

Protocol - Independent media and free flow of information: and evidence gap map

Miriam Berretta
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)

Charlotte Lane
3ie

Kerstin Tomiak
The American University of Kurdistan

Katherine Garcia
3ie

Ingunn Storghaug
3ie

Jane Hammaker
3ie

Douglas Glandon
3ie

John Eyers
3ie

EGM Protocol

June 2021



About 3ie

The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) promotes evidence-informed equitable, inclusive and sustainable development. We support the generation and effective use of high-quality evidence to inform decision-making and improve the lives of people living in poverty in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). We provide guidance and support to produce, synthesise and quality assure evidence of what works, for whom, how, why and at what cost.

3ie evidence gap maps

3ie evidence gap maps (EGMs) are thematic collections of information about impact evaluations and systematic reviews that measure the effects of international development policies and programmes. The maps provide a visual display of completed and ongoing systematic reviews and impact evaluations in a sector or sub-sector, structured around a framework of interventions and outcomes.

The EGM protocol provides all the supporting documentation for the map, including the background information for the theme of the map, and details the methods that will be applied to systematically search and screen the evidence base, extract and analyse data, and develop the EGM report.

About this evidence gap map protocol

This report presents the protocol for a systematic search to identify and map the evidence base of impact evaluations and systematic reviews of interventions that aim to promote an independent media as a democratic institution in low- and middle-income countries. The EGM was developed by 3ie, made possible with generous support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)'s Center of Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance (DRG Center), via a partnership with NORC at the University of Chicago. The content of this report is the sole responsibility of the authors and does not represent the opinions of 3ie, its donors or its Board of Commissioners. Any errors and omissions are also the sole responsibility of the authors. Please direct any comments or queries to the corresponding author, Miriam Berretta, mberretta@3ieimpact.org.

Suggested citation: Berretta, M, Lane, C, Tomiak, K, Garcia, K, Storhaug, I, Hammaker, J, Glandon, D and Eysers, J, 2021. *Independent media and free flow of information: an evidence gap map protocol*. New Delhi: International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie).

Contents

List of figures and tables	ii
1. Background	1
1.1 Development problem being addressed.....	1
1.2 Study objectives and questions.....	4
2. Scope	4
2.1 Definitions.....	4
2.2 Conceptual framework.....	8
2.3 Criteria for including or excluding studies.....	9
3. Methods	26
3.1 Overall methodological approach.....	26
3.2 Conceptual framework development.....	27
3.3 Search strategy.....	27
3.4 Screening protocol.....	28
3.5 Data extraction and critical appraisal.....	29
3.6 Dealing with multicomponent interventions.....	30
3.7 Analysis and reporting.....	30
3.8 Timeline.....	31
3.9 Engagement and communication plan.....	31
4. Review information	32
4.1 Sources of support.....	32
4.2 Declarations of interest.....	32
4.3 Plans for updating the EGM.....	32
Appendix A: Search strategy	33
Appendix B: Data extraction template	41
Appendix C: Critical appraisal tool	43
Appendix D: Details about the EGM advisory group	51
References	53

List of figures and tables

Table 1: EGM research questions.....	4
Table 2: Interventions included	10
Table 3: Outcomes included	18

1. Background

1.1 Development problem being addressed

An independent media is expected to support democracy, human rights and sustainable development (Puddephat, 2010). It does this by holding the government accountable and providing access to information (Freedom House, 2019; Kumar, 2006). Through government accountability and transparency, free and independent media can decrease corruption (DFID, 2015; Haider, Mcloughlin and Scott, 2011). The favourable effects of media are thought to be grounded in what Jürgen Habermas (1974) described as the public sphere: a place where people could come together, be informed and organise to demand public goods and good governance from their governments.

Despite - or maybe because of - this, media freedom is severely challenged in most regions of the world (UNESCO, 2017/2018). The independence of media organizations and media workers is under attack and deteriorated in the last decade, including in multiple democracies (Freedom House, 2019; Benequista, 2019). Depending on metrics used, between approximately half (RSF, 2016) to 13% (Deane, 2016) of the world's population has access to an independent media. In fragile states, organisations that want to avoid accountability invest heavily in ensuring that the media reflects and protects their interests, thereby threatening the independence of the media (Deane, 2016). The Freedom House's press freedom scores declined by 9% in Eurasia, 11% in the Middle East and North Africa, and 8% in Europe since 2014. There has been no change in the Freedom House's press freedom scores for America and Asia-Pacific since 2014, and there has been a 3% increase in sub-Saharan Africa (Freedom House, 2019). Threats to media freedom include political, legal and economic forces that undermine the media's capacity to become or remain independent (Deane, 2016).

Leaders have attempted to silence critical media voices and strengthen outlets that produce coverage they favor (Freedom House, 2019). For example, in India, the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party has supported campaigns to discourage speech that is 'anti national' and government-aligned thugs have raided critical journalists' homes and offices. The media has become increasingly flattering of the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi. The government has become selective in who they provide with television licenses, excluding unfriendly outlets (Freedom House, 2019). These practices threaten democracy by silencing critical information and result in elections that are unfair because the public receives manipulated information.

Further challenges to independent media include a lack of funding possibilities and consequent conceptual blurring. In low- and middle- income countries (L&MICs), media often depend on grant income from donor organisations (Ismail, 2018). Consequently, funding shortages can force media organisations to close down. This challenge is even larger in fragile states (Ismail, 2018). However, media organizations that receive significant donor funding may be viewed by their audience as non-independent.

1.1.1 *The funding landscapes*

Media assistance dates back to the post-Second World War period. Interest in media assistance and funding increased during the third wave of democratisation during the late 1980s (Turner, 2015; Kumar, 2006). Most of the focus was on independent media in

Latin America (Cauhape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015). The media assistance programs that were funded promoted development of civil society, economic and political decentralization, free and fair elections, and the rule of law (Kumar, 2006).

After the fall of the Soviet Union and the tragic events in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s, there was another increase in media assistance (Cauhape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015; Kumar, 2016). The civil wars showed that the media could play a role in instigating and directing violence, which demonstrated the power of independent media and led to an increase in funding for media assistance (Susman-Pena, 2012). The newly funded programs mainly focused on legal reforms, journalism training and fostering the economic stability of the independent media (Cauhape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015). In recent years, there has been another push for media assistance, spurred by the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals 16. This goal includes a target to increase public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms (Myers and Juma, 2018).

From 2010-2015, bilateral and multilateral donors provided \$2.7 billion for media development, however, the bilateral gave the most of it covering the 92.5 percent of all official flows to media, while the multilaterals donors (such as the United Nations and the World Bank) covered the remaining 6.5 percent (Myers and Juma, 2018). The top donors between 2010-2015 were Germany with \$893 million, the United States spending \$440 million and Japan spending \$196 million (Myers and Juma, 2018). However, it is important to note that some donors, notably Germany and the Netherlands, and to a lesser extent France and the United Kingdom, include in the ODA large subsidies for their own international state broadcasters (i.e. Deutsche Welle) which many other countries, such as the United States, include in the bucket of public diplomacy and not media development, resulting in data which are not exactly comparable (Myers and Juma, 2018). The Media Development Investment Fund (MDIF) has supported independent media since 1995. They have provided \$125 million, financing 91 independent news businesses in 31 countries with a history of media oppression (Escalera et al., 2013). The Gates Foundation supported international media with more than \$11 million from 2010-2015 (Myers and Juma, 2018). In 2016 the Gates Foundation reported to CIMA that they spent \$23 million on support for media development. Other foundations have also contributed greatly to media support such as the Knight Foundation who spent nearly \$25 million and Open Society Foundation who spent around \$11 million in 2016, although most of this was directed to US-based recipients (Myers and Juma, 2018).

The United Kingdom funded a project in Iraq in 2015 that aimed to enable a legal and regulatory environment that would allow the Iraqi media to operate safely, freely and effectively. This would improve transparency and accountability and therefore strengthen the independent media. Another example was a project funded by Norway in 2012 that targeted Ukrainian journalists. This project was called 'Shining a Light on Corruption'; it trained journalists to establish a virtual platform that aimed to increase the electorate's corruption knowledge and strengthen their means to combat it during parliamentary elections (Myers and Juma, 2018).

Despite these impressive contributions and increased interest in assistance to the independent media, ODA allocated to media support (\$441 million) only represented

around 0.45% (around \$650 million) of total sector allocable ODA in 2014 and this figure decreased to 0.3% (\$487 million) in 2015 (Cuahape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015; Benequista, 2019; Myers and Juma, 2018). Of the original 0.4%, 45% (or roughly \$198 million) was allocated to media development, and only 8% was allocated to communication for development (Cauhape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015).

These numbers imply that donors continue to be marginally committed to funding media. The figure showing media support funding is a fraction of funding representing 0.4% of total sector allocable ODA, suggesting donors still have reservations about the media field (Cauhape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015). Funding to support knowledge creation (including research), building coalitions, and opening the spaces needed for dialogue and discussion on media systems is needed to guarantee a free flow of information and a pluralist media sector (Cauhape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015).

A major shortcoming of many efforts to support independent media is that organizations and donors often see as a rather technical endeavour with a focus on closing assumed knowledge gaps. The media's political function and how it is connected to a certain form of government is sometimes omitted. International experts value technical expertise over local knowledge and construct the intervened-in spaces according to outsider's expectations and expertise; local expectations are not given enough attention (see, for example, Autesserre, 2014; Koddenbrock, 2016; also Smirl, 2015; Perera, 2017). Important factors that might shape these expectations towards media include former media uses, expectations towards leadership, and understanding of rights and duties. For example, in many LMICs, colonial powers have used the media and these experiences shape the expectations of local audiences and governments. Local expectations can differ significantly from those of international experts and donors engaging in media interventions, making newly built media foreign in the country of intervention (Tomiak, forthcoming 2021).

1.1.2 Why is it important to do this EGM?

Given the threats to independent media, interventions to strengthen independent media are frequent and common in LMICs. Although the proportion of funding as a total of ODA funds may be small (0.3%) (Cuahape-Cazaux and Kalathil, 2015) in absolute numbers, a considerable amount of resources are spent supporting independent media, as explained in the previous paragraph. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that these resources are used effectively. However, their complexity and sensitivity to local context make media interventions incredibly challenging to study.

The publication of systematic reviews, literature reviews and landscape analysis on independent media interventions is scarce. There are some literature reviews on interventions to strengthen the financial independence or viability of independent media organisations (Ismali, 2018), or on the impact of media development projects (Arsenault and Powers, 2010), and a meta-analytic review has previously explored the effects of media literacy interventions (Jeong et al., 2012). Additionally, a report by BBC Media Action Research has summarised how experimental design has been used to assess the effectiveness of governance interventions and to understand the effects of the media on political opinion and behaviour (Moheler, 2014). BBC Media Action also carried out an evaluation of five capacity-strengthening projects (Parkyn and Whitehead, 2016). These studies represent key contributions to the relatively sparse area of independent media

interventions research. This evidence gap map will gather the such evidence into an easily retrievable to allow it to be used in decision making.

Mapping the research can help utilise the research to its full potential through informing policy makers and researchers. This map can identify gaps where more research is needed both in terms of synthesis and impact evaluations. The final report will also report specific information on the geography context and settings in which the interventions were implemented.

1.2 Study objectives and questions

This project aims to improve access to evidence on the effects of media development and media for development interventions in LMICs among policy makers, researchers and the development community. It will do this by identifying, describing and summarising the available evidence in a clear and structured way. In turn, it is expected the project will facilitate the use of evidence to inform research and policy decisions.

To meet this aim, the specific objectives of this EGM are twofold:

- Identify and describe the evidence on the effects of media development interventions on independent media strengthening outcomes, and media *for* development interventions on democratisation and peacebuilding outcomes in LMICs;
- Identify potential primary evidence and synthesis gaps.

To meet these objectives, we will address the research questions shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: EGM research questions

No.	Research Question	Type
RQ1	What is the extent and what are the characteristics of empirical evidence on the effects of media development and media for development interventions in LMICs?	Coverage
RQ2	What are the major primary and synthesis evidence gaps in the literature?	Gaps
RQ3	What intervention/outcome areas could be prioritised for primary research and/or evidence synthesis?	Research needs

2. Scope

2.1 Definitions

The ‘media’ can be defined as every device and institution that distributes messages on current or past issues to a wider audience and enables consumers to engage in discussions and public life. This includes electronic media (TV and radio), print products (newspapers and magazines) and social media (e.g. Facebook and Twitter). According to USAID’s Standardised Program Structure and Definitions for the Independent media program area,

The Independent Media and Free Flow of Information area encompasses interventions that promote or strengthen mediums for citizens to access information on issues of public interest across a variety of sectors, conduct free and open communication, engage with government and civil society, and increase constituency mobilization, and/or oversight of government functions to increase transparency and accountability. Interventions also work with media professionals, content creators, and other practitioners to improve their editorial, business, and technical skills while advancing the integrity of the sector. Finally, these interventions help build a supportive legal and regulatory environment to protect and promote press freedom — USAID 2018

UNESCO states that there are two aspects that need to be fulfilled for the media to be defined as independent. First, a media regulator needs to be independent from governmental influence and commercial interests. Second, the media and journalists need to remain free from political, governmental or commercial control (UNESCO, 2017/2018). Here, the media's political function is salient; it scrutinises those in power and thus contributes to good governance and government accountability (Kumar 2006; Coronel 2010; Kalathil 2011). However, development journalism as a counterpart to independent media has a focus on utilizing the media for social and economic growth, here, the media is understood to serving a country's development. In this function, media has been criticized as a mouthpiece of government (Biagi, 2007). Nonetheless, UNESCO has at one point emerged as a proponent of the practice (Ogan 1980); more recently, the organisation has recommended 'to include development journalism as an elective course in journalism programmes for emerging democracies' (Skjerdal 2011, p.58).

Kaplan defines media development as 'activities aimed at strengthening the media to be independent, pluralistic and professional' (Kaplan, 2012, p.6), and Moheler says that "these activities include increasing citizen engagement with the media, training media professionals, improving journalism schools, financing independent new organisations, supporting professional associations, teaching business and management skills, building a supportive legal and regulatory environment, protecting press freedom and reforming state broadcasters" (Moheler, 2014, p.9); a similar point is made, for example, by Kumar (2006).

Media *for* development, on the other hand, means communication campaigns that aim to initiate behaviour change. It is 'the strategic employment of media and communication as facilities for informing, educating and sensitising about development and pertinent social issues' (Manyozo, 2012, p.54). While the media can be utilised as a means to achieve a large variety of outcomes, including getting children to go to school or increasing the use of health services, in this EGM we will only look at interventions that use the media to promote accountability and democratic outcomes, and/or peacebuilding and institutional change outcomes (La Ferrara, 2016).

2.1.1 Media interventions: the theories behind the idea

The foundational idea underpinning media interventions is that media can be used to inform and educate populations on pressing and important issues and thus engage them in participating in society and governance. The media can be considered the fourth estate, a means to control governments and counter authoritarian, illiberal or patrimonial

regimes. In this way, an independent media is an end in itself; it represents a cornerstone of a functioning democracy. However, much of the development system and development journalism expands upon this by claiming that the media, which is concerned with social, cultural and political aspects of a society, follows an educational agenda that aims to deliver the information needed for human development and society's prosperity (Biagi 2007; Skjerdal 2011; Chattopadhyay, 2019). According to modernization theory, the media's ability to distribute information contributes to peace and democratisation, and through this, to stability and economic prosperity. This results in two philosophies around the media in the development community: one that views independent media as an end in itself and another that views independent media as a means for development. However, these goals are not mutually exclusive and can, in many cases, be synergistic.

2.1.2 The public sphere: media as an end

Habermasian theory of the public sphere argues that independent media is an end in itself (Habermas, 1974). If the media is independent and journalists are able and permitted to examine and inform on those in power, the media provides the foundation for population's engagement in governance. This theory posits that the free flow of information will result in informing populations and empowering them to phrase their demands and thus participate in governance (Habermas, 1974). The public sphere is described as a space to discuss issues of social and societal importance, independent from institutions such as governments and the church. It is located between the state and the domestic sphere (Boyd-Barrett, 2001). Habermas described the public sphere as emerging from the 18th century coffeehouse: a place where citizens shared information and discussed issues (Cowan, 2004, Habermas, 1974). Of particular importance were the newly emerging newspapers that were on display in the coffeehouses. Visitors were thus informed on everyday issues of interest: politics, business, culture and sport (Habermas, 1974). With this information came the wish of visitors to have a say in how the money they paid as taxes was spent by their rulers. In this way, the public sphere was a counterpart to royalty and aristocracy: an elite not elected but born into their position. The information available and the possibility of discussing this among each other and organising led to a demand for more participatory government. The public sphere thus re-shaped the relationship between the classes and, with its focus on participatory governance, played a role in the development of new forms of government.

The most apparent flaw in this theory is probably that the open room described by Habermas, to which everyone has access, is in practice an enclosed space, open just to the few people who had enough time and money for leisurely visits to the coffeehouse. The working class, as well as women, were excluded (Thompson, 2001). In media interventions today, the problem of exclusion instead of participation can also be spotted, e.g. in the introduction of the profession of 'serial-callers': people who claim to represent public opinion and call in regularly to call-in shows on the radio (Brisset-Foucault, 2018) but also in the exclusion of people from media production. In more general, media interventions change power structures in host countries, sometimes in unexpected and unintended ways (see, for one example, Brisset-Foucault, 2011).

Further concern about the public sphere mostly surrounds its connection to and destruction by the mass media. Boyd-Barret (Boyd-Barrett, 2001) explains how with the acquisition of mass audience media was commodified, and eventually bound to a

consumerist ideology. Through the mass media, people are now encouraged to search for private solutions to problems through consuming. This point is driven further by Garnham (2001), who states that, with the emergence of mass media, public problems were presented to people as individuals, instead of to people as a social group. Whereas in the coffeehouses the focus was on the discussion between members of a group, with the media supporting this discussion by providing information and opinion, modern mass media are addressing people as individuals. As a solution for this problem, a re-making of the public sphere has been proposed: a return to a model of public broadcasts with fixed access to broadcasting for civil society organisations, human rights groups, and the like (Garnham, 2001, Elliot, 2001). This, however, would bring the public sphere conceptually further away from the idea of being independent and closer to the ideas of development journalism by producing and distributing information that promotes certain causes.

2.1.3 Modernisation theory: media as a means

The use of media to distribute information that promotes causes is supported by modernisation theory, which aims to answer the question of how societies develop. Modernization theory emerged as the main theoretical framework for international development by US-American policymakers during the 1950s and 1960s, when the focus was on winning the de-colonised and newly independent states of the global South as allies in the Cold War. This meant helping them achieve economic growth and prosperity and, eventually, democracy. Modernisation theory states that economic growth inevitably leads to liberal democratic capitalism and stable polities, modelled on Western examples (So, 1990). A condition for modernisation was understood to be a 'modern mindset' in the population of developing countries; this 'modern mindset' was to be achieved by overcoming "traditional" beliefs (Lerner, 1958), something that was thought to be achieved using the mass media as a distributor of educational messages. UNESCO adopted the idea to use mass media to alter attitudes, change belief systems, and thus promote "modernity" (Sreberny, 2000). Modernising society by mass media emerged as the dominant paradigm, with the belief being that educating media's audiences and subjecting them to so-called modern attitudes and approaches would inevitably lead them to adopt modern ideas about, for example, health, education, and political behaviour.

The most profound criticism of modernisation theory is that, despite mass media programs, attitudes and behaviours have not changed on a significant scale. While it was assumed that with knowledge, provided by mass media, practices would change, this did not happen on a grand scale: "After many decades of employing the modern mass media as tools for development, the records in many African countries show that very little has been achieved in such critical areas as political mobilisation, national unity, civic education, and the diffusion of new agricultural techniques and products" (Okigbo, 1995). One problem is that in communication campaigns – when media is used as a means - a linear cause-effect trajectory is assumed that is removed from human behaviour. In contrast to this, it has been argued that there are three primary conditions for people to change their behaviour and attitudes. In brief, people make up their minds about the consequences of a certain way of action, they seek the approval of significant others and factor in how easy a new behaviour can be implemented or how hard it might be to overcome obstacles (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). Further to this, the importance of group

membership and a tendency to agree with a group have been mentioned (Tomiak, forthcoming, Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In addition to this, others pointed early on to an oversimplified view of the so-called developed countries on the global South. Pakenham (1973) criticised modernisation theory for its assumption that the transition to market democracy would go in an easy and self-assembling way, and Thusu (2000) criticized the early modernisation theorists for their ethnocentrism, and points to the problem that they were too strong in their assumption that traditional societies wanted a modern way of life, and that 'modern' equals 'western'.

These critiques led to some adjustment, but not to a general rejection of the whole model. Beltran (1974, in Sparks, 2007) pointed out that the concept of modernity and the - mostly US-American - experts who communicated it, were alien to the societies in the developing countries. Consequently, those experts were unaware of underlying social structures, which would have been needed to be addressed and acknowledged to initiate change. Some adjustments were made. Still, modernisation theory is still underpinning media campaigns. In the Malaysian media, the influence of the theory and a tendency to Americanization could be traced as late as the 1990ies (Postill, 2006) and it can still be seen as underpinning media interventions today (Peña-Susman, 2012, p. 13,14).

2.1.4 Combining theories

The conceptual difference between media as an end - supporting an independent media - and media as a means - understanding media as a distributor of educational messages, broadly conceptualized - is in theory clear-cut. There are considerable differences in the philosophy and practice of media interventions (see, for example, Deane, 2014; Manyozo, 2012). However, the approaches of media as an end and media as a means for peacebuilding and democratization are conceptually interlinked and bound to access to information. Media cannot be used as a means if media has not yet been built. The justification for media as an end is that it will support good governance, peace, and eventually contribute to democratization, making it a means for achieving these outcomes. With this, it has features of media as a means: the independent media is used to contribute to the development of a society. The two endeavors of media as an end and media as a means share aims: the provision of good governance and government accountability, and the overcoming of old enmities and counteracting of internal security dilemma (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2007; Staub, 2013).

2.2 Conceptual framework

Because of the overlap between interventions to support media development (media as an end) and interventions that use media *for* development (media as a means), we will consider both. However, we are limiting the outcomes to those related to (1) the strength of independent media itself or (2) democratization and peacebuilding.

The decision to include interventions that consider media as an end in itself and a means for democratization and peacebuilding is because the distinction, while philosophically clear, is practically ambiguous. Although some activities are unique to each category, there is considerable overlap between interventions that take these two different approaches. For example, funding to several media houses to support independent media in their countries (media as an end) allows them to broadcast peacebuilding programmes (media as a means). Internews' Eye Radio in South Sudan is an example

of this (Eyeradio, n.d.). In practice, media houses that are supported under the heading of media development often distribute educational messages; this makes clearly distinguishing the two endeavours challenging. Media development aims to create and support a 'commercial, public service or community media that works largely in the public interest and is reasonably free of influence from government, political, commercial, factional or other interests' (Deane, 2016, p.4). The media's use as a distributor of messages that promote peace and prosperity is also beneficial for a society's development. This existence of a considerable grey area at the intersection of media development and media for communication gives rise to a more holistic approach to examine media interventions.

2.3 Criteria for including or excluding studies

2.3.1 Population

We will include studies that target any population from low- and middle-income countries (L&MIC), as defined by the World Bank for the first year of implementation. For studies that target populations in both an L&MIC as well as a high-income country (HIC), we will include them if the results for the L&MIC population are analysed and reported separately, i.e. with unique intervention and comparison groups from the L&MIC(s). Studies that compare the effects of an intervention group from an L&MIC to a comparison group in an HIC will be excluded.

As stated by Parkin and Whitehead (2006), there are four key actors or 'levels' to reach a change in media development interventions: media organisations, media practitioners, the audience, and the 'wider' media system (i.e. institutional and legal environment). There is a site-specific interplay between these four levels and an intervention might target one or more of them. The most complex interventions involve all of them (Parkin and Whitehead 2006). We will therefore look at interventions that aim to target one of more of these four levels.

2.3.2 Interventions

For a study to be eligible, at least one of these interventions should be evaluated.

Table 2: Interventions included

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
Institutional and regulatory environment	Activities to develop favorable conditions for an independent media, including support for the development of media policies, grievance procedures and binding codes of conduct	Freedom of expression policies	Media governance policies, regulations and national law or constitutional guarantee that promote freedom of expression and eliminate priori censorship.	For instance, a country has signed and ratified relevant treaty obligations, with no significant exemptions, and public is aware of and exercises its right to free expression, and there are tools and bodies which guarantee the concrete application of this right (Peña-López, I., 2008, Puddephatt, 2010).
		Access and right to information policies	Increase of public information infrastructure, rights to and enforcement of access. Policies related to responsive, timely and equitable access to public information and state transparency by media, civil society and citizens (Peña-López, I., 2008, Puddephatt, 2010).	
		Editorial independence from regulatory systems	Changes to government and commercial policies that decrease regulation on broadcasting time or editorial content, including press law that allows state actors to seize control of broadcasters in an emergency (Peña-López, I., 2008).	

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
		Independent media regulator	The establishment of an independent media regulator that is free from government control, enforces constitutional protections for freedom of expression, fairly allocates broadcast licences and frequencies, is protected from political and commercial interference and explicitly promotes and defends media freedom and other human rights rather than restrict them (Puddephatt, 2010).	
		Media self-regulations systems	Development of clear codes of ethics and professional editorial guidelines and/or establishment of journalist associations that disseminate good practice (Kalathil 2011).	
		Direct financial assistance for media outlets	Direct provision of funds and crowd sourcing campaigns for media outlets.	
		Advocacy	Advocacy for press freedom, or freedom of expression, where there is advocacy for against impunity, against detention of donors, against journalist murders.	
		Protection of market competition and media plurality	Interventions to secure and maintain funding to ensure a fair, competitive marketplace for media financing and advertising, that safeguards a plurality of media and viability for independent media.	

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
Relationships & coalition building	Creation and support of engagement between the media and stakeholders in society and government, including partnerships with business, civil society and government	Creation of opportunities or provision of support for media - private sector partnerships	Workshops, regular meetings, networking events to promote partnerships, coalitions and networks between media organizations and private sector.	These events facilitate enabling conditions for media financial viability and platform accountability and/or promote civic groups.
		Creation of opportunities or provision of support for media and individual journalists to engage with one another	Workshops, regular meetings, networking events to promote partnerships, coalitions and networks between media organizations and individual journalists.	Can support media organisations' abilities to advocate for improved conditions including better alliances and labour rights for media workers. Interventions to improve the ability of media organizations to advocate for improved enabling conditions including building appropriate alliances between media institutions and other stakeholders and labour rights for media workers. This would include relevant research skills.
		Creation of opportunities or provision of support for media-government partnerships	Workshops, regular meetings, networking events to promote understanding between state, state security forces, and media.	Can help security forces and journalists better understand each others' roles and duties. Events facilitate trust and respectful partnerships with government & security forces. Initiatives to promote understanding between state, state forces and media. Training for security forces and journalists to understand

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
				<p>each other's role and duties. Can provide evidence of government commitment to work with civil society to develop law and policy on the media (e.g. conferences, seminars, public fora, official engagement in debates on the airwaves or in print).</p> <hr/> <p>Creation of opportunities or provision of support for engagement between media and CSOs</p> <p>Workshops, regular meetings, networking events to support media participation and exchange with civil society, including partnerships, coalitions and networks and civil society's media participation</p> <p>including through blogs, social media presence, and other citizen journalism</p> <hr/> <p>Creation of opportunities or provision of support for Media training institutions</p> <p>Establishment of or support for media training institutions, trainings to improve ability of journalism centers and/or support organizations to provide training and education to media practitioners.</p>
Capacity building and technical support	The development of journalistic, managerial and technical skills to ensure high quality media contents and sustainable	Training on journalistic skills	Provision of technical assistance in the form of training or mentoring for media providers, individual journalists, and/or editors.	Interventions include trainings and workshops to improve reporting skills and/or specialized topics such as social networking. An example is here (https://www.mdif.org/our-work/initiatives/myanmar-media-program/)

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
	management of the media organization.	Institutional capacity-building for media organizations	Provision of institutional capacity-building training and systems/infrastructure support for media organizations.	Activities that build internal governance, improve administration, incorporate business models/financial planning, and/or impart management practices
		Fundraising capacity-building for media organizations	Provision of fundraising skills trainings to develop and ensure consistent and stable funding over time.	The source of funding should not compromise its editorial independence, and there should be combinations of revenues including sales, advertising, or public subsidies (Puddephatt, 2010).
		Media infrastructure: Establishment of media outlets (public or private)	This includes support for broadcasting infrastructure, as well as provision of basic equipment. However, other ICT infrastructure programs are not included in this category (Cauhape-Cazaux et al. 2015)	For example, newspapers or broadcast outlets that cover 'non-threatening' issues, such as business, environment, reliable humanitarian news, unbiased information in conflict context etc. (Puddephatt, 2010)
		Media infrastructure: Establishment of community media/broadcasting	The creation of local alternatives to mainstream broadcasting such as local community newspapers, radio stations, or magazines with a high degree of openness, horizontality and possibilities for participations especially for ordinary citizens, versus standard commercial audience building.	Usually they have 'social mission'. For example, community radio stations created by the community, for the community that focus on health- and childcare programmes, farming tips, human and women's rights, literacy classes (Milan, S., 2009).

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
		Media market research	Training and/or support to carry out market research activities or studies that aim to help media organizations better understand their audiences' needs and expectations.	Training can be simple and cost-effective to teach local media organisations to carry out research, or the implementer itself can help to collect and record info through, for instance, voice-calls and messages (Parkyn et al. 2016). "In Tanzania, for example, a combination of a formative audience-level survey, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews across the country helped local radio partners to understand what 'governance' meant to their audiences." (Parkyn et al. 2016)
Information dissemination and pace/democratic messaging	The creation and dissemination of content related to peacebuilding and democratization to be consumed by the public	Creation and dissemination of media content related to social norms for peacebuilding	Media content that advocates for peacebuilding through change in values, behaviours and attitudes towards peace, social cohesion, and violence reduction (La Ferrara, E., 2016).	For example, studies on the effect of media content on social cohesion and violence reduction outcomes. Paluck and Green (2009) study post-genocide reconciliation in Rwanda, and assess whether a radio soap opera containing messages on the importance of independent judgement and on the origins of violence is able to change beliefs about the source of violence and norms of trust and cooperation.

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
		Creation and dissemination of media content related to accountability, transparency, and democracy promotion	Media content that promotes information availability to strengthen accountability of democratic institutions. This includes content that provides clear information on political candidates, including their criminal records and corruption history, checks institutional power and authority, and/or reports on political performance over time.	Interventions that provide "information on candidates ex ante, and on politicians' performance ex post, an independent media can allow the system of checks and balances embedded in a democracy to work, ensure that electoral threat incentivize governments, and ultimately improve the functioning of institutions" (La Ferrara, E., 2016). This can also include electoral interventions that provide clear information on the candidates, such as their criminal records and corruption history.
		Creation and dissemination of media content related to media laws and standards	Interventions that provide information related to and raise awareness of international media law standards.	Interventions to educate government, state forces and communication ministries. These include workshops and interventions to clarify roles of media in international / global perspective.

Intervention group	Definition	EGM Intervention	Definition	Examples / additional detail
		Audience media literacy	Training related to media and information literacy among citizens, CSOs, government stakeholders. These are trainings to promote notion of independent media and development media. Media literacy centers on specific knowledge and skills that can help critical understanding and usage of the media (Jeong et al. 2012). The fundamental objective of media literacy is to help audiences maintain “critical autonomy in relationship to all media” (Jeong et al. 2012). Silverblatt (2001) defined media literacy as a “critical thinking skill that allows audiences to develop independent judgments about media content.	
Media protection services	Provision of protective measures of journalists, media organisations and journalistic work, including development of legal policies and also provision of physical, psychological and legal support.	Provision of physical security and digital safety support	Interventions to provide physical security or digital safety support and assistance to journalists and media providers, including surveillance detection, personal safety measures, and protection of security equipment/hardware.	
		Provision of psychosocial support to journalists	Interventions to provide psychosocial security support, mental health services, and/or other assistance to journalists who experience trauma or conflict.	
		Provision of legal security support and protection of their sources	Legal advice and defence counsel or other support to prosecute crime against journalists and guarantee of protection of their sources without being prosecuted (Peña-López, I., 2008). Interventions to provide appropriate legal advice, assistance and support including defence counsel and support to prosecute crimes against journalists.	

2.3.3 Outcomes of interest

For a study to be included, at least one of the following outcomes should be measured in the evaluation.

Table 3: Outcomes included

Outcome category	Description	Specific outcome	Description
Enabling environment	Outcomes related to a conducive, open enabling environment for independent media.	Media competition, plurality and diversity	Measures of a fair and competitive marketplace, e.g. number of national media companies. Extent to which effective regulations prevent undue ownership concentration and promote plurality (Kalathil 2011).
		Media freedom and government censorship	Extent to which freedom of expression is guaranteed in law and respected in practice. Includes behaviors related to freedom of expression and presence of spaces for free/open dialogue. For example, number of instances in which local media criticize individuals or institutions, international organizations and NGOs in power. It also includes implementation of media governance policies, regulations and national law or constitutional guarantee on freedom of expression and elimination of priori censorship. For instance, a country has signed and ratified relevant treaty obligations, with no significant exemptions, and public is aware of and exercises its right to free expression, and there are tools and bodies which guarantee the concrete application of this right (Peña-López, I., 2008, Puddephatt, 2010). Number of websites blocked by state because they have been deemed sensitive or detrimental (Kalathil 2011), or shut down of the internet.
		Media fairness and impartiality	Extent to which the broadcasting code does not compromise the editorial independence of the media; for example, through imposing prior restraint (Kalathil 2011)
		Access to media and information	Measures of areas served by public and private media (e.g. radio and newspaper coverage) and accessibility to public information such as data archiving documents, number or use of freedom of information requests. Also includes measures of accessibility of media for people with disabilities and minority groups, such as minority language information, use of alternative text or closed captioning for visual media, or technology to enable blind users to access media and information.

Outcome category	Description	Specific outcome	Description
		Violence against journalists	Measures of incidents of violence and crimes against journalists in a certain period (Kalathil 2011).
Newsroom professionalization	Outcomes related to improved newsroom professionalization, including training and education outcomes	Journalism skills	Measures of journalists' and editors' reporting skills, skills on understanding and practicing professional standards, ethics and norms, skills on investigative journalism reporting skills, and skills on using and applying digital tools, including audio and video capabilities, and using and applying data journalism techniques and approaches including applying data science and storytelling
		Infrastructure & institutional capacity to maintain industry standards	Measures of infrastructure, systems and support; Measures of organisational capacity to hold media practitioners accountable to industry standards, measures include quality of content, relevance of content, and culture of unbiased sources
		Investigative journalism	Measure of journalists and media workers/organisations to conduct investigative journalism.
		Financial sustainability	Measures of financial sustainability, including diversity of income sources and measures of institutional financial strength.
Community / societal participation	Outcomes related to improved independent media engagement in community and society	Media literacy skills	Measures of media literacy for citizens, CSOs and government stakeholders e.g. critical ability to engage with media and information, and ability to recognize and reject disinformation
		Media trust and audience perception	A measure of whether the audience feels that the media outlet covers the issues that matter to them in a way that resonates (Parkyn et al. 2016). Perception that media content has improved in quality and has become more trustworthy (Parkyn et al. 2016). Percentage of population listening to radio, watching TV, reading the news, obtaining information from computer-based Internet, obtaining information from cell phones (Kalathil 2011).

Outcome category	Description	Specific outcome	Description
		Participation in media coalitions	Measures of participation or engagement in coalitions/coalition building and networking. Measures of how media workers/organisations are able to connect between them and other civil society organisations, private and public organisations.
		Perceptions and social norms, attitudes and beliefs	Measuring changes in citizens' perceptions of social norms on the role of free and independent media, and perceptions of the value of or ability to question those in power. For example, perceptions of whether it is 'worth it' to dissent or question those in power. Measuring changes in beliefs or attitudes among media actors and government officials on the role of free and independent media
		Representation and Inclusion of vulnerable groups	Measures of representation and inclusion of vulnerable/minority groups in content. Measures of broad spectrum of social interests and communities reflected and represented in media. Includes inclusivity, measures of the inclusion of traditionally neglected and/or vulnerable groups in the media content and media staffing and leadership/management composition. (note: this is about the CONTENT of the media, while the 'Access to media' outcome is about the way in which that content is communicated or accessed)
Governance and democratization	Outcomes related to effects on democratic attitudes, norms and behaviors	Civic engagement in democracy and governance	Measures of citizens' participation in democratic processes, such as elections, and governance processes, participatory budgeting or community monitoring. It also includes measures of engagement of marginalised groups in state institutions and democratic processes.
		Democratic beliefs, attitudes and norms	Measures of citizen support for and perceptions of the value of democracy, democratic and inclusive processes, and norms of participation
		Access to services, rights and justice	Measures of access to and equity of distribution of public services (including health, education, etc.) and access to justice and rights, including protection of human rights (including access to documentation) and political security

Outcome category	Description	Specific outcome	Description
		Government transparency, accountability and performance	Measures of government transparency and accountability. This includes measures of how well state institutions are functioning (e.g. indicators of how consistent or high-quality a service is), or perceived to be functioning, corruption, strength of democratic practices, and government capacity
Social cohesion	Outcomes related to the strength or resilience of social cohesion, including vertical cohesion (relationships between government & society), bridging and bonding relationships between individuals and groups within society	Trust	Measures of trust in government, institutions (including trust in media), intergroup trust (trust across social groups) and intragroup trust (trust within social groups, e.g. within a community)
		Sense of belonging and acceptance of diversity	Measures of people's perception or feelings of belonging and inclusion in civil society and government, including both whether they feel that government represents them, and whether they think others should be included. It also includes measures of partisan and ethnic polarization and measures of acceptance of diversity, including acceptance of multiple points of view or versions of history, bias and prejudice, tolerance, and openness to e.g. intergroup marriage.
		Altruism and service	Measures of citizens' willingness to participate in civil society and help each other. This outcome group also includes measures of citizens' participation or inclusion in civil society, including capacity for collective action, altruism and community service. It does NOT include measures of willingness to participate in democracy or government, as this is captured by civic engagement above.
Violence reduction	Outcomes related to violence, conflict resolution and conflict transformation	Conflict resolution and transformation	Measures of conflict resolution capacities, instances of conflict resolution or transformation, or the presence of systems or structures to facilitate conflict transformation
		Instances of violence and displacement due to violence (includes SGBV)	Measures of reported violent crime rates, casualties of conflict, self-reported use of violence, and measurements of the frequency and/or levels of displacement due to violence. Measures of incidence levels, attitudes, or norms related to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). SGBV "refers to any act that is perpetrated against a person's will and is based on gender norms and unequal power relationships. It encompasses threats of violence and coercion. It can be physical, emotional, psychological, or sexual in nature, and can take the form of a denial of resources or access to services. It inflicts harm on women, girls, men and boys." (UNHCR, n.d.)

Outcome category	Description	Specific outcome	Description
		Social norms regarding violence	Measures of attitudes, norms and behaviours surrounding violence, including support for political violence or armed groups, and attitudes towards the use of violence.
Human security and resilience	Outcomes related to people's multidimensional human security and resilience	Economic security	Measures of economic well-being, such as income or assets or agricultural output
		Health security	Measures of physical and psychological well-being, as well as health practices
		Educational security	Measures of educational enrollment, retention, performance, and graduation
		Environmental security	Measures of disaster risk reduction capacities, exposure to or impact of disasters, ecosystem health

2.3.4 Types of studies

We will include impact evaluations and systematic reviews that measure the effects of a relevant intervention on outcomes of interest, including both selected quantitative and qualitative study designs. Although standard practice for an EGM is to consider only quantitative impact evaluations, selected methods for qualitative impact evaluation will be included in order to align with norms in the field. These norms account for some of the practicalities of conducting evaluations and recognize the importance of contexts.

In quantitative evaluations, a certain amount of decontextualisation is necessary; otherwise, the number of variables would become too hard to handle. This decontextualisation, however, might mean that unintended consequences of an intervention are not noticed. This indeed happened in media interventions regarding call-in shows, which were thought to increase the audience's participation in politics. Instead, they reinforced old power structures by introducing the new political 'profession' of the serial caller (Brisset-Foucault 2018, Stremlau, Fantini and Gagliardone 2015). Disregarding this literature base would significantly diminish the utility of this EGM.

Quantitative study designs

We will include studies that implement at least one of the following study designs that are widely used to evaluate intervention effectiveness (Reeves et al. 2017; Aloe et al. 2017). Only studies that *clearly state* the method that they use and that we determine are applying that label correctly will be included. This will result in the exclusion of papers, likely mostly qualitative work, that employs a method without naming it.

Included quantitative study designs:

Impact evaluations (IEs)

1. Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) with assignment at the individual, household, community or other cluster level, and quasi-RCTs using prospective methods of assignment such as alternation.
2. Non-randomised designs with either a known assignment variable(s) or a seemingly random assignment process:
 - a. Regression discontinuity designs, where assignment is based on a threshold measured before intervention, and the study uses prospective or retrospective approaches of analysis to control for unobservable confounding.
 - b. Natural experiments with clearly defined intervention and comparison groups that exploit apparently random natural variation in assignment (such as a lottery) or random errors in implementation, etc.
3. Non-randomised studies with pre-intervention and post-intervention outcome data for both intervention and comparison groups, where data are individual-level panel or pseudo-panels (repeated cross-sections), which use the following methods to control for confounding:
 - a. Studies controlling for time-invariant unobservable confounding, including difference-in-differences, fixed-effects models, or models with an interaction term between time and intervention for pre-intervention and post-intervention observations.
 - b. Studies assessing changes in trends in outcomes over a series of time points with a contemporaneous comparison (controlled interrupted time series, ITS), and with sufficient observations to establish a trend and control for effects on outcomes due to factors other than the intervention (such as seasonality).

4. Non-randomised studies with a similar comparison group that control for observable confounding, including statistical matching, covariate matching, coarsened-exact matching, propensity score matching, and multiple regression analysis.
5. Non-randomised studies that control for confounding using instrumental variable (IV) approaches such as two-stage least squares procedures.

Systematic reviews (SRs):

We will include systematic effectiveness reviews that describe the search, inclusion criteria, data collection and synthesis methods used (Snilstveit et al. 2016). Any evidence reviews, such as literature reviews, that do not adopt these methods will be excluded. We will exclude systematic reviews that are not effectiveness reviews (i.e. that do not aim to synthesise the evidence of the effects of a relevant intervention on priority outcomes of interest), such as systematic reviews of the barriers and facilitators to implementation of a media development intervention. For reviews that include multiple research methods, we will include them if over 50 percent of the primary studies include at least one impact evaluation design specified above, or where the effectiveness component of the review was empty (i.e. no eligible studies were identified) and thus no findings on effectiveness are reported.

We will exclude before-after studies or cross-sectional studies that do not attempt to control for selection bias or confounding in any way. Studies that only examine willingness-to-pay for goods, services, process and business models will be excluded. Experiments conducted in tightly-controlled settings, like those of a laboratory, and studies that measure immediate reactions to a short-term exposure, i.e. studies where implementation and data collection is started and completed within a single day, will be excluded.

Qualitative study designs

We recognize that quantitative impact evaluations can be difficult to perform for some of the interventions we have included in the framework. Therefore, we will include a limited number of qualitative impact evaluation methods that clearly try to identify the causal relationship between the interventions and outcomes. This list is based on White and Phillips 2012 and the Magenta Book on evaluation published by the UK government (HM Treasury 2020). The definitions have been developed by using two additional sources (INTRAC 2017a,b,c,d and Remnand and Avard, 2016). We will only include studies that state, in the title, abstract, or full text, that they used one of the methodologies listed below. We will exclude all those studies where it is not clearly stated which analysis has been used.

Included qualitative study designs:

Realist evaluation:

Realist evaluations assume that projects and programmes work under certain conditions and are heavily influenced by the way that different stakeholders respond to them. Authors must clearly state a theory tested through an intervention indicating how and for whom a program would work. They compare contexts, mechanisms, and outcomes within a program (not with a control). There is a strong emphasis on the social and historical context and comparison of those who benefited from the program and those who did not benefit (White and Philip, 2012). A realist evaluation is therefore not just

designed to assess whether a development intervention worked or not. It is designed to address questions such as “What works (or doesn’t work)?”; “for whom (and to what extent)?”; “in which circumstances does it work?”; “How and why does it work?” (INTRAC, 2017a).

Process tracing:

Develop a set of (competing) hypotheses linking an intervention to an outcome including how these hypotheses could be (in)validated. Gather relevant evidence to determine which hypothesis most closely matches observed data. In its pure form, process tracing is based around a set of formal tests. These are designed to assess causation. They are applied to all the different possible explanations for how a particular change might have come about in order to confirm some and/or eliminate others. Within the process tracing these different explanations are known as hypotheses (INTRAC, 2017b).

Contribution analysis:

Contribution analysis is a methodology used to identify the contribution a development intervention has made to a change or set of changes. The aim is to produce a credible, evidence-based narrative based on a theory of change that a reasonable person would be likely to agree with, rather than to produce conclusive proof. Contribution analysis can be used during a development intervention, at the end, or afterwards (INTRAC, 2017c).

Contribution tracing:

Contribution tracing is a participatory mixed-method (qual-quant) to establish the validity of contribution claims with explicit criteria to guide evaluators in data collection and Bayesian updating to quantify the level of confidence in a claim. Includes a contribution ‘trial’ with all stakeholders to establish what will prove/disprove the claim (HM Treasury 2020).

The qualitative impact assessment protocol (QuIP):

QuIP studies serve to provide an independent reality check of a predetermined theory of change, which helps stakeholders to assess, learn from, and demonstrate the social impact of their work. The QuIP gathers evidence of a project’s impact through narrative causal statements collected directly from intended project beneficiaries. Respondents are asked to talk about the main changes in their lives over a pre-defined recall period and prompted to share what they perceive to be the main drivers of these changes, and to whom or what they attribute any change - which may well be from multiple sources (Remnand and Avard, 2016).

General elimination methodology (GEM):

Scriven’s GEM (2008) builds upon his earlier Modus Operandi Method (1976) to provide an approach specifically geared towards substantiating causal claims. The methodology entails systematically identifying and then ruling out alternative causal explanations of observed results. It is based on the idea that for any event it is possible to draw up *Lists of Possible Causes* (LOPCs) or alternative hypothetical explanations for an outcome of interest. Each putative cause will have its own set of “footprints”, or *Modus Operandi* (MO) – “a sequence of intermediate or concurrent events, a set of conditions or a chain of events that has to be present when the cause is effective (Scriven, 2008)” (White and Phillips, 2012, pp. 38).

Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA):

Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) is a methodology that enables the analysis of multiple cases in complex situations. It can help explain why change happens in some cases but not others. QCA is designed for use with an intermediate number of cases, typically between 10 and 50. It can be used in situations where there are too few cases to apply conventional statistical analysis (INTRAC, 2017d).

Outcome harvesting

Outcome harvesting is designed to collect evidence of change (the ‘outcomes’) and then work backwards to assess whether or how an organization, program or project contributed to that change. Outcomes are defined as changes in the “behaviour writ large” (such as actions, relationships, policies, practices) of one or more social actors influenced by an intervention (Wilson-Grau, 2015)

2.3.5 Other inclusion and exclusion criteria

We will also apply the following criteria when selecting studies for inclusion.

- **Language:** Studies published in any language will be included, although the search terms will be in English only.
- **Publication date:** Studies will be included if their publication date was 1990 or after. This decision was taken to include insights gained from early media interventions, e.g. in the former Yugoslavia and the Balkans.
- **Status of studies:** We will include all studies regardless of publication status, i.e. both peer-reviewed and studies published in ‘grey literature’. We will include both ongoing and completed impact evaluations and systematic reviews. For on-going studies, we will include prospective study records, protocols and trial registries. Providing an indication of the prevalence and characteristics of on-going evaluation evidence is expected to enrich the analysis of current evidence gaps and support decision making in relation to evidence generation.

3. Methods

3.1 Overall methodological approach

We will follow the standards and methods for EGMs developed by 3ie (Snilstveit et al., 2016; Snilstveit et al., 2017). An evidence gap map aims to establish what we know, and do not know, about the effects of interventions in a thematic area (Snilstveit et al., 2016).

The map will be populated by systematically searching and screening all relevant completed, and ongoing, impact evaluations and systematic reviews. The included studies will be mapped onto the framework of interventions and outcomes and will be presented on an interactive platform which provides a graphical display of the evidence in a matrix framework. This provides a visual display of the volume of evidence for intervention-outcome combinations, the type of evidence (impact evaluation, systematic reviews, completed or ongoing), and a confidence rating of the quality for systematic reviews. The final map will be published on an online interactive platform that provides additional filters so that users can further explore the available evidence, including by global regions, country income levels, study methodology or target population.

The interactive map will be accompanied by a report addressing the key research questions, including an analysis of the characteristics of the available evidence, key trends (i.e. number of impact evaluation published over the time, geography, focus on interventions and outcomes, targeted audiences).

Evidence gap maps highlight both absolute gaps, which should be filled with new primary studies, and synthesis gaps, which are ready for new systematic reviews and meta-analyses. They are envisioned as a global public good, and this allows them to be used as a tool which facilitates access to high-quality research.

3.2 Conceptual framework development

We have developed the framework by consulting the relevant literature cited in the paragraphs above. We have received feedback on the proposed framework from stakeholders within USAID and an external Advisory Group (see Appendix D). Kerstin Tomiak, the subject matter expert for this project, provided extent and essential inputs to develop the framework, the theory background and the scope section.

3.3 Search strategy

List of proposed search databases:

- *CAB Abst*
- *Comms & Mass Media*
- *ERIC*
- *Gender Studies database*
- *Int Political Science Abst*
- *PsycInfo (Ebsco)*
- *Web of Science (SSCI/AHCI)*
- *Africa-Wide (Ebsco - LSHTM)*
- *Econlit (Ovid)*
- *Repec*
- *WB e-library (Ebsco Discovery)*

List of additional specific Websites:

<i>BBC Media Action</i>	https://www.bbc.co.uk/mediaaction/publications-and-resources/research-long
<i>GFMD</i>	https://gfmd.info/research-impact/
<i>IREX Media</i>	https://www.irex.org/programming-area/media
<i>IREX Media Sustainability Index (MSI)</i>	https://www.irex.org/resource/media-sustainability-index-msi
<i>ARTICLE 19</i>	https://www.article19.org
<i>Internews</i>	https://internews.org
<i>Center for International Media Assistance (CIMA)</i>	https://www.cima.ned.org/publications/
<i>ICFJ</i>	https://www.icfj.org
<i>Center for Media, data and society</i>	https://cmds.ceu.edu
<i>USAID Learning Library</i>	https://usaidlearninglab.org/site-search/CSOs

Other organisations Websites

Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-Pal)
African Development Bank (AfDB) – Evaluation Reports
Alliance for Peacebuilding – Peacebuilding evaluation
Asian Development Bank (ADB) – Evaluation Resources
British Library of Development Studies (BLDS)
Campbell Library
Centre for Effective Global Action (CEGA)
Department for International Development (DFID)
Experiments in Governance and Politics (EGAP)
German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval)
Google Scholar
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA)
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)
International Rescue Committee (IRC)
Mercy Corps
NBER Working Papers
Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
Registry of International Development Impact Evaluations (RIDIE)
Social Science Research Network (SSRN)
USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
World Bank – Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME)
World Bank – Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)
World Food Programme (WFP)
International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)
European Commission - EU evaluations
United States Institute of Peace
Sida

3.4 Screening protocol

The search results will be imported into the systematic review software “EPPI-Reviewer 4” ([link](#)). This platform will be used to manage references, identify and remove duplicate studies, and screen records for inclusion using the procedures outlined below.

Title and abstract screening (TAS): double screening will be combined with EPPI-reviewer’s machine learning functionality to speed up the screening process. Initially, a randomly selected set of around 800-1000 studies will be screened to provide a training to the team. During the training the results given by the researchers will be compared, and any discrepancy in coding decisions will be discussed, including a clarification of the inclusion criteria as needed. The results of this training will be used as a base for the machine-learning algorithm, specifically the classifier functionality which is used to prioritise studies for screening according to their likelihood of inclusion. The entire screening process will continue with a double screening approach where each abstract is screened by two independent researchers and any disagreement is reconciled with the supervision of a senior review team member.

Full text screening (FTS): for each study that meets all the TAS inclusion criteria the full text will be retrieved. Two reviewers from the core team will independently examine each full text in detail against the protocol again and will decide to include it or not. The output of this stage will be a set of studies deemed suitable to be included in the EGM. Any disagreements between reviewers will be reconciled with the supervision of a senior review team member.

3.5 Data extraction and critical appraisal

We will systematically extract data from all included studies using the data extraction tool available in Appendix B. We plan to convert the Excel tool for use in KoBoToolbox ([link](#)), which is a useful software for consistent data extraction. The data will cover the following broad areas:

- Basic study and publication information: This coding will focus on capturing the general characteristics of the study including authors, publication date and status, study location, intervention type, outcomes reported, definition of outcome measures, population of interest, study and programme funders, time periods for delivery and analysis;
- Topical cross-cutting issues: We will extract data on a number of cross-cutting issues, including gender, democratic/autocratic context, equity and cost-effectiveness.
- Critical appraisal: All included systematic reviews will be critically appraised following the practices adopted by 3ie systematic review database protocol, which draws on Lewin et al. (2009). This appraisal assesses systematic reviews according to criteria relating to the search, screening, data extraction, and synthesis activities conducted, and covers all the most common areas where biases are introduced. Each systematic review will be rated as low, medium, or high confidence drawing on guidance provided in Snilstveit et al. (2017). We will not critically appraise impact evaluations, as this is typically beyond the scope of EGMs. The tool used for this process is presented in Appendix C.

Depending on the number and nature of multi-component interventions included, the project team will adopt one approach to coding these in the map so that we are consistent. This approach may be to determine the main intervention of focus in the study and grouping the study with others that focus on that main component, grouping all multicomponent studies together or a combination of those approaches. The approach adopted and the associated limitations will be clearly stated in the final report.

The following processes will be implemented to collect this information:

- Develop and refine data extraction tools and codebooks: The draft tools developed for this project will be reviewed and potentially refined in light of any feedback received by the EGM advisory group and insights from project implementation.
- Data extraction training and pilot: Coders assigned to each data extraction task will undergo theory- and practice- based training in using the tools provided. Each coding group will all code a 'training set' of studies and assessments of inter-rater reliability will be calculated. Additional group training will be completed as required prior to the main-stage extraction.

- Main-stage extraction: In the case of descriptive and equity-based information, studies will be coded by one coder. In the case of critical appraisal assessments, studies will first be single coded and then reviewed by a systematic review methods expert. Meetings will be held periodically with coders on the project to provide support and resolve queries.
- Quality checks: Since the beginning of the data extraction phase, the project team will check the extracted data. In practice, a member of the core team will check the consistency of data extracted by consultants.

The following processes will be implemented to collect this information:

- Develop and refine data extraction tools and codebooks: The draft tools developed for this project will be reviewed and potentially refined in light of any feedback received by the EGM advisory group and insights from project implementation.
- Data extraction training and pilot: Coders assigned to each data extraction task will undergo theory- and practice- based training in using the tools provided. Each coding group will all code a 'training set' of studies and assessments of inter-rater reliability will be calculated. Additional group training will be completed as required prior to the main-stage extraction.
- Main-stage extraction: In the case of descriptive and equity-based information, studies will be coded by one coder. In the case of critical appraisal assessments, studies will first be single coded and then reviewed by a systematic review methods expert. Meetings will be held periodically with coders on the project to provide support and resolve queries.
- Quality checks: Since the beginning of the data extraction phase, the project team will check the extracted data. In practice, a member of the core team will check the consistency of data extracted by consultants.

3.6 Dealing with multicomponent interventions

Depending on the number and nature of multi-component interventions included, the project team will adopt one approach to coding these in the map so that we are consistent. This approach may be to determine the main intervention of focus in the study and grouping the study with others that focus on that main component, grouping all multicomponent studies together or a combination of those approaches. The approach adopted and the associated limitations will be clearly stated in the final report.

3.7 Analysis and reporting

We will conduct a range of descriptive analyses to provide an overview of included studies across the following dimensions:

- Publication year
- Publication type
- Geography
- Study participants
- Interventions
- Outcomes
- Study type characteristics
- Results of the systematic review critical appraisal

- Equity and cross cutting themes considerations, e.g. democratic/autocratic context and gender.

Where appropriate, we will consider running cross-tabs to provide a more nuanced overview of the evidence identified. We will produce the following analytical outputs:

- **Interactive EGM:** An interactive evidence gap map that visually presents the current evidence base that is categorised by coverage with respect to the predetermined intervention-outcome framework, quality and completeness. Filters may be incorporated into the map to enable more targeted use – for example, by restricting the studies to a specific unit of analysis, by levels of fragility or democracy. This will be stored on the 3ie website and shared as a public good.
- **Presentation:** A Microsoft PowerPoint presentation will provide an overview of the emerging findings of the EGM. This will be presented by the evaluation team and will provide an opportunity for USAID to comment on findings and to collaboratively discuss opportunities for additional analyses, presentation of results and implications. It will be designed such that it can be used by USAID and for internal learning purposes.
- **EGM technical report:** The EGM technical report will include a detailed overview of the method, Theory of Change and the key results of the EGM; it will provide a high level of analytical detail and will be supported by technical annexes. This report will conclude by directly addressing the key research questions stated in Section 2 and provide a set of research and policy implications. This will be published by 3ie and shared as a public good.
- **EGM executive summary:** This report will provide a high-level summary of the results and primarily focus on answering the research questions specified in Section 2 using non-technical language.

3.8 Timeline

The approximate date for submission of the EGM report is July 2021. All final analytical outputs will be published on the 3ie Evidence Hub. USAID may also publish relevant materials.

3.9 Engagement and communication plan

It is important that the results of the EGM are shared with USAID and its internal audiences, and more broadly to the development sector. The project will complete the following activities to engage with key stakeholders to attempt to ensure the results of the project accurately reflect the policy and research needs of key stakeholders:

- **Develop an EGM advisory group:** The project team, in collaboration with USAID, will engage with key stakeholders with academic and/or practitioner expertise in the field of rule of law and justice. 3ie will set up an advisory group which will have the aim of providing pro-bono support to the project at several key stages of the project. These stages include developing the project protocol, reviewing the search results produced, reviewing and interpreting emerging findings, and developing and optimising the analytical outputs produced to aid evidence uptake and use.
- **Develop a Stakeholder Engagement and Communication Plan:** A stakeholder engagement and communication plan (SECP) will be drafted. The

aim of this plan is to ensure that findings from the EGM are effectively disseminated to the appropriate audiences, in an engaging and accessible format. This plan includes a provisional analysis of key stakeholder groups, focusing on their relevant interests and the extent to which 3ie and/or USAID have access to them, and an assessment of what the most value-added EGM project outputs might be to aid evidence uptake and use. The SECP is considered to be a 'live document' and will be refined if necessary as additional information needs or dissemination opportunities are identified by the project team, advisory group or USAID.

Analytical outputs: Additional analytical outputs will be produced as required depending on the needs of specific audiences, as described in subsection 3.6 above.

4. Review information

4.1 Sources of support

This EGM was commissioned by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under its Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Learning, Evaluation, and Research (DRG-LER) II Activity. As a consortium sub-contractor to NORC, 3ie was tasked to produce an evidence gap map (EGM) for each of the six Democracy, Human Rights and Governance (DRG) program areas under the US Government Foreign Assistance Framework. These program areas are: 1) rule of law; 2) good governance; 3) political competition and consensus-building (i.e. elections and political processes); 4) civil society; 5) independent media and free flow of information; and 6) human rights.

4.2 Declarations of interest

No conflicts of interest to declare.

4.3 Plans for updating the EGM

At the time of publication, there were no plans in place for updating the EGM.

Appendix A: Search strategy

Example of search run in Ebsco Databases: ERIC, International Political Science Abstracts, Gender Studies, APA PsycInfo, CAB Abstracts, Communications & Mass Media – Searched

S25 TI ((TV or television or press or presses or journal* or campaign* or audio* or drama or news* or ICT or "information and communications technology" or media or radio or "soap opera*" or broadcast* or podcast* or magazine* or "mobile phone*" or "cell* phone*" or mms or sms or email* or e-mail* or "electronic mail*" or information or blog* or newsfeed* or twitter or facebook)) OR AB ((TV or television or press or presses or journal* or campaign* or audio* or drama or news* or ICT or "information and communications technology" or media or radio or "soap opera*" or broadcast* or podcast* or magazine* or "mobile phone*" or "cell* phone*" or mms or sms or email* or e-mail* or "electronic mail*" or information or blog* or newsfeed* or twitter or facebook)) OR SU ((TV or television or press or presses or journal* or campaign* or audio* or drama or news* or ICT or "information and communications technology" or media or radio or "soap opera*" or broadcast* or podcast* or magazine* or "mobile phone*" or "cell* phone*" or mms or sms or email* or e-mail* or "electronic mail*" or information or blog* or newsfeed* or twitter or facebook))

S23 TI ((security or "psychosocial therapy" or counselling or "legal advice" or ((defense or defence) N2 counsel) or prosecut* or ("mental health" N2 service*) or (media N2 (develop* or assist* or knowledge)) or (technology N2 transfer*) or ((digital or computer*) N2 litera*) or misinform* or ((false or fake) N2 news))) OR AB ((security or "psychosocial therapy" or counselling or "legal advice" or ((defense or defence) N2 counsel) or prosecut* or ("mental health" N2 service*) or (media N2 (develop* or assist* or knowledge)) or (technology N2 transfer*) or ((digital or computer*) N2 litera*) or misinform* or ((false or fake) N2 news))) OR SU ((security or "psychosocial therapy" or counselling or "legal advice" or ((defense or defence) N2 counsel) or prosecut* or ("mental health" N2 service*) or (media N2 (develop* or assist* or knowledge)) or (technology N2 transfer*) or ((digital or computer*) N2 litera*) or misinform* or ((false or fake) N2 news)))

S22 TI ((vote or voting or voter* or election* or (accountab* N3 (government* or authorit* or communit* or leader* or politician* or policy or policies or institution* or private or company or companies)) or "social norm*" or transparen* or ((access* or disseminat*) N2 information) or "media literacy" or "information literacy" or peacebuilding or (peace N2 build*) or (critical* N2 think*) or democra*) OR AB ((vote or voting or voter* or election* or (accountab* N3 (government* or authorit* or communit* or leader* or politician* or policy or policies or institution* or private or company or companies)) or "social norm*" or transparen* or ((access* or disseminat*) N2 information) or "media literacy" or "information literacy" or peacebuilding or (peace N2 build*) or (critical* N2 think*) or democra*) OR SU ((vote or voting or voter* or election* or (accountab* N3 (government* or authorit* or communit* or leader* or politician* or policy or policies or institution* or private or company or companies)) or "social norm*" or transparen* or ((access* or disseminat*) N2 information) or "media literacy" or "information literacy" or peacebuilding or (peace N2 build*) or (critical* N2 think*) or democra*)

S21 TI ((journalis* or (media N3 provider*) or editor or editors or (capacity N2 build*) or mentor* or reporting or "social network*" or "community media" or broadcast* or audience* or fundraising or (fund* N2 rais*) or ((provid* or provision) N3 equipment) or ((media or ict or "information and communications") N3 infrastructure) or "market research" or ((training or skill* or educat*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) OR AB ((journalis* or (media N3 provider*) or editor or editors or (capacity N2 build*) or mentor* or reporting or "social network*" or "community media" or broadcast* or audience* or fundraising or (fund* N2 rais*) or ((provid* or provision) N3 equipment) or ((media or ict or "information and communications") N3 infrastructure) or "market research" or ((training or skill* or educat*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) OR SU ((journalis* or (media N3 provider*) or editor or editors or (capacity N2 build*) or mentor* or reporting or "social network*" or "community media" or broadcast* or audience* or fundraising or (fund* N2 rais*) or ((provid* or provision) N3 equipment) or ((media or ict or "information and communications") N3 infrastructure) or "market research" or ((training or skill* or educat*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*))

S20 TI ((((centre* or center*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) or "private sector" or ((partnership* or coalition* or network* or alliance* or workshop* or association*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) or workshop* or (regular* N2 meet*) or "social event*" or "state security" or (media N3 participat*) or (information N3 exchang*) or dialog* or communication or (consensus N2 build*) or CSO* or "civil society" or bilateral or trilateral or discussion* or consortium or consortia) OR AB ((((centre* or center*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) or "private sector" or ((partnership* or coalition* or network* or alliance* or workshop* or association*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) or workshop* or (regular* N2 meet*) or "social event*" or "state security" or (media N3 participat*) or (information N3 exchang*) or dialog* or communication or (consensus N2 build*) or CSO* or "civil society" or bilateral or trilateral or discussion* or consortium or consortia) OR SU ((((centre* or center*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) or "private sector" or ((partnership* or coalition* or network* or alliance* or workshop* or association*) N3 (journalis* or report* or media or news*)) or workshop* or (regular* N2 meet*) or "social event*" or "state security" or (media N3 participat*) or (information N3 exchang*) or dialog* or communication or (consensus N2 build*) or CSO* or "civil society" or bilateral or trilateral or discussion* or consortium or consortia)

S19 TI ((freedom* or policy or policies or governance or regulat* or (access* N2 (information or right)) or "right to know" or disclos* or (editorial* N3 (independen* or guideline*)) or self-regulat* or "crowd sourc*" or "financial assistance" or (market* N3 competiti*) or law* or legal* or funding or ((government* N2 (control* or licenc* or licens* or censor* or pluralit*) N3 (speech or freedom* or press or media)))) OR SU ((freedom* or policy or policies or governance or regulat* or (access* N2 (information or right)) or "right to know" or disclos* or (editorial* N3 (independen* or guideline*)) or self-regulat* or "crowd sourc*" or "financial assistance" or (market* N3 competiti*) or law* or legal* or funding or ((government* N2 (control* or licenc* or licens* or censor* or pluralit*) N3 (speech or freedom* or press or media)))) OR AB ((freedom* or policy or policies or governance or regulat* or (access* N2 (information or right)) or "right to know" or disclos* or (editorial* N3 (independen* or guideline*)) or self-regulat* or "crowd sourc*" or "financial assistance" or (market* N3 competiti*) or law* or legal* or funding or

((government* N2 (control* or licenc* or licens* or censor* or pluralit*) N3 (speech or freedom* or press or media))))

S17 TI (("process tracing" or (outcome* N2 harvest*) or "realist evaluation" or (qualitative N2 ("comparative analysis" or study or assessment or analysis or evaluation)) or QCA or "general elimination method*" or "impact assessment" or QulP or (contribution N2 (analysis or trace or tracing)))) OR AB (("process tracing" or (outcome* N2 harvest*) or "realist evaluation" or (qualitative N2 ("comparative analysis" or study or assessment or analysis or evaluation)) or QCA or "general elimination method*" or "impact assessment" or QulP or (contribution N2 (analysis or trace or tracing)))) OR SU (("process tracing" or (outcome* N2 harvest*) or "realist evaluation" or (qualitative N2 ("comparative analysis" or study or assessment or analysis or evaluation)) or QCA or "general elimination method*" or "impact assessment" or QulP or (contribution N2 (analysis or trace or tracing))))

S14 TI ((random* or experiment* or (match* N2 (propensity or coarsened or covariate)) or "propensity score" or ("difference in difference*" or "difference-in-difference*" or "differences in difference*" or "differences-in-difference*" or "double difference*" or ("quasi-experimental" or "quasi experimental" or "quasi-experiment" or "quasi experiment") or ((estimator or counterfactual) and evaluation*) or "instrumental variable*" or (IV N2 (estimation or approach)) or "regression discontinuity" or "time series" or "segment* regression" or (non N2 participant*) or ((control or comparison) N2 (group* or condition* or area* or intervention)))) OR AB ((random* or experiment* or (match* N2 (propensity or coarsened or covariate)) or "propensity score" or ("difference in difference*" or "difference-in-difference*" or "differences in difference*" or "differences-in-difference*" or "double difference*" or ("quasi-experimental" or "quasi experimental" or "quasi-experiment" or "quasi experiment") or ((estimator or counterfactual) and evaluation*) or "instrumental variable*" or (IV N2 (estimation or approach)) or "regression discontinuity" or "time series" or "segment* regression" or (non N2 participant*) or ((control or comparison) N2 (group* or condition* or area* or intervention)))) OR SU ((random* or experiment* or (match* N2 (propensity or coarsened or covariate)) or "propensity score" or ("difference in difference*" or "difference-in-difference*" or "differences in difference*" or "differences-in-difference*" or "double difference*" or ("quasi-experimental" or "quasi experimental" or "quasi-experiment" or "quasi experiment") or ((estimator or counterfactual) and evaluation*) or "instrumental variable*" or (IV N2 (estimation or approach)) or "regression discontinuity" or "time series" or "segment* regression" or (non N2 participant*) or ((control or comparison) N2 (group* or condition* or area* or intervention))))

S13 TI (("systematic review" or "literature review")) OR AB (("systematic review" or "literature review")) OR SU (("systematic review" or "literature review")) OR SO (cochrane database of systematic reviews)

S12 TI (((afghanistan or albania or algeria or "american samoa" or angola or "antigua and barbuda" or antigua or barbuda or argentina or armenia or armenian or aruba or azerbaijan or bahrain or bangladesh or barbados or belarus or byelarus or belorussia or byelorussian or belize or "british honduras" or benin or dahomey or bhutan or bolivia or "bosnia and herzegovina" or bosnia or herzegovina or botswana or bechuanaland or brazil or brasil or bulgaria or "burkina faso" or "burkina fasso" or "upper volta" or burundi

or urundi or "cabo verde" or "cape verde" or cambodia or kampuchea or "khmer republic" or cameroon or cameron or cameroun or "central african republic" or "ubangi shari" or chad or chile or china or colombia or comoros or comoro islands or "iles comores" or mayotte or "democratic republic of the congo" or "democratic republic congo" or congo or zaire or "costa rica" or "cote d'ivoire" or "cote d'ivoire" or "cote d'ivoire" or "cote d'ivoire" or "ivory coast" or croatia or cuba or cyprus or "czech republic" or czechoslovakia or djibouti or "french somaliland" or dominica or "dominican republic" or ecuador or egypt or "united arab republic" or "el salvador" or "equatorial guinea" or "spanish guinea" or eritrea or estonia or eswatini or swaziland or ethiopia or fiji or gabon or "gabonese republic" or gambia or "georgia (republic)" or georgian or ghana or "gold coast" or gibraltar or greece or grenada or guam or guatemala or guinea or "guinea bissau" or guyana or "british guiana" or haiti or hispaniola or honduras or hungary or india or indonesia or timor or iran or iraq or "isle of man" or jamaica or jordan or kazakhstan or kazakh or kenya or "democratic peoples republic of korea" or "republic of korea" or "north korea" or "south korea" or korea or kosovo or kyrgyzstan or kirghizia or kirgizstan or "kyrgyz republic" or kirghiz or laos or "lao pdr" or "lao people's democratic republic" or latvia or lebanon or "lebanese republic" or lesotho or basutoland or liberia or libya or "libyan arab jamahiriya" or lithuania or macau or macao or "republic of north macedonia" or macedonia or madagascar or "malagasy republic" or malawi or nyasaland or malaysia or "malay federation" or "malaya federation" or maldives or "indian ocean islands" or "indian ocean" or mali or malta or micronesia or "federated states of micronesia" or kiribati or "marshall islands" or nauru or "northern mariana islands" or palau or tuvalu or mauritania or mauritius or mexico or moldova or moldovian or mongolia or montenegro or morocco or ifni or mozambique or "portuguese east africa" or myanmar or burma or namibia or nepal or "netherlands antilles" or nicaragua or niger or nigeria or oman or muscat or pakistan or panama or "papua new guinea" or "new guinea" or paraguay or peru or philippines or philippines or philippines or philippines or poland or "polish people's republic" or portugal or "portuguese republic" or "puerto rico" or romania or russia or "russian federation" or ussr or "soviet union or union of soviet socialist republics" or rwanda or ruanda or samoa or "pacific islands" or polynesia or "samoan islands" or "navigator island" or "navigator islands" or "sao tome and principe" or "saudi arabia" or senegal or serbia or seychelles or "sierra leone" or slovakia or "slovak republic" or slovenia or melanesia or "solomon island" or "solomon islands" or "norfolk island" or "norfolk islands" or somalia or "south africa" or "south sudan" or "sri lanka" or ceylon or "saint kitts and nevis" or "st. kitts and nevis" or "saint lucia" or "st. lucia" or "saint vincent and the grenadines" or "saint vincent" or "st. vincent" or grenadines or sudan or suriname or surinam or "dutch guiana" or "netherlands guiana" or syria or "syrian arab republic" or tajikistan or tadjikistan or tadjikistan or tadjik or tanzania or tanganyika or thailand or siam or "timor leste" or "east timor" or togo or "togolese republic" or tonga or "trinidad and tobago" or trinidad or tobago or tunisia or turkey or turkmenistan or turkmen or uganda or ukraine or uruguay or uzbekistan or uzbek or vanuatu or "new hebrides" or venezuela or vietnam or "viet nam" or "middle east" or "west bank" or gaza or palestine or yemen or yugoslavia or zambia or zimbabwe or "northern rhodesia" or "global south" or "africa south of the sahara" or "sub-saharan africa*" or "subsaharan africa*" or "africa, central" or "central africa*" or "africa, northern" or "north africa*" or "northern africa*" or magreb or maghrib or sahara* or "africa, southern" or "southern africa*" or "africa, eastern" or "east africa*" or "eastern africa*" or "africa, western" or "west africa*" or "western africa*" or "west indies" or "indian ocean islands" or caribbean or "central

america*" or "latin america*" or "south and central america*" or "south america*" or "asia, central" or "central asia*" or "asia, northern" or "north asia*" or "northern asia*" or "asia, southeastern" or "southeastern asia*" or "south eastern asia*" or "southeast asia*" or "south east asia*" or "asia, western" or "western asia*" or "europe, eastern" or "east europe*" or "eastern europe*" or "developing country" or "developing countries" or "developing nation*" or "developing population*" or "developing world" or "less developed countr*" or "less developed nation*" or "less developed population*" or "less developed world" or "lesser developed countr*" or "lesser developed nation*" or "lesser developed population*" or "lesser developed world" or "under developed countr*" or "under developed nation*" or "under developed population*" or "under developed world" or "underdeveloped countr*" or "underdeveloped nation*" or "underdeveloped population*" or "underdeveloped world" or "middle income countr*" or "middle income nation*" or "middle income population*" or "low income countr*" or "low income nation*" or "low income population*" or "lower income countr*" or "lower income nation*" or "lower income population*" or "underserved countr*" or "underserved nation*" or "underserved population*" or "underserved world" or "under served countr*" or "under served nation*" or "under served population*" or "under served world" or "deprived countr*" or "deprived nation*" or "deprived population*" or "deprived world" or "poor countr*" or "poor nation*" or "poor population*" or "poor world" or "poorer countr*" or "poorer nation*" or "poorer population*" or "poorer world" or "developing econom*" or "less developed econom*" or "lesser developed econom*" or "under developed econom*" or "underdeveloped econom*" or "middle income econom*" or "low income econom*" or "lower income econom*" or "low gdp" or "low gnp" or "low gross domestic" or "low gross national" or "lower gdp" or "lower gnp" or "lower gross domestic" or "lower gross national" or lmic or lmicr or "third world" or "lami countr*" or "transitional countr*" or "emerging economies" or "emerging nation*"))) OR AB (((afghanistan or albania or algeria or "american samoa" or angola or "antigua and barbuda" or antigua or barbuda or argentina or armenia or armenian or aruba or azerbaijan or bahrain or bangladesh or barbados or belarus or byelarus or belorussia or byelorussian or belize or "british honduras" or benin or dahomey or bhutan or bolivia or "bosnia and herzegovina" or bosnia or herzegovina or botswana or bechuanaland or brazil or brasil or bulgaria or "burkina faso" or "burkina fasso" or "upper volta" or burundi or urundi or "cabo verde" or "cape verde" or cambodia or kampuchea or "khmer republic" or cameroon or cameron or cameroun or "central african republic" or "ubangi shari" or chad or chile or china or colombia or comoros or comoro islands or "iles comores" or mayotte or "democratic republic of the congo" or "democratic republic congo" or congo or zaire or "costa rica" or "cote divoire" or "cote d ivoire" or "cote divoire" or "cote d ivoire" or "ivory coast" or croatia or cuba or cyprus or "czech republic" or czechoslovakia or djibouti or "french somaliland" or dominica or "dominican republic" or ecuador or egypt or "united arab republic" or "el salvador" or "equatorial guinea" or "spanish guinea" or eritrea or estonia or eswatini or swaziland or ethiopia or fiji or gabon or "gabonese republic" or gambia or "georgia (republic) " or georgian or ghana or "gold coast" or gibraltar or greece or grenada or guam or guatemala or guinea or "guinea bissau" or guyana or "british guiana" or haiti or hispaniola or honduras or hungary or india or indonesia or timor or iran or iraq or "isle of man" or jamaica or jordan or kazakhstan or kazakh or kenya or "democratic peoples republic of korea" or "republic of korea" or "north korea" or "south korea" or korea or kosovo or kyrgyzstan or kirghizia or kirgizstan or "kyrgyz republic" or kirghiz or laos or "lao pdr" or "lao people's democratic republic" or latvia or lebanon or "lebanese republic"

or lesotho or basutoland or liberia or libya or "libyan arab jamahiriya" or lithuania or macau or macao or "republic of north macedonia" or macedonia or madagascar or "malagasy republic" or malawi or nyasaland or malaysia or "malay federation" or "malaya federation" or maldives or "indian ocean islands" or "indian ocean" or mali or malta or micronesia or "federated states of micronesia" or kiribati or "marshall islands" or nauru or "northern mariana islands" or palau or tuvalu or mauritania or mauritius or mexico or moldova or moldovian or mongolia or montenegro or morocco or ifni or mozambique or "portuguese east africa" or myanmar or burma or namibia or nepal or "netherlands antilles" or nicaragua or niger or nigeria or oman or muscat or pakistan or panama or "papua new guinea" or "new guinea" or paraguay or peru or philippines or philippines or phillippines or poland or "polish people's republic" or portugal or "portuguese republic" or "puerto rico" or romania or russia or "russian federation" or ussr or "soviet union or union of soviet socialist republics" or rwanda or ruanda or samoa or "pacific islands" or polynesia or "samoan islands" or "navigator island" or "navigator islands" or "sao tome and principe" or "saudi arabia" or senegal or serbia or seychelles or "sierra leone" or slovakia or "slovak republic" or slovenia or melanesia or "solomon island" or "solomon islands" or "norfolk island" or "norfolk islands" or somalia or "south africa" or "south sudan" or "sri lanka" or ceylon or "saint kitts and nevis" or "st. kitts and nevis" or "saint lucia" or "st. lucia" or "saint vincent and the grenadines" or "saint vincent" or "st. vincent" or grenadines or sudan or suriname or surinam or "dutch guiana" or "netherlands guiana" or syria or "syrian arab republic" or tajikistan or tadjikistan or tadjhikistan or tadjhik or tanzania or tanganyika or thailand or siam or "timor leste" or "east timor" or togo or "togolese republic" or tonga or "trinidad and tobago" or trinidad or tobago or tunisia or turkey or turkmenistan or turkmen or uganda or ukraine or uruguay or uzbekistan or uzbek or vanuatu or "new hebrides" or venezuela or vietnam or "viet nam" or "middle east" or "west bank" or gaza or palestine or yemen or yugoslavia or zambia or zimbabwe or "northern rhodesia" or "global south" or "africa south of the sahara" or "sub-saharan africa*" or "subsaharan africa*" or "africa, central" or "central africa*" or "africa, northern" or "north africa*" or "northern africa*" or magreb or maghrib or sahara* or "africa, southern" or "southern africa*" or "africa, eastern" or "east africa*" or "eastern africa*" or "africa, western" or "west africa*" or "western africa*" or "west indies" or "indian ocean islands" or caribbean or "central america*" or "latin america*" or "south and central america*" or "south america*" or "asia, central" or "central asia*" or "asia, northern" or "north asia*" or "northern asia*" or "asia, southeastern" or "southeastern asia*" or "south eastern asia*" or "southeast asia*" or "south east asia*" or "asia, western" or "western asia*" or "europe, eastern" or "east europe*" or "eastern europe*" or "developing country" or "developing countries" or "developing nation*" or "developing population*" or "developing world" or "less developed countr*" or "less developed nation*" or "less developed population*" or "less developed world" or "lesser developed countr*" or "lesser developed nation*" or "lesser developed population*" or "lesser developed world" or "under developed countr*" or "under developed nation*" or "under developed population*" or "under developed world" or "underdeveloped countr*" or "underdeveloped nation*" or "underdeveloped population*" or "underdeveloped world" or "middle income countr*" or "middle income nation*" or "middle income population*" or "low income countr*" or "low income nation*" or "low income population*" or "lower income countr*" or "lower income nation*" or "lower income population*" or "underserved countr*" or "underserved nation*" or "underserved population*" or "underserved world" or "under served countr*" or "under served nation*" or "under served population*" or "under

served world" or "deprived countr*" or "deprived nation*" or "deprived population*" or "deprived world" or "poor countr*" or "poor nation*" or "poor population*" or "poor world" or "poorer countr*" or "poorer nation*" or "poorer population*" or "poorer world" or "developing econom*" or "less developed econom*" or "lesser developed econom*" or "under developed econom*" or "underdeveloped econom*" or "middle income econom*" or "low income econom*" or "lower income econom*" or "low gdp" or "low gnp" or "low gross domestic" or "low gross national" or "lower gdp" or "lower gnp" or "lower gross domestic" or "lower gross national" or Imic or Imics or "third world" or "lami countr*" or "transitional countr*" or "emerging economies" or "emerging nation*"))) OR SU (((afghanistan or albania or algeria or "american samoa" or angola or "antigua and barbuda" or antigua or barbuda or argentina or armenia or armenian or aruba or azerbaijan or bahrain or bangladesh or barbados or belarus or byelarus or belorussia or byelorussian or belize or "british honduras" or benin or dahomey or bhutan or bolivia or "bosnia and herzegovina" or bosnia or herzegovina or botswana or bechuanaland or brazil or brasil or bulgaria or "burkina faso" or "burkina fasso" or "upper volta" or burundi or urundi or "cabo verde" or "cape verde" or cambodia or kampuchea or "khmer republic" or cameroon or cameron or cameroun or "central african republic" or "ubangi shari" or chad or chile or china or colombia or comoros or comoro islands or "iles comores" or mayotte or "democratic republic of the congo" or "democratic republic congo" or congo or zaire or "costa rica" or "cote divoire" or "cote d ivoire" or "cote divoire" or "cote d ivoire" or "ivory coast" or croatia or cuba or cyprus or "czech republic" or czechoslovakia or djibouti or "french somaliland" or dominica or "dominican republic" or ecuador or egypt or "united arab republic" or "el salvador" or "equatorial guinea" or "spanish guinea" or eritrea or estonia or eswatini or swaziland or ethiopia or fiji or gabon or "gabonese republic" or gambia or "georgia (republic) " or georgian or ghana or "gold coast" or gibraltar or greece or grenada or guam or guatemala or guinea or "guinea bissau" or guyana or "british guiana" or haiti or hispaniola or honduras or hungary or india or indonesia or timor or iran or iraq or "isle of man" or jamaica or jordan or kazakhstan or kazakh or kenya or "democratic peoples republic of korea" or "republic of korea" or "north korea" or "south korea" or korea or kosovo or kyrgyzstan or kirghizia or kirgizstan or "kyrgyz republic" or kirghiz or laos or "lao pdr" or "lao people's democratic republic" or latvia or lebanon or "lebanese republic" or lesotho or basutoland or liberia or libya or "libyan arab jamahiriya" or lithuania or macau or macao or "republic of north macedonia" or macedonia or madagascar or "malagasy republic" or malawi or nyasaland or malaysia or "malay federation" or "malaya federation" or maldives or "indian ocean islands" or "indian ocean" or mali or malta or micronesia or "federated states of micronesia" or kiribati or "marshall islands" or nauru or "northern mariana islands" or palau or tuvalu or mauritania or mauritius or mexico or moldova or moldovian or mongolia or montenegro or morocco or ifni or mozambique or "portuguese east africa" or myanmar or burma or namibia or nepal or "netherlands antilles" or nicaragua or niger or nigeria or oman or muscat or pakistan or panama or "papua new guinea" or "new guinea" or paraguay or peru or philippines or philipines or phillipines or philippines or poland or "polish people's republic" or portugal or "portuguese republic" or "puerto rico" or romania or russia or "russian federation" or ussr or "soviet union or union of soviet socialist republics" or russia or rwanda or ruanda or samoa or "pacific islands" or polynesia or "samoan islands" or "navigator island" or "navigator islands" or "sao tome and principe" or "saudi arabia" or senegal or serbia or seychelles or "sierra leone" or slovakia or "slovak republic" or slovenia or melanesia or "solomon island" or "solomon islands" or "norfolk island" or

"norfolk islands" or somalia or "south africa" or "south sudan" or "sri lanka" or ceylon or "saint kitts and nevis" or "st. kitts and nevis" or "saint lucia" or "st. lucia" or "saint vincent and the grenadines" or "saint vincent" or "st. vincent" or grenadines or sudan or suriname or surinam or "dutch guiana" or "netherlands guiana" or syria or "syrian arab republic" or tajikistan or tadjikistan or tadhikistan or tadhik or tanzania or tanganyika or thailand or siam or "timor leste" or "east timor" or togo or "togolese republic" or tonga or "trinidad and tobago" or trinidad or tobago or tunisia or turkey or turkmenistan or turkmen or uganda or ukraine or uruguay or uzbekistan or uzbek or vanuatu or "new hebrides" or venezuela or vietnam or "viet nam" or "middle east" or "west bank" or gaza or palestine or yemen or yugoslavia or zambia or zimbabwe or "northern rhodesia" or "global south" or "africa south of the sahara" or "sub-saharan africa*" or "subsaharan africa*" or "africa, central" or "central africa*" or "africa, northern" or "north africa*" or "northern africa*" or magreb or maghrib or sahara* or "africa, southern" or "southern africa*" or "africa, eastern" or "east africa*" or "eastern africa*" or "africa, western" or "west africa*" or "western africa*" or "west indies" or "indian ocean islands" or caribbean or "central america*" or "latin america*" or "south and central america*" or "south america*" or "asia, central" or "central asia*" or "asia, northern" or "north asia*" or "northern asia*" or "asia, southeastern" or "southeastern asia*" or "south eastern asia*" or "southeast asia*" or "south east asia*" or "asia, western" or "western asia*" or "europe, eastern" or "east europe*" or "eastern europe*" or "developing country" or "developing countries" or "developing nation*" or "developing population*" or "developing world" or "less developed countr*" or "less developed nation*" or "less developed population*" or "less developed world" or "lesser developed countr*" or "lesser developed nation*" or "lesser developed population*" or "lesser developed world" or "under developed countr*" or "under developed nation*" or "under developed population*" or "under developed world" or "underdeveloped countr*" or "underdeveloped nation*" or "underdeveloped population*" or "underdeveloped world" or "middle income countr*" or "middle income nation*" or "middle income population*" or "low income countr*" or "low income nation*" or "low income population*" or "lower income countr*" or "lower income nation*" or "lower income population*" or "underserved countr*" or "underserved nation*" or "underserved population*" or "underserved world" or "under served countr*" or "under served nation*" or "under served population*" or "under served world" or "deprived countr*" or "deprived nation*" or "deprived population*" or "deprived world" or "poor countr*" or "poor nation*" or "poor population*" or "poor world" or "poorer countr*" or "poorer nation*" or "poorer population*" or "poorer world" or "developing econom*" or "less developed econom*" or "lesser developed econom*" or "under developed econom*" or "underdeveloped econom*" or "middle income econom*" or "low income econom*" or "lower income econom*" or "low gdp" or "low gnp" or "low gross domestic" or "low gross national" or "lower gdp" or "lower gnp" or "lower gross domestic" or "lower gross national" or Imic or Imics or "third world" or "lami countr*" or "transitional countr*" or "emerging economies" or "emerging nation*"))

Appendix B: Data extraction template

Code	Subcode
Study Information	Study EPPI internal ID
	Coder name
	Title name
	Foreign Title
	Short title
	Language
Author Information	Authors Name
	Authors Affiliation Institution
	Authors Affiliation Country
Publication Information	Publication Type
	DOI
	Study status
	Abstract
	Keywords
	Journal name
	Other journal name
	Journal volume
	Journal issue
	Pages
	Year of Publication
	URL
	Publisher location
Open access	
Sector Information	Sector name
	Sub-sector name
	DAC rank
	Primary DAC Code
	Secondary DAC Code
	CRS-Voluntary (tertiary) Code
	SDGs
	WB first theme
	WB first sub-theme
	WB second theme
	WB second sub-theme
	WB third theme
	WB third sub-theme
	Other topics
	Equity focus
Equity dimension	
Equity description	
Geographic Information	First year of intervention
	Continent name
	Country name
	Additional country

	Country income level Region name State/province name District name City/town name Location name
Target population and cost data	Age Sex Setting Sexual orientation Specific population group Cost data Type of cost data
Methodological information	Evaluation Design Evaluation Method Mixed Method Additional quantitative Methods Additional qualitative Methods Unit of Observation
Program, Funding and Implementation Information	Project Name Implementation Agency Category Implementation Agency Name Program Funding Agency Category Program Funding Agency Name Researching Funding Agency Category Researching Funding Agency Name
Intervention Information	Treatment group/Arm 1 Treatment group/Arm 1 Description Intervention group/Arm 2 Treatment group/Arm 2 Description Create 3 different treatment options in case there is more than one intervention group.
Outcome Information	Outcome description

Appendix C: Critical appraisal tool

Checklist for making judgements about how much confidence to place in a systematic review of effects.

This checklist has been adapted from Supporting the Use of Research Evidence (SURE) Collaboration. SURE, checklist for making judgements about how much confidence to place in a systematic review. In SURE guides for preparing and using policy briefs. www.evipnet.org/sure

Question	Criteria
Section A: Methods used to identify, include and critically appraise studies	
<p>A.1 Were the criteria used for deciding which studies to include in the review reported? Did the authors specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Types of studies ▪ Participants/ settings/ population ▪ Intervention(s) ▪ Outcome(s) 	<p>Yes; partially; no; can't tell Coding guide - check the answers above YES: All four should be yes NO: All four should be no PARTIALLY: Any other</p>
<p>A.2 Was the search for evidence reasonably comprehensive? Were the following done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Language bias avoided (no restriction of inclusion based on language) ▪ No restriction of inclusion based on publication status ▪ Relevant databases searched (<u>Minimum criteria</u>: All reviews should search at least one source of grey literature such as Google; for health: Medline/ Pubmed + Cochrane Library; for social sciences IDEAS + at least one database of general social science literature and one subject specific database) ▪ Reference lists in included articles checked ▪ Authors/experts contacted 	<p>Yes; partially; no; can't tell Coding guide - check the answers above: YES: All five should be yes PARTIALLY: Relevant databases and reference lists are both reported NO: Any other</p>

Question	Criteria
<p>A.3 Does the review cover an appropriate time period? Is the search period comprehensive enough that relevant literature is unlikely to be omitted?</p>	<p>Yes; can't tell (only use if no information about time period for search); no; unsure Coding guide: YES: Generally, this means searching the literature at least back to 1990 NO: Generally, if the search does not go back to 1990 CAN'T TELL: No information about time period for search Note: With reference to the above – there may be important reasons for adopting different dates for the search, e.g. depending on the intervention. If you think there are limitations with the timeframe adopted for the search which have not been noted and justified by the authors, you should code this item as a NO and specify your reason for doing so in the comment box below. Older reviews should not be downgraded, but the fact that the search was conducted some time ago should be noted in the quality assessment. Always report the time period for the search in the comment box.</p>
<p>A.4 Was bias in the selection of articles avoided? Did the authors specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Independent screening of full text by at least 2 reviewers ▪ List of included studies provided ▪ List of excluded studies provided 	<p>Yes; partially; no Coding guide: YES: All three should be yes, although reviews published in journals are unlikely to have a list of excluded studies (due to limits on word count) and the review should not be penalised for this. PARTIALLY: Independent screening and list of included studies provided are both reported NO: All other. If list of included studies provided, but the authors do not report whether or not the screening has been done by 2 reviewers review is downgraded to NO.</p>

Question	Criteria
<p>A.5 Did the authors use appropriate criteria to assess the quality and risk of bias in analysing the studies that are included?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The criteria used for assessing the quality/ risk of bias were reported ▪ A table or summary of the assessment of each included study for each criterion was reported ▪ Sensible criteria were used that focus on the quality/ risk of bias (and not other qualities of the studies, such as precision or applicability/external validity). “Sensible” is defined as a recognised quality appraisal tool/ checklist, or similar tool which assesses bias in included studies. Please see footnotes for details of the main types of bias such a tool should assess. 	<p>Yes; partially; no Coding guide: YES: All three should be yes PARTIALLY: The first and third criteria should be reported. If the authors report the criteria for assessing risk of bias and report a summary of this assessment for each criterion, but the criteria may be only partially sensible (e.g. do not address all possible risks of bias, but do address some), we downgrade to PARTIALLY. NO: Any other</p>
<p>A.6 Overall – how much confidence do you have in the methods used to identify, include and critically appraise studies?</p> <p>Summary assessment score A relates to the 5 questions above.</p> <p>High confidence applicable when the answers to the questions in section A are all assessed as ‘yes’</p> <p>Low confidence applicable when any of the following are assessed as ‘NO’ above: not reporting explicit selection criteria (A1), not conducting reasonably comprehensive search (A2), not avoiding bias in selection of articles (A4), not assessing the risk of bias in included studies (A5)</p> <p>Medium confidence applicable for any other – i.e. section A3 is assessed as ‘NO’ or can’t tell and remaining sections are assessed as ‘partially’ or ‘can’t tell’</p>	<p>Low confidence (limitations are important enough that the results of the review are not reliable)</p> <p>Medium confidence (limitations are important enough that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously, if a better review cannot be found)</p> <p>High confidence (only minor limitations)</p>

Question	Criteria
Section B: Methods used to analyse the findings	
<p>B.1 Were the characteristics and results of the included studies reliably reported?</p> <p>Was there:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Independent data extraction by at least 2 reviewers</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A table or summary of the characteristics of the participants, interventions and outcomes for the included studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A table or summary of the results of all the included studies</p>	<p>Yes; no; partially; not applicable (e.g. no included studies)</p> <p>Coding guide:</p> <p>YES: All three should be yes</p> <p>PARTIALLY: Criteria one and three are yes, but some information is lacking on second criteria.</p> <p>No: None of these are reported. If the review does not report whether data was independently extracted by 2 reviewers (possibly a reporting error), we downgrade to NO.</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE: if no studies/no data</p>
<p>B.2 Are the methods used by the review authors to analyse the findings of the included studies clear, including methods for calculating effect sizes if applicable?</p>	<p>Yes; partially; no; not applicable</p> <p>Coding guide:</p> <p>YES: Methods used clearly reported. If it is clear that the authors use narrative synthesis, they don't need to say this explicitly.</p> <p>PARTIALLY: Some reporting on methods but lack of clarity</p> <p>NO: Nothing reported on methods</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE: if no studies/no data</p>
<p>B.3 Did the review describe the extent of heterogeneity?</p> <p>Did the review ensure that included studies were similar enough that it made sense to combine them, sensibly divide the included studies into homogeneous groups, or sensibly conclude that it did not make sense to combine or group the included studies?</p> <p>Did the review discuss the extent to which there were important differences in the results of the included studies?</p> <p>If a meta-analysis was done, was the I², chi square test for heterogeneity or other appropriate statistic reported? If no statistical test was reported, is a qualitative justification made for the use of random effects?</p>	<p>Yes; partially; no; not applicable</p> <p>Coding guide:</p> <p>YES: First two should be yes, and third category should be yes if applicable should be yes</p> <p>PARTIALLY: The first category is yes</p> <p>NO: Any other</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE: if no studies/no data</p>

Question	Criteria
<p>B.4 Were the findings of the relevant studies combined (or not combined) appropriately relative to the primary question the review addresses and the available data?</p> <p>How was the data analysis done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Descriptive only ▪ Vote counting based on direction of effect ▪ Vote counting based on statistical significance ▪ Description of range of effect sizes ▪ Meta-analysis ▪ Meta-regression ▪ Other: specify ▪ Not applicable (e.g. no studies or no data) <p>How were the studies weighted in the analysis?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Equal weights (this is what is done when vote counting is used) ▪ By quality or study design (this is rarely done) ▪ Inverse variance (this is what is typically done in a meta-analysis) ▪ Number of participants (sample size) ▪ Other: specify ▪ Not clear ▪ Not applicable (e.g. no studies or no data) <p>Did the review address unit of analysis errors?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes - took clustering into account in the analysis (e.g. used intra-cluster correlation coefficient) ▪ No, but acknowledged problem of unit of analysis errors ▪ No mention of issue ▪ Not applicable - no clustered trials or studies included 	<p>Yes; partially; no; not applicable (e.g. no studies or no data); can't tell.</p> <p>Coding guide:</p> <p>YES: If appropriate table, graph or meta-analysis AND appropriate weights AND unit of analysis errors addressed (if appropriate).</p> <p>PARTIALLY: If appropriate table, graph or meta-analysis AND appropriate weights AND unit of analysis errors not addressed (and should have been).</p> <p>NO: If narrative OR vote counting (where quantitative analyses would have been possible) OR inappropriate reporting of table, graph or meta-analyses.</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE: if no studies/no data</p> <p>CAN'T TELL: if unsure (note reasons in comments below)</p>

Question	Criteria
<p>B.5 Does the review report evidence appropriately?</p> <p>The review makes clear which evidence is subject to low risk of bias in assessing causality (attribution of outcomes to intervention), and which is likely to be biased, and does so appropriately</p> <p>Where studies of differing risk of bias are included, results are reported and analysed separately by risk of bias status</p>	<p>Yes; partially; no; not applicable</p> <p>Coding guide:</p> <p>YES: Both criteria should be fulfilled (where applicable)</p> <p>NO: Criteria not fulfilled</p> <p>PARTIALLY: Only one criterion fulfilled, or when there is limited reporting of quality appraisal (the latter applies only when inclusion criteria for study design are appropriate)</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE: No included studies</p> <p>Note on reporting evidence and risk of bias: For reviews of effects of 'large n' interventions, experimental and quasi-experimental designs should be included (if available). For reviews of effects of 'small n' interventions, designs appropriate to attribute changes to the intervention should be included (e.g. pre-post with assessment of confounders)</p>
<p>B.6 Did the review examine the extent to which specific factors might explain differences in the results of the included studies?</p> <p>Were factors that the review authors considered as likely explanatory factors clearly described?</p> <p>Was a sensible method used to explore the extent to which key factors explained heterogeneity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Descriptive/textual ▪ Graphical ▪ Meta-analysis by sub-groups ▪ Meta-regression ▪ Other 	<p>Yes; partially; no; not applicable</p> <p>Coding guide:</p> <p>YES: Explanatory factors clearly described and appropriate methods used to explore heterogeneity</p> <p>PARTIALLY: Explanatory factors described but for meta-analyses, subgroup analysis or meta-regression not reported (when they should have been)</p> <p>NO: No description or analysis of likely explanatory factors</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE: e.g. too few studies, no important differences in the results of the included studies, or the included studies were so dissimilar that it would not make sense to explore heterogeneity of the results</p>

Question	Criteria
<p>B.7 Overall - how much confidence do you have in the methods used to analyse the findings relative to the primary question addressed in the review?</p> <p>Summary assessment score B relates to the 5 questions in this section, regarding the analysis.</p> <p>High confidence applicable when all the answers to the questions in section B are assessed as 'yes'.</p> <p>Low confidence applicable when any of the following are assessed as 'NO' above: critical characteristics of the included studies not reported (B1), not describing the extent of heterogeneity (B3), combining results inappropriately (B4), reporting evidence inappropriately (B5). Medium confidence applicable for any other: i.e. the "Partial" option is used for any of the 6 preceding questions or questions and/or B.2 and/ or B.6 are assessed as 'no'.</p>	<p>Low confidence (limitations are important enough that the results of the review are not reliable)</p> <p>Medium confidence (limitations are important enough that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously, if a better review cannot be found)</p> <p>High confidence (only minor limitations)</p>
<p>Section C: Overall assessment of the reliability of the review</p>	
<p>C.1 Are there any other aspects of the review not mentioned before which lead you to question the results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional methodological concerns – only one person reviewing ▪ Robustness ▪ Interpretation ▪ Conflicts of interest (of the review authors or for included studies) ▪ Other ▪ No other quality issues identified
<p>C.2 Are there any mitigating factors which should be considered in determining the reviews reliability?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limitations acknowledged ▪ No strong policy conclusions drawn (including in abstract/ summary) ▪ Any other factors

Question	Criteria
<p>C.3 Based on the above assessments of the methods how would you rate the reliability of the review?</p> <p><u>Low confidence in conclusions about effects:</u></p> <p><u>Medium confidence in conclusions about effects:</u></p> <p>The systematic review has the following limitations...</p> <p><u>High confidence in conclusions about effects:</u></p>	<p>If applicable: The review has the following minor limitations... Coding guide:</p> <p>High confidence in conclusions about effects: high confidence noted overall for sections A and B, unless moderated by answer to C1.</p> <p>Medium confidence in conclusions about effects: medium confidence noted overall for sections A or B, unless moderated by answer to C1 or C2.</p> <p>Low confidence in conclusions about effects: low confidence noted overall for sections A or B, unless moderated by answer to C1 or C2.</p> <p>Limitations should be summarised above, based on what was noted in Sections A, B and C.</p>

Appendix D: Details about the EGM advisory group

BBC Media Action - Anna Godfrey

Center for International Media Assistance (CIMA) - Heather Gilberts

Center for Media, data and society - Susan Abbott

Erich Brost Institute - Ines Drefs

ICFJ - Luis Botello

Independent consultants - Mary Myers

International media development advisers - Michelle Betz

Internews - Emily Bango

Internews - Gillian McCormack

Internews - Meghan Guidrey

Internews - Rosie Parkyn

IREX - Sarah Bushman

IREX - Tara Susman-Pena

Michigan State University - Jeff Conroy-Krutz

Splice Media - Rishad Patel

University of Massachusetts, Lowell - Jenifer M. Whitten-Woodring

University of Technology, Sydney - Maureen Taylor

Terms of reference for an EGM advisory group

EGM advisory groups are a requirement for all 3ie EGMs. They help authors determine the parameters of their proposed map and provide inputs throughout the research process to help ensure that the final product is policy relevant and useful in informing decision-making.

Members of the advisory group should be diverse including policymakers, programme managers, researchers and other key stakeholders (e.g. the funder, if appropriate). Members will be asked to provide inputs on various aspects of the EGM throughout the mapping process.

The details of member inputs will be finalised by the project manager or principal investigator prior to member recruitment. The total time commitment is not likely to exceed two days and may be less depending on members' availability. Indicative inputs are listed here (the examples are not exhaustive):

- Advise on key decisions regarding the EGM scope, including refining the objectives and definitions of key concepts;
- Determine important outcomes;
- Suggest relevant background literature and studies for inclusion;
- Participate in up to 2-3 teleconferences for the duration of the EGM (title/ scoping stage, draft protocol, draft report);
- Provide written comments on the draft protocol and draft report;
- Help the team draw policy implications from the EGM findings. This can involve participating in a brainstorming session or focus group meeting to review the lessons and implications of the EGM in terms of policy and research investments;
- Assist the study team in implementing the communication plan developed for the project. This can involve advising on the project team's plan, identifying key

- audiences or hosting launch events for the report;
- Identify opportunities for policy influence to increase investments in evidence production and synthesis; and
 - Act as a knowledge broker, providing a link between the author team and the end users by facilitating access to, interpretation and translation of the EGM findings for use locally.

References

- Arsenault, A., and S. Powers. 2010. "The Media Map Project. A Resource on the Impact of Media Development Worldwide." <https://mediamapresource.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/literature-review-the-media-map-project.pdf>.
- Autesserre, S. (2014) *Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benequista, N. 2019. *Confronting the Crisis in Independent Media. A Role for International Assistance*. CIMA. https://www.cima.ned.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/CIMA_Entry-Points-Report_web150ppi-1.pdf.
- Biagi, S. (2007) *Media/Impact: An Introduction to Mass Media*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning.
- Bogaards, M. (2018) "De-democratization in Hungary: diffusely defective democracy."
- Boyd-Barrett, O. 2001. "Conceptualising the 'Public Sphere.'" Edited by O. Boyd-Barrett and C. Newbold. London: Arnold.
- Bratic, V. 2006. "Media Effects during Violent Conflict: Evaluating Media Contributions to Peacebuilding." *Conflict & Communication Online* 5.
- Brisset-Focault, F. 2018. "Serial Callers: Communication Technologies and Political Personhood in Contemporary Uganda." *Ethnos* 83: 255–73.
- Brisset-Foucault, Florence. 2011. "Peace-making, power configurations and media practices in northern Uganda: A case study of Mega FM." *Journal of African Media Studies* 3 (2): 205-225. https://doi.org/10.1386/jams.3.2.205_1.
- Cauhape-Cazaux, E., and S. Kalathil. 2015. "Official Development Assistance for Media: Figure and Findings. A Report by CIMA and the OECD." CIMA. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/CIMA.pdf>.
- Chattopadhyay, S. (2019) *Development Journalism*, in Vos, T., P. & Hanusch, F. (eds), *The International Encyclopedia of Journalism Studies* Wiley-Blackwell.
- Coronel, S. 2010. "Corruption and the Watchdog Role of the News Media." Edited by P. Norris. *Public Sentinel: News, Media and Government Reform*.
- Cowan, B. 2004. "Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37: 345–66.
- D.F.I.D. 2015. "Why Corruption Matters: Understanding Causes, Effects and How to Address Them." In *Evidence Paper on Corruption* [Online]. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/406346/corruption-evidence-paper-why-corruption-matters.pdf.
- Deane, J. (2014) *Media Development*, in Wilkins, K. G., Tufte, T. & Obregon, R. (eds), *The Handbook for Development Communication and Social Change*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 226-241.

- Deane, J. 2016. The Role of Independent Media in Curbing Corruption in Fragile Settings. BBC Media Action.
<http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/mediaaction/policybriefing/curbing-corruption-in-fragile-settings-report.pdf>. Democratization, 25(8): 1481-1499.
- Development. Available at: <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/peace-justice/> [Accessed: 16 December 2019].
- Doyle, M.W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." Philosophy & Public Affairs 12: 205–35.
- EFJ. 2019. "New report: Hungary dismantles media freedom and pluralism." European Federation of Journalists. <https://europeanjournalists.org/blog/2019/12/03/new-report-hungary-dismantles-media-freedom-and-pluralism/>
- Elliot, P. 2001. "Intellectuals, the "Information Society" and the Disappearance of the Public Sphere." In Approaches to Media: A Reader, edited by O. Boyd-Barrett and C. Newbold. London: Arnold.
- Escalera, C., R. Li, H. Shin, and P. Uebel. 2013. "Measuring Outcomes of Impact Investing in Independent Media: Developing a Media Impact Index. MDIF." <https://www.sipa.columbia.edu/academics/capstone-projects/measuring-outcomes-impact-investing-independent-media-developing-media>.
- Eyerradio (n.d.) About us. [online] <https://eyerradio.org/about-us/>. Accessed 15 February 2021. Field Experiment on a Mass Media Intervention in Rwanda."American Political Science
- Fraser, C., and S. Restrepo-Estrada. 1998. Communication for Development: Human Change for Survival. London: I.B. Tauris Publishers.
- Freedom House. 2019. "Freedom and the Media 2019. A Downward Spiral." https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/FINAL07162019_Freedom_And_The_Media_2019_Report.pdf.
- Garnham, N. 2001. "The Media and the Public Sphere." Edited by O. Boyd-Barrett and C. Newbold. London: Arnold.
- Habermas, J. 1974. "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article." New German Critique 3: 49–55.
- Hallin, D., and P. Mancini. 2004. Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HM Treasury, 2020. Magenta Book: Central Government guidance on evaluation. OGL. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/879438/HMT_Magenta_Book.pdf
- Howard, R. 2002. An Operational Framework for Media and Peacebuilding. Vancouver, B.C: Institute for Media, Policy, and Civil Society.

- HRW 2020. "Turkey: Press Freedom under Attack." Human Rights Watch <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/10/14/turkey-press-freedom-under-attack>
- I.C.G. 1997. Media in Bosnia and Herzegovina. How International Support Can Be More Effective. International Crisis Group.
- I.P.I. 2020. "Hungary: Press freedom threatened as Orbán handed new powers." International Press Institute. <https://ipi.media/hungary-press-freedom-threatened-as-orban-handed-new-powers/>
- Intervention and Statebuilding, 11(1), 42-57. *Intervention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- INTRAC. 2017a. Realist evaluation. Available at: <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Realist-evaluation.pdf>
- INTRAC. 2017b. Process tracing. Available at: <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Process-tracing.pdf>
- INTRAC. 2017c. Contribution analysis. Available at: <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Contribution-analysis.pdf>
- INTRAC. 2017d. Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA). Available at: <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Qualitative-comparative-analysis.pdf>
- Ismail, Z. 2018. "Strengthening the Financial Independence of Independent Media Organisations." K4D Helpdesk Report. Birmingham UK: University of Birmingham.
- Jeong, S., Cho, H. and Hwang, Y. 2012. Media Literacy Interventions: A Meta-Analytic Review. *The Journal of Communication*. 62(3), p. 454-472.
- Kalathil, S., 2011. Developing independent media as an institution of accountable governance: a how-to guide. World Bank Publications. (Framework citation)
- Kaplan, D., ed. 2012. Empowering Independent Media: U.S. Efforts to Foster a Free Press and an Open Internet Around the World. Washington, DC: Center for International Media Assistance.
- Kempf, W. 2019. "Concepts and Conceptions of Peace Journalism." *Conflict and Communication* 18.
- Koddenbrock, K. (2012) Recipes for Intervention: Western Policy Papers Imagine the Congo. *International Peacekeeping*, 19(5), 549-564.
- Koddenbrock, K. (2016) Practice of Humanitarian Intervention: Aid Workers, Agencies and Institutions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Oxon: Routledge.
- Kumar, K. 2006. "International Assistance to Promote Independent Media in Transition and Post-Conflict Societies." *Democratization* 13 (4): 652-67.
- La Ferrara, E., 2016. The media as a tool for institutional change in development. EDI-RA1 presentation.

Lavigne, R. (2019) "The End of Opposition: The AKP's Ten-Year War on Press Freedom in Lerner, D. 1958. *The Passing of Traditional Society. Modernising the Middle East.* USA: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Lynch, J., and A. McGoldrick. 2007. "Peace Journalism." In *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, edited by C. Webel and J. Galtung, 248–63. Oxon: Routledge.

Manyozo, L. (2012) *Media, Communication and Development. Three Approaches.* London: SAGE.

McCurdy, P.M., and G. Power. 2007. "Journalism Education as a Vehicle for Media Development in Africa: The AMDI Project." *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies* 28: 127–47.

Milan, S., 2009. Four steps to community media as a development tool. *Development in Practice*, 19(4-5), pp.598-609. (Framework citation)

Moehler, D.C. 2014. *Democracy, Governance and Randomised Media Assistance.* BBC Media Action.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a089efed915d622c000487/democracy_governance_research_report.pdf.

Myers, M., and L.A. Juma. 2018. *Defending Independent Media: A Comprehensive Analysis of Aid Flows.* CIMA. https://www.cima.ned.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/CIMA-AidData-Report_web_150ppi_rev.pdf.

Noske-Turner, J. 2015. "10 Years of Evaluation Practice in Media Assistance : Who, When." *Why and How? Nordicom Review* 36: 41–56.

Noske-Turner, J. 2017. *Rethinking Media Development through Evaluation. Beyond Freedom.* Palgrave MacMillan.

Ogan, C. L. (1980) *Development Journalism/Communication: The Status of the Concept,* International Division, Association for Education in Journalism. Annual Convention. Boston, Mass.: ERIC. Institute of Education Sciences.

Okigbo, C. 1995. "Media and Sustainable Development: A Prologue." In *Media and Sustainable Development*, edited by C. Okigbo. Nairobi: African Council for Communication Education.

Paluck, E.L., and Green, D.P. (2009). "Deference, Dissent, and Dispute Resolution: A Field Experiment on a Mass Media Intervention in Rwanda." *American Political Science Review* 103(4), 622-644. (Framework citation)

Paris, R. 2004. *At War's End. Building Peace After Civil Conflict.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parkyn, R. and Whitehead, S., 2016. *Media Development: An evaluation of five capacity strengthening projects.* (Framework)

Peña-López, I., 2008. *Media development indicators: A framework for assessing media development.* (Framework citation)

- Peña-Susman, T. 2012. A Special Report to the Center for International Media Assistance: Making Media Development More Effective. Washington, DC: Center for International Media Assistance / National Endowment for Democracy.
- Perera, S. (2017) Bermuda triangulation: embracing the messiness of researching in conflict. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 11(1), 42-57.
- Peri, Y. 2012. "The Impact of National Security on the Development of Media Systems. The Case of Israel." In *Comparing Media Systems beyond the Western World*, edited by C. D. Hallin and P. Mancini, 11–25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Postill, J. (2006). *Media and Nationbuilding. How the Iban became Malaysian*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Puddephat, A. 2010. *Sida's Guidelines for Media Development*. Sida.
- Remnant, F. and Avard, R. 2016. *Qualitative Impact Assessment Protocol (QUIP). Better Evaluation*. Retrieved from: <http://betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/QUIP>
- Rhodes, A. 2007. "Ten Years of Media Support to the Balkans: An Assessment." Amsterdam: Media Task Force of the Stability Pact for South-East Europe and Press Now.
- Rozumilowicz, B. 2002. "Democratic Change: A Theoretical Perspective." In *Media Reform. Democratising the Media, Democratising the State*, edited by M. Price, B. Rozumilowicz, and Verhulst S, 9–26. London: Routledge.
- RSF (2016). Presentation. Reporters sans Frontières. <https://rsf.org/en/presentation>.
- RSF (2019) "Level of media control in Hungary is 'unprecedented in an EU member state'." <https://rsf.org/en/news/level-media-control-hungary-unprecedented-eu-member-state>
- Schoemaker, E., and N. Stremlau. 2014. "Media and Conflict: An Assessment of the Evidence." *Progress in Development Studies* 14: 181–95.
- Silverblatt, Art, Donald C. Miller, Julie Smith, and Nikole Brown. *Media literacy: Keys to interpreting media messages: Keys to interpreting media messages. ABC-CLIO, 2014. (Framework)*
- Skjerdal, T. S. (2011) *Development journalism revived: The case of Ethiopia*. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies*, 32(2), 58-74.
- Smirl, L. (2015) *Spaces of Aid: How Cars, Compounds and Hotels Shape Humanitarianism*. London: Zed Books.
- Sparks, C. 2007. *Globalisation, Development and the Mass Media*. London, Sage.
- Sreberny, A. 2000. "The Global and the Local in International Communication." In *Mass Media and Society*, edited by J. Curran and M. Gurevitch. London: Arnold.
- Staub, E. 2013. "Building a Peaceful Society. Origins, Prevention, and Reconciliation after Genocide and Other Group Violence." *American Psychologist* 68: 576–89.

Stremlau, N. 2014. From the Field: In Search of Evidence - Media and Governance in Fragile States. https://www.db-thueringen.de/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/dbt_derivate_00031133/GMJ8_Stremlau_final.pdf.

Stremlau, N., E. Fantini, and I. Gagliardone. 2015. "Patronage, Politics and Performance: Radio Call-in Programmes and the Myth of Accountability." *Third World Quarterly* 36: 1510–26.

Susman-Pena, T. 2012. "Making Media Development More Effective. CIMA." https://internews.org/sites/default/files/resources/CIMA_MediaDevelopment_2012-10.pdf.

Thompson, John B. 2001. "The Theory of the Public Sphere." In *Approaches to Media - A Reader*, edited by O. Boyd-Barrett and C. Newbold. Arnold, London.

Thussu, D. 2010. *International Communication: A Reader*. London: Routledge.

Tomiak, K. (forthcoming 2021) *Statebuilding missions and media development: A context-sensitive approach*. Oxon: Routledge

Tomiak, K. 2018. "Humanitarian Interventions and the Media: Broadcasting Against Ethnic Hate." *Third World Quarterly* 39: 454–70.

Truman, Harry S. 1949. "Truman's Inaugural Address." Delivered. http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm.

U.N.E.S.C.O. 2008. "Media Development Indicators: A Framework for Assessing Media Development." United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

U.N.E.S.C.O. 2017. "World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development." (Global Report). Paris: UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000259756>.

United Nations (2015a). *Peace and justice - United Nations Sustainable*

USAID. 2018. *Updated Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure and Definitions*. Document shared with 3ie.

White, H. and Phillips, D. 2012. *Addressing attribution of cause and effect in small n impact evaluations: towards an integrated framework*. International Initiative for Impact Evaluation. Working paper 15.

Wilson-Grau, R. 2015. *Outcome Harvesting. Better Evaluation*. Retrieved from http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/outcome_harvesting [Accessed 17/03/2021]