happenings in everyday life" (Campbell, 2000, p. 532).

"News Sources" is defined for this study as any persons that provide information that is used to make news reports.

"News Coverage" is defined for this study as the preparation and dissemination of a report that can be defined as news; the concept is used in the context of "covering," i.e., reporting, on a specific subject that is considered to be newsworthy, i.e., the report fulfills the criteria in accepted definitions of "news."

"Newshole" is the space left over in a newspaper for news content after all the ads are placed" (Campbell, 2000, p. 532).

"Value" is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state (Goodstein et al., 1993, p. 147).

"Values" are the broad dominant social attributes, behaviors and larger goals that are advocated, promoted and defended by a society (Dicken-Garcia, 1989, p. 15).

"Zakazukha" is a Russian word that can be translated as "order for the story," or "paid-for-publicity" (Holmes, March 12, 2001, p. 13). Specifically, this is "the payment of newspapers and individual journalists for media coverage" (Holmes, March 12, 2001, p. 2).

APPENDIX B—DESCRIPTION OF “CASH FOR NEWS COVERAGE”;
CONTEXTUAL DESCRIPTIONS OF THE BASIC CONCEPTS/CONSTRUCTS
DEFINED IN APPENDIX A

“Cash for news coverage” has been unfairly coined "**zakazukha**," a Russian slang word that can be translated as “order for the story,” or “paid-for-publicity” (Holmes, March 12, 2001, p. 13). Specifically, this is "the payment of newspapers and individual journalists for media coverage" (Holmes, March 12, 2001, p. 2). However, the practice in Russia has many counterparts elsewhere throughout the world. "**Cash for News Coverage**" is a more accurate descriptor of this practice that can be found globally.

The term "**information subsidies**" was originally conceived by communication scholar O. H. Gandy Jr. to label editorial content that public relations practitioners provide free of charge to media (Hunt and Grunig, 1994, p. 46). "**Editorial content**" is synonymous with Newsom, VanSlyke Turk and Kruckeberg's (2000, p. 524) definition of "**editorial matter**," i.e., "The entertainment or educational part of a broadcast program or publication, exclusive of commercial messages." This would include the "news," "feature" and "editorial opinion" sections of consumer news media, not including advertisements and commercials. "**Consumer news media**" are channels of communication that are devoted primarily to "news" dissemination to a general audience, and they include both print and electronic media, e.g., newspapers, radio, television and the Internet. "**News**" is "(t)he process of gathering information and making narrative reports ... which create selected frames of reference and help the public make sense of prominent people, important events, and unusual happenings in everyday life" (Campbell, 2000, p. 532).

A "**bribe**" is anything, especially money, that is given or promised to induce a person to do something illegal or wrong or anything given or promised to induce a person to do something against his wishes" (Guralnik, 1980, p. 176). An assumption about news coverage is that a given story has been published or broadcast because of its "**newsworthiness**," i.e., "(t)he often unstated criteria that journalists use to determine which events and issues should become news reports, including timeliness, proximity, conflict, prominence, human interest, consequence, usefulness, novelty, and deviance" (Campbell, 2000, p. 532). Ostensibly, no factors other than "newsworthiness" influence placement of information subsidies into the newsholes of consumer news media. A "**newshole**" is "the space left over in a newspaper for news content after all the ads are placed" (Campbell, 2000, p. 532); this newspaper term also describes electronic media's programming for "editorial matter." Such news—when presented accurately, truthfully, fairly and as objectively as possible—becomes a commodity that has value to the consumers of news media and that can be sold accordingly. A "**commodity**" is "anything bought and sold; any article of commerce" (Guralnik, p. 286).

However, considerable anecdotal evidence suggests that “cash for news coverage” occurs regularly and with impunity worldwide; “**news sources**” pay "bribes" to have their information subsidies disseminated in many consumer news media (e.g., public relations practitioners, government officials, business executives, advertisers and others). This

phenomenon might occur between a public relations practitioner and any of the "**Gatekeepers**," who might be "editors, producers, and other media managers who function as message filters, making decisions about what types of messages actually get produced for particular audiences" (Campbell, 2000, p. 530). Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim and Wrigley (2001, p. 235) note that "gates" are decision points at which items may be stopped or moved from section to section or from channel to channel, while "gatekeepers" are the individuals or sets of routine procedures that determine whether items pass through the gates.

"Cash for news coverage" in reality becomes somewhat like an advertisement, rather than a news story. Cutlip, Center and Broom (2000, p. 11) define "**advertisement (advertising)**" as "... information placed in the media by an identified sponsor that pays for the time or space. It is a *controlled* method of placing messages in the media." Newsom, VanSlyke Turk and Kruckeberg (2000, p. 6) note that designing advertisements, preparing their written messages and buying time or space for their exposure are the tasks of advertising. In contrast, Campbell, 2000, p. 532) define the "**newshole**" as the space left over in a newspaper for news content after all the ads are placed" (Campbell, 2000, p. 532). However, an advertisement is transparent in its paid placement, while "cash for news coverage" is insidious in the assumption it gives to news consumers that it is not paid.

APPENDIX C—IMPLICATIONS OF THE MORAL AND ETHICAL PROBLEM FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONERS, CONSUMER NEWS MEDIA PROFESSIONALS AND CONSUMERS OF NEWS MEDIA; DEFINITIONS OF RELATED CONCEPTS/CONSTRUCTS

Both public relations practitioners (as one type of news source) and consumer news media professionals share responsibility as citizens in alleviating the social ills that are created by the existence of “cash for news coverage” to consumer newspaper media by news sources.

As highly educated and trained professionals who are keenly aware of the critical importance of a dynamic marketplace of ideas to sustain and encourage democratic societies and free marketplace economies, professional public relations practitioners and consumer news media professionals worldwide are rightly incensed for purely moral reasons about this phenomenon. Usually, a public relations professional association has a **"code of professional conduct"** or **"code of professional ethics,"** e.g., those codes of the International Public Relations Association, the International Association of Business Communicators and the Public Relations Society of America forbid practitioners to participate in corrupting the integrity of communication channels, particularly of consumer news media that are perceived to be "objective" and "fair" in using newsworthiness as the sole criterion in their role as gatekeepers. Such codes are usually consistent with the aims of the various and sundry codes of professional journalists, e.g., the Code of Ethics of the Society of Professional Journalists and the "Principles of Ethical Conduct for Newsrooms" of the Gannett Newspaper Division (Johannesen, 2002, pp. 198-203).

However, compelling arguments for the elimination of "cash for news coverage" must satisfactorily address several issues that have to be reconciled in eliminating this practice. For example, apologists for the practice might cite the need for tolerance because of journalists' low pay in some countries and the assumption of public relations practitioners' and other news sources' perceived attempt to exploit the resulting poverty of journalists; others will excuse an immature and unsophisticated understanding of the role and function of a free press among journalists and public relations practitioners and other news sources in newly emerging democracies—suggesting the need for patience and forbearance with the assumption that the practice might ultimately disappear on its own as these democracies continue to evolve.

Accusations might also be heard concerning a perceived Western hegemony by wealthy and influential public relations agencies and their Western or transnational clients—perhaps accompanied by a plea for "cultural sensitivity." Also frequently cited are respect for societies' prevailing social/economic/political traditions as well as specific cultures' historical antecedents—again accompanied with a plea for tolerance and acceptance of such practices.

While such arguments may be easily countered and rebutted, defenders of "'cash for news coverage' to countries' consumer newspaper media by news sources" are

essentially correct when they declare that public relations practitioners do not have a right as a professional group to impose and declare valid their professional culture and values upon another professional group, i.e., journalists; neither do journalists have the right to impose their professional values on public relations practitioners.

Nevertheless, because of their impact upon society, both public relations practitioners and journalists have the obligation to act "professionally," i.e., socially responsibly, within their indigenous societies, even though they arguably do not fulfill all criteria of a "profession" (Delattre, 1984, June, p. 12). "Professional" groups develop codes of ethics to define the scope of their membership, identifying who they are as professionals as well as who may join their ranks (Behrman, p. 104). More importantly, professional groups' codes of ethics also codify these groups' relationship to society (Behrman, p. 106). Such codes must be consonant with the expectations of society, although—within those confines—society allows professional groups the freedom to determine specifically what they ethically may do in their relationships to society (Behrman, p. 101).

Thus, two distinct forces shape professional ethics: 1) the wider moral principles of society; and 2) the aims of the occupation. Such aims will generate functions that, in turn, will generate certain role-based obligations. Ultimately, society's general moral principles provide overall constraints on these aims and functions and how these functions may be executed (Olen, pp. 5-6).

Thus, it may be up to the two professional groups themselves to define their roles within—and responsibility toward—the society in which they practice their profession by defining their own ethics—again, within the moral parameters of that society. However, while it may be true that public relations practitioners do not have the ethical right—as a "professional group"—to define the ethics of another professional group, i.e., journalists, public relations practitioners as "professionals" have the responsibility to define their own ethical behavior and to enforce it within their own professional community. Again, the same holds true for journalists.

Williams (1995) reminds us that "culture" dictates what constitutes criminality (p. 299). One can easily extend this observation to infer that a pervasive culture also determines what is unethical, albeit perhaps not illegal, within a society. Goodstein et al. (1993, p. 58) define "**culture**" as a social system based on a central set of beliefs and values. Dicken-Garcia (1989, p. 15) describes "**values**" as the broad dominant social attributes, behaviors and larger goals that are advocated, promoted and defended by a society. Goodstein et al. (1993, p. 147) say a "**value**" is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state.

Thus, the argument against "cash for news coverage" must be made solely (and ultimately more compellingly) by public relations practitioners and consumer news media professionals, not as professionals, but rather in their role as citizens—both of the countries in which "cash for news coverage" occurs, but also as global citizens whose

"professional" values include truth and honesty in message construction and dissemination—values that these professionals declare as important to society at large.

Furthermore, public relations practitioners and journalists alike DO have the "professional right and obligation" to declare that their professional groups ethically won't yield to attempts to create the phenomenon of "cash for news coverage," i.e., neither by being willing participants nor allowing themselves to become unwilling victims of the practice.

This is not only because information subsidies, e.g., news releases, are a valuable commodity given to consumer news media for free, i.e., an information subsidy having newsworthiness has inherent value and thus can be marketed by the medium for its own profit. But, also, from the ethical perspective of public relations practitioners and consumer news media professionals alike, this commodity must be given to consumer newspaper media only for its intrinsic value to the ultimate consumers of news. Thus, newsworthiness must be the sole criterion that determines usage in a consumer news medium, especially when an information subsidy is to appear in a medium that conveys and reinforces newspaper consumers' implicit assumption that an information subsidy was selected totally because of newsworthiness.

Thus, while some public relations practitioners and consumer news media professionals may attempt to rationalize as being ethical or excusable "cash for news coverage" to disseminate information subsidies for the afore-mentioned reasons, public relations practitioners and journalists have their own professional ethical rights and obligations to determine and to declare that submission to such a phenomenon is professionally unacceptable to their own communities of professional public relations practitioners and consumer news media professionals—more importantly—is repugnant to them as citizens of their respective countries and as global citizens.

In the global arena, another vexing issue in resolving the problem of "cash for news coverage" is in defining "journalism" itself, especially in a 21st Century multicultural and global environment. Kruckeberg (1995, pp. 78-79) discusses the complexities of journalism and the role of the journalist when he observes that we can be no more precise than to argue that "'journalism' is what 'journalists' do." He notes that a journalist could be a public affairs reporter of government activity or an advice columnist, an ideological interpreter of news for a propagandistic medium owned or sanctioned by an authoritarian government or a reporter for a commercially "controlled" medium. "**Journalism**" is defined in this study as "the process of reporting news," and a "**journalist**" is someone who is engaged in this process for his or her primary livelihood.

Nevertheless, given the difficulty in defining what is journalism in contemporary global society, to a great extent consumer news media and their journalists/gatekeepers must be defined according to "**press systems**"—which still vary tremendously throughout the world in the post-Cold War 21st Century. Such systems may range from authoritarian to social responsibility to libertarian models (Kruckeberg, 1995, pp. 79-80). Siebert, Peterson and Schramm (1956) identified four models of that time: authoritarian,

libertarian, Soviet communist, and social responsibility theories, while Lowenstein (Merrill and Lowenstein, 1971; Mundt, 1991) modified this typology, identifying ownership types (private, multiparty and government ownership) as well as five press philosophies. Other scholars have identified additional typologies.

However, Kruckeberg (1995) attempts to identify which media and messages should be included in a nation's press system when he excludes special interest periodicals and media controlled by public relations practitioners, marketing communicators and the like:

Helpful is the identification of a predominant *general* news orientation of qualifying media as a uniform and consistent threshold criterion. Public affairs reportage about journalists' respective governments likewise is a strong definitional component of such journalism as it is practiced in the general news media. (p. 79).

All apologies for "cash for news coverage" become meaningless when held to the spectrum of what arguably is a universal human value, i.e., truthfulness and accuracy of information that is presented as well as an accurate contextualization and understanding of the criteria that are used in presenting such information when this information is held out to consumers to be fair and truthful by those disseminating the news, i.e., the consumer news media. A consumer news medium in no culture or situation can declare its objectivity, fairness and communication integrity when gate-keeping decisions are influenced by factors that are unseen and unknown—such as occurs with "cash for news coverage." This is especially true in societies that claim to be democratic and civil and humane. An attempt to present truth in a fair and objective manner and in a known context must be seen as a universal value when the value of truthfulness is declared, either explicitly or implicitly.

Thus, "cash for news coverage" can only be regarded as an insidious attempt to control people through the manipulation of information and must be viewed as a threat to civil society, regardless whether "cash for news coverage" is offered by public relations practitioners or is solicited by consumer newspaper media that publicly portend to value fairness and objectivity and truth. Public relations practitioners and journalists alike—as citizens of their respective countries and of the world who are well-informed about the importance of the integrity of media channels—need to take leadership in eliminating this misleading and thereby untruthful practice in keeping with both their professional and their human values.

Such ideals are predicated on the essential need for integrity of communication channels to assure an informed citizenry that is given the resources to responsibly and capably make decisions regarding their lives and well-being. Thus, it can be argued that professional groups, public relations practitioners, and consumer news media professionals may not have the right to define the ethics of another professional group; however, public relations practitioners as professionals have the moral right and obligation to themselves refuse to yield to demands for "cash for news coverage" by consumer newspaper media to news sources," i.e., by refusing to be willing participants

or unwilling victims of the practice. And journalists have a right to be professionally offended when “cash for news coverage” is offered. More importantly, as citizens of their respective countries—although in concert with others in their professional communities as well as with global citizenry at large—public relations practitioners and journalists not only have the moral right, but also the ethical obligation, to determine:

- 1) if “cash for news coverage” is occurring; if so, ...
- 2) they must ask, "Is such ‘cash for news coverage’ within the moral parameters of indigenous and global society and within the professional ethics of the professional group of journalists working in that medium?"

In sum, it must be argued that, as citizens who have an understanding and appreciation of the power of communication channels, public relations practitioners and journalists have the moral obligation to make other citizens aware of any behavior of news sources and consumer news media professionals that lie outside these moral parameters.

APPENDIX D—FACTORS USED IN THE FINAL INDEX AND DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY

Since the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage” cannot be measured directly, the researchers looked for surrogate factors for a composite index. They sought factors that were predictive, but not necessarily causative. Based on experience and anecdotal evidence, as well as research literature, the researchers identified more than 20 possibilities and narrowed this number to 14 (see survey instruments in appendix). The researchers sought to validate our selection of factors by surveying two highly qualified sets of experts, representing public relations practitioners and consumer news media professionals. Based on those responses, the researchers identified nine factors, but could only find reliable data on eight.

- Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens
- Perception of comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement
- Accountability of government to citizens at all levels
- High adult literacy
- High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists
- Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism codes of professional ethics
- Free press, free speech and free flow of information
- High media competition (multiple and competing media)

1. GOVERNMENT CATEGORY

Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens.

The researchers used the *CIA World Factbook, 2001*, to collect the secondary data. Three-page print-outs that contain factual information on “government type,” “legal system,” “suffrage” and “elections” were collected for each country. The source used for retrieving this information was located on-line at:

<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

The rationale for usage of this source is the same as for other governmental variables. The researchers made their judgments based on “Government type,” “Legal system,” “Suffrage” and “Elections.” These four factors were evaluated according to the length of time they had existed. Each of them was weighted equally. Even though some might question equal weight of these factors, the researchers propose that a longtime tradition of self-determination is best presented by these factors equally. In addition, equal representation minimizes the measurement errors in the statistical analysis of data. The factual information was used to collect information and to assign a score for each country. Even time periods were measured for each country. All time periods were averaged and scored according to a presented table. Thus, this variable measures length of time of self-determination by citizens.

5 = 50 years or more

4 = 41-50 years

3 = 31-40 years

- 2 = 21-30 years
- 1 = 11-20 years
- 0 = 10 years or less

Perception of comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement

The *2001 Corruption Perception Index (CPI)* was used for scoring of this variable. CPI was found online at <http://www.gwdg.de/~uwvw/2001Data.html> . The researchers used the “2001 Corruption Perceptions Index” of Transparency International (<http://www.transparency.org/>), a recognizable institution that is known worldwide, to measure this variable since this index relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, risk analysts and the general public. This organization collects data on 99 countries through multiple surveys and uses an original indexing system to assign each country a score on a corruption perception scale. The scale ranges from 10 (highly clean) to 0 (highly corrupt).

This reliable and highly respected index demonstrates effective enforcement of comprehensive corruption laws through the populations’ perceptions of corruption, which is one of the more reliable sources reflecting available data for most countries in the world. Without these laws and their effective enforcement, corruption would be perceived as inherently existing in a country’s society. One could argue that a cultural propensity toward corruption might exist in some countries; however, the counter argument answers that corruption would indeed occur in such countries without any comprehensive corruption laws and their effective enforcement.

One could further argue that countries that score in the bottom half of the index are, indeed, corrupt because the perception of corruption is high. The formal discussion of this analysis appears in the final 2001 CPI data report. In this study, straight CPI index scores were used rather than each country’s relative ranking (those countries not scoring in the top half in the 0-10 scoring would merit the minimum, a zero). The following scale was used for assigning the score for each country.

- 5 = 9.1-10 score
- 4 = 8.1-9 score
- 3 = 7.1-8 score
- 2 = 6.1-7 score
- 1 = 5.1-6 score
- 0 = 0-5 score

Since the numerical index and a numerical scale are used for assigning a score for this variable, there is no subjective evaluation of the data.

Accountability of government to citizens at all levels

This variable uses the same source that was used for first variable, the *CIA World Factbook, 2001*. The rationale for choosing this source is that it not only presents comprehensive data, but also better assures consistency of the data that were used to create this index.

Assigning a numerical value for each country for this variable required interpretation of the data that were presented in the *CIA World Factbook, 2001*. The researchers made judgments which scores to assign based on the same four equally weighted factors, “Government type,” “Legal system,” “Suffrage” and “Elections.” Although an element of subjective analysis and evaluation were required in the scoring, the researchers used a process for assigning this variable’s scores for each country so that others, if they choose to accept the logic of data gathering and scoring for this composite index, will be able to reproduce the same scores. Thus, this variable measures the extent and intensity of the accountability of government to citizens at all levels, but not the length of time of its existence.

2. EDUCATION CATEGORY

High adult literacy

This variable uses data retrieved from UNESCO Institute for Statistics database that was available online at: <http://www.unesco.org/> .

UNESCO Institute for Statistics is a part of the United Nations organization that collects and analyzes statistical data on the main human development factors for all countries that are members of the United Nations. Thus, this is one of the most reliable and comprehensive sources to access the statistical data related to educational, economical, and intellectual human development.

For this variable, the following objective (strictly numerical) scheme of assigning scores was used. The numbers reflect the percentage of the adult literacy in relation to the total country population in 2002.

- 5 = 91-100 percent
- 4 = 81-90 percent
- 3 = 71-80 percent
- 2 = 61-70 percent
- 1 = 51-60 percent
- 0 = 50 percent or lower

High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists

The source that the researchers used to assign numeric values for this variable was *World Press Encyclopedia: A Survey of Press Systems Worldwide* (2003). This newly released second edition provides comparative in-depth essays that describe the press systems of 232 countries and territories. The two-volume set is regarded as an authoritative source of accurate information that is gathered and written by experts who are knowledgeable about each country’s press system. The researchers interpreted the information that is presented in the *World Press Encyclopedia* for the category of “high liberal and professional education of practicing journalists” for the 66 countries that are represented in Table 1.

Such education throughout the world varies greatly, from “certificate programs” in Europe and elsewhere to training programs funded by newspapers to highly theoretical programs sponsored by the European Journalism Training Association as well as by journalist unions. The researchers looked for a high level of professional education within a foundation of liberal arts education. Again, although an element of subjective analysis and evaluation were required in the scoring, the researchers used a process for assigning this variable’s scores for each country so that others, if they choose to accept the logic of data gathering and scoring for this composite index, will be able to reproduce the same scores. The entry in *World Press Encyclopedia: A Survey of Press Systems Worldwide* (2003) for each country was read to compare common variables; these variables were: 1) undergraduate training (existence and requirement for a career in journalism); 2) graduate and doctoral studies in journalism-related fields; 3) a longtime tradition of education in journalism; 4) availability of professional training, e.g., seminars and short courses, for practicing journalists; and 5) existence and tradition of professional institutions that deal with journalism. A score of 5 was assigned to those countries that had all variables, while a score of 0 was assigned to those countries that fulfilled none of these variables’ criteria.

3. MEDIA CATEGORY

Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics

The data for this variable were collected through the International Journalism Network available online at: <http://www.ijnnet.org/code.html>. This source lists all known journalistic codes of ethics from countries around the world available in English. Codes of ethics presented for each country were printed, read and carefully analyzed by the researchers.

Since this is a qualitative data set, a different type of analysis and score assignment were used to index this variable. First, the set of evaluative criteria was established. It included a presence of a journalists’ professional code of ethics (the answer “no” automatically scored 0; otherwise, a country automatically scored 1), its comprehensiveness (whether it was created within the last five, ten or more (very high) years; how detailed it is (more than 4 pages – very high); which subjects it covers (covers at least five different subjects – very high), and to what extent it is specific, such as whether it lists specific examples of ethical and non-ethical behavior (more than three examples – very high); specific situations that might be ethically questioned (at least one – very high) and/or potential problems that journalists can face (at least one – very high). If all of these criteria were rated as very high, a country scored +2. If none or only one of these were rated very high, a country stayed with a score of 1. If the least two criteria (specific situations that might be ethically questioned and/or potential problems that journalists can face) were rated very high, a country scored +1. If the code was officially adopted by a professional organization of the country, the country scored +1, if not, the country scored –1. Finally, if the code has potential reinforcement value, which is expressed by the direct mentioning of such reinforcement in the code and/or by punishment by a professional organization, the country scored +1.

This is a somewhat subjective evaluation, which however can be traced and relied upon if one accepts a logic and rationale for indexing.

Free press, free speech and free flow of information

The most comprehensive index of press freedom available was *Press Freedom Survey 2002* originally conducted by Freedom House, an internationally known nongovernmental organization. This comprehensive index analyzes a set of variables and creates its own indexing, results of which was available at:
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/pfs2002/pfs2002map.pdf>

At the time of the research, index scores that were used by Freedom House were indexed as follows:

- 5 = 1-15 score (free)
- 4 = 16-30 score (free)
- 3 = 31-45 score (partly free)
- 2 = 46-60 score (partly free)
- 1 = 61-75 score (not free)
- 0 = 76-100 score (not free)

High media competition (multiple and competing media)

Data for this variable were gathered from two main sources: Walden's World of Information Business Intelligence Reports, or Walden Country Reports (*World of Information Business Intelligence Reports, 2001*, Walden Publishing Ltd (online) and Editor & Publisher International Yearbook 2002 (*Editor & Publisher International Yearbook: The encyclopedia of the newspaper industry, 2002* (82nd edition). New York: Editor & Publisher).

Walden's Country Reports were accessed through the Lexis Nexis Academic Universe database available at Purdue University. Under Academic Search Forms, Lexis Nexis Academic allows viewers to access Country Profiles and then choose to use either CIA World Fact book or Walden's Country Reports.

Walden Country Reports include the following categories of information: key facts, introduction, political structure, political situation, membership of international organizations, industry, banking and finance, companies, investment, stock exchange, natural resources, energy, agriculture, transport, communications and the media, armed forces, education, health and welfare, geography and climate, visitors' guide, useful business addresses. Each of the 100-plus country reports is updated once each year; if a significant event occurs, the report will be updated to reflect this.

If specific numbers of daily newspapers from Walden Country Reports were not available, researchers used Editors and Publishers Yearbook 2002. If there was a conflict in the number of daily newspapers, researchers used the highest obtainable number (from these two sources).

The 82nd edition (2002) of the Editor & Publisher International Yearbook (for numbers of daily newspapers) was used for collecting the data for this variable. This widely known and recognized reference indicates numbers of newspapers and their locations in each city of countries in nine regions in the world as well as in Britain, Canada, and the U.S.A. The source lists a number of papers and a population of each country.

The researchers calculated a competition variable by dividing the population number by the number of daily newspapers published in the country, as listed in the Walden's Country Reports or Yearbook. If the data were different in these two sources, the researcher went with a higher number of newspapers listed. The total population was checked through the World Bank statistical database in case of discrepancies. Although the total number of newspapers published in some countries may not be accurately reflected in the yearbook (for instance, not all the newspapers published in Russia or Ukraine are listed in the Yearbook), they were reflected in the Walden's Country Reports. These two sources are the best available for collecting data on a number of daily newspapers published in different countries worldwide.

The scores were assigned on the basis of computation of data on a single country value and an average of population to one newspaper among the examined 66 countries. The formula used to calculate the proportion was Country's population / number of newspapers = X thousands per newspaper. Then, the results were organized in 6 equal parts, from the smallest to the largest population number per newspaper. If countries had equal numbers, they were assigned the same table value. Thus, twelve (12) countries received 5, eleven (11) scored 4, ten (10) scored 3, eleven (11) scored 2, and eleven (11) countries scored 1, while ten (10) countries scored 0.

APPENDIX E—IPRA BOARD AND COUNCIL MEMBERS SURVEY FOR CONTENT VALIDITY OF THE INDEX VARIABLES

General information about the survey: The survey was distributed over a three-week period in November 2002 to 97 members of the International Public Relations Association Board and Council (through official IPRA e-lists). The researchers received a total of 39 valid responses (38.1% response rate). The data were analyzed over a one-week period. Responders represent a total of 33 countries and 8 regions (Latin America, North America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Asia, Middle East, Africa, and Australia).

Raw data for each variable

Each variable has several sets of data:

- 1) number of responses for each of the five answers on the scale (completely disagree; somewhat disagree; no impact; somewhat agree; completely agree)
- 2) number of responses for each of the three grouped levels of the scale (generally disagree; no impact; generally agree)
- 3) converted to percentages numbers for each of three groups (rounded up to 0.1)
- 4) 5-point scale mean

Means rank-ordered (highest to lowest)

9. Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics	Mean = 4.4
3. Comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement	Mean = 4.3
14. Journalists and other gatekeepers are paid at a professional level	Mean = 4.3
4. Accountability of government to citizens at all levels (omitted - 1)	Mean = 4.2
8. High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists	Mean = 4.0
11. Free press, free speech and free flow of information	Mean = 4.0
2. Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens	Mean = 3.9
7. High spending on primary school education as % of GDP	Mean = 3.6
12. High media competition (multiple and competing media)	Mean = 3.6
13. Media ownership not closely allied to/owned by other industries	Mean = 3.6
5. High adult literacy	Mean = 3.4
1. Civilian control of government and military	Mean = 3.3

6. High percentage of eligible population enrolled in secondary school

Mean = 3.3

10. Private control and/or ownership of media (as opposed to government control)

Mean = 3.2

Raw data and percentages

1. Civilian control of government and military

1)	completely disagree	5	12.8%	1 x 5 =	5
	somewhat disagree	5	12.8%	2 x 5 =	10
	no impact	8	20.5%	3 x 8 =	24
	somewhat agree	14	35.9%	4 x 14 =	56
	completely agree	7	17.9%	5 x 7 =	35

N = 39
Mean = 130/39 = 3.3

2)	generally disagree	10
	no impact	8
	generally agree	21

3)	generally disagree	25.6%
	no impact	20.5%
	generally agree	53.8%

4) Mean = 3.4

2. Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens

1)	completely disagree	3	7.7%	1 x 3 =	3
	somewhat disagree	3	7.7%	2 x 3 =	6
	no impact	4	10.3%	3 x 4 =	12
	somewhat agree	13	33.3%	4 x 13 =	52
	completely agree	16	41%	5 x 16 =	80

N = 39
Mean = 39/153 = 3.9

2)	generally disagree	6
	no impact	4
	generally agree	29

3)	generally disagree	15.4%
	no impact	10.3%
	generally agree	74.3%

4) Mean = 3.9

3. Comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement

1)	completely disagree	2	5.1%	1 x 2 =	2
	somewhat disagree	1	2.6%	2 x 1 =	2
	no impact	2	5.1%	3 x 2 =	6
	somewhat agree	14	35.9%	4 x 14 =	56
	completely agree	20	51.3%	5 x 20 =	100

N = 39 100%

Mean = 166/39 = 4.3

2)	generally disagree	3
	no impact	2
	generally agree	34

3)	generally disagree	7.7%
	no impact	5.1%
	generally agree	87.2%

4) Mean = 4.3

4. Accountability of government to citizens at all levels (omitted - 1)

1)	completely disagree	1	2.6%	1 x 1 =	1
	somewhat disagree	1	2.6%	2 x 1 =	2
	no impact	4	10.5%	3 x 4 =	12
	somewhat agree	17	44.7%	4 x 17 =	68
	completely agree	15	39.5%	5 x 15 =	75

N = 38 99.9%

Mean = 158/38 = 4.2

2)	generally disagree	2
	no impact	4
	generally agree	32

3)	generally disagree	5.2%
	no impact	10.5%
	generally agree	84.2%

4) Mean = 4.2

9. Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics

1)	completely disagree	0	0%	1 x 0 =	0
	somewhat disagree	1	2.6%	2 x 1 =	2
	no impact	3	7.7%	3 x 3 =	9
	somewhat agree	14	35.9%	4 x 14 =	56
	completely agree	21	53.9%	5 x 21 =	105

N = 39
Mean = 172/39 = 4.4

2)	generally disagree	1	2.6%
	no impact	3	7.7%
	generally agree	35	89.7%

3)	generally disagree	2.6%
	no impact	7.7%
	generally agree	89.8%

4) Mean = 4.4

10. Private control and/or ownership of media (as opposed to government control)

1)	completely disagree	2	5.3%	1 x 2 =	2
	somewhat disagree	8	21.1%	2 x 8 =	16
	no impact	10	26.3%	3 x 10 =	30
	somewhat agree	15	39.5%	4 x 15 =	60
	completely agree	3	7.9%	5 x 3 =	15

N = 38
Mean = 123/38 = 3.2

2)	generally disagree	10
	no impact	10
	generally agree	18

3)	generally disagree	26.4%
	no impact	26.3%
	generally agree	47.4%

4) Mean = 3.2

11. Free press, free speech and free flow of information

1)	completely disagree	1	2.6%	1 x 1 =	1
	somewhat disagree	3	7.7%	2 x 3 =	6
	no impact	6	15.4%	3 x 6 =	18
	somewhat agree	13	33.3%	4 x 13 =	52
	completely agree	16	41%	5 x 16 =	80

N = 39` 100%
Mean = 157/39 = 4.0

2)	generally disagree	4
	no impact	6
	generally agree	29

3)	generally disagree	10.3%
	no impact	15.4%
	generally agree	74.3%

4) Mean = 4.0

12. High media competition (multiple and competing media)

1)	completely disagree	0	0%	1 x 0 =	0
	somewhat disagree	10	25.6%	2 x 10 =	20
	no impact	5	12.8%	3 x 5 =	15
	somewhat agree	16	41%	4 x 16 =	64
	completely agree	8	20.5%	5 x 8 =	40

N = 39 99.9%
Mean = 139/39 = 3.6

2)	generally disagree	10
	no impact	5
	generally agree	24

3)	generally disagree	25.6%
	no impact	12.8%
	generally agree	61.5%

4) Mean = 3.6

13. Media ownership not closely allied to/owned by other industries

1)	completely disagree	1	2.6%	1 x 1 =	1
	somewhat disagree	3	7.7%	2 x 3 =	6
	no impact	12	30.8%	3 x 12 =	36
	somewhat agree	19	48.7%	4 x 19 =	76
	completely agree	4	10.3%	5 x 4 =	20

N = 39
 Mean = 139/39 = 3.6
 100.1%

2)	generally disagree	4
	no impact	12
	generally agree	23

3)	generally disagree	10.3%
	no impact	30.8%
	generally agree	59%

4) Mean = 3.6

14. Journalists and other gatekeepers are paid at a professional level

1)	completely disagree	1	2.6%	1 x 1 =	1
	somewhat disagree	2	5.1%	2 x 2 =	4
	no impact	1	2.6%	3 x 1 =	3
	somewhat agree	15	38.5%	4 x 15 =	60
	completely agree	20	51.3%	5 x 20 =	100

N = 39
 Mean = 168/39 = 4.3
 100.1%

2)	generally disagree	3
	no impact	1
	generally agree	35

3)	generally disagree	7.7%
	no impact	2.6%
	generally agree	89.8%

4) Mean = 4.3

15. Other factors listed by respondents as ones that decrease the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept cash for news coverage.

1. Peer pressure	completely agree
2. Healthy democratic system	completely agree
3. Strong editorial track record of publication or broadcaster	completely agree
4. If news has a views value and is not promotional	completely agree

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 5. If big advertisers stop using their ads quid pro quo | completely disagree |
| 6. If independence of media is respected by the corporate world and the government | completely disagree |
| 7. Media self-discipline council | completely agree |
| 8. Strong sense of standards/values reg. Journalism and free press | somewhat agree |
| 9. Education on code of ethics | somewhat agree |
| 10. Media revenue streams achieve more balance up between subscriptions and advertising | somewhat agree |
| 11. Provision of logistical supporteg [sp.?] Transport, meals and necessary out of pocket expense by the media house/owners | completely agree |
| 12. Good recruitment policy free from nepotism ensuring that those who get the job and promoted are those who deserve on merit. Contrary to this you have job dissatisfaction and news gathering lose its seriousness become a hobby or charitable function | completely agree |
| 13. Improvement of quality of PR practitioners. Those who know their job well, confident, can research, plan implement and demonstrate effective PR programs as opposed to those who merely look for publicity as an end in itself hence victim to unprofessional journalists who promise to deliver such expectations on their terms – often involving money changing hands or other favors | completely agree |
| 14. PR practitioners with educational qualifications and membership of professional associations | completely agree |
| 15. A nations value system | somewhat agree |
| 16. Poverty level of the country where the media is located | somewhat agree |
| 17. The higher the salary of journalist, the lesser tendency to get paid for editorial | completely agree |
| 18. Professionalism in management organization will decrease the tendency of paid journalist | somewhat agree |
| 19. Establishing personal contract with journalist will decrease the payment for editorial | somewhat agree |
| 20. Freedom of information that covered by the constitution and laws which increases the transparency | completely agree |
| 21. Revitalizing the values of the society | completely agree |
| 22. “Computer-, “ “digital-,” and “information-literacy” | completely agree |
| 23. Attention on the subject – alerting readers | somewhat agree |
| 24. Strong and clearly communicated public relations professional code of ethics that prohibits corruption of Channels of communication or government | somewhat agree |
| 25. Strong news media organization which goes on record as being against the practice and which seeks self-enforcement by agreeing to end the employment of journalist found accept payment | somewhat agree |

26. Government law with penalties	somewhat agree
27. Journalists must not accept “cash for news coverage” but nobody have to propose this practice to journalist. They are paid by their media to have coverage and people paid media to read some information, no more	Not rated
28. Privately owned media with financial problems will ask for advertising budgets for news coverage	(completely?) agree
29. String censure by journalist associations	completely agree
30. Degree of seniority of the journalist	somewhat agree
31. Media group culture when recruiting	somewhat agree
32. Professional and ethical public relations specialists	completely agree

Cover Letter to IPRA Board and Council Members Survey

Dear IPRA Board or Council member:

You are invited to participate in a critically important survey that seeks your expert opinion about factors that influence the occurrence of “cash for news coverage” paid by news sources to daily newspapers or journalists.

This survey builds on the IPRA Media Transparency Campaign, with which you are already familiar. This follow-up project, conducted by the Institute for Public Relations in the US, seeks to create an international index that can be repeated every few years to compare countries regarding the likelihood that journalists seek or accept “cash for news coverage” from public relations practitioners.

In this survey, you will give your expert opinion about the relevance of the factors to the existence of “cash for news coverage.” Please understand that this is different from the IPRA survey in which you may have participated recently. Here, you will not be asked to evaluate whether or not these practices exist in your country or region. Rather, we are asking you to evaluate the relevance of certain factors to the practice of “cash for news coverage” in any or all countries where you have experience.

We are asking you to participate in this survey because the IPRA Board and Council members collectively have valuable expertise about media relations practices in a wide variety of countries and situations. Knowing your opinion will help the researchers to further validate, or confirm, the factors related to the “cash for news coverage” phenomenon.

Please note that this survey focuses specifically on “cash for editorial” practices with regard to daily newspapers. While the problem may also occur with other media, it is important for research purposes to have all respondents using the same frame of reference.

Your participation in this survey is voluntarily, and we guarantee that all responses to all questions will be anonymous and will not be reported individually. If you have any questions about this particular survey or about the IPR study in general, please send your questions via email to the researchers:

Prof. Dean Kruckeberg, Ph.D., Dept. of Communication Studies, University of Northern Iowa, at: dean.kruckeberg@uni.edu

OR

Katerina Tsetsura, Doctoral Candidate, Dept. of Communication, Purdue University, at: tsetsura@purdue.edu

Thank you for participating in this survey!

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPATING

To respond to this survey, please begin by hitting your email "Reply" button. Then, within the reply message, you can then fill out the survey. Once you have completed the survey, please hit your email "Send" button. If you have any problem with these instructions, or if the survey does not automatically appear in your reply message, please send an email to tsetsura@purdue.edu for assistance.

Please evaluate the relationship of the following factors to the “cash for news coverage” phenomenon. Again, we are not asking you to rate whether the practice exists in your country or other countries with which you are familiar; instead, we ask you whether these factors are related to the phenomenon of “cash for news coverage” in daily newspapers.

Government Category

Please evaluate each factor based on whether you believe it decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept “cash for news coverage.” Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- Completely disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- No impact
- Somewhat agree
- Completely agree

1. Civilian control of government and military (decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage")

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

2. Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

3. Comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

4. Accountability of government to citizens at all levels

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Education Category

Please evaluate each factor based on whether you believe it decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept “cash for news coverage.” Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

5. High adult literacy (decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage")

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

6. High percentage of eligible population enrolled in secondary school

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

7. High spending on primary school education as % of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

8. High level of education of practicing journalists

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Media Category

Please evaluate each factor based on whether you believe it decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept “cash for news coverage.” Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

9. Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics (decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage")

_____ Completely disagree
_____ Somewhat disagree
_____ No impact
_____ Somewhat agree
_____ Completely agree

10. Private ownership of media (as opposed to government ownership)

_____ Completely disagree
_____ Somewhat disagree
_____ No impact
_____ Somewhat agree
_____ Completely agree

11. Free press, free speech and free flow of information

_____ Completely disagree
_____ Somewhat disagree
_____ No impact
_____ Somewhat agree
_____ Completely agree

12. High media competition (multiple and competing media)

_____ Completely disagree
_____ Somewhat disagree
_____ No impact
_____ Somewhat agree
_____ Completely agree

13. Media ownership which is not closely allied to/owned by other industries

_____ Completely disagree
_____ Somewhat disagree
_____ No impact
_____ Somewhat agree
_____ Completely agree

14. Journalists are paid at a professional level

_____ Completely disagree
_____ Somewhat disagree

- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

15. Please list and rank any other factors, not listed above, that you believe decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept “cash for news coverage.” Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Factor:

-
- _____ Completely disagree
 - _____ Somewhat disagree
 - _____ No impact
 - _____ Somewhat agree
 - _____ Completely agree

Factor:

-
- _____ Completely disagree
 - _____ Somewhat disagree
 - _____ No impact
 - _____ Somewhat agree
 - _____ Completely agree

Factor:

-
- _____ Completely disagree
 - _____ Somewhat disagree
 - _____ No impact
 - _____ Somewhat agree
 - _____ Completely agree

Upon completing the survey as a "reply" message, please hit your email "Send" button. If you have any problem with these instructions, please send an email to tsetsura@purdue.edu for assistance.

Thank you again for participating in this survey, and responding by November 11!

**APPENDIX F—SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL PRESS INSTITUTE BOARD,
NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND FELLOWS FOR CONTENT
VALIDITY OF THE INDEX VARIABLES**

General information about the survey: This survey, identical to the IPRA content validity survey distributed among International Public Relations Association Board and Council members, was distributed in March 2003 over the three-week period to the total of 70 members of the International Press Institute Board, National Committee and Fellows via electronic mailing. The researchers received a total of 19 valid responses (27.1% response rate). The data were analyzed over a one-week period. Respondents represented a total of 15 countries and six regions (North America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Asia, Middle East, and Africa).

Raw data for each variable

Each variable has several sets of data:

- 1) number of responses for each of the five answers on the following scale (completely disagree; somewhat disagree; no impact; somewhat agree; completely agree)
- 2) number of responses for each of the three grouped levels of the scale (generally disagree; no impact; generally agree)
- 3) converted to percentages numbers for each of three groups (rounded up to 0.1)
- 4) 5-point scale mean (rounded up to 0.1)

Means rank-ordered (highest to lowest)

3. Comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement	Mean = 4.6
9. Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics	Mean = 4.6
4. Accountability of government to citizens at all levels	Mean = 4.5
11. Free press, free speech and free flow of information	Mean = 4.5
14. Journalists and other gatekeepers are paid at a professional level	Mean = 4.5
8. High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists	Mean = 4.2
2. Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens	Mean = 4.1
5. High adult literacy	Mean = 3.95
6. High percentage of eligible population enrolled in secondary school (omitted: 1)	Mean = 3.9

- 2) generally disagree 1
no impact 1
generally agree 17
- 3) generally disagree 5.3%
no impact 5.3%
generally agree 89.5%
- 4) Mean: 4.1

3. Comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement

- 1) completely disagree 0 0% 1 x 0 = 0
somewhat disagree 0 0% 2 x 0 = 0
no impact 2 10.5% 3 x 2 = 6
somewhat agree 4 21% 4 x 4 = 16
completely agree 13 68.4% 5 x 13 = 65
- N = 19 99.9%
Mean = 87/19 = 4.58

- 2) generally disagree 0
no impact 2
generally agree 17
- 3) generally disagree 0%
no impact 10.5%
generally agree 89.5%
- 4) Mean: 4.6

4. Accountability of government to citizens at all levels

- 1) completely disagree 0 0% 1 x 0 = 0
somewhat disagree 0 0% 2 x 0 = 0
no impact 1 5.3% 3 x 1 = 3
somewhat agree 7 36.8% 4 x 7 = 28
completely agree 11 57.9% 5 x 11 = 55
- N = 19 100%
Mean = 86/19 = 4.53

- 2) generally disagree 0
no impact 1
generally agree 18

- 3) generally disagree 0%
- no impact 5.3%
- generally agree 94.7%

4) Mean: 4.5

5. High adult literacy

- 1) completely disagree 0 0% 1 x 0 = 0
- somewhat disagree 2 10.5% 2 x 2 = 4
- no impact 2 10.5% 3 x 2 = 6
- somewhat agree 10 52.6% 4 x 10 = 40
- completely agree 5 26.3% 5 x 5 = 25

N = 19 99.9%

Mean = 75/19 = 3.95

- 2) generally disagree 2
- no impact 2
- generally agree 15

- 3) generally disagree 10.5%
- no impact 10.5%
- generally agree 78.9%

4) Mean: 3.95

6. High percentage of eligible population enrolled in secondary school (omitted: 1)

- 1) completely disagree 0 0% 1 x 0 = 0
- somewhat disagree 0 0% 2 x 0 = 0
- no impact 4 22.2% 3 x 4 = 12
- somewhat agree 11 61.1% 4 x 11 = 44
- completely agree 3 16.7% 5 x 3 = 15

N = 18 100%

Mean = 71/18 = 3.94

- 2) generally disagree 0
- no impact 4
- generally agree 14

- 3) generally disagree 0%
- no impact 22.2%
- generally agree 77.8%

4) Mean: 3.9

7. High spending on primary school education as % of GDP (omitted: 1)

1) completely disagree	0	0%	1 x 0 =	0
somewhat disagree	0	0%	2 x 0 =	0
no impact	3	16.7%	3 x 3 =	9
somewhat agree	13	72.2%	4 x 13 =	52
completely agree	2	11.1%	5 x 2 =	10

N = 18
Mean = 71/18 = 3.94

2) generally disagree	0
no impact	3
generally agree	15

3) generally disagree	0%
no impact	16.7%
generally agree	83.3%

4) Mean: 3.9

8. High liberal and professional education of practicing journalists

1) completely disagree	0	0%	1 x 0 =	0
somewhat disagree	1	5.3%	2 x 1 =	2
no impact	0	0%	3 x 0 =	0
somewhat agree	12	63.2%	4 x 12 =	48
completely agree	6	31.6%	5 x 6 =	30

N = 19
Mean = 80/19 = 4.21

2) generally disagree	1
no impact	0
generally agree	18

3) generally disagree	5.3%
no impact	0%
generally agree	94.8%

4) Mean: 4.2

9. Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics

1) completely disagree	0	0%	1 x 0 =	0
somewhat disagree	0	0%	2 x 0 =	0
no impact	0	0%	3 x 0 =	0
somewhat agree	8	42.1%	4 x 8 =	32

	completely agree	11	57.9%	5 x 11 =	55
	N = 19		100%		
	Mean = 87/19 = 4.58				
2)	generally disagree	0			
	no impact	0			
	generally agree	19			
3)	generally disagree	0%			
	no impact	0%			
	generally agree	100%			
4)	Mean: 4.6				

10. Private control and/or ownership of media (as opposed to government control)

1)	completely disagree	1	5.3%	1 x 1 =	1
	somewhat disagree	5	26.3%	2 x 5 =	10
	no impact	3	15.8%	3 x 3 =	9
	somewhat agree	9	47.4%	4 x 9 =	36
	completely agree	1	5.3%	5 x 1 =	5
	N = 19		100.1%		
	Mean = 61/19 = 3.21				
2)	generally disagree	6			
	no impact	3			
	generally agree	10			
3)	generally disagree	31.6%			
	no impact	15.8%			
	generally agree	52.7%			
4)	Mean: 3.2				

11. Free press, free speech and free flow of information

1)	completely disagree	0	0%	1 x 0 =	0
	somewhat disagree	1	5.3%	2 x 1 =	2
	no impact	2	10.5%	3 x 2 =	6
	somewhat agree	2	10.5%	4 x 2 =	8
	completely agree	14	73.7%	5 x 14 =	70
	N = 19		100%		
	Mean = 88/19 = 4.53				

- 2) generally disagree 1
no impact 2
generally agree 16
- 3) generally disagree 5.3%
no impact 10.5%
generally agree 84.2%
- 4) Mean: 4.5

12. High media competition (multiple and competing media)

- 1) completely disagree 1 5.3% 1 x 1 = 1
somewhat disagree 3 15.8% 2 x 3 = 6
no impact 1 5.3% 3 x 1 = 3
somewhat agree 8 42.1% 4 x 8 = 32
completely agree 6 31.6% 5 x 6 = 30
- N = 19 100.1%
Mean = 72/19 = 3.79

- 2) generally disagree 4
no impact 1
generally agree 14
- 3) generally disagree 21.1%
no impact 5.3%
generally agree 73.7%
- 4) Mean: 3.8

13. Media ownership not closely allied to/owned by other industries

- 1) completely disagree 1 5.3% 1 x 1 = 1
somewhat disagree 1 5.3% 2 x 1 = 2
no impact 3 15.8% 3 x 3 = 9
somewhat agree 8 42.1% 4 x 8 = 32
completely agree 6 31.6% 5 x 6 = 30
- N = 19 100.1%
Mean = 74/19 = 3.89

- 2) generally disagree 2
no impact 3
generally agree 14

- 3) generally disagree 10.6%
- no impact 15.8%
- generally agree 73.7%

4) Mean: 3.9

14. Journalists and other gatekeepers are paid at a professional level

- 1) completely disagree 0 0% 1 x 0 = 0
- somewhat disagree 0 0% 2 x 0 = 0
- no impact 1 5.3% 3 x 1 = 3
- somewhat agree 8 42.1% 4 x 8 = 32
- completely agree 10 52.6% 5 x 10 = 50

N = 19 100%
 Mean = 85/19 = 4.47

- 2) generally disagree 0
- no impact 1
- generally agree 18

- 3) generally disagree 0%
- no impact 5.3%
- generally agree 94.7%

4) Mean: 4.5

Less than 60% of respondents generally agreed that the following factors decrease the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept “cash for news coverage”:

- 1. Civilian control of government and military (52.6%)
- 10. Private control and/or ownership of media (as opposed to government control) (52.6%)

Cover Letter to IPI Board, Committees and Fellows Survey

Dear Colleagues of the IPI Board, Committees and Fellows:

An article in the next issue of The Global Journalist will explore the subject of corruption and the media. On a related matter, a new international index of bribery for news coverage is being developed by the Institute for Public Relations. You are invited to participate in this index by responding to an important survey that seeks your expert opinion about factors that influence the occurrence of "cash for news coverage" paid by news sources to daily newspapers or journalists in some countries. Your response is required no later than Monday, March 10. The survey will not take long, and we urge you to read and respond immediately if possible.

It is intended that this international index be repeated every few years to compare countries regarding the likelihood that journalists seek or accept "cash for news coverage" from news sources. In this survey, you will give your expert opinion about the relevance of multiple factors to the existence of "cash for news coverage." You will not be asked to evaluate whether or not these practices exist in your country or region. Rather, we are asking you to evaluate the relevance of certain factors to the practice of "cash for news coverage" in any country.

We are asking you to participate in this survey because the IPI Board, National Committee Members and Fellows collectively have valuable expertise about a wide variety of countries and situations. Knowing your opinion will help the researchers to further validate, or confirm, the factors related to the "cash for news coverage" phenomenon.

Please note that this survey focuses specifically on "cash for news coverage" practices with regard to daily newspapers. While the problem may also occur with other media, it is important for research purposes to have all respondents using the same frame of reference. Even if you do not currently work at a daily newspaper, we are asking your opinion.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary, and we guarantee that all responses to all questions will be anonymous and will not be reported individually. If you have any questions about this study, please send your questions via email to the researchers:

Prof. Dean Kruckeberg, Ph.D., Dept. of Communication Studies, University of Northern Iowa, at: dean.kruckeberg@uni.edu

OR

Katerina Tsetsura, Doctoral Candidate, Dept. of Communication, Purdue University, at: tsetsura@purdue.edu

Thank you for participating in this survey!

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPATING

To respond to this survey, please begin by clicking your email "Reply" button. Then, within the reply message, you can fill out the survey. Once you have completed the survey, please click your email "Send" button. If you have any problem with these instructions, or if the survey does not automatically appear in your reply message, please send an email to tsetsura@purdue.edu for assistance.

Please evaluate the relationship of the following factors to the "cash for news coverage" phenomenon. Again, we are not asking you to rate whether the practice exists in your country or other countries with which you are

familiar; instead, we ask you whether these factors are related to the phenomenon of "cash for news coverage" in daily newspapers.

Government Category

Please evaluate each factor based on whether you believe it decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage." Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

1. Civilian control of government and military (decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage")

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

2. Longtime tradition of self-determination by citizens

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

3. Comprehensive corruption laws with effective enforcement

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

4. Accountability of government to citizens at all levels

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact

- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Education Category

Please evaluate each factor based on whether you believe it decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage." Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

5. High adult literacy (decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage")

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

6. High percentage of eligible population enrolled in secondary school

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

7. High spending on primary school education as % of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

8. High level of education of practicing journalists

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Media Category

Please evaluate each factor based on whether you believe it decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage." Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

9. Well-established, publicized and enforceable journalism code of professional ethics (decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage")

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

10. Private ownership of media (as opposed to government ownership)

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

11. Free press, free speech and free flow of information

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

12. High media competition (multiple and competing media)

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

13. Media ownership which is not closely allied to/owned by other industries

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

14. Journalists are paid at a professional level

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

15. Please list and rank any other factors, not listed above, that you believe decreases the likelihood that journalists will seek or accept "cash for news coverage." Use the following ranking, and place an X before your choice for each factor below:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Factor:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Factor:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Factor:

- _____ Completely disagree
- _____ Somewhat disagree
- _____ No impact
- _____ Somewhat agree
- _____ Completely agree

Upon completing the survey as a "reply" message, please click your email "Send" button. If you have any problem with these instructions, please send an email to tsetsura@purdue.edu for assistance.

Thank you again for participating in this survey, and responding by Monday, March 10!

APPENDIX G—VARIABLES THAT RESEARCHERS HYPOTHESE MIGHT ALSO MIGHT AFFECT “CASH FOR NEWS COVERAGE”

Some variables (many of which relationships won't be measurable in the initial survey, but may be revealed as the study progresses) may be:

Space in newshole devoted to information subsidies

How much other news is influenced by public relations releases?

Codes of ethics that are adhered to by public relations practitioners and journalists as well as the reliance on formal codes vs. personal codes.

How advertising is separated from news stories and other editorial material.

Freedom of information across borders into and out of each country.

News values of the culture.

Language of newspaper (what indigenous or other language is written in the newspaper).

Press laws and government control mechanisms that distinguish and legislate distinctions between news and advertising.

Type of press system and press ownership—both normative and positive.

Gatekeeper identification and role.

Newspaper influence local, metropolitan, regional, or national.

Type of economic system, i.e., capitalism vs. socialism.

Political ideology of newspaper (if any).

Political (management) system internally.

Political system externally that controls and/or influences the newspaper.

External and internal control system sanctions that can be applied to influence newspaper content.

Why "cash for news coverage" happens; or why not.

Degree of reciprocity

Relationship with advertising

APPENDIX H—SIXTY-SIX (66) COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE INDEX

1. Argentina
2. Australia
3. Austria
4. Bahrain
5. Bangladesh
6. Belgium
7. Bosnia-Herzegovina
8. Brazil
9. Bulgaria
10. Canada
11. Chile
12. China
13. Croatia
14. Cyprus
15. Czech Republic
16. Denmark
17. Egypt
18. Estonia
19. Finland
20. France
21. Germany
22. Greece
23. Hong Kong
24. Hungary
25. Iceland
26. India
27. Indonesia
28. Ireland
29. Israel
30. Italy
31. Japan
32. Jordan
33. Kenya
34. Korea (South)
35. Kuwait
36. Latvia
37. Lithuania
38. Malaysia
39. Mauritius
40. Mexico
41. Netherlands
42. New Zealand
43. Nigeria
44. Norway

45. Pakistan
46. Poland
47. Portugal
48. Puerto Rico
49. Russia
50. Saudi Arabia
51. Singapore
52. Slovakia
53. Slovenia
54. South Africa
55. Spain
56. Sweden
57. Switzerland
58. Taiwan
59. Thailand
60. Turkey
61. Ukraine
62. United Arab Emirates
63. United Kingdom
64. USA
65. Venezuela
66. Vietnam