Made for minds.

DW Akademie

Instructions Episode Evaluation – Content Analysis

Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Tunisia

Instrument of analysis 2019/20 | DW Akademie | P&C

Name of program under investigation:_____

Number of episode under investigation:_____

Topic(s) of episode under investigation (if one topic):_____

Frequency of program:_____[how many days a week or month?]

Duration of episode:_____[in minutes]

Date of episode:_____[dd/mm/yyyy] [broadcast or upload date]

Starting and ending time of episode:_____[hh:mm:ss-hh:mm:ss]

Platforms published:_____[____TV/radio channel, websites, apps etc.]

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. MAKE SURE YOU HAVE THE FIRST FOUR EPISODES OF EACH FORMAT THAT WAS BROADCAST. IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE RADIO/TV FORMAT IN A GIVEN PROJECT, YOU SHOULD HAVE AT LEAST ONE EPISODE PER FORMAT AND AT LEAST FOUR EPISODES IN TOTAL, E.G. IF THERE ARE TWO FORMATS, TWO EPISODES PER FORMAT (= 4 IN TOTAL). THESE SHOULD BE ANALYZED.

2. PLEASE FILL OUT A FORM LIKE THIS FOR EACH EPISODE OF THE FORMAT UNDER ANALYSIS, E.G. IF YOU HAVE FOUR EPISODES OF A FORMAT, FILL OUT THIS FORM FOR EACH OF THE FOUR EPISODES SEPARATELY.

3. DO THE QUANTITATIVE CODING WHILE YOU LISTEN TO OR WATCH THE FORMAT AND DO THE QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS (MORE EXTENSIVE WRITING IN THE BOXES PROVIDED) AFTERWARDS, E.G. FILL OUT 1.1 AND 1.2 WHILE YOU LISTEN / WATCH AND FILL OUT THE BOX UNDER 1.3 AFTER YOU HAVE FINISHED LISTENING / WATCHING. YOU MIGHT WANT TO HAVE ALL QUANTITATIVE CATEGORIES (MARKED AS "QUANT") IN A SEPARATE DOCUMENT, SO YOU DON'T HAVE TO JUMP PAGES TO FILL THEM IN DURING THE PROGRAM.

Category 1	**Quantity and Diversity of Participants**	**Research question:** Does the episode give space for participation?

1.1 [Quant] Please count how many individual persons participated in the episode directly (i.e. their voice is heard in the program). Put the number of active participants in the box on the right. For live shows this means you count the people in the show (including audience voices) and via telephone (call-in voices) that can be heard (excluding the presenter/s), for news shows it means counting the number of all voices you hear in the news segments (excluding the news speaker / anchor).	**1.1**
1.2 [Quant] Please count the number of individual persons that cannot be heard in the episode but that are quoted by the participants or the moderator. This can mean for example that the presenter or speaker narrates what someone has said or that Twitter, WhatsApp or Facebook messages of members of the audience are read out aloud during the show. Put the number of indirect participants in the box on the right.	**1.2**

1.3 [Qual] Please analyze in the box below: What kinds of people participate in the episode? Are young people included and to what extent? Are these young people treated as agents (e.g. experts, important actors) or simply as bystanders with nothing substantial to say? Are voices of girls / women included and to what extent? Are voices of marginalized groups (e.g. ethnic minorities, poor, disabled etc.) included and to what extent? Are voices of refugees included?

1.3

Category 2	**Form of Discussion**	**Research question:** Does the episode allow for organized debate?

Please skip this category if the episode does not involve discussion between participants, otherwise continue:

2.1 [Quant] Do the participants listen to each other's arguments? Please answer by putting "often", "sometimes", "rarely" or "never" in the box on the right.	**2.1**
2.2 [Quant] Is the atmosphere of the debate hostile? Please answer by putting "often", "sometimes", "rarely" or "never" in the box on the right.	**2.2**
2.3 [Quant] Does the presenter enable every guest the opportunity to take part in the conversation? Please answer by putting "often", "sometimes", "rarely" or "never" in the box on the right.	**2.3**

2.4 [Qual] Please give examples to support your answers in the box below: When do participants interrupt each other? When is the atmosphere of the debate hostile? How does the presenter enable guests and the audience to participate in the conversation?

2.4

Category 3	**Positive content**	**Research question:** Does the episode offer constructive solutions?

3.1 [Quant] Does the episode offer practical advice that listeners / viewers can use in their daily lives? Please answer by putting "often", "sometimes", "rarely" or "never" in the box on the right.	**3.1**
3.2 [Quant] Does the episode also focus on positive aspects of topics, such as reporting on solutions that were found elsewhere to a problem or pointing to perspectives that grant hope for the future? Please answer by putting "often", "sometimes", "rarely" or "never" in the box on the right.	**3.2**
3.3 [Quant] Are decision makers included in the discussion to make sure that it is not just young people "letting off steam" but that the show has an impact beyond that? Please answer by putting "often", "sometimes", "rarely" or "never" in the box on the right.	**3.3**

3.4 [Qual] Please give examples for practical advice given, positive aspects of the topics and which decision makers were included to support your answer. What knowledge or skills do viewers / listeners gain from the program? In what way would you say it is educational?

3.4

Category 4	**Relevance of Topic**	**Research question:** Is the topic relevant to young people?	
4.1 [Quant] Please rate the relevance of the topic of the program for young people on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = completely irrelevant and 10 = extremely relevant. Put your rating in the box on the right.			**4.1**
4.2 [Quant] Please rate how interesting the topic is presented for young people on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = completely boring and 10 = extremely interesting. Put your rating in the box on the right.			**4.2**
4.3 [Quant] Please rate how critical the perspective of the episode is on the topic on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = completely uncritical and 10 = extremely critical. Put your rating in the box on the right.			**4.3**
4.4 [Quant] Please rate the episode in terms of having a clear regional or local focus on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = no local/regional focus at all and 10 = strong local/regional focus. Put your rating in the box on the right.			**4.4**
4.5 [Qual] Please support your ratings for relevance and appeal for a young audience with arguments. Why is the topic relevant? Why is the program interesting for young people? Please focus on the language, the style and the way people interact during the episode. Does the episode use an interesting or unusual angle (e.g. visiting unusual settings) on the topic or include popular voices (e.g. social media influencers) to make it attractive for the audience? Please also support your ratings on critical perspective and local/regional focus.			
4.5			

Category 5	**Suitability of presenter(s)**	**Research question:** Is the presenter well chosen for the young episode?

5.1 [Quant] Please estimate how old the presenter(s) is (are). Put your guess in the box on the right.	**5.1**
5.2 [Quant] Please rate the presenter(s) in terms of being entertaining on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = very boring and 10 = very entertaining. Put your rating in the box on the right.	**5.2**
5.3 [Quant] Please rate the presenter(s) in terms of being professional on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = very amateurish and 10 = very professional. Put your rating in the box on the right.	**5.3**
5.4 [Quant] Please rate the presenter(s) in terms of being easy to understand on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = very difficult and 10 = very easy. Put your rating in the box on the right.	**5.4**
5.5 [Qual] Please analyze in the box below: Do you feel the presenter(s) is/are well equipped and suited to the episode? Please give reasons for your ratings above (entertainment value, professionalism, easiness to understand). Also focus on other aspects of language (e.g. colloquial?) and style (e.g. engaging?) of the presenter(s) and how he/she/they interact(s) with the audience (if applicable).	
5.5	

Category 6	**Form of program**	**Research question:** Is the program well executed?

6.1 [Quant] Please rate the episode in terms of the technical and journalistic quality of its audio and/or video reports (sound, picture quality, well cut, good story line etc.) on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = very low and 10 = very high. Put your rating in the box on the right.	**6.1**
6.2 [Quant] If the program is TV or video, please rate the episode in terms of the quality of the studio set-up (placement of cameras, presenters, guests, audience, lighting etc.) on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = very low and 10 = very high. Put your rating in the box on the right.	**6.2**
6.3 [Quant] If the format is TV or video, please rate the episode in terms of the quality of design (logos and captions, infographics, animated text etc.) on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = very low and 10 = very high. Put your rating in the box on the right.	**6.3**

6.4 [Qual] Please detail in the box below how you arrived at your judgements on video reports, the studio and the quality of design.

6.4

Category 7	**Online activities**	**Research question:** Is the program supplemented online?

7.1 [Quant] Please write the names of the online platforms or mobile apps on which the whole program can be listened to / watched in the box on the right.	**7.1**
7.2 [Quant] Please write the names of the online platforms or mobile apps in the box on the right, on which the audience can get extra information on the program, discuss the program or participate in the program discussions. These should be explicitly provided by the producers of the format (e.g. Facebook page, own app, etc.).	**7.2**

7.3 [Quant] Please write down the number of comments, shares and likes the episode generated on Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, the website, app or any other platform deemed relevant (provide separate numbers for each platform).

7.3

7.4 [Qual] Please analyze the online activity of the episode in the box below, concentrating on what was done to enhance the format online / mobile and the success in terms of quantity of online interaction. Also provide a short appraisal of the quality of interaction between editorial staff and audience, as well as between members of the audience online.

7.4