



Search for
Common
Ground

1601 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 200
Washington, DC 20009-1035 USA
+1 (202) 265 4300 | +1 (202) 232 6718 fax
search@sfcg.org | www.sfcg.org

Rue Belliard 205 bte 13
Brussels B-1040 BELGIUM
+32 2 736 7262 | +32 2 732 3033 fax
brussels@sfcg.be | www.sfcg.org

RESEARCH REPORT:

The Team Vernacular: Exposure, Attitude and Interpersonal Communication about Political Process

Prof. Rick Busselle
University of Washington
Funded by USIP

Contact:

Deborah Jones
Executive Producer
1601 Connecticut Ave #200
Washington DC, USA

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary	3
2.	Introduction	5
3.	Findings:	6
4.	Results:.....	8
5.	Exposure and Reactions to Scenarios:.....	11
6.	Summary and Conclusions	16
	Annex 1: Tools.....	18

1. Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate potential impact of radio broadcasts of *The Team* on Kenyan citizens' attitudes related to tolerance, communication, and participation in political processes.

The study's design was cross-sectional, with all data collected at one point in time. Its purpose was not to provide definitive evidence of causal relations. Instead, it was designed to reveal difference between those who exposed themselves to *The Team* through radio, and those who did not.

Respondents (318) were interviewed in communities in and around Nairobi, Kisumu, and Eldoret. Almost two-thirds of respondents (196) had listened to one or more episode of *The Team*. Fifteen percent (47) had not seen or heard the program.

We measured exposure to the series; frequency of discussing issues related to political, religious and ethnic tolerance; engagement in the program while viewing; and three attitudes related to intergroup tolerance and political engagement. Political attitudes were 1) perceived importance of "Communication and Respect" among members of different religious and ethnic groups, 2) perceived importance of "Political Engagement," and 3) perceived "Political Efficacy."

In these data we found a number of small but statistically significant and theoretically important differences:

- Those who listened to *The Team* were more supportive of Political Engagement than those who didn't listen to it.
- More listeners (69.5%) than non-listeners (58.3%) reported discussing issues related to politics and tolerance frequently. More non-listeners (41.7%) than listeners (30.5%) reported rarely discussing these issues.
- Engagement was positively related to perceived importance of Communication & Respect. While these differences were not large, less than one-half unit on a four-point scale, there were statistically significant, indicating a less than 5% likelihood of their occurring by chance.

From our interpretation of these data, we can draw three conclusions. First, *The Team* appears to encourage political engagement. Second, listening to The Team can also encourage discussions of issues related to politics and tolerance. Third, the positive relation between engagement in the program while listening to The Team and the attitude toward Communication & Respect suggests that the more programs like *The Team* can engage listeners, the greater their potential for positive influence.

Because of some data collecting flaws (over-representation of listeners in Kisumu and delayed data collection), we failed to detect all the possible impact of *The Team* on attitude change among respondents (such as their attitudes toward Political Efficacy, and the different impact of exposure levels on their attitudes regarding the three attitude scales).

In conclusion, exposure to the program appears related to pro-social attitudes about political engagement regarding people from different religious and ethnic groups. Listening to the program is also positively related interpersonal communication with family and friends about politics and tolerance.

2. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate potential impact of radio broadcasts of *The Team* on Kenyan citizens' attitudes related to tolerance, communication, and participation in political processes.

The study's design was cross-sectional, with all data collected at one point in time at three locations. The study was designed to reveal difference between those who exposed themselves to *The Team* through radio, and those who did not.

Method

Listeners and non-listeners were surveyed in person, in or near their homes. Questions about political attitudes and communication about political topics were asked first, followed by questions about awareness, exposure and location regarding *The Team*. Demographic questions were asked last. The questionnaire instrument is in Appendix A.

Respondent Sample

A total of 318 respondents (167 males, 147 females; 4 missing gender data) were interviewed. Respondents' ages ranged from 18 to 52 years, with an average of 25.46 years and a median age of 25.

More than half of the respondents, 176, reported being "single," 139 reported being "married," 2 said they were either a widow or widower, divorced, or cohabitated. One did not respond.

Twenty two respondents reported their education level as "primary school," 128 reported some "secondary school," 124 reported "college," 40 reported "university," and four did not respond.

Table 1. Communities and Number of Respondents

Data Collection Location	Number of Surveys Collected
Nairobi	118
Kisumu	100
Eldoret	100

3. Findings:

Awareness by the Team: Of the 318 respondents, 242 said they were aware of *The Team*; 63 said they were unaware of the program. Thirteen did not answer the question.

Awareness by Medium: Of the 242 respondents who were aware of *The Team*, the majority, 174 (71.9%) said they heard about the program on the radio. Forty four (19.4%) learned about it on TV. Five (2.1%) reported that they heard about the program from someone else or in some other way. Sixteen (16.6%) didn't answer the question.

Exposure Locations for Radio listeners: Of the 318 respondents, 196 (61.6%) reported having listened to the program on radio. The majority of them - 162 (82.7%) - listened to the program at home. Eight (4.1%) reported having listened to it in restaurants or bars. Twenty two said they had the opportunity to listen to the program in their neighbors' houses. Two listened to it in some other places. Another two didn't answer this question.

Exposure Frequency for Radio listeners: Of the 196 listeners, 74 (37.8%) listened to 3 to 6 episodes of the program. Fifty-nine (30.1%) reported having listened to two to three episodes of the program. Fifty-two (26.5%) indicated that they listened to more than half of the episodes of the program. Eight (4.1%) said they listened to almost all of the programs. Three didn't answer this question.

Distributions of Listeners and Non-listeners in Different Geographic Locations: Of the 246 listeners and non-listeners, the distributions across the three different locations where the data was collected were significantly different ($\chi^2 = 25.399$, $df = 2$, 1 , $p < .001$). There were very few non-listeners were interviewed in Kisumu (3.8%) compared to the other two places (22.1% for Nairobi and 36.6% for Eldoret). The results are in the table below.

Table 2. Distributions of Listeners and Non-listeners in Different Locations

		Nairobi	Kisumu	Eldoret
Listeners	Freq.	74	77	45
	%	77.9%	96.3%	63.4%
Non-Listeners	Freq.	21	3	26
	%	22.1 %	3.8%	36.6%
$\chi^2 = 25.399$, $df = 2$, 1 , $p < .001$				

Measures: A primary goal of the study was to investigate relations among exposure, exposure levels, and attitudes. Three indices consisting of twelve questions were used. These three scales, namely, communication & Respect, Political Engagement, and Political Efficacy were developed in the previous study to measure respondents' attitudes and beliefs related to the importance of dialog in the political process, the importance of tolerance for citizens from different tribal and ethnic groups, and efficacy of engagement in political processes.

Communication & Respect: Four items comprising this scale were “No matter how severe the problem it can be solved through dialogue”, “People of different ethnicities would get along better if they made more of an effort to understand each other”, “Even if people are from different religious groups they have more in common than they think”, and “In a peaceful community it is necessary for different groups to respect each other”. Participants responded to a 4-point Likert-type scale where 1 indicated *strongly disagree* and 4 indicated *strongly agree*. The mean for this scale was 3.59, indicating a high level of support among all respondents. The Cronbach's alpha value for this scale was 0.71, indicating an acceptable reliability of the measure.

Political Engagement: The five-item scale included questions such as “In Kenya people are actively involved in the political process”, “We should engage more politically to make the government's work more transparent”, and “We need to be more active politically to influence political decisions”. The same *agree-disagree* 4-point Likert-type scale was employed. The mean for this scale was 3.11. The Cronbach's alpha value for this scale was 0.58.

Political Efficacy: This scale was also adopted from the previous study. The items are “People like me cannot have any influence on the government anyway” and “Apart from voting there is no other way to influence what the government does”. Four-point Likert-type scale was used with 4 indicated *strongly agree* and 1 for *strongly disagree*. The two items were reverse coded before the data analysis. The mean for this scale was 2.83. The 2-item correlation of this scale was .30.¹ The reliability values for Political Engagement and Political Efficacy were low, but acceptable.

Engagement: A 12-item scale measuring narrative engagement on four dimensions: narrative understanding, attentional focus, emotional engagement, and narrative presence (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2009) was used. Responses were collected using a 4-point Likert-type scale with 4 indicated *strongly agree* and 1 indicated *strongly disagree*.

¹ Alpha cannot be calculated for few than three items. Zero-order correlation between the two items represents the relation between the two items.

4. Results:

Gender & Attitudes : There was no difference between males (n = 167) and females (n = 147) in attitudes about Political Engagement (mean for male = 3.15, mean for female = 3.04, t = 1.42, p > .10), Communication and Respect (mean for male = 3.63, mean for female = 3.53, t = 1.68, p > .05), and Political Efficacy (mean for male = 2.86, mean for female = 2.79, t = .59, p > .10).

Education & Attitudes: Respondents who were graduated from universities held more supportive attitude (Mean = 3.00) toward Communication & Respect than people who reported having primary school as the highest level of education (Mean = 2.29). The difference was statistically significant (F = 2.4, p<.05). The other two politically related attitudes did not based on respondents' level of education.

Location & Attitudes: As shown in Table 3 below, respondents from Kisumu (Mean = 3.41) were less supportive toward Communication & Respect than people from Nairobi (Mean = 3.61) and from Eldoret (Mean = 3.73). The two differences were statistically significant (F = 9.936, p < .001).

The other two politically related attitudes were not related to respondents' locations, as shown in the table below:

Table 3. ANOVA Output for Politics-Related Attitudes and Attitudes' Means of Respondents from Different Locations

	Means			F	P
	Nairobi	Kisumu	Eldoret		
Communication	3.61	3.41	3.73	9.936	.000
Political	3.13	3.06	3.12	.327	.721
Political	2.79	2.81	2.89	.346	.708

Relations among Exposure and Attitudes

Aware vs. Unaware: There were no differences between those who were aware and those who were unaware of the program regarding any of the three attitude measures; Political Engagement, Communication and Respect, and Political Efficacy.

Listeners vs. Non-listeners: Those who reported listening to one or more episodes of *The Team* were more supportive of Political Engagement than those who did not listen (means 3.14 and 2.94; t = 3.26). The difference was marginally significant (df = 244, p = .069). There was no difference between listeners and non-listeners regarding their attitudes about Communication & Respect or Political Efficacy.

Exposure levels: Respondents who reported listening to *The Team* were asked how many episodes they watched. Response options were “1 or 2,” “3-to-6,” “more than half,” and “almost all of them.” This analysis is limited to respondents who reported listening at home, as they were the only group large enough to conduct correlational analyses ($n = 168^2$). As shown in Table 3 below, respondents with different exposure levels only differed significantly ($F = 4.585, p < .01$) in their attitude toward Political Efficacy. Those who listened to three or six episodes had higher level of efficacy (Mean = 3.09) than those who listened to more than half of the episodes (Mean = 2.59) and those who listened to all of them (Mean = 2.19). Please note that there were only 8 respondents who reported listening to “almost all” of the episodes (as shown in Table 3). As Table 2 revealed, there were only three non-listeners in Kisumu. Therefore, the negative relation between exposure and attitude toward Political Efficacy could be a function of the over-representation of Kisumu residents among the listeners in the sample. Kisumu residents were least supportive of Communication & Respect. The significant difference in attitude toward Political Efficacy among respondents of different exposure levels is consistent with this pattern.²

As for the other two attitudes scales, this pattern is not that obvious since the mean differences between those who listened to more than half episodes and those who were exposed to almost all of them was very small. In general, there were no significant differences among respondents with different exposure levels for these two attitude scales. The results are also shown in Table 4 below:

² Data collection for this project isn't close to exposure to preclude a two-step-flow from listeners to non-listeners.

Table 4. ANOVA Output for Politics-Related Attitudes and Attitudes' Means of Respondents of Different Exposure Levels

	Means					
	One or Two Episodes (n = 48)	Three or Six Episodes (n = 65)	More Than Half (n =47)	Almost All of Them (n =8)	F	P
Political Efficacy	2.95	3.09	2.59	2.19	4.585	.004
Communication	3.64	3.67	3.51	3.63	1.101	.350
Political	3.13	3.26	3.01	3.17	1.188	.316

There were three respondents among the 171 who reported listening to the program at home didn't indicate their exposure levels and thus were excluded from this analysis.

5. Exposure and Reactions to Scenarios:

Exposure and Reactions to Scenarios

As part of the assessment, participants were read two brief, related scenarios about an interpersonal conflict involving money and potential dishonesty. Both scenarios leave the conflict unresolved and ask the participants to complete the story by choosing one of four potential actions that might be taken by the main characters. The options range from cooperative and pro-social to violent or anti-social.

Scenario #1 - Conflict & Communication: After several months of preparation and fundraising, Michael and Juma are ready to begin a new business venture. They visit the local government council to find out how to proceed with registering their initiative and begin operations. Tom, a junior staff member, encourages the men to let him deposit their money in a government-backed business account until they have secured office space. A few weeks later Michael and Juma are ready to withdraw some cash so they can make a deposit on a rental property. They are stunned to find out there is no money in their account. The men hurry to Tom office to get some answers. When Tom finally emerges he dismisses Michael and Juma, saying that the money went toward business tax and registration fees. Michael and Juma are shocked. As their frustration grows and tempers rise, they consider what they should do next. Here are four options. Which should they choose?

- (1) Request a meeting to present their concerns to a larger group within the local administration.
- (2) "Send a message" to local administration by breaking some windows or burning the office.
- (3) Blockade the entrance to the local administration to prevent any work from being done until they get their money back.
- (4) Inform the larger community that their money was stolen by the local administration to sensitize people about the injustice (make it public).

Scenario #2 - Social Responsibility: Imagine that several months have passed since the initial incident. Tom has spent a lot of time musing over the events. A big part of him feels guilty about what has happened between him and the two young men. How could he begin to tell Michael and Juma what really happened to their money? The truth of the matter is that the local government has been low on funding for several months. Tom has not been paid for four months and the financial strain on his family is growing. The final straw had come a few days after opening the bank account for Michael and Juma, when his 10-year old son was removed from school because his fees were overdue. When Tom made the suggestion that Michael and Juma put their hard-earned cash in a safe place, he honestly thought it was a good idea. He wonders how to handle the situation with the men now. What do you think he should do?

- (1) Tom sticks to the story that Michael and Juma were responsible for various taxes and fees.
- (2) He admits that he took the money but does nothing because that is how the system works.
- (3) He apologizes and asks his family to help him reimburse the men so he doesn't lose face.
- (4) He apologizes, pledges to return the money, and asks his superiors for an improvement regarding his salary payments.

Scenario #1 Results:

Overall, the majority of respondents (201, 63.2%) chose the first option ("Request a meeting..."), 103 participants (32.4%) chose the fourth option ("Inform the larger community..."). Ten respondents (3.1%) chose the third option ("Blockade the local administration...") and two (0.6%) chose second option ("Send a message' ...by breaking some windows or burning the office."). Two respondents (0.6%) didn't answer this question. Clearly the least violent and most pro-social was the most popular choice.

Comparison of the choices of those who listened to one or more episodes of The Team to those who did not listen revealed no significant differences (Table below). 66.5% and 66% of both groups chose option 1, 29.4% and 32% chose option 4. Fewer than 5% of listeners and non-listeners (0%) chose options 2 or 3. The results are shown in table 5 below.

Table 5. Selection of Options to Scenario #1

		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Listeners	Freq.	129	2	6	57
	%	66.5%	1%	3.1%	29.4%
Non-listeners	Freq.	33	0	1	16
	%	66%	0%	2%	32%
$\chi^2 = 0.774, df = 3, 1, p > .10$					

Scenario #2 Results

We performed the same comparisons for Scenario 2. Overall, the vast majority respondents (248, 78%) chose option 4 (Apologize and ask family for help), 52 (16.4%) chose option 3 (Apologize and ask superior for salary increase), 10 (3.1%) and 7 (2.2%) chose options 2 or 1 respectively. One respondent (0.3%) didn't answer this question.

As shown in Table 6 below, comparison of the choices of those who listened to one or more episodes of The Team to those who did not revealed significant differences. The majority of non-listeners (76.4%) and listeners (86%) chose option 4. 17.9% listeners and 10% of non-listeners chose option 3. 3.6% listeners and 4% of non-listeners chose option 2. 2.1% listeners and no non-listeners chose option 1.

Table 6. Selection of Options to Scenario #2

		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Listeners	Freq.	4	7	35	149
	%	2.1%	3.6%	17.9%	76.4%
Non-listeners	Freq.	0	2	5	43
	%	0%	4%	10%	86%
$\chi^2 = 3.051, df = 3, 1, p > .10$					

Frequency of Discussions

Respondents were asked how often they talk with others about “topics like these,” referring to political and social issues referenced in the attitude questions. Response choices were “never,” “rarely,” and “often.” Listeners discussed these topics more frequently than non-listeners. According to the result, 68.4% of listeners reported discussing these issues frequently and 56% of non-listeners reported frequent discussions. Listeners and non-listeners also had difference in their reported percentages of having discussions about politics and social issues rarely (non-listeners = 40%; listeners = 30%). However, the difference between those listeners and non-listeners who never talked about politics and social issues was small (non-listeners 4.0%; listeners 1.6%). The distribution was not significantly different for the two groups ($\chi^2 = 3.275$, $df = 2, 1$, $p > .10$). Results are shown in the table below.

Table 7. Frequency of Discussions about Politics & Social Issues

		Never	Rarely	Often
Listeners	Freq.	3	57	130
	%	1.6%	30%	68.4%
Non-Listeners	Freq.	2	20	28
	%	4 %	40%	56%
$\chi^2 = 3.275$, $df = 2, 1$, $p > .10$				

Since there were so few respondents reported never discussed about politics and social issues, we ran the analysis with these several respondents excluded to see if there was any difference between listeners and non-listeners about their frequencies of discussions about these issues. The results are shown in the table below:

Table 8. Frequency of Discussions about Politics & Social Issues

		Rarely	Often
Listeners	Freq.	57	130
	%	30.5%	69.5%
Non-Listeners	Freq.	20	28
	%	41.7%	58.3%
$\chi^2 = 2.169, df = 1, 1, p > .10$			

As can be seen above, the pattern is consistent with that of Table 6. More listeners reported discussing these issues “often” than non-listeners. Conversely, more non-listeners indicated they “rarely” discussed these issues. Again, the distribution was not statistically significant.

Engagement While Viewing *The Team*

Research suggests that individuals who are more engaged in a story are more likely to be influenced by it. We asked respondents how engaged or involved they recall being in *The Team* while they watched the program. Engagement was measured using a 12-item narrative engagement scale. The scale’s validity and reliability has been established in previous studies (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2009). The analyses regarding the influence of engagement were limited to respondents who listened to the program because it does not make sense to ask for a non-listener to indicate to what extent he/she was engaged during their exposure to the program.

Gender and Education: There was no significant difference in engagement in the program between male and female respondents. There also was no relation between education level and engagement in the program.

Relations among Engagement and Attitudes: We performed multiple regression analysis to investigate relations between engagement and each of the three attitude variables. This analysis allowed us to control for the influence of gender and education level. Results are in the table below.

Table 9. Relations among Narrative Engagement and Communication & Respect, Political Engagement and Political Efficacy

	Communication & Respect	Political Engagement	Political Efficacy
Gender	-.079	-.135†	-.018
Education	.157*	.025	.088

Narrative Engagement	.228**	.115	.088
F value	5.572	2.175	.982

† = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

After controlling for the influence of gender and education, engagement predicts support for the importance of Communication & Respect ($\beta = .228$, $p < .01$).

Education level also predicted attitudes toward Communication & Respect. Higher level of education was associated with more positive attitude toward Communication & Respect ($\beta = .157$, $p < .05$). For political engagement, results suggest that males also reported greater efficacy.

6. Summary and Conclusions

This study investigated relations between exposure to *The Team* and attitudes related valuing the principles of tolerance, communication, and non-violent political engagement in the post-violence context of Kenya.

This was a post-exposure-only design in which weeks or months may have passed since the last time respondents had listened to an episode of *The Team*. Thus, one would not expect observed relations and differences to be strong. Also, data collection was temporally distant enough from exposure that a two-step flow communication process from listeners to non-listeners could not be ruled out. (Those exposed to the program had plenty of time to communicate with those not exposed and may have shared opinions and observations. Despite this, a number of relations we observed were statistically significant and important from a media influence perspective.

We measured three politically related attitudes:

“Communication & Respect” measured the extent to which respondents value respect for and communication with people from other groups about potential disagreements and conflicts. Respondents who perceived the program more engaging were more likely to support this attitude.

“Political Engagement” measured the attitude that Kenyans should be more politically active and involved in the political process. Those who listened to *The Team* were more supportive of this attitude than those who did not listen to it.

“Political Efficacy” measured rejection of the idea that people can have little influence on government and that their sole form of influence is voting. Put another way, these items measured rejection of political apathy. Because of data collection issues (over-representation of listeners in Kisumu and delayed data collection), we couldn’t detect the impact of *The Team* on attitude change regarding this issue.

We were also interested in the relationship between the frequency with which participants discussed issues and topics related to tolerance and the political process. Listeners reported discussing these issues more frequently than non-listeners. Meanwhile, more non-listeners reported rarely talked about politics and social issues than listeners although the difference is not large.

Finally, respondents were asked to listen to two conflict scenarios and choose the most appropriate response. No significant differences between listeners and non-listeners were found.

References

Busselle, R. & Bilandzic, H. (2009). Measuring Narrative Engagement, *Media Psychology*, 12(4), 321-347.

Annex 1: Tools

Date: _____ Location: _____

Interviewer: _____

Introduction: I'm conducting research for an organization call Search for Common Ground. We are collecting opinions and perceptions about some social issues. I'd like to ask you some question. This will probably take about 10 minutes. By completing this survey you will help us better understand how people relate to each other and how society deals with social problems today and in the future.

All of your answers are completely confidential. We are collecting opinions from other parts of Kenya too. We want to know your views and get general opinions of the public in different places.

Can you spare me a few minutes? Thank you...

First,can I ask how old you are? _____

Section 1: First I would like to read some statements about social issues in Kenya. Sometimes people agree or disagree with statements. But sometimes they only agree or disagree a little. After I read each statement, I'm going to ask you about that.

...Do you agree or disagree...a lot or a little?	disagree strongly	disagree a little	agree a little	agree strongly
No matter how severe the problem it can be solved through dialogue. <i>[Preference of dialogue over violence] DIALOG1</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of different ethnicities would get along better if they made more of an effort to understand each other. <i>[Tolerance & Mutual Respect] TOLERANCE 1</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Even if people are from different religious groups they have more in common than they think. <i>[Tolerance & Mutual Respect] TOLERANCE 2</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In a peaceful community it is necessary for different groups to respect each other. <i>[Tolerance & Mutual Respect]TOLERANCE 3</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In Kenya people are actively involved in the political process. <i>[Social/Political Engagement]POLENGAGE1</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We should engage more politically to make the government's work more transparent. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] POLENGAGE2</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

We need to be more active politically to influence political decisions. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] POLENGAGE3</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/>
People like me cannot have any influence on the government anyway. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] EFFICACY1</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/>
Apart from voting there is no other way to influence what the government does. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] EFFICACY2</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/>
Even though it is sometime difficult, I can make a difference in the political process. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] EFFICACY3</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/>
Sometimes politics are so complicated that someone like me does not understand what is going on. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] POLENGAGE4</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/>
Even people who are not in a position of power can bring public attention to crimes and corruption. <i>[Social/Political Engagement] POLENGAGE5</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/> ----- <input type="checkbox"/>

Section 2. Now, I’m going to read a very brief story and then ask you some questions. OK?

Scenario #1: After several months of preparation and fundraising, Michael and Juma are ready to begin a new business venture. They visit the local government council to find out how to proceed with registering their initiative and begin operations. Tom, a junior staff member, encourages the men to let him deposit their money in a government-backed business account until they have secured office space. A few weeks later Michael and Juma are ready to withdraw some cash so they can make a deposit on a rental property. They are stunned to find out there is no money in their account. The men hurry to Tom office to get some answers. When Tom finally emerges he dismisses Michael and Juma, saying that the money went toward business tax and registration fees.

Michael and Juma are shocked. As their frustration grows and tempers rise, they consider what they should do next. **Here are four options. Which should they choose?**

(Circle one answer)

- (1) Request a meeting to present their concerns to a larger group within the local administration.
- (2) “Send a message” to local administration by breaking some windows or burning the office.
- (3) Blockade the entrance to the local administration to prevent any work from being done until they get their money back.
- (4) Inform the larger community that their money was stolen by the local administration to sensitize people about the injustice (make it public).

I would like to read one more story.

Scenario #2 - Social Responsibility: Imagine that several months have passed since the initial incident. Tom has spent a lot of time musing over the events. A big part of him feels guilty about what has happened between him and the two young men. How could he begin to tell Michael and Juma what really happened to their money? The truth of the matter is that the local government has been low on funding for several months. Tom has not been paid for four months and the financial strain on his family is growing. The final straw had come a few days after opening the bank account for Michael and Juma, when his 10-year old son was removed from school because his fees were overdue. When Tom made the suggestion that Michael and Juma put their hard-earned cash in a safe place, he honestly thought it was a good idea. He wonders how to handle the situation with the men now. What do you think he should do?

Again, here are four options. Which should they choose?

(Circle one answer)

- (1) Tom sticks to the story that Michael and Juma were responsible for various taxes and fees.
- (2) He admits that he took the money but does nothing because that is how the system works.
- (3) He apologizes and asks his family to help him reimburse the men so he doesn't lose face.
- (4) He apologizes, pledges to return the money, and asks his superiors for an improvement regarding his salary payments.

3. [Interpersonal Communication about violence, tolerance, engagement]

As I said earlier we are interested in the social issue of violence, tolerance, and social engagement.

How often do you talk about these topics with other people?

Never (1) Rarely (2) Often (3) [please circle one]

With whom do you talk about these things? (Rank first three choice.)

- Family (1)
- Friends/Peers (2)
- People from School or Work (3)
- Casual Acquaintance (4)
- Religious Leader (5)
- Community Leader (6)
- Neighbors (7)

Think about the last conversation you had about a social issue like those we have discussed.

With whom did you talk? (Check one)

- Family (1)
- Friends/Peers (2)
- People from School or Work (3)
- Casual Acquaintance (4)
- Religious Leader (5)
- Community Leader (6)
- Neighbors (7)

What was it you talked about? [Open-ended - note answer]

4. [Exposure to show]

Have you heard about the program, “The Team?” It’s been on television and radio.

Yes (1) No (2) (If no, go to “Demographics.”)

If yes, how did you hear about it?

Radio (1) Television (2) Poster (3) Word of mouth (4) Other (5)

Did you listen to “The Team?”

to 1st season)

Yes (1) No (2) No, (3) but someone else told me the story (if no, go

If yes, what radio station was it? (Enter Station)

Where did you listen to the program?

Home (1) Restaurant/Bar (2) Neighbors (3) Other (4) 0

How many episodes have you listened to this season?

1 or 2 3 to 6 more than half almost all of them

Did you listen to the second season of The Team?

Yes (1) No (2)

If yes, how many episodes have you listened to the second season?

1 or 2 (1) 3 to 6 (2) more than half(3) almost all of them (4)

Have you listened to The Team in a language other than your own first language?

Yes (1) No (2)

If yes, often (1), or just once or twice (2)?

Do you listen to other radio programs in another language?

Yes (1) No (2)

If yes, often (1), or just once or twice (2)?

If yes, Why do you listen to the Team in language other than your own?

Realism...

	disagr ee strongl	disagr ee a little	agre e a little	agree strong ly
The issues that come up in programs like the Station are very similar to issues in the real world.	□-----□-----□-----□			
The personal problems characters have are very similar to the problems people have in the real world	□-----□-----□-----□			
My world is very similar to that in the show	□-----□-----□-----□			

5. [Narrative engagement]

[Interviewer instruction: Begin with, “When I watched the show,” and then read statement. Ask: Do you agree or disagree? Then ask: do you agree/disagree somewhat or strongly?]

	disag ree strongl	disagr ee a little	agre e a little	agree strong ly
... I sometimes had a hard time making sense of what was going on in the program. (-) <i>[Narrative Understanding]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... my understanding of the characters was unclear. (-) <i>[Narrative Understanding]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I had a hard time recognizing the thread of the story. (-) <i>[Narrative Understanding]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I often found my mind wandering while the program was on. (-) <i>[Attentional Focus]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I found myself thinking about other things. (-) <i>[Attentional Focus]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I had a hard time keeping my mind on the program. (-) <i>[Attentional Focus]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I often felt that during the show, my body was in the room, but my mind was inside the world created by the story. <i>[Narrative Presence]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I had the impression that the show created a new world, and then that world suddenly disappeared when the show ended. <i>[Narrative Presence]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... at times during the show, the story world was closer to me than the real world. <i>[Narrative Presence]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... the story affected me emotionally. <i>[Emotional Engagement]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... when a main character succeeded, I felt happy, and when they suffered in some way, I felt sad. <i>[Emotional Engagement]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			
... I often felt sorry for some of the characters in the program. <i>[Emotional Engagement]</i>	□-----□-----□-----□			



Search for Common Ground

1601 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 200
Washington, DC 20009-1035 USA
+1 (202) 265 4300 | +1 (202) 232 6718 fax
search@sfcg.org | www.sfcg.org

Rue Belliard 205 bte 13
Brussels B-1040 BELGIUM
+32 2 736 7262 | +32 2 732 3033 fax
brussels@sfcg.be | www.sfcg.org

6. [Reflection] Did the show make you think about today's society in Kenya and its issues?

- Not at all (1)
- A little (2)
- Somewhat (3) → What did it make you think about?

- Very much (4) → What did it make you think about?

7. Demographics

Gender: Male (1) Female (2) (Don't ask. Circle one)

Age: _____

Marital status: Single Married Other (specify) _____

Education Level: Primary School (1) Secondary School (2) College (3) University (4)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

(Interviewer please note home district _____)